

F12641



THE
HISTORY OF CIVILIZATION,

BY

AMOS DEAN, LL.D.

IN SEVEN VOLUMES.

VOL. I.



ALBANY, N. Y.;
JOEL MUNSELL.
1868.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
LIFE OF AMOS DEAN, LL.D., - - - - -	v
INTRODUCTION, - - - - -	1
CHAP.	
I. ETHNOGRAPHY—The Distribution of Races, -	19
II. ELEMENTS OF HUMANITY—Nomadic and Settled Races; Plateau of Central Asia; Scythians, Huns, Turks, - - - - -	62
III. MONGOLES, TARTARS, - - - - -	88
IV. CHALDÆA, - - - - -	105
V. CHALDÆA, ASSYRIA, - - - - -	126
VI. ASSYRIA, - - - - -	147
VII. BABYLONIA, - - - - -	173
VIII. MEDO-PERSIA, - - - - -	198
IX. MEDO-PERSIA, - - - - -	221
X. MEDO-PERSIA, - - - - -	238
XI. EGYPT, - - - - -	255
XII. ARABIA, - - - - -	461
XIII. PALESTINE, - - - - -	553
XIV. PHŒNICIA AND SYRIA, - - - - -	630
XV. ASIA MINOR, - - - - -	681

LIFE OF AMOS DEAN, LL.D.

To fully comprehend the nature of a work, to judge of it fairly, we should be, to some extent, in sympathy with its author. To appreciate his labors, we should know the circumstances in which he was placed, the disadvantages he had to overcome, the obstacles he had to surmount, the positions he filled, his modes of thought, his methods of study, his fitness for authorship in temperament and character. These we may gather in part from his book ; but only in part. The writer of history deals with the facts of the outer world, rather than with his inner-self. He must, therefore, exhibit somewhat of the nature and tendency of his mind, his opinions and judgment. He must breathe into it much of his own character ; yet, from such imperfect gleanings we can form but a limited conception of the man. It will not, therefore, be deemed out of taste to give a short sketch of the life of Prof. Amos Dean, the author of the present work. By his many friends such a narration will be welcomed, while it may not be devoid of interest to the general reader and student.

Amos Dean was born in Barnard, Windsor county, Vermont, on the 16th day of January, 1803. His father,

Nathaniel Dean, moved early in life from Massachusetts, and settling in one of those quiet valleys of the Green Mountain state, toiled to secure a home by clearing and cultivating the land. That period and locality afforded but poor advantages for education. The district school could do no more than teach the rudiments, laying a foundation upon which to build. But the scarcity of books, the few opportunities of improvement, and the mode of life made this a most difficult matter. It required an intense thirst for knowledge, together with much hardihood and persistence, to launch out into the untried and unknown world of letters. We, of to-day who, in addition to the benefits of the academy, the college, and the university, have a talented pulpit's yearly courses of finished and instructive lectures, and extensive libraries, public and private, can scarcely realize the difficulties our fathers had to meet and conquer to secure an education. They who, under such embarrassments, have attained to eminence in the field of literature must have been endowed with a student's nature and an indomitable will. Such was the case with Amos Dean. In his boyhood he manifested craving to know the causes of things. He was peculiarly thoughtful and abstracted, showing a great dislike for agricultural pursuits, not because of aversion to physical toils, but because his mind was elsewhere. This natural desire was stimulated by the conversation and attainments of his uncle, Hon. Jabez D. Hammond; and to him he often, in after years, attributed much of his success.

Spurred on by this natural tendency, he attended the district school during the winter months; but during the summer he was obliged to work. The season for study was all too short for the gratification of his favorite object; so during the summer he availed himself of every rainy day, of every circumstance that gave a respite from the duties of the farm. Even during his labors, he did not cease. He used to tell with great glee of the long rests he gave the horses when ploughing, that he might read some time-worn book, or drill himself in the elements of Latin grammar from a copy written on some old scrap of paper. It was a rare treat to him to be sent to the village on an errand; for then he could call on the minister, ask him some questions that had perplexed him, and borrow some book. His father used to wonder at the length of time it took him to execute these trifling matters of business, little dreaming how much he had accomplished. Of books he possessed but a very limited number, and these bore unmistakable evidence of having been perused and mastered. One of the first volumes he was ever enabled to purchase, after weeks of the most rigid economy, was *Robertson's History of America*. We have heard him tell with what a feeling of pride he carried it home, and how eager he was to acquire its contents. His large library, collected in after years, did not thrust this book out of sight, but there it stood on his shelves, still retaining its original leather cover.

In these early pursuits he was obliged to rely mainly upon himself; and hence, for a boy, he manifested a marked

preference for study, and developed decided originality and independence. His isolation on the farm strengthened his natural disposition for meditation and thought. Who can tell how much this quiet life, and constant communion with nature amid the rugged hills of his native place, tended to give tone to his mind and strength to his thought? Thus he passed from boyhood to youth, and into early manhood; his desire for knowledge growing with his growth and strengthening with his strength.

In those times the first step towards profession at studies, after leaving the district school, was in taking charge of one as teacher. So he left home with his small bundle of clothes, and smaller bundle of books, to teach in a neighboring district. In the duties of this position, and in the old custom of "boarding around" he acquired his first real experience of life. He accepted it as a stepping stone to something greater, and conscientiously devoted himself to his new avocation. He regarded it as a school for himself as well as for his pupils. We can easily imagine with what exultation he received his first quarter's salary, half in money and half in produce. He continued teaching till he had earned enough to support himself one term at an academy, and to purchase some books. He then set out for the academy at Randolph, Vt., and there caught a glimpse of the boundless world of thought beyond. With all the enthusiasm of youth and the steady purpose of manhood, he began to explore, feeling his way cautiously but surely. It was with great heaviness that, at the expiration of the

term, he was forced to return home to resume his life of self-culture and teaching. But he brought to the work an indomitable will, keeping ever before him the great aim of his life, a professional career. How this could be achieved he did not see, but he never doubted. He always believed that a place would be ready for him when he was ready for it; and he acted accordingly. At length in his twenty-third year he had a chance to enter college; and, in the fall of 1825, he bade good-bye to his family, and in home-spun and home-cut clothing set out for Schenectady. Presenting himself to Dr. Nott, then, and for so many years since, the popular and efficient president of Union College, he made application to enter the senior class. Although he could not, in every respect, meet the requirements of the course, he was after examination admitted. Of his college life we need say little, except that he devoted himself to his studies, like a man determined to make the most of every opportunity for improvement. Graduating in 1826, with the second honor, he went to Albany, and commenced the study of the law with his uncle, Jabez D. Hammond.

Having thus narrated the circumstances of his early life, and having seen him in his profession, we shall speak of him in his three-fold character, as a lawyer, as an educator, and as a scholar and author.

In the profession of the law he soon rose to prominence. Quick to grasp the vital points in a case, he was ready to apply the legal principles that settled them. Having

attentively heard his client's statements he carefully went over it, summed it up, and submitted it to his conscience. If satisfied of its justice he undertook it; and then, entering completely into sympathy with his client, he made the cause his own. He thus won and maintained an enviable reputation for honesty and integrity. He delighted in the theory and practice of the law; but his natural tendency to the quiet life of a student led him to prefer the patient labor of the office to the more showy duties of the pleader. He chose to make out a case, rather than to argue it before the court, thereby gaining more extensive knowledge of the principles of his profession. He was exhaustive in his research. He sought to know the whole of the subject. As a referee he was very favorably known; and his decision, supported by numerous and standard authorities, very frequently settled a case. This habit of complete mastery, and of condensing the points of a case into a clear, concise summary, fitted him for the great work of preparing a universal history. He continued the practice of his profession till 1854, when he gradually withdrew to devote himself to the Law School, and to the more careful prosecution of his historical studies.

But, though Amos Dean achieved a reputation as a lawyer, he is more widely known as an educator. His own struggle for education, the lack of the right discipline in his youth, and the need of universal mental training, early induced him to give the subject considerable attention. His first movement in this direction was in 1833, when,

feeling the necessity of literary culture, both for himself and others, he organized "The Young Men's Association of Albany." This was the pioneer of those institutions for mutual mental improvement, which have since found their way into almost every village and city. We are all too well acquainted with their character, to require any account of their working; and we have too often experienced their utility as general educators, by means of literary discussions, annual courses of lectures, and libraries, to need any further proof.

At this period the steady advance of medical science, both in its practice and in the numbers of those entering it, demanded greater facilities for its study than was then afforded. The idea of founding a Medical College in Albany, suggested itself to two intimate friends of Prof. Dean, Dr. Alden March and Dr. James H. Armsby, both very eminent in their profession. Accordingly in 1838, they organized the "Albany Medical College." Prof. Dean accepted the chair of medical jurisprudence; and for more than twenty years filled that position. His theory of the true method of teaching was somewhat in advance of the manner then pursued, although now it is being very generally adopted. He endeavored not so much to pour into a student, as to draw him out, to cultivate in him the habit of thought, to discipline his mind, and make him more practical and self-reliant. To effect this, he taught by lectures, thus bringing the mind of the student into contact with the living mind of the teacher. This was the plan pur-

sued with such marked success by Dr. Wayland, whose lectures have been published and used so extensively. In his manner a class of thinkers is trained, the system demanding continuous and close study on the part of the instructor, and a mastery of the subject by the pupil. Prof. Dean aimed in his lectures to give the principles in the most comprehensive and comprehensible form, referring to those text-books and authors where they were drawn out and exemplified. Thus having noted down the salient points of a subject, the student was prepared to read systematically, and to think clearly. This method of teaching he pursued in the Medical College, each year advancing in his department, and by hard study developing it more and more completely.

In 1851 Prof. Dean, together with Hon. Ira Harris and Hon. Amasa J. Parker, established a Law School under the name of "The Department of Law of the University of Albany," more generally known as "The Albany Law School." He assumed the active management, and lectured daily on that department of the law pertaining to business, personal property, contracts, partnerships, bills and promissory notes, negotiable paper, insurance, bankruptcy, etc. In order to devote himself to this new duty, and to his studies, he withdrew from practice, and in 1859 resigned his chair in the Medical College. Feeling deeply the responsibility of this position, he labored conscientiously to fit himself for it. Although he prepared his lectures at the establishment of the school, he never deemed them

finished. After an experience of sixteen years, he worked on them much harder than any student, who listened to them. He was continually revising, condensing, and adding to them. In addition, he studied them thoroughly. Being asked once, why he always read them over for two hours before delivering them, he replied: "Any man to teach must be so conversant with his subject that he can answer all questions pertaining to it, and give his authorities." He has left a complete course of these manuscript lectures, which would, if published, be a most valuable book for lawyers and students of law. In the delivery of these lectures, he had a most excellent system. He first dictated the principle so that it could be taken down verbatim, and then cited those authorities which sustained it.

Prof. Dean had every quality that endeared him to his classes. He understood the nature of young men; and was himself so young in feeling as to sympathize with them in all things. He entered fully into their plans, felt for, and helped them out of their difficulties, directed their reading, gave them the use of his library, and always welcomed them to his house. His genial disposition, large heart, and wholesome advice made them feel at home with him, and led them to respect and love him. Although the classes were large, numbering over a hundred students, he knew them all by name, and made himself acquainted with their general circumstances and character. He regarded them as gentlemen, old enough to appreciate and improve the advantages they enjoyed; and based his discipline

on their honor. So thoroughly did he make them feel their responsibility, that he rarely had to resort to external means to preserve order: but when he did speak reprov-ingly the disturber always felt the keenness of his rebuke.

In the moot courts, where the classes argued cases by way of applying the principles so carefully laid down, he particularly delighted; and there he was even more winning than in the lecture room. All who attended these well remember with pleasure the warmth of the discussion, the unfolding of the case, the happy hits of the disputants, the opinions read by some members of the class, the vote; and then, as the twilight deepened and the gas was lighted, the spluttering of numerous pens recording the points of the professor's judgment, and the expectancy with which they awaited his decision.

In 1855, Prof. Dean was elected chancellor and professor of history of the University of Iowa. He desired to establish this institution on the university system, where all the branches should be taught, and the studies pursued according to his favorite method; but he felt too old to break up a long-continued life in the east, and commence anew in the growing west. So after spending three summers in Iowa city he resigned, and continued the active manager of the Law School till his death. He also gave much attention to other educational interests in Albany. He was connected with the large Female Academy in that city as a trustee and lecturer on history. Deeply interested in the founding of the Dudley Observatory, he was soon elected

a member of the *board of trustees*. He was also one of the directors of the State Normal School.

Let us now speak of Prof. Dean as a scholar and an author. We have said he was a student by nature; and so, while practicing law, and lecturing in the Medical College and Law School, he found many spare hours to devote to polite literature and to history, his favorite pursuit. Shakspeare ever unfolded to him new beauties and a profound knowledge of character. True poetry he loved; and his well disciplined memory enabled him to recall at any time choice morsels or whole poems. Three years ago, while speaking with him of the English poets, he cited Shelley's ode to the skylark as a chaste and beautiful production, and then quoted it entire, bringing out its buoyant glee and undertone of sadness with great power. His early education had been so imperfect that he could not read the classics in the original; but in the best translations he felt their grandeur and beauty. This loss he always deplored; but his time was so occupied with his duties that he could not repair it.

In the first years of his profession, he read extensively upon the subject of political economy, with the design of preparing a work; but, after a time, abandoned it, and gave his attention to phrenology, then in its infancy in this country. He delivered a course of lectures upon this subject, which were published in 1835. Encouraged by the success of this book, he studied into and wrote a work upon *The Philosophy of Human Life*, which appeared in 1839.

In 1850 his Lectures on Medical Jurisprudence were published, and in 1860 he condensed a portion of his law lectures into a work for students and business men, entitled *Bryant & Stratton's Commercial Law*. Both of these were well received, the latter having had a very extensive sale.

But, while he was pursuing these varied studies, he was engaged upon what he regarded his life work. The study of history had fascinated him from boyhood. He gave himself to it with ever fresh delight. In its vast extent, he found a field for his love of research; in its wonderful unfoldings, he gratified his craving to trace events back to their causes; in its tragic element, his mind found excitement and stimulus. But he was not satisfied with the prevailing method of studying it. He considered history a connected whole, the unfolding of God's plan in the world. He studied it in its philosophy, and aimed to trace the events of one age back to some preceding cause, or causes, thus linking age to age, and nation to nation. In this way only, he believed, could one really understand history. As a result of his reading and reflection, he struck out a general plan for prosecuting the study of the progress of man as unfolded in his civilizations. In 1833, being then thirty years of age, he commenced *The History of Civilization*; and, with unflagging zeal, pursued it throughout the remainder of his life, throwing aside all that are esteemed life's pleasures for the single purpose of pushing on this life-long performance. The original plan included all the phenomena of human progress in civilization in

five elements. He soon discovered that to be exhaustive, another element was needed. By adding society to the five other organizing forces or elements, industry, religion, government, philosophy, and art, the plan was completed.

At the meeting of the Association for the Advancement of Science, held in Albany, Prof. Dean read a paper on the *True Method of Studying and Teaching History*, which is, in substance, the introduction to the present work. This elicited much criticism and praise, coupled with the suggestion that he should write a universal history on that plan. For the prosecution of this great undertaking, a large library was, of course, necessary. To meet this want he secured the London and American catalogues of publications; and purchased the highest authorities that could aid him. In this way he collected a choice private library composed of standard works. He had quite a fancy for rare and curious books, but he did not gratify it at the expense of those needed for reference. As, with the years, he advanced from one subject, nation and age to another, many new works were published, throwing much light on that which he had already treated. These he noted down as they appeared; and from time to time added them to his collection. His history he completed in 1863, thirty years after its inception; and then began the revision of it in the light of all the more recent authorities. This occupied him three years longer. Although the work was now completed, he was in no hurry to publish it, saying that the more he studied and added to it, the more perfect it would

be. His sudden death cut short his labors, but not before they were done, and well done. The result of so many years of investigation and study must add something to historical knowledge, and hence *The History of Civilization* is now presented to the world. It remains for the future to decide its merits; but we may say that it is original in plan, clear and concise in language, and — as the author had no favorite theories, either social, moral, governmental, religious, or otherwise, to sustain — truthful in its presentation of facts.

It will readily be seen that, to meet the various engagements which demanded the attention of our author, a systematic mode of study was necessary. No life can be successful unless such be the case; and if it be systematized, it is wonderful how much can be accomplished. Prof. Dean was eminently methodical. Every portion of the day was set apart for some particular duty; and, by long continued discipline, he had learned to turn readily from one pursuit to another, dropping the first subject and taking up the next just where he had left off on the preceding day. The first three hours of the day, beginning at five o'clock, were mainly devoted to the study of his class lecture. This he delivered between the hours of nine and ten, and then attended to all correspondence and matters of business. By twelve, he was again in his study reading reviews, etc., till dinner, after which he read and wrote upon his history till half-past ten at night. During the summer he generally sought recreation in his native state, but always carried his historical works with him.

He found no time for amusements, attending only literary gatherings and the most instructive lectures.

His manner of writing was also systematic. He first read carefully all those works which treated of his subject. Then he went over them again, marking those passages he deemed of the most vital importance. His books are so emphasized that a distinguished historical scholar, who looked over his library after his death, said he was prepared to speak highly of his work. Having thus made the subject his own, and having digested it in his mind, he sat down to write. He never put pen to paper till he was fully ready; and then he wrote with great facility and directness. As his health was firm, and his spirits elastic, his mind was clear and always in working order. He neither required nor used any stimulus to quicken his faculties; nor did he depend upon those moods, which, while they sometimes enable a student to work with great rapidity, as often cripple and retard him.

It remains for us to consider the general character of Prof. Dean, in its relations to the state, to the family, and to religion. This, though a pleasing duty, is always difficult; and rendered doubly so where so much must be said in so small a compass.

He was endowed with a strong, vigorous constitution and great vitality, which his early life on the farm had developed into a healthy manhood. His wants were, on this account, very few, and his habits very simple. This simplicity he always retained, which undoubtedly had

much to do in preserving his health, and enabling him to follow so closely the sedentary life of after years.

He was also blessed with a very happy temperament, naturally taking a cheerful view of life ; and, in misfortune, consoling himself with the thought that it might have been so much worse. Three months before his death he had a severe fall, which fractured his right arm and rendered it useless. One of his first expressions was thankfulness that his arm instead of his head was shattered.

He did not believe in borrowing trouble ; but, when it came, he met it with Christian fortitude, patiently enduring what he could not overcome. It must not be inferred from this that he lacked feeling. His sensibilities were very acute both to suffer, and to feel for the sorrows of others ; but he never gave way to them. Keenly sensitive himself, he was careful not to wound another ; and, if he had done so unwittingly, anxious to make reparation. While he would not condescend to court the good opinion of men, he always valued and endeavored to deserve it.

His temperament unfitted him for a political life. He could find no pleasure in its strife. Although feeling very deeply for the success of republican institutions, he worked in silence, generally avoiding public assemblies and rarely making speeches. He was singularly devoid of that ambition which seeks to shine in public places and on great occasions. In politics his sympathies were with the whig party ; but he always maintained his independence in voting for men and principles. At the organization of the

republican party he allied himself to it because it more nearly embodied his own views. Although not strictly an abolitionist he saw the sin and curse of slavery, and rejoiced when the time came for that proclamation which made us truly a free nation. Throughout the war he was unfaltering in his faith in, and fidelity to, the government. He watched with the deepest anxiety the course of the struggle, exulting in every victory that crowned our arms, and lamenting every reverse that delayed the ultimate triumph of the cause. Few who met his cheerful smile and happy greeting during the darkest days of the conflict ever realized the load of anxiety that weighed upon his mind. And, when peace was finally restored, no one felt a greater sense of relief and gratitude.

In the family the real nature of Prof. Dean manifested itself in all its warmth and fullness. He was peculiarly domestic, clinging to every relation with the strongest attachments. Almost every summer during the later year of his life he visited his native state renewing and strengthening these ties.

As he grew older he seemed to be drawn more closely to his old homestead and to the friends of his youth. How well we remember with what joy he would ride or walk miles to call upon some relation, and with what eagerness and rapidity he would put question after question concerning some whom he had not seen for years. His coming was always the signal for the gathering of the family, and merrily the laugh went round at the rehearsal of boyhood recollections. This, together with his strong personal

love, made his visit as pleasant to his kindred as it was to himself. But he lavished all the wealth of his affections upon his immediate family.

In September, 1842, he married Miss Eliza Joanna Davis, of Uxbridge, Mass., a lady every way adapted to make him happy. God blessed them with children, who bound them together the more closely; and when He called two prattling babes to Himself the stricken parents found consolation in God and in each other, and loved the more intensely those whom He had spared.

As a husband, Prof. Dean was always considerate and attentive; but his attentions were of that unobtrusive character which are the outgrowth of a true union. He showed the depth of his affections less by words of endearment than by acts of love. His love was, like the steady flow of a river, quiet because deep.

As a father, he was indulgent, but not to excess. He held his children as a trust; and, by precept and example, endeavored to fit them for future usefulness. His discipline was mild, yet effective, appealing to their higher nature; and when he reproved they felt it was in sorrow not in anger. As they grew older he entered into all their purposes and became their counselor in all matters. He secured and maintained their confidence by promising only that which he could fulfill; and, by pointing out the good or evil effects of their conduct, led them to pursue or renounce it. Although he seldom laid down a positive prohibition, he carried his point by judicious management.

Having himself lacked the advantages of a careful instruction, he made many sacrifices that his children might have the benefit of a liberal education ; but he left to each the free choice of his profession.

These cares of the family and his protracted studies left Prof. Dean but little time to cultivate society. He was of a very social disposition ; but he felt that he must deny himself that gratification rather than neglect his duties. Hence he sought society in his family, his classes, a few intimate friends, and in his books. Besides, his long continued studies had, to some extent, unfitted him to enjoy social gatherings. He felt most at home in his library ; and there he received his friends with the utmost cordiality.

He was very easy of approach, drawing every body, and especially young people and children, to him by his pleasant smile and kindly greeting. His manners were homely and unaffected, but no one could mistake the largeness of his heart and the sincerity of his nature that prompted every act. True nobility shows itself in a refined sensibility that feels for other's misfortunes, and shrinks from obtruding itself on the attention of others. But when called out it is genial, prompt to render acts of kindness, and anxious to make all about it happy.

Prof. Dean was a firm believer in religion. He seemed almost to have grown up into the kingdom. From his boyhood he maintained a pure and unblemished life. His principles were firmly established ; and, though subjected to the hitherto unknown temptations of college and city life, he

did not yield. He did not, however, make a public profession of religion till soon after his marriage, when he united himself with the Fourth Presbyterian church of Albany, then under the charge of the Rev. Edward N. Kirk, D.D. His religion was that of the heart and life, his grand actuating motive. He considered the subject as one sacred to every heart, and therefore he made no parade of it. He lived it.

His last sickness was very short. He was taken ill Sunday morning, January 19, 1868, and suffered acute pain for two days, when he seemed to improve. His friends and class had strong hopes of seeing and hearing him again in a few days. But, though we little dreamed it, his work was done. Sunday night, January 26, 1868, he suddenly but peacefully entered into that rest prepared for the people of God.

But a short time before his sickness, he quoted the following beautiful lines which, in view of his peaceful departure, seem almost prophetic :

“Life, we’ve been long together
Through pleasant and through stormy weather :
’Tis hard to part when friends are dear,
’Twill cost a sigh, perhaps a tear.
Then steal away, give little warning,
Say not good night,
But in some happier clime
Wish me good morning.”

We have thus endeavored to sketch the character of Amos Dean. We submit it to his friends with confidence, knowing that they will supply what is lacking; and to the general reader with the hope that he will overlook its imperfections.

HISTORY OF CIVILIZATION.

INTRODUCTION.

“History,” says Lord Bolingbroke, “is *philosophy teaching by examples.*” But I apprehend the “examples” must have some higher warrant for their occurrence than simply philosophy. I would rather define it to be *God teaching by examples*, for God is, in history alike as in the workings of inanimate nature, carrying out his plans and purposes through laws which he ordains and enforces.

The present mode of teaching history seems to me unsatisfactory in reference to the character of the facts which it brings to our knowledge. The great burden of its story is made up of changes and revolutions in governments; heroic conduct of individuals; plots and conspiracies; rebellions, successful and unsuccessful; wars, with their bloody accompaniments of battles and sieges; the assault and the blockade; together with all acts of violence, individual and national. It rarely condescends to detail the industrial pursuits of a people; to give their religious beliefs and forms of worship; to exhibit their government and jurisprudence; or to present their manners and customs, their philosophy or their arts. All these are less striking in their character; less marked in their attributes; less palpable in their effects; and furnish less food for the marvelous in our nature.

The great difficulty seems to be, that the outgoings of human nature in history are studied more in their wonder-workings than in their ordinary quiet exhibitions; more in their abnormal conditions than in their normal state.

It is much the same as studying the river in its cataracts; the ocean in its storms; the wind in its tornadoes; the functions of the human organs in a raging fever; the muscles in their spasms; or geology in its rocky upheavals. The river has its quiet flow as well as its cataracts; the ocean its calm as well as its storms; the wind its soft breathings as well as its tornadoes; the human organs their harmony of function as well as febrile excitement; the muscles their natural contractions as well as spasms; and geology its slow depositions of strata as well as violent upheavals.

I understand history to be *a record of human progress*, and I would teach it:

1st, In the evidences upon which its revelations rest.

2d, In certain great principles that lie at the foundation of all historical development.

FIRST, The revelations of history rest mainly upon three sources of evidence — *the monument, the man, the written record*. In passing around the head of the Mediterranean sea we find ourselves successively in the primitive homes of each one of these sources. Egypt gives us the monument, Arabia the man, and Phœnicia the written record.

Egypt is peculiarly the land of the monument. The pyramid there towers aloft in its solemn grandeur, the temple presents its forest of columns, the palace its massive architecture, and the catacomb speaks after its silence of centuries. What high promptings must have stirred the minds of those primitive fathers of human industry and art to lead them to the performance of those gigantic labors that have enabled the world in its infancy to speak to the world in its maturity.

But the Nilotic valley is not alone the home of the monument. That elder civilization that once held dominion on the banks of the Euphrates, the Tigris, the Choaspes and the Araxes, is now being proclaimed to us through the monuments of Babylon, of Nineveh, of Susa, and Persepolis. These lead us towards the orient. But in reversing our course and traveling towards the occident, we encounter in Greece and Italy the old ruins of Lycosura,

of Tyrius, of Norba, and of many other cities ; the remains of that cyclopean architecture that marks the pathway of the Pelasgi.

In passing from Egypt into Arabia, we find ourselves also, in one sense, in a land of monuments, but its monuments are men. Man is there monumental, because he is unchanged. The Bedouin of the desert and the rocky Arabia possesses the same general features, traits of character, modes of life and civilization, that were in ancient times possessed by the immediate descendants of Ishmael. The Chaldean, and Syrian, Babylonian and Persian civilizations have traveled by him on their journey westward ; while the Egyptian, Hebrew, Phœnician, Grecian and Roman have for ages hovered around him ; and yet he has remained the same. The manners, customs, forms of intercourse, social habits and modes of life that belonged to the early patriarchs are yet to be seen impressed upon the living page of Arabian being. Man has there no institutions, but he is himself an institution. He has no history, but he is himself a record.

In passing into Phœnicia we find the home of the written record — the alphabetic character — without which man could be little more than the mere creature of the present.

SECOND, The great principles that lie at the foundation of all historical development. What are they ? They are all those included, respectively, in what are termed the six elements of humanity. These are :

1. Industry.
2. Religion.
3. Government.
4. Society.
5. Philosophy.
6. Art.

These are so many vast organizing forces, that together, embrace and exhaust all there is of human power, energy and activity, whether it feels or thinks in the mind, thrills in the nerve, or is developed in the muscle.

Each one of these elements has its own proper foundation, its own embodiment and culminating point.

Industry is founded upon the *useful*. It is embodied in the various industrial pursuits of a people. It culminates in the science of political economy. Its destiny is to satisfy man's physical wants.

Religion is founded on the *holy* and *divine*. It is embodied in all the various forms of worship. It culminates in theology. Its destiny is to satisfy the wants of the soul.

Government is founded upon the *just*. It is embodied in the different governmental forms and systems of jurisprudence. It culminates in the state. It results in the enforcement of order.

Society is founded upon the *agreeable*. It is embodied in the manners and customs of a people. It culminates in the principles of politeness. Its mission is to gratify the social instinct.

Philosophy is based on the *true in itself*. Its embodiment is in the people's thought and systems of philosophy. It culminates in the pure intellect.

Art is founded upon the *beautiful* and *sublime*. It is embodied in thought realized in some form of beauty and sublimity. It culminates in the ideal.

These elements are to be considered:

1st, In their separation from each other.

2d, In their development.

It is only in the separate, distinct, and uncombined action of each one of these elements that we can expect to witness the gradual development of its intrinsic perfections. To accomplish this separation and development requires the exercise of every active principle of our nature.

The first great epoch in the history of man exhibits these elements in a state of combination. The historical drama opens in Asia. There we behold the infancy of man; and there that infancy still continues. All the elements are there enveloped in each other, or so intimately blended together as to preclude the action of each without rendering necessary that of all.

This envelopment, or intimate blending of the elements, is attested by all the important phenomena that have been observed in Asia; excluding, however, from that term, the regions more immediately bordering upon the Caspian, Black, and Mediterranean seas, which, in their physical character, are more strictly European than Asiatic.

The specimens of art exhibited in Asia are so indefinite in outline, so general in character, so deficient in just proportion, as to indicate a still indissoluble union between the arts and their associate elements. Witness, for instance, the strange, uncouth and gigantic figures that are to be found in the rock temples of Elephanta and Ellora in India.

The dictates of the religion, the maxims of the despotic government, the precepts of the morality, the spirit of society trammelled by caste, the deductions of the philosophy of the east, equally with the specimens of art, are all in strict unison with each other, and exclude the idea that there is between them any line of separation.

This state of envelopment or intimate union seems, therefore, to be the condition under which the existence of man is given in Asia. This condition has stamped one peculiar feature upon this primitive epoch in our history, and that is, mental inaction, profound repose, a destitution of well directed physical effort.

To these the local peculiarities of Asia strongly conduce. Its centre is one immense continuous plateau of elevated land. The intense heat at the south tends to divest the human frame of its energy and the mental and moral fabric of its power.

The events brought down to us by history have mostly transpired within the temperate zones. In Asia there is no temperate zone. The regions of fire and frost there border upon each other. At the foot of the Himmaleh you are scorched by a torrid sun. Ascend their steep acclivities, and you stand on the immense plateau of Central Asia, directly within the sphere and influence of the northern polar sanctuaries.

Many of the institutions of Asia, particularly of the southern part, come in aid of these local peculiarities. The government is, in the extremest degree, despotic; fettering body, mind and soul. Society has distributed mankind into castes, and thus transformed the entire social fabric into a bed of Procrustes.

The religion and morality of Southern Asia, more particularly of India, both lead to the same general inaction. What is its religion? A deformed theology, absorbing everything into itself; allowing man no part to perform but that of a mere machine, and leaving it indifferent in the great system of things whether even that part be or be not performed by him.

What is its morality? That also inspires repose. It teaches man if action be necessary, to act as though he acted not; to act with a profound indifference to all its results: that, whether he acted or not, the eternal principle that creates, and modifies, and renews, and sustains all things, would be still the same.

Under these combined influences, man, in Asia, has ever remained the same. We have seen him exhibiting no striking evidences of mental or moral advancement; bequeathing us no important discoveries in science or art; handing down to us no trophies of his victories over the elements of nature. Exclusive of what foreign agency has effected, when have we ever witnessed an alteration in the manners, customs, laws or institutions of Southern, Eastern, or Central Asia? The sun that gladdens this time is shining upon the same, with few or no modifications, that were dawned upon by the sun of Zoroaster.

Centuries have there come and gone and left no impress. Let foreign influence and agency cease to operate and they never will leave any. As soon may we expect to see the Egyptian mummy bursting the cerements of its sepulchre and displaying anew the energies of a life long lost, as to witness the Asiatic competing with the European or American in the actings and doings of this world.

Industry, religion, government, society, philosophy and art there form one mingled mass. No attempt at separation — no effort at development, except in combination. We see everywhere exhibited the same dull, dead uniformity; the same Sahara of the mental and moral world.

It is not here intended to assert that there is a want of intellect or of a national literature, among some of the oriental nations, especially the Chinese and Hindoos. The intellect possessed is sometimes very acute, and the reasoning faculty extremely subtle in its displays. The difficulty lies not in the *want* but in the *direction* of the intellectual powers. The objects about which their energies have been expended have not been of such a nature as to separate and develop the elements of humanity, or to advance the great interests of civilization.

In this primitive epoch we are led to contemplate one great exhibition of human nature. We see it presenting one strong, peculiar characteristic — that of inaction — arising from the envelopment or intimate commingling of all its elements.

Let us now mark their successive separation. All rational existence is given subject to one condition, to the operation of one uniform law — the law of progression. The man must walk forth from the boy; the civilized from the savage. The man advances by a successive separation and development of his powers; humanity, by a successive separation and development of her elements.

In the opening of a new epoch, to be influenced by a new spirit, we are to view man under a different aspect. We are to proceed from inertia to action; from where man was nothing to where he is everything; from despotism to democracy; from union to separation; from envelopment to development; from Asia to Greece.

This new epoch required a new theatre of action. It found one in the mildness of a Grecian sky; in the balm of a Grecian atmosphere; in the variegated beauties of a Grecian landscape; in the diversified qualities of a Grecian soil. The mountain, the stream, the bay, the harbor,

unproductive Attica and fruitful Messenia, all furnished motives for action. Man did act, and thus became acquainted with his own powers and the extraordinary faculties with which God had endowed him. Here, for the first time, the important secret was discovered, that, in the inventory of the universe, man forms an item of value. The high estimation in which he here held himself is inferrable from the fact that he has invested his very gods with human attributes. He has transferred his own nature to his own heavens, and admired, and loved, and feared its display in the wisdom of his Pallas; in the loves of his Venus; in the valor of his Mars; in the thunders of his Jupiter.

The spirit actuating the movements of the Greek and Roman were essentially the same, so that both really form but one epoch. In the government of Rome we perceive more clearly developed the aristocratic feature. To that undoubtedly is owing the greater permanence of its institutions.

In Greece and Rome human elements strongly tended to separation and development. Industry, religion, government, society, philosophy and art, no longer form, as they did in Asia, one commingled mass. Society, philosophy and art here achieve their enfranchisement.

The first, escaped from the dominion of caste, asserts its own prerogatives. It claims and exercises the right of yielding obedience to its own laws, and of being governed upon its own principles. It annexes to its decrees its own sanction, and visits its members with its own joyous approval, or lays upon them the weight of a blasted name.

The enfranchisement of philosophy was still more important. The very point of separation is the centre of a deep feeling, of an intense interest. That point was sealed with the blood of a Socrates. In him philosophy first awoke to a knowledge and comprehension of itself. It afterwards investigated earth and its productions in the researches of its Aristotle. It ascended to the source of things in the splendid idealism of its Plato.

Art, liberated from its fetters, and encouraged in its efforts, here brings forth its choicest products. This is, in fact, the crowning element of Grecian civilization. Its charm has never vanished from the world. Its spell has never been broken. It has aided in sustaining civilization in its most fearful extremity; and in every age and clime, where it has become known, it has awoke in the human mind a sense of the beautiful, and kindled in the human soul a love of the ideal. To the eye it has presented its forms of peerless beauty as they glow on the canvas of Apelles, or stand forth in the marble of Phidias; while on the ear has fallen its full diapason, mingling the song of Sophocles and Euripides with the thunder tones of Demosthenes.

The remaining elements, industry, government and religion, were still intimately blended together. A successive separation was necessary, for the purpose of allowing each an opportunity of being developed or carried out into all its possible applications.

Of these yet enveloped elements that of government, or the state, was predominant. It was the central element of the Greek and Roman movement. Around this, as a nucleus, gathered all the others. To strengthen the patriotic love of country, industry lent its application, religion its inspiration, society its warm approvals, philosophy its deductions, and art its glowing canvas and chiseled monument.

The Greek formed a part of his state. Its acts were, therefore, to some extent, his acts. To him that state was the world. To it belonged the dawn of his infancy, the bloom of his youth, the vigor of his manhood, the decay of his age. Had he affections? that was their centre. Had he powers of action? that furnished motives for their exercise. To him it embodied all that was beautiful, all that was interesting, all that was lovely, all that was worth living for, all that was worth dying for. Beneath him was the Grecian soil; around him were Grecian monuments; above him the abodes of Grecian gods.

Individual worth, during this epoch, is estimated from the extent of individual sacrifice. The nation is the actor. The wave of Salamis; the straits of Thermopylæ; the plain of Marathon; the field of Cannæ; Carthage in ashes; a demolished empire; a subjugated world; attest the energy of its action.

The existence of the individual is here merged in that of his nation. It is *that*, that inscribes its achievements in living lines on this page of the history of our race; investing this epoch with a nationality, rather than an individuality of character; rendering it resplendent from the display of national glory, imposing from the exhibition of national power.

In central, northern, and western Europe we are to find that portion of our world's surface devoted to a new epoch, characterized by the movement of a new spirit. This region of country, in its physical aspects, its mountain, valley, river and ocean scenery; and in those arrangements which facilitate intercourse and naturally lead to commercial exchanges, bears nearly the same relation to the eastern continent that Greece does to Europe.

In the preceding epoch we had seen society, philosophy and art separated from the other elements, and, to a very considerable extent, developed by the Greek and Roman spirit. We had seen industry, government and religion still bound together by the ties of a strong, and seemingly indissoluble union.

In the epoch to which we have now arrived, we are to witness the efforts of industry in effecting its separation from the remaining primary elements, and its consequent development, leaving only government and religion in a state of combination. This effort of industry in effecting its enfranchisement brings more strongly into view the powers and energies of man as an individual, and from their freedom and vigor in action arises the distinctive spirit of this epoch.

This truth is deeply engraven on every page of European history. It is told in the insubordination of its earlier

periods; in the anarchy of the middle ages; in the necessity that originated the feudal system; even in the very essentials of that system itself; in the curious institution of chivalry; in that wide spread movement the crusades; in the origin and triumphant success, during the middle ages, of numerous free commercial cities; and finally in the creation of the middle class, the third estate, the commons, whose voice has been heard with varying power in the diets of Germany, the cortes of Spain, the states-general of France, and the parliament of England; whose terrible energies, roused into fearful activity, have more than once surrounded Italy, Germany and France, with all the horrors of revolution, while in the British isles, having attained their political supremacy, they are swaying the sceptre of universal empire, under the guaranties of the British constitution. True, this spirit has been both warlike and peaceful; at one time appealing to the sword as the sovereign arbiter of individual right; at another, pursuing the even tenor of its way under the quiet sanction of law. It was, nevertheless, the same spirit still. Its achievements in all the departments of industry, as well as in philosophy, and in art, are numerous and important. The inventions, the discoveries of modern times, all stand its debtors. It has pervaded space, sought an acquaintance with other orbs, followed the tractless course of the comet in its wanderings, and brought back intelligence from the very outposts of creation. In the sciences that instruct, in the arts that refine, it is conspicuous. It has demanded of the material world, the elements that compose it; the manner of their combination, the mode of their action. It has sought a familiar acquaintance with the laws of life, the subtle ties of organization, the main facts of existence. It has penetrated the deepest recesses of mind, investigated its powers, classified its faculties, and explained their modes of operation. It has been active in agricultural pursuits, in the mechanic arts and inventions, in the direction of human industry, into every possible available channel. It has instituted commercial

relations, and connected together the human family by the mutual ties of a common intercourse. It has acquired a mastery over physical nature, and compelled the very elements to labor for its benefit. It has ascended to the source of things, inquired into the reasons and modifications of existence, and investigated God's moral government of the world.

The grand result flowing from the spirit of this epoch is told in the fact of individual advancement. The science of political economy originated from the activity of this spirit. That science was unknown to the Greeks and Romans. They never dreamed of dividing themselves into producing, distributing and consuming classes. Indeed, they could not, for they all formed the consuming class. Their labor was performed by slaves, and hence was degraded, and incapable of rising to the dignity of a science. It was left to this epoch to develop the individual spirit in all the various departments of industry. To facilitate its operations, the numerous and diversified objects of pursuit have been subdivided into their distinct and appropriate classes. The division of labor has been regarded as the true barometer, indicating, with unerring certainty, the degree towards perfection, to which every social system has advanced. This extreme division has resulted in giving, or tending to give, to every person employment; in presenting to every one a choice of employment; in extending the comforts and conveniences of life to the greatest possible number; in producing a mutual intercourse between man and man; in rendering all the parts of society reciprocally dependent on each other, thus consolidating the whole by the strongest of earthly bonds — the bond of interest.

But notwithstanding the triumphs of industry during this epoch; notwithstanding the proud trophies it has handed down to us as the fruits of its herculean efforts, it has not yet achieved its complete enfranchisement from its previously enveloped condition. Its union with government was still too clearly perceptible in the adoption of

restrictive systems by most of the European powers, thus limiting its beneficial results, by restraining its freedom of action. Industry can only find its best possible distribution, and its greatest quantity of encouragement, when all the markets of the world are freely open to its products.

Humanity, during this and the previous epoch, had attained much, but not all. She had not yet reached her acme. Her highest point of attainment, her last separation, yet lay in another hemisphere.

We had seen a successive separation and gradual development of human elements. Society, philosophy, art and industry, except one remaining point of union, had successively achieved their enfranchisement, and inscribed, in enduring characters, on the historic page, the results of their progressive development. We were yet to see industry completely disenthralled. We were yet to see the only remaining separation, that of religion from government.

We had seen a lifeless inertia characterizing the first epoch of our history, a spirit of national movement pervading the second; and individual enterprise and activity, restrained, however, by governmental interference, enlivening the third. We were yet to see carried more extensively into practical operation, the important doctrine, that this world was made for individuals, not for nations. We were yet to see the great truth universally acknowledged and received, that all the possible developments of human nature in industry, in religion, in government, in society, in philosophy, and in art, are far better made in accordance with the laws enacted by its Author, than under those imposed by governmental, or any other agency.

A new portion of our earth was required for this last separation, and for the further progressive development of human elements. In finding it, humanity, to be consistent with her former movements, must travel westward. She did so, and found a new hemisphere awaiting her coming. The new world presents remarkable adaptations to the

highest developments of history. Its towering mountains, its spreading lakes, its noble rivers, its waving forests, and its matchless prairies seem to have been kept in reserve, to preside in all their virgin beauty over the final separation of human elements, and to open up in exhaustless treasures to their ever onward and unceasing development.

We are here called upon to witness the separation of the last elements that still remained in a state of combination. Government and religion had continued bound together during all the three previous epochs. The throne and the altar had been inseparable companions. So very intimate had been their union, both in fact and in idea, that when in 1789, the people of France overturned the throne, they also, at the same time, overthrew the altar; not comprehending how it was possible for the one to exist separate from the other. And Napoleon I, when he reestablished the one, restored also the other. There was to be sundered the bond of their union. Government was called upon to account to man; man only recognized his accountability to his God. The last lingering tie that connects industry with government, is also being gradually sundered in the slow, but progressive rejection of the restrictive system.

Well might humanity hold a jubilee upon the final separation of her elements. Well might she pause upon this proud pinnacle of her attainment, this elevated Himalah of her world, and examine the successive steps of her progress hither. The world had been the theatre of her action; time the chronicler of her acts; nations and individuals her actors. She had traveled over the fallen column; the mouldering monument; the sepulchral city; the ruined state; the demolished kingdom; the dismembered empire. At her bidding the nation had appeared upon her theatre; performed its part in developing the grand plot in her drama; retired behind the scene. It disappeared when it had nothing more to perform; when its mission was accomplished; when the condition was complied with under which its existence had been permitted. Every important step in her advancement had

required a sacrifice. Greece and Rome had retired to give place to the modern European movement. Nations had disappeared to make room for the race. All had been losers except herself. Her progress had been onward still, whether she encountered society or solitude, the city's hum or the empire's grave.

Fully recognizing the fact that the successive separation of these elements, in the manner already indicated, has formed a part of the order of providence, the great object of this work will be to trace out the agency of different nations and peoples in their development. In the accomplishment of this task it will not be deemed necessary to consider the civilization of the oriental nations—the Hindoos and Chinese—not only for the reason that the elements are there in a state of envelopment, but also because they are not the sources, and have never furnished any considerable contributions to our own civilization. The main agents in all historical development have been nations and races, the latter having been the primordial materials out of which the former have been formed. The identification of races, and their agency in the production of historical events and development, have never received the attention they merit from the historian. In the attempt here made to give the progressive advances of our civilization, all questions of race will have a very prominent place. The very first object will therefore be to state the results of ethnographical research so far as regards the Hamitic, Semitic and Indo-European races; and throughout, great care will be taken to preserve clearly the distinction of race, and the agency exerted by each in contributing to the general progress of civilization. It is, however, the nations, or peoples, that have simultaneously or successively appeared upon the world's theatre, which have been formed, each out of one or more races, that have been the most directly instrumental in advancing the world's civilization. Next, therefore, after giving the results of ethnography, and briefly referring to the nomadic races, those early peoples or nations, passing under the names of the Chaldæan,

Assyrian, Babylonian, and Medo-Persian, who held dominion upon the banks of the Euphrates, the Tigris, the Choaspes and the Araxes, will come up for consideration. Then the dwellers in the valley of the Nile. Then traveling around the head of the Mediterranean sea, Arabia, Palestine, and Phœnicia, will successively engage our attention. Next Greece and the Grecian era; then Rome, and finally the states and kingdoms of modern Europe considered together. In considering successively these different nations or peoples, we shall

1. Invoke physical geography, so far as to learn the general principles that have presided over the formation of the country; with the view more especially of determining to what character of mind, and kinds of industry, its physical arrangements are adapted.

2. Study the history of the nation, or nations that have there flourished; limiting all inquiries, however, to acts done in a sovereign capacity. Such would be its negotiations, treaties, wars, and other national acts; including also a brief reference to its representative men. The object to be kept constantly in view is not to give a full narrative of events, but rather to state the facts out of which the events have issued, thus showing the relations either of causation or of succession existing between them. In this manner we should endeavor to trace the origin of historical events, the frequently hidden causes of those results that are more obvious and easily understood. The principle here assumed is the same as that lying at the foundation of international law, viz: that the state or nation is a moral person, and its acts moral acts, whatever be the political machinery through which its sovereignty is developed. The history to which we should here confine ourselves would be in the nature of a personal history, somewhat analogous to that of individuals. Considered in this manner we should come better to understand the nation in its origin, youth, manhood, old age and death.

3. Inquire as to what has been the kind, character, direction, extent and amount of development of each one of

these several or collective nations or peoples in each one of the six elements of humanity.

1st. In what particular channels has their industry been directed; what have been their principal industrial pursuits; what the order of their succession, and their relations with each other.

2d. What have been their religious beliefs; what the deities worshiped; what the forms of worship; what the instruments through which it was performed, and the influence of their religious faith upon the character of the people.

3d. What has been the form of government; what the distribution of political forces; what the relation between these forces, the checks, if any established, the way and manner in which they have shaped themselves in action; the general system of law under which the operations of society have been carried on.

4th. What has been the state of society, the manners and customs of the people; the sports in which their grave or gladsome spirit has indulged; the forms of social intercourse; the rites and ceremonies that have presided over marriage, death and burial; the main characteristics of that ceaseless life ebullition caused by the constant promptings of the social instinct.

5th. What has been the nation's thought, its philosophy; who have been its great thinkers, how, wherein, in what direction, to what extent have they developed the pure reason; what have been their systems of philosophy, what the succession of those systems; what the effect produced by them upon the nation's character.

6th. What has been the nation's art; wherein has its thought been realized in some form of beauty or sublimity; how spread upon canvas, how chiseled in marble, how designed in architecture; how has it melted in music, glowed in poetry, fascinated in eloquence; how has it mimicked life upon the stage and marshaled armies upon the battle field; how, in fine, developed itself in that infinitude of artistic creations that tend to assimilate man to God, and earth to Paradise.

By faithfully gathering up and presenting all that can be

collected from the evidences upon which the truth of history rests, in relation to the developments of the people in these six elements of humanity, we certainly possess ourselves of all that went to constitute the life of that people. And if sufficient were obtainable, we could reproduce them and their institutions in all their primitive freshness, and look upon them now as if we were one of their own contemporaries.

We trust that such a course, fully and faithfully carried out, will result, in presenting a record of man and his institutions, his acts and his thoughts; in giving a history of his civilization in both its aspects — the one regarding the interior development of the individual mind, and the other the progress of society, the advance of man, the full and complete development of the human mind. The past will once more live not alone in its deeds, but also in its thoughts and institutions. We can satisfactorily ascertain what were the contributions furnished to civilization by each nation, and people and race. We shall present kinds and varieties of knowledge, fitted for all stations, conditions and occupations in life. We shall furnish materials for solving profound problems in morals, in metaphysics, in religion, in government, in all the social relations. We shall draw systematically from the great store house of the past, those lessons that will furnish to the present its wisdom, to the future its prophecy. We shall familiarize the mind with the great fact of human progress in all the possible developments of which man's varied nature is susceptible. We shall lift history from the mere narrative of events, often without cause, or consequence, into the region of ideas, the domain of significances. We shall surround it with all that can captivate, enliven, illustrate. We shall evolve from it, in systematic order, all that God has implanted in man, whether physical, intellectual, æsthetic, moral, or spiritual. We shall bring it within the empire of cause and effect, and thus place it in the same category with physics and morals. Thus elevated and ennobled, we shall find it as impossible to banish God from history, as we should from creation, or the plan of redemption.

CHAPTER I.

ETHNOGRAPHY — THE DISTRIBUTION OF RACES.

Man is the centre of many relations, and the subject of many kinds of development. He has relations with time, with space, with created objects around him, with his fellow man, with his Creator. The kinds of development of which he is susceptible have reference to these relations, and also to the different natures which make up his being. Thus he is developed in time, in space, in industrial pursuits, in works of art, in social intercourse, in the machinery of government, in the feelings of religion, and in the mysterious operations of thought.

The successive developments of the individual have been termed biography, those of the race, history. The office of history has been too much circumscribed. To give lists of kings, accounts of battles, sieges and victories; narratives of changes and great events; have been principally, if not entirely, the burden of its record. It has never, until recently, undertaken an exposition of the great principles that underlay the currents of human action, nor has it yet offered to embrace in its record all the developments to which the race has given birth.

History, in the enlarged sense here assigned to it, should be preceded by the natural history of man, and by ethnography. Man should be studied in his different varieties, and understood in his distribution over the surface of the earth in different races, before history can appropriately undertake her task of unfolding his different developments, as he has worked, and acted, and felt, and thought.

The most generally received division into varieties is that adopted by the Baron Cuvier.¹ This refers the different

¹ *Prichard's Natural History of Man*, 133.

varieties to certain mountain chains as the seats whence they originated. The birthplace of what is termed the Caucasian variety is supposed to have been Mount Caucasus.

The inhabitants of Central and Eastern Asia are supposed to have originated in the neighborhood of Mount Altai, and are called Mongolian from a tribe of that name found in the highest region of that chain of hills.

The African variety is derived from the southern face of the chain of Mount Atlas. Some have added to these the American variety consisting of most of the aborigines of this continent, and the Malay variety found in the south-eastern parts of Asia.

Each one of these, in its extremest departure from a common standard, presents certain peculiar physical characteristics, which mark the individual and designate the variety to which he belongs.

The Caucasian is characterized by an oval and straight face, with the different parts tolerably distinct from each other; the forehead is capacious, high and expanded; the nose narrow, and slightly aquiline; no prominence of the cheek bones; mouth small, with lips slightly turned out, particularly the lower one; the chin full and rounded.¹

In the Mongolian the face is broad and flattened, with the parts slightly distinguished, and as it were running together; the eyes far apart, the space between them being flat and broad; the nose flat; the cheeks rounded and projecting; the eyelids have a narrow linear aperture extending toward the temples, the internal angle of the eye being depressed toward the nose, and the superior eyelid continued at that part into the inferior by a rounded sweep; the chin is slightly prominent.

In the African or Ethiopian variety the face is narrow, projecting toward its lower part; the forehead arched, slanting and narrow; the eyes prominent; the nose thick, and confused on either side with the projecting cheeks; the lips, particularly the upper one, very thick; the jaws

¹ *Lawrence Lectures*, 283.

prominent, and the chin retracted. The form of skull in this variety is what is termed prognathous.

Although the different varieties preserve their original types, yet they are frequently found in some individuals to run into one another, so as almost to lose their peculiar characteristics. The intellectual and moral condition, the mental powers and faculties possessed; all that enters into psychology, is found to vary about as much in the different varieties as do the physical characteristics. The Caucasian variety appears to be the only one that, with few, or no exceptions, has a history, because it is the only one that has been progressive.

Ethnography teaches the distribution of mankind in races over the surface of the earth. These races are identified as being originally the same or different, by characteristics chiefly psychological. Identity in manners and customs, forms of thought, habits, modes of belief, and more especially in language establishes the common origin of races, however variously they may be distributed. While, therefore, the division into varieties is physiological, that into races, by ethnology, is psychological. The great facts that have thus far characterized human progress all combine to prove the necessity of first understanding the distribution and some of the peculiarities of races before considering their respective contributions to general civilization. The following sketch is necessarily very general in its character, and is designed to exhibit merely a skeleton view of the historic races. As we successively take up and unfold the history and civilization of the different nations of the Hamitic, Semitic, and Indo-European nations, more especially the Grecian, Roman, and modern European, we shall deem it necessary to allude more particularly to the different races that respectively compose them.

Among the human species language has ever been an instrument of thought, is the product of an inward necessity, and has, from the very nature of its origin, a principle of development. This principle applies not only to each particular language, but its higher elements are discernible

working at the foundations of all language, and so distributing the different families as to give the clearest indications of a progress and a history. The present mode of viewing language, both in England and in this country is to regard it as an organism, as having in it a principle of development which, in the course of ages, has pushed it out into the results we are now beholding. This has flowed principally from the teachings of Bunsen and Max Müller. The latter, more especially, has brought to view, what we shall presently briefly exhibit, the isolating stage, the agglutinating stage, the inflecting stage, all these gradually sliding into each other, while in the far back ground is shadowed forth the evolution of language from a unity not yet visible, but hoped to become so some future day. It is, however, but fair to say that in Germany these views are not accepted as correct. There the celebrated author of grammatical structure by a system of symbols—Schleicher of Jena, declares expressly: “There was therefore not one original language but many.” Of the same opinion appear to be Professor Pott of Halle, and Buschmanno and Steinthal of Berlin. *Anthropological Review*, II, 24–5, No. 4.

The persevering labors of ethnologists, aided by the recent revelations from the monuments of Egypt, and of Assyria and Babylonia, have produced many surprising results that have filled with astonishment and delight the inquirer after knowledge. And, with few exceptions, these labors, although independently conducted, have harmonized in their conclusions. One conclusion very generally, if not universally, arrived at, is that men, although distributed into ethnic diversities, have nevertheless everywhere and at all times composed but one race; that the human species is distinct from every other, and includes within it all men of human form and language. The widest generalizations of ethnology would perhaps exclude any other conclusion.

All ethnologists are unanimous in the admission originally of at least three great families of languages, viz: the *Turanian*, *Semitic* and *Iranian*. The first is so called from *Tûrân*, a term used to signify all those countries

which lie beyond or outside of *Iran*, or the *Aryans*. This can be hardly said to be a family in the sense in which the other two are so termed. It is rather a *stage* in the history of language than any particular *form* of it. "It is the earliest mould into which human discourse naturally, and as it were spontaneously, throws itself."¹ It is simple, rude, coarse, having in it nothing elaborate, or scarcely artificial. The great principle prevailing is that of *agglutination* — the *glueing together* of the pronoun and verb, for instance,² to form a conjugation, or of the pronoun and noun to form a declension. So peculiar and marked is this glueing process that the conjugation and declension can still be taken to pieces, and although the terminations have by no means retained their significative power as independent words, they are still felt as modificatory syllables, and distinct from the words to which they are added.³ The various languages of this family are almost, or quite, necessarily in a constant state of flux and change, absolutely devoid of a literature, and maintain themselves in existence by means of the scanty conversation of nomades. This is supposed to be the earliest form of speech, or rather the earliest after its first offshoot, the *Chinese*. This latter is regarded as an instance of language arrested at the first stage of its growth, and presenting itself, therefore, as a broken link — a reflection of the earliest consolidation of human speech.⁴ This was prior even to agglutination, as the language is monosyllabic in its character, each word representing an implicit sentence, not divided in its component logical parts, and serving therefore according to its position and accent, sometimes as a substantive or adjective, sometimes as a verb. As the crystal lies at the foundation of the inorganic world, so the Chinese language in its pure monosyllabic character, presents us with crystals of thought. The Chinese are compelled to attach much to the architectural arrangement of words, and to musical changes

¹ Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, 524. ² Bruce, 27. ³ Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, 524. ⁴ Bunsen's *Philosophy of Ancient History*, 480.

in the pronunciation. It is not a little curious to observe that many monosyllabic words are the same, or nearly the same, in many languages different and remote from each other; thus by its scattered links proclaiming the unity of the race. The word *gin*, for instance, in Chinese, means man. In the Celtic, as spoken in Ireland it is *giv*, the *v* being substituted for *n*. Hence our English word *girl*, which is really made up from two words, viz: *gir* a man and *li* a line or race—a female. When we go to the Latin we find that language changing the Chinese and Celtic *g* into a *v*, and thus with the Romans giving *vir* as the name of man. The Latin, however, paid its regards to the old Chinese by making the original *gin* the very centre of its *re-gin-a*, *regina*, *qucen*; and the English out of the union of the Latin and Chinese produces its *vir-gin*, *virgin*.¹

From all that can be gathered, the Turanian, including the Chinese, is to be regarded as the oldest form of speech. But imagination itself tires in the effort to go back to that early period, when the first emigrations started from the high table land of Asia. Even the first emigrations of the Pelasgian, Celt, and Teuton, although long subsequent, are yet far beyond the light of history, and are hardly within the domain of tradition. How much more than those early emigrants who gave origin to the Allophyllian races, whose early works in the ages of stone and of bronze, we shall allude to when on the subject of European races. The lines of their emigration, however, have been conjectured, if not actually traced, by the evidences derived from their language. The great stream of universal history, it has been said, runs in a few great beds, the rest are canals branching off from them.

The first migration from the common centre of mankind proceeded eastward, and became the founders of the Chinese empire.² The next was a migration towards the south, of those speaking the Tai dialects, who settled along

¹ *American Phrenological Journal*, August, 1863, 38. ² *Bunsen's Philosophy of Ancient History*, 481.

the river basins of the Meikong, Meinam, Irawaddi and Brahmaputra. Then followed the Tungusic tribes toward the north to the basins of the Amoor and the Lena. The Malaic tribes in the south followed the same direction as the Tai tribes, but finding the land occupied, pushed onward to the islands and the sea. A second migration toward the north was the Mongolic races, pressing on the Tungusic, their predecessors, and spreading westward along the chain of the Altai mountains. The third migration toward the south wended its way to Bhota, or Tibet, and the frontiers of India. They chose the high plateau north of the last named country, and in later times poured into it through the mountain passes of the Himalah. Next followed the Turkish tribes toward the north, who finding all the intermediate country taken possession of, proceeded westward to the Ural and the frontier of Europe. The last colony in the south was the Tamulic, and in the north the Finnic, both at an early period advanced to a comparatively high degree of civilization, of which the traces still remain in the wise economy of their languages, and in the few remains of their early institutions and literature. Besides these great radial lines of emigration, there are several sporadic clusters of dialects, equally belonging to the Turanian stage of language, which are found spoken in the impenetrable valleys of the Caucasus, the Basque,¹ in the Pyrenees, and on the very edge of Europe, and the Samoiedic in the still less accessible Tundras of the north of Siberia.² These fragmentary outcroppings of the old Allophyllian races, together with the Finnic tribes driven into the fens of Finland, and the Tamulic into the hills and mountainous regions of the Deccan of Southern India, as the ancient Britons were driven into the mountains of Wales, all evidence the gigantic pressure of the superior forces embraced in the Iranian, or Aryan nations. And yet all those comprised in the Aryan and Semitic families of languages, are now

¹ *Bunsen's Philosophy of Ancient History*, 481. ² *Idem*, 482.

found occupying, and that incompletely, but four peninsulas of the primeval continent, viz: India, Arabia, Asia Minor, and Europe; all the rest still belonging to the Turanian, or Allophyllian races. But the Arian, Semitic, and disputed Hamitic, occupy the countries which mark the high road of civilization, and present the stage on which the drama of ancient and modern history has been acted. .

The next step brings us into the region of controversy, and that relates to what family of languages occupied Egypt and the upper Nile, and to what belonged the early Canaanites and Chaldeans. The inquiry is important because it determines who were the fathers of our civilization. The early ethnologists and perhaps all down to the time of Rawlinson, have regarded them as Turanians who ultimately became Semitic in the character of their languages. These, therefore, are believers in only three families of languages. Col. Rawlinson, on the contrary, claims to introduce a new family, viz: the Hamitic, and to make it the fountain head of our civilization. He identifies this race as the ancient Ethiopian, which was made up of the Egyptian, the dwellers upon the upper Nile, the original Canaanites and the old Chaldeans. To establish his position he brings to his aid 1, The Mosaic account which he fully adopts; 2, The inscriptions found on the earlier Chaldean monuments; and 3, The traditions that have been handed down to us. His views are fully set forth in his *Five Ancient Monarchies*, and present a strong case to compel belief in their correctness. The roots of the old Egyptian language are, in the majority of cases, monosyllabic, and identical with the corresponding roots in Sanskrit and Hebrew.¹ The grammatical forms have throughout analogous formations in both. The pronominal system is, however, preponderantly Semitic.

The Hamitic failed to perpetuate itself as a family of languages. It died in giving birth to those early civilizations that appeared in the valleys of the Nile and the

¹ *Bunsen's Philosophy of Ancient History*, 185.

Euphrates. It seems to have resolved itself into Semitic and Arian elements; principally the former.

Next to the *Hamitic*, or language of *Ham*, the *Semitic*, *Shemitic*, or language of *Shem*, constitutes the oldest family of languages, aside from the Turanian already mentioned. This great family is peculiar in the structure of its roots, which consist mostly of three consonants, those of the Aryan and Turanian having only one or two. From these triliteral or dissyllabic roots, the words of the language are derived.¹ These words are generally formed by merely varying the vowels, and in some cases by adding a syllable.² The three consonants express the leading idea connected with the word,³ and the interior vowels its shades of meaning, and the modifications of time and mood, agency or passion, actual or potential existence.⁴ The verb has two tenses, the noun two genders, and the relations of case are rarely expressed by inflected forms. The sentence is constructed by little more than a process of addition.

The development of this family of languages belongs to the early part of the twentieth century before Christ.⁵ Commencing in Babylonia, it advanced into the continent northward and westward, up the course of the two great streams, the Tigris and the Euphrates, and across the upper part of Arabia, extending gradually in the one direction to the Sinaitic peninsula, where the rock inscriptions are Semitic, and in the other to the shores of the Mediterranean and the range of Taurus. The ancient peoples who spoke the Semitic language were the northern Arabians, the later Babylonians, the Assyrians, the Syrians or Aramæans,⁶ the Phœnicians with their colonies, the later Canaanites, the Hebrews, the Cyprians, the Solymi and the Cilicians.

Unlike the unity recognized in the Hamitic family, this will be found to exhibit great diversity. Nomadic shepherds, agriculturists, and those devoted to manufacturing and commercial pursuits, are all embraced in this great

¹ Bruce, 53. ² Prichard, iv, 552. ³ *Idem*, 555. ⁴ Bruce, 53. ⁵ Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, 532. ⁶ *Idem*, 534.

family of languages.¹ It embraces within it the elements of intense activity. It is a language in and through which all the religions of the world, that claim to be revealed, have originally been promulgated amongst men. These are the Jewish, the Christian, and the Mahometan.

There are three different idioms or dialects of this language.

1. The northern and eastern branch, termed Aramæan or Syrian. This was the original dialect of the Hebrews, until they entered upon the possession of Palestine, when they adopted the Canaanitish or proper Hebrew.²

2. The Hebrew, Phœnician, later Canaanitish, for they were nearly the same, spoken by the inhabitants of Phœnicia and Canaan and by the Hebrews after they took possession of the latter until the Babylonish captivity, when they adopted the later Chaldee, a dialect akin to their primitive speech. This, with slight variations, was the dialect of Sidon and Tyre and of Carthage.³

3. The third dialect is the Arabic, including also the western Arabian language.⁴

Of the people who once spoke these different dialects, the Syrians now scarcely exist. The Hebrew and Arabian races are both extensively dispersed, carrying their language and national peculiarities into almost all parts of the world.⁵

The latest family of languages is variously termed as the Aryan or Arian, the Iranian, Japhetic, or Indo-European, and it is that to which the destinies of civilization have been mainly committed. The race or races composing this family have been aggressive upon other races, and progressive in their character. The principal languages which make up this family are the Sanskrit, Persian, Greek, Latin, Slavonic, Teutonic, and Celtic; and all these bear the same relations to that one original language from which they are all derived, as the Spanish and Portuguese, French and Provençal, Italian and Wallachian bear to the Latin, which is to them the parent stock.

¹ Prichard's *Natural History of Man*, 141. ² *Idem*, 141. ³ *Idem*, 142. ⁴ *Idem*, 143. ⁵ *Idem*, 124, 125.

The languages composing this family, although the latest coming into existence, are yet the most abundant in resource, and the most complete and perfect in their function and character. This form of speech is the most perfect in its organization, and presents the culminating point in all language. The Chinese and the Sanskrit occupy the extremes, and between the two are all the stages of development in all the varieties of human speech. The first presents us with the original elements, the roots. These are monosyllabic, as when they consist of more than one syllable they can be shown to be derivative roots. In the Chinese these are all separate, no analysis is required for the discovery of its component parts. There is in it no coalescence of roots. Every word is a root, and every root is a word.¹ It is the most primitive state of all language. It has been called the inorganic stage. It is the starting stage of all language, and the singularity is that the Chinese should have been arrested at that point, and thus have presented to the world a living language illustrating the earliest possible vehicle which could serve as the conveyance of thought. An instance of a root may be found in the word *gin*, already mentioned. There are three modes in which roots are put together, which constitute three stages in the gradual formation of speech :

1. They are used as words, each root preserving its full independence. This is the *monosyllabic, radical, inorganic, or Chinese stage*.²

2. Two or more of them may be joined together to form words, and in these compounds both roots may lose their independence. Here the word results from the coalescence of the roots; one of them retaining its radical independence, the other sinking down to a mere termination. This is the *terminational stage*, and is represented by the Turanian family of speech. Thus the progress of language was arrested at this second stage, and the Turanian family left to carry it out into all its varieties of development.

¹ *Muller*, 272-3. ² *Muller's Science of Language*, 286-7.

3. Two or more roots may be joined together to form words, and in the words or compounds thus formed all the roots entering into them may lose their independence. Here is a complete coalescence, so that neither the one nor the other retains its substantive independence. This is the highest and *inflectional* stage, and is represented by the Semitic and Aryan families. This has been also called *organic* or *amalgamating*.

The principal difference between the two last named stages is, that the languages embraced in the second stage preserve the consciousness of their roots, and therefore do not allow them to be affected by phonetic corruption;¹ and although they have lost the consciousness of the original meaning of their terminations, they feel distinctly the difference between the significative root, and the modifying elements. In regard to those embraced in the third stage, the various elements which enter into the composition of words may become so welded together, and suffer so much from phonetic corruption, that none but the educated would be aware of an original distinction between root and termination.

The general conclusion is that what is now *inflectional* was formerly *agglutinative*, and that what is now *agglutinative* was at first *radical*.² That "the great stream of language rolled on in numberless dialects, and changed its grammatical coloring as it passed from time to time through new deposits of thought. That the different channels which left the main current and became stationary and stagnant retained forever that coloring which the main current displayed at the stage of their separation." And when a language becomes stereotyped by its literature, and thus loses its capability of change, its natural life ceases, and its existence becomes merely artificial. Hence the so-called classical languages have become dead, being like stagnant lakes by the side of great rivers, or like the frozen surface of a river, brilliant and smooth, but stiff and cold. They

¹ Muller, 324. ² *Idem*, 331.

have yielded up their life as a penalty for their greatness. They are embalmed in the forms of their own highly wrought grammar, but their vitality has gone into living dialects. It is thus that the old Sanskrit and Zend, and the more modern Greek and Latin, having been pushed by their several literatures into the extremest limits of their possible development, and, having evolved all that ever lay within their respective capacities, been stereotyped into dead and changeless forms, stand arrayed in all their robes of beauty, more splendid monuments of human achievement than Indian or Egyptian, the proud landmarks of linguistic progress of the Aryan races as they have traveled through the ages.

The living languages in the Aryan family receive their modeling and perpetuation through the agency of two forces which are termed *phonetic decay*, and *dialectical regeneration*.¹ These are to this family of languages much the same as the centripetal and centrifugal forces are to the movements of the heavenly bodies.

As long as words are fully understood and kept alive, they resist phonetic corruption,² but the moment their life becomes doubtful this corruption sets in, and its ravages once commenced, those portions of a word which it affects, retain a merely artificial, or conventional existence, and dwindle down to grammatical terminations. These terminations, originally arising out of independent words, are slowly reduced to mere dust, by the constant wear and tear of speech. It will sometimes eat away the whole body of a word, leaving nothing behind, but decayed fragments.

The *dialectical regeneration* is a directly opposite force, or process. Dialects are the feeders of a language. They develop themselves progressively, and the further back we trace the history of a language the smaller is their number, and the less definite their features. They have been found to multiply, and become more and more perfected as the

¹ Muller, 51. ² Idem, 55.

Aryan races have divided and subdivided in the conquest of the earth. Like so many countless rivulets of speech, they furnish their mutual contributions to the great streams of language which have rolled on their ever changing forms until stereotyped into changeless perfection through the efforts of their own respective literatures.

In reference to all the families of languages, we cannot do better than to adopt the beautiful language of Müller; "And if now we gaze from our native shores over that vast ocean of human speech, with its waves rolling on from continent to continent; rising under the fresh breezes of the morning of history, and slowly heaving in our own more sultry atmosphere — with sails gliding over its surface and many an oar ploughing through its surf, and the flags of all nations waving joyously together — with its rocks and wrecks, its storms and battles, yet reflecting serenely all that is beneath, and above, and around it — if we gaze, and hearken to the strange sounds rushing past our ears in unbroken strains, it seems no longer a wild tumult, but we feel as if placed in some ancient cathedral, listening to a chorus of innumerable voices; and the more intensely we listen, the more all discords melt away into higher harmonies, till at last we hear but one majestic trichord, or a mighty unison, as at the end of a sacred symphony."¹

The original home of the races composing the Aryan family is supposed to have been the mountain district of Armenia. From thence the course of emigration was northward, westward, and eastward. To the north across the Caucasus went forth numbers of emigrants who settled partly in the steppes of upper Asia, but principally in Northern and Central Europe.² These were the Celtic, Teutonic, Lithuanian, Thracian, and Slavonic tribes. Westward into the high plateau of Asia Minor descended another body — the Phrygians, Lydians, Lycians, Pelasgi, who, possessing themselves of the whole country above Taurus, in some instances penetrated to the south of it and

¹ *Bunsen's Philos. of Univer. History*, 1, 486. ² *Rawlinson's Herodotus*, 540.

proceeded thence across the Hellespont and the islands from Asia into Europe, where they colonized the coasts of Greece and Italy. To the east wandered the Aryan tribes, and fixed their early home in the mountains of Afghanistan, and upon the sources of the upper Indus. From this latter one portion advanced along the rivers of the Punjab, singing the hymns of the Rig-Veda, and finally swarmed upon the plains of Hindoostan; while another, contributing some of the early portions of the Zendavesta sought the higher regions of Media and Persia. Thus the various nations or tribes composing the Aryan family people a broad belt of land stretching from the mouth of the Ganges in the east to the British islands in the west.

In these isles are two extant languages each having a peculiar literature. They are the languages of Britain and Ireland.¹ Under each one of these are three cognate dialects, the Welsh, Cornish, and Hemonian, belong to the former; and the Irish, Manx, and Scottish Gaelic, to the latter.

The ancient Gauls or Celts are represented as tall of stature, fair and red-haired, and horrible from the fierceness of their eyes, fond of strife and haughtily insolent.² Their voices terrific and threatening, all ages, young and old, thought fit for war, fond of wine and inventing drinks resembling it.

There has obviously been a great change in the Gaulish or Celtic physique. The type of the modern Celt is a small frame, with dark hair, swarthy complexion, and darkish or black eyes. This is varying much from the ancient Gaul. The mingling with other, and perhaps Allophyllian races may have done much to bring about this change.³

Another great family of the Indo-European race, nearly or quite as extensive as the Celts, and far more important in their influence upon general history, are the Teutonic or German nations.⁴ Ancient Germany was of indefinite extent, being bounded by the Rhine and Danube towards the

¹ *Prichard's Researches*, III, 52. ² *Prichard's Natural History of Man*, 194. ³ *Bruce*, 379. ⁴ *Prichard's Researches*, III, 342-3.

south, by the ocean on the west, on the east by the Vistula or uncertain limits of Sarmatian tribes, and towards the north it had no limitations.

There were two principal divisions of this extensive family, the one including the Northmen, ancestors of the Icelanders, Norwegians, Swedes and Danes;¹ the other of the proper Teutonic stock in its three principal subdivisions, viz: the Saxon or western German, the Suevians or high German, and the Gothic or eastern Germans.

The country occupied by the German tribes was not only very extensive but much diversified, which perhaps might have led to the great varieties observable in the character of the inhabitants.² On the Rhine were cultivated districts; and cities soon made their appearance, Strasburg, Spires, Mentz and Cologne. The Hercynian forest covered immense tracts in the interior of Germany. Of this there long continued many remains, such as the Black forest, the Odenwald, the Westerwald, Spertart, the wolds of Bohemia, Thuringia and the Hartz. On the northern coast were many morasses, and between them and the Heroynian forest were vast heaths or steppes chiefly fit only for pasturage and the chase.

The Germans have large broad heads. They were anciently universally celebrated for red hair and blue eyes, and these characters were universally ascribed to them. It seems that the ancient races who peopled the northern and western parts of Europe were of that variety of complexion termed xanthous.³ This is not the fact with a great proportion of their descendants. Whether the causes which have operated this change have been moral or physical or both, or whether it has arisen from intermixture with other people or races is not now easy to be determined.

Another family of the Indo-European race, although far less extensive than the two already mentioned, is the old Prussian, Lithuanian or Lettish race. The country occu-

¹ Prichard's *Natural History of Man*, 183. ² Prichard's *Researches*, III, 343. ³ Prichard's *Natural History of Man*, 194-5.

ped by this family lay on the lower Vistula, embracing the inhabitants of east and west Prussia.¹ Before the manners, customs and language of the Germans were introduced there these inhabitants had not only a speech peculiar to themselves, but also national superstitions, rites, ceremonies and objects of religious worship of their own.

The language spoken by this family differed considerably from other eastern European dialects,² and more nearly than any other resembled the ancient Sanskrit. This language is now no longer in use. The migrations and settlements of this family were probably at a later period than those of the German nations, as they were undoubtedly subsequent to those of the Celtic tribes.

Another and a fourth great family of the Indo-European race is the Slavonian. The Slavonic nations occupy the greater part of Europe east of the Vistula,³ and divide almost equally with the German race the northern regions of this quarter of the world. This race is divided into two great branches,⁴ the Antes and Slavini, the former the eastern, the latter western branch of this family.⁵

To the eastern division or Antes belong the Russian and its dialects, the old Slavonian, the modern Slavonic or Illyrian dialect, the Croatian, and the Windish. To the western branch belong the Slavonian, the Bohemian, the Wendish in upper and lower Lusatia, and the Polish, including the Silesian variety.⁶

The dialects belonging to these two classes are distinguishable by certain particles, the use of which is common to a whole class, but unknown to the other class.

The Slavonians appear to have no distinctly marked or peculiar characteristics that distinguish them from other European nations.⁷ In the southeastern parts they are of dark complexion, with black eyes and hair. The Poles vary in complexion. Many of them have dark eyes and hair, and are tall and well made figures. The northern Russians are fair.

¹ *Prichard's Researches*, III, 447. ² *Idem*, III, 461. ³ *Idem*, III, 404. ⁴ *Idem*, 407. ⁵ *Idem*, III, 408. ⁶ *Idem*, III, 408. ⁷ *Idem*, 442.

These four families of the Indo-European race, viz: the Celtic, Germanic, Prussian and Slavonic extend from the extreme west to the extreme east of Europe, peopling much of the western, central, eastern and northeastern parts.

The south of Europe, embracing the three peninsulas of Spain and Portugal, Italy and Greece, with the exception, perhaps, of a portion of the first, have not been peopled by any one of these families of nations. Their original settlement and subsequent history has little in common with those of other parts of Europe.

Beginning at the east there appear to have been four groups of nations occupying the countries in Europe lately belonging to the Ottoman empire.¹ Between these the ancients could discover no affinity. The first which was the most numerous and extensive was the Thracian. This race occupied the eastern parts of southern Europe as well as the central plains to the southward of the Danube, and also an extensive tract in Asia Minor.

The Thracians were anciently very numerous, and embraced: 1st, The Getæ and Dacians, the former at one period occupying a region of country north of the Danube. 2d, The Macedonians, who spoke a language unintelligible to the Greeks. 3d, The Abantes, the original inhabitants of Eubœa, and 4th, Several nations in Asia Minor supposed to belong to the same stock.²

West of the country occupied by the Thracians and stretching from thence to the Adriatic, were the tribes of the Illyrian race, a nation of barbarous mountaineers.³

South of the country occupied by the Illyrians were situated the Epicotic tribes, who possessed a tract of hill country reaching from the Ionian sea to Macedonia,⁴ and cutting off the western parts of Greece from the Illyrian territory. The country occupied by the Epicots was of considerable extent, and they were clearly distinguishable from the Greek nations.⁵

¹ Prichard's *Researches*, III, 463. ² *Idem*, III, 465-8. ³ *Idem*, III, 463.

⁴ *Idem*, III, 463. ⁵ *Idem*, III, 472-3.

The fourth nation are the Greeks, the Hellenic race hemmed in towards the north by the Epicots on the western, and by the Thracians on the eastern side.¹ Of these four nations the Greeks alone have left an undoubted posterity, preserving the language and perpetuating the stock of their ancestors.²

The limits of the Grecian race would include all south of a line drawn from the Ambracian to the Maliac gulf. Perhaps the valley of the Peneus further north should be included.³

The original inhabitants of Greece appear with few exceptions, to have been the Pelasgi.⁴ This race originally peopled Thessaly, the valley of the Peneus. They were the first inhabitants of the Peloponnesus, and if the ancient boundaries of Pelasgia are geographically correct they must have extended over the whole of Greece.⁵

The Greek character was no doubt greatly influenced in its formation by the colonies from other countries that successively settled in different parts of Greece, as the colonies of Egyptians led by Danaus and Cecrops, into Argolis and Attica; of Phœnicians by Cadmus into Bœotia; and of Phrygians by Pelops into Laconia, whence came the term Peloponnesus.⁶

The Greek language presents in its structure very clear evidence that it was not of mixed formation. It must have been formed from primitive elements, which were common to it and many other Indo-European idioms. The laws regulating its inflection and development proclaim it kindred with the Sanskrit, Latin, and Mæso-Gothic.⁷ This language, the most expressive and eloquent of human idioms, the most perfect instrument of human thought, perhaps the best adapted for conveying every variety of thought⁸ and grade of feeling, was derived from the old Pelasgian or mother tongue which gave birth to the different idioms or dialects, such as the Doric, Ionic, etc., that came to prevail in different parts of Greece.⁹

¹ Prichard's *Researches*, III, 463. ² *Idem*, III, 463. ³ *Idem*, III, 482. ⁴ *Idem*, III, 486. ⁵ *Idem*, III, 488. ⁶ *Idem* III, 489. ⁷ *Idem*, III, 492. ⁸ *Idem*, III, 488. ⁹ *Idem*, III, 497.

The Greeks, as their paintings, and more especially their sculptures, afford abundant evidence, attained nearly to perfection of form and physical organization.¹ They had the same varieties of complexion, recognized among other nations in the south of Europe. They were generally tall and finely formed; their eyes full of fire; their mouth was beautiful and ornamented with the finest teeth. The Grecian profile was peculiarly pleasing and beautiful, and the Grecian cranium was not only distinguished for its capacity, but more, perhaps, for its harmonious proportions.

Proceeding from the Grecian peninsula, westward to the next, or Italian peninsula, we find the ancient Italian population divisible into three departments, viz :

1. The Umbrians, the earliest known inhabitants of northern Italy, or of that portion lying between the Alps and the river Tiber.²

2. The Etruscans, who in some remote period dispossessed the Umbrians of a large part of their territory.

3. The inhabitants of Italy south of the Tiber, who consisted of several nations termed Siculi, Enotrians, Aborigines, Latins, Sabines, Opici or Ansones.

Of these nations, the Umbrians in the north, and the Latins, Opici or Ansones, including the Sabine or Sabelian branch, and the Siculi and their kindred in the south,³ seems at one period to have occupied the whole of Italy.

Ancient Italy, like Greece, was a fruitful field for colonization; although the colonies planted in Italy, instead of settling among and civilizing the people they found there, like the colonies that settled in Greece, seem to have expelled them.

The first colonists were the Pelasgi, who came into Umbria on the side of the Adriatic.⁴ The second were the people formerly noticed, viz : the Etruscans, who at a very early period dispossessed the Umbrians and occupied their country. They also, in all probability, overcame the Pe-

¹ *Prichard's Researches*, III, 505-7. ² *Idem*, III, 203. ³ *Idem*, III, 253.
⁴ *Idem*, III, 254.

lasgi, as the latter had no independent cities at the time Etruria was subjugated by the Romans.¹

The Etruscans or Etrurians had twelve confederated cities on the lower or Tyrrhene sea, and their dominion extended south to the Tiber,² and in some instances seem to have passed it. So, also, was the valley of the Po occupied by twelve flourishing Etrurian cities. Their sway extended northward nearly, or quite to the base of the Alps. There was also, according to Strabo, a third Etruria, containing twelve cities, among which were Capua and Nola. The Etruscans at one period are said to have been so flourishing and so powerful that all Italy, from the Alps to the Sicilian straits, was subject to their government.

The ancient Etruscans were a remarkable people, highly cultivated, possessing industry, devoted to agriculture and manufactures; ³ acquainted with arts both useful and ornamental, having some knowledge of literature and science. Their priests were the depositaries of learning, and their religion had an elaborate system of rights and ordinances.

The Etruscan language was much more strongly distinguished from the Hellenic and the Latin, than was either the Oscan or Umbrian.⁴ The grammatical flexions indicate a remote affinity to the former, but all that can be safely inferred, is that it belonged to the class of Indo-European languages.⁵

The third colonists were the Gauls, who within the period termed historical, dispossessed the Etruscans, as these last had previously dispossessed the Umbrians,⁶ and occupied those parts of the country from which it is said the Umbrians once expelled the Sicala. The Liburnians and Ligurians entered Italy with the Gauls, and occupied the countries between the sources of the Arnus and the Po.

Another remove westward brings us to the third peninsula, that of Spain and Portugal, in which we find in early times a very mixed population. These were

¹ *Prichard's Researches*, III, 238. ² *Idem*, III, 238, 239, etc. ³ *Idem*, III, 250. ⁴ *Idem*, III, 234. ⁵ *Idem*, III, 236. ⁶ *Idem*, III, 254.

1. The Celtiberians being a mixture of Celts and Iberians, who mostly occupied the high mountainous region near the sources of the great rivers in the central parts of Spain.¹ These were a fierce and rude people, and the most warlike of Spain. They long retained traits both of their Iberian and Celtic origin.

2. Another Celtic people were in the south-western extremity occupying a considerable country to the southward of the Anas, in Bœtria or Bœturia.²

Another Celtic people also occupied a part of Gallicia, from which the modern name of the province is properly derived.³

We have now glanced at the distribution of the Indo-European race in Europe, and have briefly followed it into its different ramifications. We find in some parts of the Spanish peninsula and in the island of Sicily the remains of a different race which obviously had no affinity with that of the Indo-European. We shall also find the remains of other races in the north of Europe. This has led to the arrangement of all those races having no affinity with the Indo-European under one general term, viz: the Allophyllian.

There is a region of country on the coast of the gulf of Biscay extending on both sides of the Pyrenees,⁴ inhabited by a people of a different race from the Indo-European, speaking a language termed by the French Basque, but by themselves Euskara, and they call themselves Euskaldunes.

The language differs from the Celtic, and from all the Indo-European languages, and is obviously derived from a different stock.⁵ It has some little relation to the Finnish idioms, but more nearly resembles some of the dialects spoken by the aborigines of America, and yet not sufficiently close to indicate that it belongs to the same family of languages.⁶ It is highly artificial in its forms and so compounded as to express many ideas at the same time.⁷

¹ *Prichard's Researches*, III, 32, 33. ² *Idem*, III, 34, 35. ³ *Idem*, III, 35, 36. ⁴ *Idem*, III, 20. ⁵ *Idem*, III, 25. ⁶ *Prichard's Natural History of Man*, 257. ⁷ *Prichard's Researches*, 25.

The people speaking this language have been more generally known as Iberians, and they are a very ancient people. They probably belong to the earliest stock of European nations. Their language has changed less than almost any other European idiom.¹

The Celts, Iberians and Celtiberians (a mixture of Celts and Iberians) were the ancient inhabitants of the Spanish peninsula. Of these the Celts seem to have been the oldest inhabitants of the west, and the Iberians of the eastern parts of Spain.² The Iberians probably preceded the Celts, but could not have long preceded them, otherwise they would have spread over the whole peninsula.

The ancient Iberians were not confined to the Spanish peninsula. Traces of them are found in Aquitaine and the southern part of Gaul.³ The coast of Gaul, from the Rhone westward, was occupied by Iberians, who there lived intermixed with Ligurians.⁴

The Sirani, the ancient inhabitants of Sicily, were of the Iberian stock.⁵ So also were the early occupants of Sardinia and Corsica. Thus we find the remnants of this Allophyllian race somewhat extensively diffused in the southwestern parts of Europe, although wherever found it is generally in fragments.

In the northern parts of Europe and Asia is to be found another Allophyllian race who have been in the occupation of the countries beyond the Baltic, and a tract reaching east almost to the river Yenisei in Asia.⁶ Some parts of this extensive region are still inhabited by the same original stock, while they have been driven from other parts by tribes of German, Slavonian or Tartar origin. This race has no collective name, but each tribe or people has its own particular appellative. They have sometimes been included under the terms Iotuns, Tschüdes, and Ougres.

Of these terms the Iotuns include the western Finns, Esthonians, and Lappes; the Tschüdes, the tribes of middle

¹ *Prichard's Researches*, III, 26. ² *Idem*, III, 47. ³ *Idem*, III, 30, 40. ⁴ *Prichard's Natural History of Man*, 257. ⁵ *Prichard's Researches*, 42-4. ⁶ *Idem*, III, 265.

Russia,¹ both on the Wolga and in Permland; the Ougres or Ugorian tribes, those of the Ural and Siberia.

The investigation of the tribes composing this race is interesting and important so far as concerns the natural history of man. But it is comparatively unimportant as relating to his civil history or the principles and progress of his civilization. The various tribes composing this race, with one single exception, are not subjects of civil history as they have never been progressive. This exception is peculiar, and constitutes a remarkable fact.

The Ugorian tribes were the Wogouls, Ostiaets, and Magyars, and they inhabited a dreary region of country stretching from the Ural mountains eastward into Siberia. The condition of these tribes in that region is as low as can easily be conceived. They are a wandering race, subsisting principally by hunting and fishing. And yet from the degraded Magyars, one of these tribes, originated the Hungarians or people of Hungary.

They were expelled from the southern part of the Uralian mountains by the Turkish tribes of Petschenegers and Chasars and sought refuge in the plains near the lower Danube between A.D. 829 and 842²—their history, traditions and language all identify them as of the same race with the Magyars of the Ural mountains. Soon after their arrival they formed an alliance with the German princes against their common enemies, the Slavonians, whom they expelled from the fertile parts of Hungary in which they formed permanent settlements.³

The mighty difference effected between the degraded, unsocial, wandering Magyar of the Ural mountains, and the lively, witty, warlike, handsome people of Hungary, having European features and a complexion common in that region of country, is to be accounted for in part probably from the improved physical circumstances in which they found themselves placed, on exchanging the rigorous climate and wilderness of their original country, for

¹ Prichard's *Researches*, III, 278. ² *Idem*, III, 323. ³ *Idem*, III, 331.

the fertile plains and rich harvests of Hungary, and in part from the new moral, social, and political relations into which they were brought in consequence of being surrounded by other European nations, that were advancing in civilization. Whatever may have been the causes, the fact is one of interest, and deserving of particular attention.

A glance at the nomadic nations of high Asia, will conclude this ethnographical sketch. There are three principal nomadic nations occupying the great central plateau of Asia. These are the Tungusians, Mongolians and Turks. Of these the Tungusians are situated the farthest east. They are sometimes called the Mand-Shu Tartars.¹ They occupy all the country to the northward of China, between the sea of Japan and the chain of the Siolki hills. They occupy vast spaces in the empire of Russia, being spread along the banks of the Amoor to the Alden mountains, and westward to the middle course of the river Yenisei. West of the Tungusians are the Mongoles or Moguls, extending from the limits of China on the east to the meridian of Lob-hor and the region of Khamil and Turfan, on the west, and from Tibet northward to the chain of Altai, or of Sayan and lake Baikal.

The Turkish nations are still west of the Mongoles, reaching south to the Mus-tagh, the Bolor mountains, or the Belut-tagh and to the Hindo-Khuh. Originating, as is supposed, from the northeast they established themselves in Turkistan and to the northward of the Oxus, which has been the centre of their later migrations into Europe and southern and western Asia.

These three are distinguished from each other by speaking different idioms, though perhaps of cognate origin,² but bear a mutual resemblance in their physical and moral characters, and manner of life. Their languages though not identical and considered as distinct, yet display under a careful analysis,³ such a degree of analogy as proves a

¹ Prichard's *Researches*, iv, 297. ² *Idem*, iv, 296. ³ Prichard's *Natural History of Man*, 204.

distant, but a real family relationship, and one which may well be comparable to the affinity traced among the most separate members of the great Indo-European family.

In relation to the Turkish nations, a fact is presented well worthy of notice, and that is, that they display two different types of countenance and of bodily organization,¹ according as they are found in their original abodes, or in the countries in Europe in which they have established themselves.

The nomadic tribes display still the physiognomy and general characteristics which appear to have belonged originally to the Turkish race.² The Osmanli Turks, on the contrary, which is that part of the race the most anciently civilized, present an arrangement of features,³ and an organization wholly or nearly on the European model. This is a fact analogous to that stated of the Hungarians, and the difference in both cases is probably owing to the action of the same causes.

GEOGRAPHY AND CHRONOLOGY.

Geography and chronology are two sciences important to be considered in connection with history. They have been denominated, not inappropriately, the "two eyes of history." By the first we become acquainted with the developments of man in space, by the other in time. The one furnishes us with a knowledge of the climate, soil, productions, outline of country, mountains, plains, valleys, lakes, seas, rivers, all, in fine, tending to originate those influences that are purely physical. Upon these depend very much the direction and successful prosecution of industrial pursuits, somewhat also political combinations and other things that enter into the civilization of a people. The other chronicles events in the order of time, gives birth to epochs, enables us to compare people of different ages, or the same people at

¹ Prichard's *Natural History of Man*, 210. ² *Idem*, 210. ³ *Idem*, 213.

different periods of time, together. We can note the points of resemblance and points of difference, and from hence derive, in a great measure, the idea of progress.

Chronology must have some remarkable fact to serve as a fixed point from which time may be reckoned either before or after, past or future, or both. Various points have been assumed among different people for this purpose. Among Christian nations two points have been assumed, viz: the creation of the world, and the advent of the Messiah. By the one a certain event is said to occur in such a year A. M., Anno Mundi. By the other it occurs such a year B. C., Before Christ, or A. D., Anno Domini, in the year of our Lord. The Romans computed time from the foundation of their city, and with them an event occurred, Anno Urbis, in the year of the city. The Grecian method of computation was by Olympiads. The first Olympiad from which the reckoning began was in the year 776 B. C. The last was in the 440th year of the Christian era. The interval between two Olympiads was about four of our years.

In the Mahometan world the computation is from the Hegira, an Arabic word signifying flight. The term is meant to designate the flight of Mahomet from Mecca to Medina, afterwards called the city of the prophet. This occurred on the 16th July, A. D. 622.

The early chronology of the world is, at the present day, a very exciting topic. The old Hebrew scriptures have, until recently, been recognized, not only as the earliest written records, but also as furnishing chronological data worthy of implicit reliance. But they teach no system of chronology. They avoid tying up the mind to dates, or linking particular events to particular portions of time. With them it was "In the beginning," that God created the world, and not in the year B. C. 4004. And yet in the statement of successive generations that succeed each other from the creation to the deluge there are vague limits, although indefinite, within which those events must have taken place. This has led to the proposing

different dates, known as the short and long system, by those who take the scriptures as their guide and authority. Thus Archbishop Usher places the creation in the year B. C. 4004, and the deluge in that of 2349 B. C., making the number of years intervening between the two events to be 1655 years. On the other hand Dr. Hales, following the longer chronology of Josephus and the Septuagint, places the creation of the world in the year 5411 B. C., and that of the deluge in 3155, leaving the longer intervening period between the two to be 2256, a little more than six centuries of difference. The first would make the present age of the world to be 5868, and the last 7275 years, thus making a difference of a little over fourteen centuries.

Notwithstanding, however, this long array of centuries the time they furnish is not deemed anywhere near sufficient to satisfy the demands of some of the writers of the present age. The Chevalier Bunsen demands 20,000 years to enable him to reconcile the events of history and the myths and monuments of antiquity with the present advanced stage. It may be remarked in reference to all genealogical computation of time that there is conceded to be an element of uncertainty in any computation which rests upon genealogies, as is so largely the case with the sacred chronology. The genealogies given us since the time of Abraham have been obviously condensed. Why may we not suppose that the antediluvian and ante-Abrahamic genealogies have also been condensed? St. Matthew omitted names from the ancestry of our Lord for the purpose of equalizing the three great periods over which he passes.¹ Moses may have done the same in order to bring out seven generations from Adam to Enoch, and ten from Adam to Noah. Should future discoveries bring to light evidence of a higher antiquity of the race than has hitherto been supposed, it would not impeach the authority of scripture. As the sacred record does not profess to teach chronology, but only to state a few facts of early history,

¹ *Green's Pentateuch Vindicated*, 128.

the generalities under which it states them are sufficient to admit large portions of time to be properly embraced within them.

From the investigations and discoveries of civilization, now making in geology, archæology, and the early stone period in human history, it is rendered quite probable that human life has existed on this planet during a much longer period than has been generally supposed. The efforts of scientific men are, at the present day, strongly enlisted in the endeavor to arrive at some possible conclusions relative to the antiquity of man. Although these cannot now be said to have been crowned with complete success, and explanations may possibly be given to some of the startling facts that have been adduced, yet the evidence in favor of man's great antiquity seems to be accumulating, and the time may come when it will command general assent. The results of well established science are always to be received and welcomed, and it is well, therefore, to understand that in matters of chronology there is no necessary conflict between the sacred records and the conclusions of science.

The years before the flood have sent down to us few, if any, memorials of their existence; and yet the teeming millions that then existed must have made vast advances in civilization. According to the longer chronology those years would cover the period of time extending from the present back to the advent of the Saviour, and almost four hundred years beyond. Thus, admitting all mankind originated from a single pair, the most ample time is afforded for covering large portions of the earth with dense populations, and allowing the arts of civilized life to have acquired a high degree of perfection. The long life that men led before the flood would conduce strongly to both these results. The head of a family could number his descendants by thousands, and the accumulated knowledge and wisdom, in the same individual, of hundreds of years, would be more than equivalent to the successive inheritances which the short lived generations of the present

receive from the past. Noah could almost have conversed with men who had held converse with Adam, and thus the prolonged experience of the early patriarchs must have led to the accumulation of such masses of knowledge as would have advanced all the arts of life to a high degree of perfection. The very wickedness of the old world, which called for such signal vengeance from heaven, is consistent only with large advances in knowledge.

The only real significance which attaches to the inquiry relating to the extent of knowledge and perfection of the arts of life possessed before the flood, concerns the further inquiry as to the condition of those who survived that catastrophe, and the amount of knowledge, and the number, value and perfection of the arts of life which constituted the capital upon which the new world commenced its operations. Many seem to reason as if the experience of the world commenced anew upon the receding of the waters of the deluge, and hence as they gather up evidence of an advanced civilization at a very early period, they argue that the world must have possessed an antiquity far beyond what the Bible record proclaims. But we do not suppose that all the lights of civilization in the old world were extinguished by the deluge. The family of Noah brought into the new the results of antediluvian experience; and were thus prepared to start in the race of life upon the same level at which the record of the old world was made to terminate its probably eventful history.

We have no good reason for believing that the progress of civilization, or the laws by which it is governed, were in any essential respect different before the deluge from what they have been since. We suppose that in all ages the great forces of humanity have ever had a steady progress, a march onward, always advancing and never receding. This has been happily illustrated by the manner in which the ancient Greek torch-race was conducted. The bearers of the torch handed it from one to the other as they became exhausted; no one being allowed to take it up till he is in the flower of youth, and he must hand it over to his

next neighbor as soon as age or accident has weakened his frame or retarded his pace. He then falls back and dies. His neighbor, the fresh youth to whom he delivers it, then carries along the torch till he, too, hands it to another. The torch of the Greek represents the light of civilization. The torch bearers are the different nations or peoples, that, for the time, stood forth as the embodiments of all that humanity had to offer; and, like the vigorous Grecian, bore aloft the torch light of civilization until their energies were exhausted and dying out, when they handed it over to newer and fresher hands. Thus the world's nations and peoples have fallen away and died when their part in the great race of human advancement has been performed, but the lights which they carried have been bequeathed to their successors, and thus, with a constantly increasing brilliancy, have advanced through the receding centuries. The old Chaldean, Assyrian, Babylonian, Persian, Egyptian, Arabian, Hebrew, Grecian, and Roman, have each in their turn borne aloft the torch of knowledge and civilization, and thus have enabled the successive generations of men to walk in the light so far as their powers and capacities would permit. Nor do we suppose that the antediluvian world furnished any exception to this ceaseless law of progress, but that the same system was then pursued until the last torch bearer, Noah, preserving it safely in the ark, launched it in the new world to be borne forward by its oncoming nations.

The inquiry would certainly not be without its interest, whether any monuments or reliable traditions have come down to us from the antediluvian world. But of this it seems we can have no certainty. There have been various speculations in regard to the early condition of the northern part of Asia, going to show from the remains of animals found there, and from other indications, that a mild climate was once enjoyed in Siberia and Spitzbergen, and that probably man and his institutions once flourished there. Indeed, there have been relics of an ancient people discovered near the river Jenesei in the vicinity of Krasnojaisk,

in Siberia.¹ In what is called the Mountain of Serpents there are mines, which were wrought by the hands of that ancient people. Sepulchres have also been opened in which were found tools, arms, and instruments of brass and gold. M. Pallas obtained from these tombs the ends of lances, points of arrows, mallets, or war hammers, daggers very neatly executed, blades of knives, and figures of all kinds of animals melted in brass, and bas-relief. These figures consisted of elks, reindeer, stags, etc., with others entirely unknown. There are no remains of any edifices, nor of any foundations upon which they rested. And yet the people who have thus left their tombs behind them have disappeared from history. There are also traditions of four other lost people, viz: the Atlantides, or inhabitants of the island of Atlantis,² and their enemies who are spoken of by Plato as having contended in battle near the pillars of Hercules, and the Peris and Dives placed by Persian tradition on the other side of Mount Caucasus. The Dives were reputed to be giants, and were the terror of Asia; and it is not a little curious that the traditions of almost all people, not excepting the Hebrews, point back to giant races in the distant past as the progenitors of the present race of men. These five lost people may probably be found reducible to a smaller number, on strictly examining all the traditions concerning them. Yet the question arises how have they disappeared, where have they gone to? If they were submerged in the waters of the deluge their final extinction would be easily accounted for.

Again it is claimed by some that in writings, other than the Hebrew scriptures, there are glimpses to be caught of entire systems of civilization which disappeared from the earth, leaving scarcely any traces behind them; literatures of high antiquity which are only represented by shreds passed through a thousand transformations, and now with difficulty recognizable. Thus the work entitled *The Book of Nabathæan Agriculture* by Kuthami, translated into Arabic

¹ *Bailey's Ancient History of Asia*, II, 200, 201. ² *Idem*, 326.

in the year A. D. 904, is claimed by Professor Chwolson to have been written originally some three thousand one hundred years before Christ, thus carrying it back several centuries before the deluge. The principles of historical criticism have, however, quite effectually disproved this high antiquity. But reference is made in it to some of the ancient sages, such as Adami, Adam, who was considered as the founder of agriculture in Chaldæa, and to whom are attributed certain books, of which, however, Kuthami doubts the authenticity. There can be no doubt on the question of identity, as he bears the title of *Father of Mankind*. So also Ishitha, Seth, the son of Adami, is described as a religious legislator, and as the founder of astrology and of astrolatria. He is even described as having followers, called Ishithians, an organized sect, having a sort of high priest, and numerous writings were circulated under his name. So Enoch, Noah and Abraham are also referred to.

All investigations that seek to look back into the antediluvian world must be more curious than useful, as none of the problems of civilization require for their solution, any passage of that barrier created by the deluge. I shall, perhaps, be reminded that although the descendants of Shem, Ham and Japhet, are in many cases so distinct that there is no difficulty in preserving their identity to each other, and thus tracing them as descendants from a common ancestor, yet the Allophyllian and Turanian races are not thus easily disposed of, and neither in their languages, or habits and customs, approximate so nearly to any others as to bear the same ethnic character. There is some force in this suggestion, but there is much to be attributed to the influence of climate and physical causes in the changes they effect in the physical, moral, and intellectual characters of different people. The single fact that an equatorial climate causes the spontaneous production of every thing necessary to sustain life, thus dispensing with all human labor; and a colder one that fails to stimulate to spontaneous production, thus rendering it necessary that men should exercise their powers to supply their wants,

creates a difference beyond all estimate between the characters, whether physical, intellectual, or moral, of the different peoples that are thus affected. Everything here depends upon development, that being the condition, subject to which life is given. The direction and extent of this must depend upon the efforts and exertions rendered necessary to supply the wants which a colder climate, and a constantly advancing civilization are ever creating. There is, perhaps, as great a difference between different varieties of the Allophyllian and Turanian races as between the Aryan, or Japhetic, and the Semitic, or Shemetic. Men, from the earliest periods, have been migratory in their habits. Their organizations, and the intellectual and moral habits thence resulting, have from a variety of causes ever been subject to great variation. This has led to great difficulties in tracing all mankind to a common source, but those equally great, if not greater, await the attempt to account for the different varieties by special creations at different places and times. There is another mode of accounting for the origin of species, viz: that by variation and natural selection — the Darwinian method of self-development. This has relieved the Creator from devising and giving effect to all those harmonious adaptations between the many varieties of living forms, and the material universe to which they are related; leaving it only necessary for him to create the material universe and the life principle, simply endowing the latter with the capacity of so moulding itself, as to give rise to these many adaptations. This would effectually dispose of the question of different species, but its clear admission is prevented by difficulties that will probably be found insurmountable.

Of the three sons of Noah, the descendants of Ham, the second son, achieved the earliest distinction. His sons were Cush, Misraim, Phut, and Canaan. Of these Misraim peopled Egypt, which is recognized as the "land of Ham." The importance of Egypt to general history will hardly be denied. The Cushite race have been little less important, but their settlements have occasioned greater

difficulty. The former, the descendants of Misraim, seem to have been confined to Egypt with the exception of the Philistine, which is the only Mizraite tribe that we know to have passed into Asia. But Cush is Ethiopia, and one of the principal difficulties presented is whether there was an eastern or Asiatic as well as a western or African Ethiopia. Recent investigations have tended to give a wide domain to the settlements of the descendants of Cush. Many proofs go to show that the Greeks believed in an Asiatic Ethiopia, situated somewhere between Arabia and India, on the shores of the Erythræan sea.¹ According to Strabo, quoting from Ephorus, the Ethiopians were considered as occupying all the south coast both of Asia and Africa, and as divided by the Arabian gulf (which separated the two continents) into eastern and western, Asiatic and African. From the names which on scripture authority were given to the sons and descendants of Cush they are very clearly traced along the southern and eastern part of the Arabian peninsula. The American geography applies the name of Cush or Ethiopia, to the four great regions,² Media, Persia, Susiana, or Elymais, and Asia, or to the whole territory between the Indus and the Tigris. In the scripture statement that Cush begat Nimrod, and the beginning of his kingdom was Babel, and Erech, and Accad, and Calneh, in the land of Shinar, is contained the fact that a primitive Babylonian kingdom is assigned to a people distinctly said to have been Cushite by blood, and to have stood in close connection with Misraim, or the people of Egypt, Phut, or those of central Africa, and Canaan, or those of Palestine. Thus is it asserted in substance that the four races — the Egyptians, Ethiopians, Libyans, and Canaanites,³ were ethnically connected, being all descended from Ham, and also that the primitive people of Babylon were a subdivision of one of these races, viz: of the Cushites or Ethiopians, connected in some degree with the Canaanites, Egyptians, and Libyans,

¹ Rawlinson's *Five Monarchies*, 1, 59. ² *Idem*, 62. ³ *Idem*, 64.

but still more closely with the people which dwelt south of Egypt upon the upper Nile. Upon the same ethnic basis there was grafted, it would seem, at a very early period, a second probably Turanian element, which very importantly affected the character and composition of the people. Thus the conviction is forced upon Rawlinson that "either from ancient monuments, or from tradition, or from the dialects now spoken by their descendants, we are authorized to infer that at some very remote period, before the rise of the Shemitic or Arian nations, a great Scythic [Hamitic] population must have overspread Europe, Asia, and Africa, speaking languages all more or less dissimilar in their vocabulary, but possessing in common certain organic characteristics of grammar and construction."¹

Thus extensive and wide spread appear to have been the Hamitic races. They were the black or dark colored races of men. They were the pioneers of our civilization. They first seized its torch on the landing of the ark, and bore it in triumph over some of the most fertile fields both of Asia and of Africa. They were emphatically the monument builders. On the plains of Shinar, and all along the valley of the Nile from Memphis to Meroe, and in Marib or Seba, and other places in the Yemen and Hadramaut of southern Arabia, they have erected those wonderful monuments, many of which at this day fully attest their greatness and power. It is to their architectural skill and resources that the monuments and mounds that occasionally dot the southern parts of Siberia, and in America are scattered along the valley of the Mississippi down to Mexico and Peru, are still the standing but voiceless witnesses? "For the last three thousand years," says Rawlinson, "the world has been mainly indebted for its advancement to the Semitic and Indo-European races;² but it was otherwise in the first ages. Egypt and Babylon — Misraim and Nimrod — both descendants of Ham — led

¹ *Dictionary of Bible*, III, 1254. ² *History of Five Monarchies*, I, 75.

the way, and acted as the pioneers of mankind in the various untrodden fields of art, literature and science. Alphabetic writing, astronomy, history, chronology, architecture, plastic art, sculpture, navigation, agriculture, textile industry, seem, all of them, to have had their origin in one or other of these two countries." But the very magnitude of effort in this early race seems to have been fatal to its continued success. Like the foremost Greek torch bearer it sank back exhausted, and left to other hands the task of carrying forward the torch of civilization.

Those hands were found in the Semitic and Aryan or Indo-European races. The first mentioned, or the descendants of Shem, occupied the region of country having the highlands of Armenia for its northern boundary;¹ the river Tigris and the ranges beyond it for its eastern, and the Red sea, the Levant and certain portions of Asia Minor as its western. These seem very contracted limits, but the two noble rivers, facilitating both foreign and internal intercourse; the extent of sea-board and desert, presenting long lines of protection against foreign invasion, have proved eminently favorable to the growth and development of this family.

The Aryan, Iranian, Indo-European, or Japhetic races, are said in scripture to have occupied the "isles of the Gentiles" that is the coast lands of the Mediterranean sea in Europe, and Asia Minor,² whence they spread northward over the whole continent of Europe, and a considerable portion of Asia. They finally came to occupy a broad belt of land extending from the shores of the Indian ocean to those of the Baltic and the Atlantic. They embrace the ever restless migratory races, and hence their precise limits are not so clearly definable.

It is these two great races that occupy almost the whole field of history, and which constitute the two poles of the axis of civilization. Indeed, the great current of history is formed mainly by the mingling of two streams, in com-

¹ *Dictionary of Bible*, III, 1251. ² *Idem*, I, 929.

parison with which all its other confluent are but little more than rivulets. The Japhetic, or Indo-European and Semitic nations have preserved their distinctness and individual identity down to the present time. The Jew, or Arab, and the European in the presence of each other, appear almost as unlike as if they were beings of different species; but the conflict of contrary tendencies, the contradictions that are found in different races, may be the very means to evoke harmony, and aid in the great fact of progress. It is certainly an inquiry of great interest and importance, what are the principal contributions furnished by each to the great fact of civilization? or, in what points have each aided in the general advance of man?

1. They have developed each a family of languages: the one termed the Shemitic or Semitic, spoken principally by the Hebrews, Phœnicians, Carthaginians, Syrians, Babylonians, from a certain period, the Arabs, and the Abyssinians. The other is made up of the ancient idioms of Brahmanic India, the different dialects of Persia, the Armenian, many dialects of the Caucasus, the Greek and Latin languages, with their derivatives, the Slavonic, German and Celtic.

2. In the element of industry the Indo-European nations have gone much beyond the Semitic, or the Hamitic. It is true certain branches seem to have had a Hamitic, or Semitic origin. Agricultural industry was largely developed by the Egyptians. The industry of the shepherd state would seem to have been born among the children of Ham and of Shem. The industry of the manufacturer and the merchant found its first permanent home among the Phœnicians. But industry never rose to the dignity of a science, except among the Indo-European nations. It is even among the later developments of some of those nations, particularly the Celtic and Teutonic races. Among the Semitic nations a great portion of labor has been done by slaves. Wherever this has occurred it has sunk the dignity of labor to the low level of menial em-

ployment. While such was its position, it could assert for itself no privileges, nor even rights. The later Celtic and Teutonic races have achieved their emancipation from the slavery to which labor was once doomed, and the Slavic are fast following in the same wake. This has given origin to the science of political economy, a science of modern growth, and which by collecting together and presenting in their natural order, the great principles that preside over all the varieties of labor in its distribution, direction, application, and results, has vastly advanced all the interests of industry, and given to it an importance as an element of civilization which the older races, of the Semitic and Hamitic stock could have had no adequate conception of. It was a mighty advance made when the forces that develop the industry, and are necessary for the support, and continued existence of mankind, were found to be under the government of fixed and immutable laws.

3. But if industry is under so many obligations to the Indo-European nations for its development and advance, religion may be considered as still more largely indebted to the Semitic. The Indo-European, it is true, has possessed veneration, devotion, worship. The things of nature have impressed themselves strongly upon his mind, and awoke in its depths the religious sentiment, but that sentiment was faint and fleeting. "It was like an echo of nature — a sort of nature's hymn — in which the idea of a single cause appeared but fleetingly and with great indistinctness." But as the hymn continued to ascend, its choral echoes awoke the longing for a higher, a purer, a more definite faith. Zoroaster heard them, and called upon the ancient Persian to recognize as the objects of his worship the embodiment of two great principles, the one the author of all good, and the other of all evil. They fell upon the ear of Greece, but the Grecian spirit, lively and imaginative, was too thoroughly imbued with nature, too much absorbed in her mighty hymn, too much entranced by her music, her beauties and her mysteries, to listen to those choral echoes. Still Greece was not entirely satisfied

with her religion, and cast a longing look towards the east. The Roman heard them, and the old Pagan worship was found fast losing its hold upon his stronger, more practical and common sense mind. With him the religion of nature no longer appealed to the imagination, and even addressed itself but feebly to the moral sentiment. The early embodiment of its powers had degenerated into mere legends, at times, it is true, amusing and pointed, but utterly destitute of all religious value. At length the music of that hymn was broken and altogether ceased, when its choral echoes, the response of the human heart, first laid hold of and appropriated the great fact that "In the beginning GOD created the heaven and the earth." This great truth, with all its marvelous precision, revealed through a Semitic nation, scattered all naturalism and pantheism to the winds. The Hebrews had their law, their law-giver, Jehovah, and their book, the Bible, in which was contained the most elevated moral teachings, and the loftiest religious poetry; but along with this was the principle of a narrow formalism and fanaticism, both exclusive and disdainful of foreigners. But in the fullness of time came the Gospel, and with its advent terminated the mission of the Hebrew, the Indo-European races awoke to the realization of a new faith.

4. In the element of government the scene is again changed, and the Indo-European races, bring in by far the largest contributions. Political life is innate and peculiar to Indo-European nations. It is these alone who have known liberty, and been able to comprehend the constitution of the state and the liberty of the subject. We never find among them those great single despotisms, which destroy all individuality, and reduce man to a sort of abstract state and nameless function, as we see prevailing in the east. Theocracy, anarchy, despotism, sum up the political philosophy of the sons of Shem. Even when the prophets of old attacked royalty, it was not in the name of a political right. It was in the name of the theocracy. They seem to have had no idea of the state, of public weal, of public good. They knew no medium between the complete

anarchy of the wandering Arabs and the most sanguinary and unmitigated despotism. It is the Indo-European who may be said to have invented the idea of the state. By him political forces have been organized. The liberty of the subject has been found consistent with the supremacy of law. Man has learnt to render his submission to the law as a compensation for the protection it affords. He has organized governments with checks and balances that serve to prevent their heavy pressure, and secure their continued existence. The great problem has been to ascertain the exact point at which the greatest possible amount of personal liberty may coexist with the mildest system of law that is adequate to its protection.

5. In the element of society we recognize a great advance by the Indo-European. At the foundation, and serving as the basis of everything appertaining to the social element, we recognize the marriage relation. An error, mistake, or wrong done there vitiates the whole social fabric, and implants a clog, a dead weight, if not a poisonous upas in the very sources of enjoyment. The sons of Shem inaugurated the principle of polygamy, and the life of the Semite, in all its social bearings, has felt its severe and unrelenting pressure. Those nations of the Indo-European race, who have adopted the principle of monogamy, have provided the means of making great advances in every thing pertaining to the social element.

6. In the element of philosophy we shall be compelled to acknowledge our indebtedness to the thinkers of the Indo-European race. It has been well remarked that "the search into causes, knowledge for the sake of knowledge, is a thing of which there is no trace previous to Greece; a process we have learnt from her alone. Babylon had science, but not the real element of science, an absolute fixidity of the laws of nature. Egypt had knowledge of geometry, but she did not produce the elements of Euclid. As to the old Semitic mind, it was in its nature anti-philosophical and anti-scientific." The utmost wisdom of the Semitic nations resolves itself into parables and proverbs.

Much has been said of Arabian science and philosophy, and during a portion of the middle ages it seemed as if the world was about to bow to the supremacy of the Arabian mind.¹ The Arabian sages seemed to sit at the fount of human knowledge, ready to dispense its blessings to all who desired their enjoyment. But on more thorough examination the ideas were found to be more Grecian than Arabian, and the sages themselves Spaniards and Persians, and not Arabs. The Semitic mind seems never to have been adapted to indulge in speculative thought. It never troubled itself with the great problems of thought and being. It was, perhaps, all the better fitted to receive and transmit the revelations of God to man. There is one man of Hebrew lineage among the great philosophers, and that is Spinoza. With that exception we should be troubled to find any who have even attempted to thread the abstruse labyrinths of metaphysical inquiry. This has been the self-imposed task of the Indo-European.

In moral science the Semitic mind has manifested considerable capacity. The code of Moses contains exalted ideas of right. But that is a revelation. So the morality of the gospel is of a similar character. In the Semitic race there is little evidence of that moral feeling which seems to be the peculiar inheritance of the Germanic and Celtic races. "The tender, deep, and melancholy emotions, those dreams of the infinite in which all the powers of the soul are mingled, that great consciousness of duty, which alone gives a solid basis to our faith and our hopes, are the work of the Indo-European races."

7. And to what races is the element of art the most largely indebted? Setting aside the monuments early erected by the Hamitic races, it is very easy to see that the arts of design are little indebted to any but the Indo-European races. It is true that in the times of the Saracenic glory, the Arabians exhibited a taste and skill in architectural art which has been much celebrated. The ruins of the Alham-

¹ *Nabathæan Agriculture*, 127.

bra in Spain, and the splendid structures in Bagdad are illustrations. It is safe, notwithstanding, to assert that the Semitic mind is little given to art. It possesses as little of art as of speculative philosophy. In the poetic art, however, the Hebrew has achieved a high position. His poetry, although furnishing no positive school, yet is admired for its splendor and ideality. The psalms have ever been admired by all those who have a true and earnest devotion to the Muses. Their subject is poetic—the destiny of man—his melancholy vicissitudes, his uneasy search into causes, his occasional complaint against heaven. The Hebrew poetry has no doubt exerted a salutary influence in moulding the minds of some of our sublimest poets. Milton must have drunk deep at this fountain, as his genius is somewhat tinged with the spirit of the psalms.

It is clearly apparent from all these considerations that the future of civilization must depend upon the Indo-European nations or races. They are its torch bearers, and to them it must belong successively or together, to carry forward the burdens and the blessings of civilization to the millions who are to throng the future.

CHAPTER II.

ELEMENTS OF HUMANITY — NOMADIC AND SETTLED RACES;
PLATEAU OF CENTRAL ASIA ; SCYTHIANS, HUNS, TURKS.

Design.—The design in what follows is to afford some contribution to the history of civilization. By civilization is meant the development, more or less perfect, of all the active instincts, propensities, and principles of human nature, which results in the progressive advancement of society, and of the individual. Civilization is the more refined and perfect in proportion as the development of the lower and grosser instincts and propensities becomes modified, restrained and subordinate to the high moral sentiments and principles with which our nature is endowed. To note the progress and attainment made by nations in this development is our object.

Method.—The method to be adopted and pursued is

I. To notice the geographical situation of the country inhabited by the nation, or people under review. Its leading physical peculiarities. Its climate, system of mountains, rivers, staple productions, the adaptations of its soil. Its facilities for commercial intercourse, all with the view of discovering the harmonies existing between human progress and development, and the place where it occurred, or between the performance and the theatre upon which it was enacted.

II. In the second place, to give a brief outline of the principal historical events, to which the nation, or people has given birth. Allusion to their great men, who have represented the nation, and to the most striking events in which it was an actor. The multiplicity of events, together with their complexity, will render it necessary to make a careful selection, and allude in the briefest terms only to

those that are supposed to have influenced the character and destiny of the nation.

III. To trace out, as clearly as possible, the development of the people composing the nation of what may be termed the six great elements of humanity. By the term elements is here meant those primary instincts, propensities, sentiments and principles of our nature, that severally manifest themselves in industry, in religion, in society, in government, in philosophy, and in art.

Each one of these has a different foundation. Industry is founded on the idea of the useful, religion on that of the holy, or divine, society on that of the agreeable, government on that of the just, philosophy on that of the true in itself, and art on that of the beautiful, or sublime.

The primitive world was bestowed upon man in a crude, disordered state and condition. The elements of nature were originally his enemies. All was hostility. By means of industry enlightened in its direction, persevering in its application, that primitive world became changed in its appearance, and those elements from destructive agents became instruments of progress. It has ever been the peculiar province of industry, to create value out of things in themselves valueless. Industrial pursuits are extremely various, and have multiplied as civilization has advanced. From the simple hunter and shepherd state in which the primitive nations are found, the advance has been first to agricultural, and then to great varieties of mechanical, manufacturing and commercial industry. Its successful efforts procure sustenance, and thus the first want of man becomes satisfied—the want of the body; the demand of his physical nature for food. This want would be equally imperative whether the individual was alone in the universe, or in the midst of society. Many of the principles that preside over the direction of industry have become fixed and settled, and are embodied in a distinct science—the science of political economy. Under this element will be included, those arts that belong strictly to the useful, and are embraced in some one of the varieties of

industrial pursuit. This is clearly an element that civilization cannot dispense with, and hence its history should exhibit its development by different nations, or peoples.

Next to the want of the body, which is satisfied by industry, is experienced a want of the soul, which is satisfied by worship. Here we arrive at the element of religion, which is founded on the holy or divine. Man has been ever seeking to find out God. There is hardly an agent of power in nature, or production of the humblest origin, from the sun down to an onion, that has not at different times and places been elevated to the rank of deity. Religion claims to appropriate one peculiar exercise of our spiritual nature, and that is faith. It demands of us the obedient homage of every power we possess, and that is worship.

The objects of worship have had almost an infinite variety. Feticism, Sabaism have prevailed to great extents. Various forms of idolatry have been witnessed among different peoples. Paganism, Judaism and Mahometanism have long continued to sway immense masses of men. Christianity, with its purer faith, and spiritual worship, is winning its way among men by its looks of love, its voice of mercy, and its soul of sympathy.

The rites, ceremonies, forms, and observances are as numerous as the deities worshiped. These have taken much of the time and engrossed much of the attention of men.

This want of the soul exists alike whether man is in solitude or in the bosom of society. Its distinctness, method of manifestation, importance, influence in life and death all point it out as an element which it is the province of civilization in its progress to develop.

Man finds himself by the want of his body satisfied by industry. He finds his God by the want of his soul satisfied by religious worship. He finds his kind by the want of society supplied by social intercourse. Thus society may well rank as the third element of humanity. It is founded on the idea of the agreeable, as in all the move-

ments of general society the desire to be pleasing and agreeable is of all others the most prevailing. This is more particularly observable where society has made the greatest progress, and has become the most refined. In all, even the grossest form, the social instinct in man is possessed of great strength and activity.

Under this element will come to be considered the manners and customs of a people; their forms of intercourse with each other; their social habits and usages; all that society develops within itself, or produces in outward manifestation.

Society is the dispenser of reputation. It can enforce its own decrees by its own peculiar sanction. It rewards its favorites by conferring upon them a desirable reputation. It punishes its delinquents or enemies by dispensing to them the miseries of a blasted name.

Industry appropriates to itself political economy, religion theology, and society politeness. We shall see that society has many varied forms. It has also a progress and a history. It is rude and often disgusting in its displays in the infancy of a people. Among the same people it may arise to a high degree of refinement. It is the great engine of that same public opinion, which, as the world grows enlightened and free, becomes more and more the arbiter of individual and even national destiny.

Society, especially in its ruder state, cannot long exist without government. In its bosom are engendered rights, and the invasion of these produces wrongs. Hence the necessity of government, which, armed with the powers assumed or confided to it, enforces the rights by redressing the wrongs. Government is society organized, and armed with moral or physical power, or both, sufficient to protect it against its own members, and against the aggression of foreign bodies. Its design is to enforce obedience to law; to represent the people in its relations with other governments, and thus perform its proper part in the great drama of general politics. It presents several varieties. There are commonly reckoned three primitive forms of govern-

ment. The first is monarchical or despotic, where all the power is lodged in one man.

This is the height of power, and the height of danger. It tends to efficiency in action because of its unity in counsel. It acts generally through the agency of fear, but despots are sometimes great benefactors. Another primitive form is aristocracy, where the power is lodged in a body of nobles. In this body every measure is discussed, before its adoption, and hence wisdom is said to be displayed in the movement of aristocracies. The third primitive form is democracy, where the people come together in their collective capacity, and direct themselves the helm of state. As the masses of people have no possible interest in doing otherwise than right, virtue is said to be the principle upon which democracies are administered.

These primitive forms have seldom been found in actual existence. The despot has had his power more or less circumscribed. Aristocracies have seldom been found without a democratic or monarchical element, and democracies in their pure state have rarely if ever existed. They all seem to be giving place very generally to constitutional monarchies with checks and balances, and representative republics, where all power actually resides with the people, to be delegated by them as they find will best promote their own interests. The experience of mankind in relation to governments has taught where the executive, legislative and judicial branches of power can be best deposited with reference to their own safety, and harmonious action. Government is founded on the idea of the just, and presents its embodiment in the state. That government is the best which governs least, and the ultimate office of government may be to serve as a mere moral engine to enforce public opinion. This also has a science. Its principles and their application are embraced in the science of government and general politics.

Under the protection of government and law the social element is permitted to exercise itself in a variety of ways, and society exhibits many combinations. The religious

element is also left free to select, arrange, and perfect its form of worship. Industry is protected in its labors, encouraged in its efforts, and rendered safe in its accumulations. Man is relieved from the pressure of physical want, can attend to the wants of the soul, to the exercise of the social instinct, and often to the gratification of ambitious aspirations by obtaining a prominent position in the administration of government. But other wants now take possession of him. His intellectual nature puts in its claims for development, and the power of thought begins to be manifested.

This introduces the element of philosophy. Humanity has clearly not exhausted her capacities until she has thought. Industry was founded upon the idea of the useful, religion upon that of the holy or divine, society upon that of the agreeable, government upon that of the just, while philosophy reposes upon that of the true in itself.

There are two different forms of thought. They may be styled the involuntary and the voluntary. The first consists of the train of ideas which, in the waking state, and to some extent in the sleeping, is constantly passing through the mind. The materials of it consist very much of "such stuff as dreams are made of." It is generally a very profitless form of thought. We have not the power to arrest this train, but we can control the direction which it may take, and in doing this, a new element is introduced, volition, will, which brings us to the second or voluntary form. The essence of this form is reflection, a power which the mind exercises over its own thought. The involuntary form is spontaneous. The mind is rather passive than active. It is a form which springs up and is continued without any active interference of the will. The voluntary is reflective. The powers of the mind are here tasked, and perform at the bidding of a master. It is this form that principally originates, discovers, invents, erects its splendid structures of reason. Reflection is philosophy, and whoever first reflected was the first philosopher.

Philosophy has had a progress and a history. The thinking of the world has been done in comparatively few

minds. The ordinary routine of life neither originates nor requires reflection, certainly not to any extent. The world's philosophers have been its great thinkers. Confucius, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Descartes, Bacon, and many others stand proudly preeminent in this great element of humanity, the exercise of original thought. They have given origin to many schools, the Academic, Peripatetic, Stoic, Epicurean, Baconian, and some others in which their peculiar forms of thought were particularly developed.

The systems introduced, and urged forward for acceptance, have been different and sometimes founded upon opposite principles. One, for instance, is based entirely upon self-love, another upon disinterested benevolence. One adopts the sensuous system, deriving all thought from sense, another that of pure intellection, tracing many, or all things, to a primitive reason. There has been diversity, perhaps equally as great, in the method of philosophizing. One adopts the analytic method, another the synthetic. To one the syllogistic course seems the best calculated to elicit the truth; to another, the inductive process appears altogether preferable.

This element includes all the forms of thought, and, like a faithful mirror, reflects all the attainments of humanity. All that man has done existed previously as the subject of his thought. The speculative has been, perhaps, the most generally understood, as more strictly embracing philosophy. But the practical should be equally included. The province of philosophy is to investigate and develop the principle of things. In industry she is the essence of its application; in religion the aid and guide of its inspiration; in society the soul of intercourse; in government the spirit of its action; and in art beauty of proportion. She is the true expositor of all elemental modifications; of all the principles of action; of all the modes of existence.

And yet there is one other element beyond that of philosophy. It is that in which thought is realized in some form of beauty, or sublimity. It is the element of art.

Here is opened a new world to the enraptured vision, a world all engrossing, and full of absorbing interest. It is the special province of art to visit all nature's productions, and to extract from all forms their peculiar beauties. She visits the cave, the cabin and the bower, and models upon each a style of architecture. She casts a searching glance at the human form, in all its beauty of proportion, and from the shapeless block, at her bidding, starts forth the sculptured statue, the all but speaking, moving marble. She looks upon the noisy brook, with its rocky bed and pebbly border, and forthwith, we behold it "murmuring down her painted landscape." She extracts from the flower its beauty, and from the "grass its glory." She gathers up all that is beautiful, sublime and grand in nature, and then calls upon mind to supply what is deficient, to remedy what is defective. She is thus enabled to add beauty to the beautiful, sublimity to the sublime, and to originate a felicity in design, a completeness in execution, a perfection in model, which is attainable only when the forms of nature are cast in the mould of mind.

Art is, however, by no means limited to material forms alone as the trophies of her triumphs. She marshals her hosts on the battle field, and presides there amid all that is terrific and fearful in sanguinary conflict. She persuades and energizes, and urges onward with resistless force by her oratory. She stirs the deep emotions of the human soul by her poetry. She awakens to a sense of the most ecstatic delight by her music. With all this in view, no one will deny to art a mighty mission in its influence and effect upon human destiny.

These are all the elements of humanity. To separate them from each other, and completely to develop them, exhausts the capacities of the race. What can remain to man after fully developing all that appertains to the useful, to the holy, to the social, to the just, to the true in itself, and to the beautiful and sublime.

Although there appears to be an order of succession in these elements, yet they are not strictly successive in their

development. They are rather simultaneous, as no people can well exist among whom there is not some industry, religion, society, government, philosophy and art: they may exist in a state of envelopment, in which each will be more or less imperfect, and not unfrequently influenced and controlled by some one that is central and more prominent than all the others. The separation of the elements from each other will be found to be successive, in order that each, when separated, may receive its full share of development, and be carried out into all its variety of applications.

The task undertaken is to bring under review :

1. The fact that in the extreme orient, as India and China, these elements have existed in a state of envelopment.

2. To notice the fact that men are all included in one of two great divisions, either the nomadic or wandering tribes, or the settled, having fixed permanent habitations.

3. To bring briefly under review the nomadic races, to show the influence and agency exerted and exercised by them in the general affairs of the world, and the contributions, if any, made by them to the great fact of human progress.

4. To take up that division which includes the fixed, settled, permanent tribes of men; to commence with the ancient Chaldæan, Babylonian and Medo-Persian, Assyrian empires, holding dominion on the banks of the Tigris and Euphrates; to travel from thence westward, taking up and passing under review the several states, kingdoms and empires as they successively rose, flourished and fell.

5. To notice as clearly as possible the times at which the different elements became separated from each other; and the people by or among whom such separation occurred.

6. In taking up each state, kingdom or empire the course will be

1. To dwell briefly upon the geography of the country, its physical character and peculiarities.

2. To give a brief outline of the chain of historical events, that which constitutes the outward history of the nation or people.

3. To examine in what respect, and how far, the nation or people have developed each one of the six elements of humanity, viz: industry, religion, society, government, philosophy, and art. This, in contradistinction to the last, may be styled its interior history. It is in the separation and development of these elements that the problem of civilization is to be solved. A complete account of what each state or people has successively done in this separation and development, would furnish a perfect history of civilization. In working out this problem, in giving birth to this history, each state or people has undoubtedly had its own peculiar mission, which it has faithfully performed. Each and all have contributed to the great fact of human progress, so that humanity, for her present advanced condition, stands a debtor to all her sons.

The history of our race has been hitherto read and regarded too much as a mere mass of particulars. The events it details have been considered more with reference to themselves merely, than as presenting the successive undivided links of one continuous chain. It is time we should profit from the lessons of the past. It is time we undertook to comprehend the great volume of our history as a whole; to observe the agency of each event in the formation of that whole; and, in this manner, to seek for the elements of order amid the apparent evidences of confusion.

In the constitution of the material universe we have not failed to discover proofs of the most perfect order. From the beauties of proportion, and the harmonies of arrangement, and the mutual adaptations existing between its diversified parts, and between each part and the whole, arises the inference, that to warrant the introduction of a new principle into its operations would require a new modeling of the entire whole.

In the phenomena of intellect are exhibited evidences of the same order. The complicated machinery of mind;

the nice adjustment of its faculties; the accurate balancing of its powers; the modifying influence of each upon all, and of all upon each, indicate with a clearness, setting all doubt at defiance, that the master mover has there left his impress.

Nor these only. In the adaptation of the material universe to the human mind; in the felicitous agency of the one in calling forth the dormant faculties of the other; in the higher harmonies of man with his material domicile; we recognize, if possible, still more distinctly, the agency of him, who is alike traceable in the order of the material universe, and in the happy arrangement of the human mind.

But do all evidences of the existence of order rest here? It would be indeed, extraordinary, if in this vast material theatre so orderly arranged; if with these actors so systematically constituted; if with these adaptations and harmonies existing between the actor and his theatre of action; the performance itself should display no order, nor arrangement, nor plan, nor system. It cannot be so. In the great volume of human actions, the Creator has also left a record of himself.

In proof of this assertion let us boldly interrogate history. Let us ask it to furnish evidences of the same profound order; of the same regular arrangement; of the same mighty plan; of the same comprehensive system, leading us irresistibly to the conclusion, that the material world, that the human mind, and that human acts, all originate from the same source, because they all exist subject to the same law, the law of order.

That intellect should be held in little estimation, that is, content to stop at the mere event, or that seeks no higher warrant for its occurrence than the immediate motive actuating its originator. Acts and events are of little importance in themselves considered. It is chiefly as the evidences of things not seen that they become important. They result necessarily from the spirit of the era in which they occur, and indicate its true direction. From the cha-

characteristics of its events must the predominating spirit of an era be collected. They are the true form under which its peculiarities are developed.

The history of humanity is divisible into as many distinct eras, as there have been different spirits, successively exercising a controlling influence in human affairs. By the term spirit, is here meant the prevailing principle discernable in the whole course of the events of any given period, and to which, as an efficient cause, those events are referable. Each era has not only had its own spirit, but also its own distinct theatre, or portion of this world's surface to which its operations have been chiefly confined.

The great drama of history opens in Asia. There we see exhibited the infancy of man, and there, in its southern and eastern parts, that infancy still continues. All the elements are there enveloped in each other, or so intimately blended together as to preclude the action of each without rendering necessary that of all.

Industry, religion, society, government, philosophy and art—these form one mingled mass. No attempt at separation. No effort at development. We see everywhere exhibited the same dull, dead uniformity; the same Sahara of the mental and moral world.

It is true there is a peculiar kind of civilization prevailing both in India and China. There are certain arts known, and some that are practiced there. Science is not unknown there except in its practical results. The Hindoos and Chinese seem to acquire by rote, without possessing the power of making any application to practice. The appearance is much the same as when scientific truths are acquired by school boys, who should always remain such, and thus be ever incapable of using them for the ends and purposes for which they were designed. Thus the inhabitants of India and China have possessed the torch of science, but they have kept it burning in a dark lantern. They may be said to have possessed knowledge without wisdom, and force without power. The effect of this envelopment, or intimate mingling of the elements, has been to render

man nothing. Society by its castes, and government by its despotism, made him a slave; while both religion and philosophy rendered him a creature of destiny.

NOMADIC OR WANDERING RACES.

The people we have been considering have fixed, permanent habitations. There are also nomadic wandering races of men among whom these elements seem enveloped and commingled with each other. These races from the earliest period of time have played no unimportant part in the great drama of history. They can neither be called civilized themselves, nor have they been the direct instruments of civilization, and yet no one can doubt their agency in general history. They may, perhaps, answer the same general purpose that the wandering comets do to the settled planetary system; that the currents of the ocean do to the great mass of its waters; or that the winds, hurricanes and tornadoes do to the whole body of the atmosphere. They may freshen and invigorate even when they overturn and destroy.

By wandering nomadic races is intended only those who pursue an unsettled, wandering life; not those tribes of barbarians that occasionally emigrate, but have, nevertheless, fixed permanent abodes. The races that lead this kind of life are found in deserts dotted here and there with oases, and also on the great plateau of Central Asia. The influence exercised by physical causes over human destiny is, perhaps, nowhere more fully proclaimed than in the connection existing between the physical peculiarities of the country inhabited by these races, and their singular habits of life.

No one can for a moment contemplate the great plateau of Central Asia, and the nomadic hordes that roam over its surface, without feeling that some mighty purpose was to be answered in some period of our world's history by this singular anomaly; let us attend first to the physical

characteristics, and second to the races that have wandered there from time immemorial.

In order to understand the physical formation of high Central Asia, we must examine the mountain ranges and the lofty plains lying between them. These ranges are :

1. The Altai range, the golden mountain of the Tartars.¹ The Altai mountains proper are the western part of the range. This is continued east by the Sayanian mountains, and further east still by the Kentai and the Daourian mountains.² These, towards the north-east, join the Sablonnai Krebet or Apple mountains. These are continued by the chain of Aldan to the shore of the Pacific ocean. This immense chain traverses the Asiatic continent from east to west, between the forty-eighth and fifty-first degrees of north latitude. On the northern slopes of this range lies the frozen region of Siberia, extending north to the frozen ocean.

2. The Himalayan chain or range, which strictly commences with Mount Taurus in Asia Minor, which extending through Armenia, and the countries to the south and south-east of the Caspian, through the northern part of Media, Hyrcania, Parthia, and Bactriana, till it reaches Great Bucharia, or the ancient Sogdiana.³ Here it divides into two branches, one taking a north-easterly, the other a south-easterly direction. The south-eastern branch passes through Great and Little Thibet, at one time bearing the name of the Mustag or Snowy mountain, being a branch of the ancient Imaus, at another swelling to the lofty heights of the Himalaya, twenty-five thousand feet above the level of the sea. This is the southern wall of mountains, and separates high Asia from the Indian peninsulas on the south.

Between these two mountain ranges lay two other, running also from east to west.⁴ One of them the Thian Shan, or the Zengri-tagh or the mountains of Heaven,⁵ travers-

¹ Prichard's *Researches*, iv, 280. ² Heeren's *Persian Researches*, i, 5, ³ *Idem*, i, 6, 7. ⁴ Prichard *Researches*, iv, 281. ⁵ *Idem*, iv, 281, 283.

ing Asia about the 42° of north latitude, and culminating in a mass of hills having three summits termed Bogheda Oola, or the Holy mountain. This chain lies next south of the Altai system of mountains.

The other lying between the Thian-shan and Himalayan chain is the Kuen-lun,¹ which, together with the Himalaya are bifurcations from one common nucleus of mountains. This nucleus is the Hindú-Khúh² or more probably, the high table land of Pamer. This table land has an elevation of 15,600 feet, and has been termed the roof of the world. These two branches the Kuen-lun and the Himalaya diverge as they extend eastward, the former keeping nearly due east, and the latter inclining towards the south.

The extensive region of country included between these immense mountain ranges is bounded on the west by a transverse mountain range extending from north to south, called the Bolor or Belut-tagh mountains,³ the Imaus of the ancients, which meet and traverse at right angles the direction of the Kuen-lun and the Himalaya, and which separates high Asia on the west from the basins of the Aral and Caspian seas.

To the east the mountain range which forms the wall of this central upland is the long chain of the Kin-gan-oola or Tushan mountains, which faces China and divides that country from Tartary.⁴

From the slopes of these mountain ranges run down the great rivers that flow through the lower kingdoms and empires of Asia.⁵ From the southern Himalayan ridge, flow the Indus, Sutlej, Ganges, Brahmaputra, Irawadi and Mehong; from the eastern Kinganoolian ridge,⁶ or through its defiles, the Ho-ang-ho or Yellow river, the Ta Kiang or great river of China, and the Amur or Sagalian of eastern Tartary, which flow into the sea of Japan and the Pacific ocean. From the northern border of this table land descend the waters of the Lena, the Yenisei, the Obi and

¹ *Prichard's Researches*, 285. ² *Idem*, 285. ³ *Idem*, 286. ⁴ *Idem*, iv, 286
⁵ *Idem*, iv, 291. ⁶ *Idem*, iv, 296.

the Irtysh, while on the west the rivers Oxus and Saxartes pour their waters into the sea of Aral.

The disposition of the highlands included between these mountain ranges,¹ and the direction of the valleys of these rivers and the defiles leading into the lower regions of Asia, have exercised great influence on the movements of the nomadic tribes, and on the destinies of the nations that have been desolated or destroyed by their ravages.

The entire region included within these mountain ranges, bears the character of a vast insulated upland,² and its extent and average elevation being taken into account, it may be said to form the most considerable projection on the surface of our planet.

The elevation of this region of country is various. Its average elevation has been estimated at from eight to ten thousand feet.³ The Iranian highland or western high Asia has had ascribed to it a medium elevation of four thousand feet above the level of the sea.

The great central plateau included within the four mountain ranges before mentioned is subdivided by the two mountain chains, the Thian-shan and the Kuen-lun into three parallel regions,⁴ which, though of great elevation, yet, relatively to each other, form three valleys containing the basins of rivers which, finding no outlet, pour their waters into inland lakes or seas. In each one of these valleys is one or more inland lakes or seas,⁵ having no visible outlet, into which are poured the waters of one or more rivers. In one is Lake Balkash which receives the river Ili. In another the Lop Nor into which roll the waters of the Tarina, the common channel in which the rivers of Kashgar, of Khoten and Yarkiang unite their streams.⁶ Nearly in the centre of the third great valley is the Lake of Zengri or of Heaven.

From these physical arrangements it is obvious that this great central plateau has a system of its own, peculiar to

¹ Prichard's *Researches*, iv, 281. ² *Idem*, iv, 288. ³ *Idem*, iv, 287. ⁴ *Idem*, iv, 288. ⁵ *Idem*, 289. ⁶ *Idem*, 290.

itself, little connected with the rest of the world; that its own waters are evaporated, and again descending replenish its own streams and lakes or seas.

On this high, cold region there is almost an entire destitution of woods and forests, but for the most part it is covered with herbage, which occasionally attains such a luxurious growth as to equal the height of the cattle that feed there.¹

This lofty upland has had, in relation to man and his development in history, a destiny as important as its physical characteristics are peculiar. Its extensive surface has, from the earliest times,² been dotted, not with houses and cities, but with tents and encampments. It has furnished the immense pasture lands where have been reared those numerous flocks and herds of sheep and cattle, horses and camels, which have afforded the sustenance, as they constituted the wealth of the nomadic or wandering races. On this high table land man has ever been a wanderer. Here have roamed the Scythian of the ancient, and the Turk, Tartar, Mongol and Tungusian of the modern world. It is the land of shepherds and herdsmen, who have never had any fixed habitation or property in the soil; who, although they have in some instances adopted the settled habits of the nations they subdued, yet have never experienced any change, while on this lofty upland. Substantially the same appearances are there presented now as have been from the earliest periods of time. The soil is property common to all;³ and when one district of country is exhausted, they have only to migrate with their numerous flocks and herds to another district where they can find fresh pasturage.

Here has been from time immemorial, the great store house of nations. The more settled civilized nations have run their rounds of luxury and degeneracy, and paved the way for their own destruction. Here have ever been rearing hardy races, who have possessed no wants, but

¹ *Heeren's Persian Researches*, 12. ² *Idem*, 12. ³ *Idem*, 13.

those which nature gave, and which she therefore can supply; whose habits of life have been marked by extreme simplicity, and whose social relations have been much influenced by the peculiarities of their situation. Each race instead of spreading out and giving origin to different nations, has been subdivided into many tribes, and these tribes have sometimes so increased in numbers as to become split into hordes, each embracing a larger, or smaller number of families according to circumstances. The bond of consanguinity is possessed of great strength. These hordes and tribes have occasionally become united under some commanding genius, some Attila, Zenghis Khan, or Tamerlane, and then they have descended, like a destructive avalanche, into the domain of civilization, marking their pathway with ruin, and causing great revolutions in the history of mankind. This may have been designed, as the world's great ventilator; to replenish the stagnant atmosphere of civilization with the freshness of man in his original simplicity. As these races seem born to a different destiny from that which awaits civilized man, it is interesting to inquire briefly what history has to relate of them.

They have no records of their own, or none that can furnish any connected series of events. It is only when they have descended from their lofty upland, and have mingled in scenes and among men, who have a past as well as a present, that history has been enabled to record and transmit their acts.

There is much reason to believe that at periods of time anterior to history, colonies from these countries and from the high table land of Persia¹ made their way into distant parts of the earth, and that nations are descended from them who, with a change of abode, have changed their habits, and become civilized and populous. From one or both of these sources three waves of population have successively swept over Europe. One was the

¹ *Prichard's Researches*, iv, 292.

Cimmerian and Celtic wave, which probably preceded the others, and stayed not its progress until it had reached the extreme western coasts of Europe.

The second was the Scythian, Gothic, or German wave, which seems to have followed upon the Cimmerian and Celtic, and occupied central Europe. The resemblance in language to the ancient Zend would furnish the presumption that this wave originated on the table land of Persia.

The third and most recent was the Slavonic and Sarmatian, which rolled only over the eastern portions of Europe, being probably arrested in its progress by the Scythian, Gothic or German, which it found occupying the central parts of Europe.

Down the Altaic border of high Asia towards the north-west descended the Finnish and Ugrian tribes, who first established themselves in the valleys and pasture lands of the Uralian mountains, whence their colonies spread into Europe,¹ occupying the countries extending to the Baltic and to Scandinavia, where they met, advancing from the south the Germanic, old Parthenian and Slavic race. In the warfares occurring between these two races, the Finno-Ugrian and Indo-European, the latter were so very much the superior, that only one tribe of the former, namely, the Magyars, were enabled to maintain themselves permanently in the midst of Europe. Their early conversion to Christianity and civilization probably enabled them to do this. These are the inhabitants of Hungary.

The next wave of population that rolled down the northern mountain barrier was the Samoiedes, who occupy the shores of the frozen ocean from Archangel in Europe to the Yenesei in Asia.

Beyond these to the east the Yakutes of the Lena, are proved by their language to be of the Turkish race, and beyond these still the Tungusians stretch from the Lena to the Pacific ocean.²

¹ *Prichard's Researches*, IV, 293. ² *Idem*, IV, 294.

From the eastern border of this central plateau descended the ancestors of the Chinese, who, according to their traditions were a little horde of barbarians in the forest of Shensi,¹ wandering without settled habitations, clothed in skins and feeding on insects and roots.

From the south-eastern branch of the plateau, along the courses of the Mehon, Irawadi, and other large rivers, descended the inhabitants of the Indo-Chinese peninsula.

Whether the Tamulian race of the Deccan is kindred with the nomadic races of Central Asia, seems not yet to be settled, but the Malayans in their physical character afford strong evidence that they are of the same original type.

The descents of these warrior shepherds within historical periods have been quite numerous, and many of them marked with circumstances of great barbarity. The earliest, but probably not the first, was when the hordes of Scythians from beyond the river Araxes invaded Media, which occurred prior to the eclipse foretold by Thales.²

After a considerable interval occurred the dismemberment and conquest of the Greek empire in Bactria and India by the Turushkas.³

Next in order followed the terrible Hunns, whose mission to the world seems to have been that of the avenger. They are supposed to have come from the borders of China. Hordes of their race destroyed the armies of Chosroes, and thus prepared the way for the conquest of Persia by the Moslems.⁴ These hordes belonged to that division of the Hunns sometimes called the White Hunns, who, in the migration of their race from the east, directed their march towards the Oxus, and established their dominion on the plains of Sogdiana, on the eastern side of the Caspian.⁵

The other division directed their march towards the Volga. With their flocks and herds, their wives, children,

¹ *Prichard's Researches*, IV, 294. ² *Idem*, IV, 292. ³ *Idem*, IV, 292. ⁴ *Idem*, IV, 292. ⁵ *Gibbon*, 421.

dependents and allies they crossed the Volga, and on the plains between that river and the Tanais encountered the Alani, a warlike and savage people,¹ who lived in tents, whose object of worship was a naked scimitar fixed in the ground, and whose most desirable trappings were the scalps of their enemies. On the banks of the Tanais these hordes encountered each other in terrible conflict. The Hunns were victorious. The Alani were defeated, their king slain, some colonized other countries. But the greatest part of the nation incorporated with the Hunns, and their mingled masses moved onward to invade the Gothic empire.

This empire under the great Hermanric then extended from the Baltic to the Euxine. Its repose was invaded by the Hunn with his shrill voice, uncouth gestures, broad shoulders,² flat nose, almost beardless face, and small black eyes deeply buried in the head. This was in the year A. D. 375. The Goths were entirely overthrown, and their fragments, gathering together, crowded to the banks of the Danube, which separated their dominions from those of the eastern Roman empire, and then stretching out their arms begged the privilege of passing over and of protection from their terrible enemy.

The victorious hordes of the Hunns driving before them the terrified Goths and Vandals had spread from the Volga to the Danube.³ Their force was for some time spent in domestic dissensions, or wasted in predatory excursions, until, under the reign of Attila, they again became the terror of the world.

This terrible barbarian, whose bloody achievements have christened him "the scourge of God," is represented as having a large head, a swarthy complexion, a flat nose, a few hairs in the place of a beard, broad shoulders, a short square body of great strength, and small deep seated eyes, which he had a custom of fiercely rolling as if he wished to enjoy the terror he inspired.⁴

¹ Gibbon, 421, 422. ² *Idem*, 422. ³ *Idem*, 553. ⁴ *Idem*, 554.

With the sword of Mars, he might well aspire to the title of supreme and sole monarch of the nomadic world. He reigned over Germany and Scythia.¹ He subdued the kingdoms of Scandinavia in the north, and reigned on the banks of the Volga and on those of the Danube. The Gepidæ and Ostrogoths acknowledged his sovereignty. Kings were ranged in the submissive order of guards and domestics, watching his nod, and trembling at his frown. When he collected his military force he was able to bring into the field an army of five, or according to one account of seven hundred thousand barbarians.

A storm was perceived gathering, but it was for some time doubtful where it would fall, whether upon Persia in the east,² or the eastern empire of Rome in the west. At length the gathering cloud discharged itself upon the eastern empire. The whole breadth of Europe, extending from the Euxine to the Adriatic,³ was at once invaded and swept over by the desolating Hunn. In three terrible engagements the armies of the eastern empire were overcome, two fought on the plains between the Danube and Mount Hæmus, and the third as the Romans were retiring towards the Chersonesus of Thrace. The provinces of Thrace and Macedonia were ravaged without resistance, or mercy. Seventy cities of the eastern empire were rolled over and destroyed by this barbaric tide. After thus desolating the provinces, destroying the cities,⁴ slaying, or carrying into captivity, the inhabitants, the Hunn dictated the terms of peace to Theodosius the eastern emperor.

We next find the indomitable Hunn preparing to invade Gaul and the provinces of the western empire.⁵ From his royal village on the plains of Hungary, his standard moved towards the west. Gaul was in dreadful consternation. Its cities, one after another fell a prey to the invader. "The grass itself will not grow,"⁶ said the exterminator, "after the steed of Attila has trampled it."

¹ Gibbon; 555. ² *Idem*, 556. ³ *Idem*, 557. ⁴ *Idem*, 559. ⁵ *Idem*, 570.

Desolated dwellings and blazing cities mark his progress in Gaul.¹ The priest was slain at the altar, the maiden crushed under chariot wheels, and old men were fastened to the necks of horses that rushed with them to destruction. The Romans under Ætius, and the Visigoths under Theodoric their king, united their forces to oppose the progress of the destroyer. The two armies met on the plains of Chalons. Here were arrayed in hostility to each other the nations from the Volga to the Atlantic. The east and the west were here contending for the mastery of Europe.² The nomadic races, and those having fixed habitations, had here met face to face in frightful conflict. It may be doubted whether the annals of the world afford another such a battle. According to one account one hundred and sixty-two thousand, according to another three hundred thousand were left dead upon the field. The west was triumphant. It was Attila's first defeat, but it was Rome's last victory. The swelling tide of the nomadic race was rolled back upon itself. Attila retreated, but the next season saw him passing the Alps,³ descending like an avalanche upon Italy, and sweeping over its northern parts with its terrible agents of destruction.

But the destructive course of the Hunn must have a termination. In his wooden palace beyond the Danube, on the night of his marriage to Ildico,⁴ a young and beautiful bride, whom he was adding to his already numerous list of wives, an artery suddenly burst which brought to a hasty conclusion the life and career of Attila, A. D. 453. With him expired the power of the Hunns. In the course of a few years their name disappears from history, and they never have since reappeared.

The most distinguished nomadic race that next in the order of time appears in history are the Turks.⁵ Their name was first revealed to the world in the year A. D. 545, about one hundred years after the death of Attila. The

¹ Gibbon, 570. ² *Idem*, 572. ³ *Idem*, 574. ⁴ *Idem*, 576. ⁵ *Idem*, 717.

cradle of the Turkish race is to be sought on the high plateau of Central Asia and eastward of Mongolia. Their invasions of Europe and western Asia occurred at two different periods of time.¹ The first comprises all the inroads made by the Turks prior to the rise of the Mongolian power,² which will be next noticed. The second embraces the subsequent events of their history until their final establishment in Europe.

The Turkish dominion rose upon the ruins of the Geougen nation, originally their masters.³ Bertesena was their first leader. The Turks rose rapidly to power. One of their armies numbered 400,000 soldiers. In less than fifty years they were known either by proceedings in war or negotiations in peace,⁴ to the Romans, Persians, and Chinese. The rapid rise of a nomadic race is partly explainable from the fact that when a conquering horde under a victorious leader appeared, other hordes belonging to the great shepherd race united with them, and thus contributed to swell their numbers.

To the east the Turks invaded China, and to the south the white Hunns, who then possessed the cities Bochara and Samarcand, and whose victorious arms had been carried to the bank of the Indus.⁵

The Turkish kingdom extended to the Oxus or Gihon, which, for some time, was the dividing barrier separating the land of Turan as it has been sometimes called, or dominion of the nomadic races, from the ancient kingdom of Iran or Persia. The Turks, about the year A. D. 575, in conjunction with the Greek empire, carried on some wars against the Persians.⁶

For some four centuries the Turks figure but little in history. About the year A. D. 1000, they rallied under Mahmood or Mahmud,⁷ called the Gaznevide, to whom was first applied the appellation of sultan. He enlarged his kingdom from Transoxiana to near Ispahan, and from

¹ *Prichard's Researches*, IV, 315. ² *Idem*, IV, 318. ³ *Gibbon*, 717. ⁴ *Idem*, 717. ⁵ *Idem*, 717, 718. ⁶ *Idem*, 720. ⁷ *Idem*, 1053.

the Caspian to the mouth of the Indus. He embraced the Mahometan faith, and made several expeditions into Hindostan.¹ His path was a path of blood. He collected the treasures of the east in Gasna, and had a force of 100,000 foot, 55,000 horse and 1,300 elephants of battle.

While the subjects of Mahmood were becoming indwellers of cities, and acquiring to some extent the habits of settled life, there were still hordes of Turkmans around the Caspian,² dwelling in tents and following the nomadic life. These shepherd warriors became bands of robbers, who, collecting together in hordes, made predatory incursions as far as Ispahan and the Tigris. Massoud the successor of Mahmood undertook to oppose the torrent that was rolling down upon his dominions, but instead of checking he was carried away by it.³ The day of the defeat of Massoud saw the establishment of the dynasty of shepherd kings in Persia.

The dynasty, known in history as the Seljukian, from Seljuk, the founder of the tribe out of which the sultan was selected, became established. The choice of sultan was made to depend upon chance, and the lot fell upon the famous Togrul Beg the grandson of Seljuk. He expelled the remnants of the Gaznevedes, annihilated the dynasty of the Bowides, conquered Media, rescued from his enemies the caliph at Bagdad, and was declared temporal lieutenant of the vicar of the prophet.

Two of his immediate successors, Alp Arslan and Malek Shah⁴ consolidated the power and still further extended the dominion of the race of Seljuk.

The greatness and unity of the Persian empire expired with Malek Shah.⁵ Three younger dynasties sprung up, those of Kerman, of Syria, and of Roum. The dominion of the first was on the shores of the Indian ocean; that of the second over Aleppo and the ancient city of Damascus, and that of the third over the provinces of Asia

¹ *Gibbon*, 1054-5. ² *Idem*, 1055. ³ *Idem*, 1056. ⁴ *Idem*, 1058-9. ⁵ *Idem*, 1062.

Minor. These dynasties were finally overthrown and swept away by an eruption of the Mongoles and Moguls, soon to be noticed.

Upon the decline of the Mongolian power a new Turkish dynasty started into being, under Othman, which not only contained within itself the elements of success, but also of continuance.¹ From him the present Turks are called Othmans or Ottomans, and the Turkish, the Ottoman empire. Rusa in Bythynia, a country in Asia Minor, was taken and made his capital, A. D. 1326. From this event may be dated the foundation of the Ottoman empire. It gradually extended itself until it overturned the Greek or eastern empire, and erected the crescent upon the lofty dome of St. Sophia, in Constantinople. The footing which the Turks acquired in Europe by the overthrow of the Greek empire was made use of by them for the achieving still further conquests, so much so that at one period of time Europe itself was threatened with subjugation by the Moslem armies.

¹ *Gibbon*, 1172.

CHAPTER III.

MONGOLES, TARTARS.

The nomadic race next brought on to the theatre of action is the Mongolian. This race exhibits a more strongly marked physignomy than any other nomadic race. The eyes are far apart from each other, with the openings of the eyelids obliquely placed; the large angle of the eyes slightly open and fleshy;¹ the nasal bones flat and broad; the cheek bones laterally projecting; and the face particularly broad and flat at the plane of the nostrils. And the zygomatic arch, the breadth of the skull at this plane with the comparatively narrow summit of the forehead giving the countenance and the anterior part of the cranium an almost triangular figure, if measured from the cheek bones upward, and a lozenge form when viewed together with the lower part of the face. The skulls of this race are pyramidal, while the greater proportional width of the head at the plane of the zygomas affords room for greater development of several organs of sense, the pastoral tribes of high Asia displaying a great perfection in the sensitive faculties. The Mongolian race originated from a part of the central plateau of Asia, which is east of Turkistan or the original seat of the Turks. The ancient Scythians, according to Herodotus, were a Mongol people, and the description given by Hippocrates, strongly confirms this. He describes them as a fat and fleshy people, in whom the articulation and organization of muscles and bones were but very imperfectly seen. This, according to Niebuhr, is a very striking feature of the Mongol nations.² Their muscles and joints, he says, cannot be discerned, and disappear

¹ *Prichard's Researches*, IV, 407. ² *Niebuhr's Lectures on Ancient History*, I, 149, 150.

on the surface. Their skin is thick and fat, and covers and disguises the forms of muscles and bones. In this respect he claims they are in great contrast with the nations of southern Europe, as the Greeks and Italians, the muscles of whose arms and legs more particularly are very strikingly developed. This he contends is the reason why their artists were not required to study anatomy so profoundly. They could see the whole of it so far as was needed in the living body. The play of the muscles could be distinctly seen, the delicate skin hardly in the slightest degree concealing them.

The Mongoles or Moguls, as they are more generally termed, appear in history under the celebrated Zingis Khan about the year A. D. 1220. The original name of this celebrated conqueror was Zemugin,¹ whose father had reigned over thirteen hordes, comprising about 30 or 40,000 families.

His first battles were fought with his rebellious subjects, when he was about thirteen years of age. He had various fortune, being at one time reduced to seek safety in flight.² When about forty years of age he had succeeded in establishing his supremacy over the adjacent tribes. One of his first victories was signalized by throwing seventy of the rebels into as many caldrons of boiling water. He invoked the aid of superstition, and at his inauguration, in a general diet, or assemblage of khans at Karakorum his capital, an inspired prophet came forward at the proper time, and announced that it was the pleasure of God, that he should thenceforth take the name of Zingis Khan, which means the greatest khan of khans. This was ratified on the spot by the great host of Mongoles, who thenceforth considered the world as belonging to the great khan.

His first business was to promulgate a code of laws, few in number,³ direct, and adapted to the preservation of domestic peace. His religion was a pure theism. His

¹ *Gibbon*, 1164. ² *Idem*, 1164. ³ *Idem*, 1165.

great object was military achievement. The nomadic hordes wandering over the great Asiatic upland, were first subjugated, so that the pastoral world, with all its fearful agents of destruction, was reduced beneath his sway. With these millions of warlike shepherds he combined the elements of a terrible power, which soon shook to their centre the nations of Asia.

The storm first lowered over the east, and broke over the devoted Chinese.¹ The Great wall interposed but a feeble obstacle. Ninety cities were stormed, or starved into submission, ten only escaping. In a second expedition, he compelled the emperor to retire beyond the Yellow river to a more southern residence. Peking was besieged, and finally taken and wrapt in the flames of a terrible conflagration.² China was made desolate, and its five northern provinces added to the empire of Zingis.

We next find him gathering together his immense hordes of Mogul warriors to the almost incredible number of 700,000 men to ravage the west and make a descent upon Carisme, Transoxiana and Persia. Mohammed, sultan of Carisme, who reigned from the Persian gulf to the borders of India and Turkestan, met him on the plains extending north of the Sihon or Jaxartes with an army of 400,000 men. In the bloody battle fought there he lost 160,000. With the remainder of his force he garrisoned his cities. But these, one after another, fell beneath the destroyer, and evidenced their former greatness only by the magnitude of their ruins. Otrar, Cogende, Bochara, Samarcand, Carisme, Herat, Meron, Nisabour, Baleh and Candahar fell beneath the wrath of the Mogul. From the Caspian to the Indus, a tract of many hundred miles adorned with the labors of man, was so utterly ruined, that five centuries were insufficient to repair the ravages of four years. After overrunning the populous countries of Transoxiana, Carisme and Chorasán he retreated loaded with the spoils of Asia. After his return, he overthrew

¹ Gibbon, 1166. ² *Idem*, 1166.

the rebellious or independent kingdoms of Tartary, and in A. D. 1227, in the fullness of years and absolute sovereign of an empire extending over a space of eight hundred leagues on one side and a thousand on the other, he was called away from a world, which perhaps he had done more than any other human being to depopulate and destroy. At the time he was laying waste the beautiful and populous regions of the Kin dominions in China it was made a matter of grave discussion in the cabinet of the destroyer,¹ whether true policy did not dictate that the Moguls should totally exterminate the millions of Chinese, with the view of converting the whole of China into a widely extended pasture, where could be reared the numerous herds and flocks that ranged over the high upland of Mongolia. The prompt and timely suggestions of his minister Gelu, dissuaded him from taking the fatal resolution, and thus probably saved China from utter annihilation.

The awful work of desolation and death which the Moguls at this period seemed commissioned to execute,² hardly paused in its career at the death of Zingis. In a harem of five hundred wives and concubines he could hardly fail to leave sons worthy of such a sire. His descendants continued to extend the arms of the Moguls in the east, south, west and north.

In the east another descent was made upon China. There were two dynasties in China, that of the Kin in the north, and of the Song in the south. The provinces of the Kin dynasty were almost entirely subdued by Zingis.

Cublai, the grandson of Zingis, with a great host, invaded the dominions of the Song. They retreated from the land to the sea, where their fleet was surrounded by a superior armament, and their last champion, with their infant emperor in his arms, leaped into the waves.³ One hundred thousand Chinese imitated his example, and the whole empire from Tonkin to the Great wall submitted to the dominion of Cublai. He founded a new dynasty in China,

¹ *Anquetil's Universal History*, v, 185. ² *Gibbon*, 1167. ³ *Idem*, 1167.

and invaded and reduced under subjection the kingdoms of Corea, Tonkin, Cochin-china, Begu, Bengal and Thibet.

In the south another of the grandsons of Zingis, Holagon Khan, invaded Iran or Persia.¹ The arms of the Moguls were triumphant. Sultans and emirs were everywhere routed. The victorious Mogul entered the dominions of the old man of the mountain, and destroyed the Assassins, or Ismælians of Persia. He besieged and took Bagdad on the Tigris and in the person of the Caliph Mostajem, the last of the temporal successors of Mahomet, he ended the race of the Abassides, who had reigned in Asia above five hundred years.

The stream of Mogul hostility being driven back by the Mamelukes of Egypt to the eastward of the Euphrates, it overflowed Armenia and Anatolia, and finally terminated that branch of the Seljukian dynasty that still lingered in Asia Minor in the sultans of Iconium.

In the west, Baton, another of the grandsons of Zingis, with an army of 500,000 men, in the year 1235, crossed, on a mission of death, several of the great rivers of Asia, and Europe, the Volga and Kama,² the Don and Borysthenes, the Vistula and Danube, destroying at first all remains of national freedom on the plains of Turkestan and Kipzah, overrunning the kingdoms of Astracan and Cusan, reducing to ashes the cities of Moscow and Kiow, the ancient capitals of Russia; making a deadly inroad into the heart of Poland, as far as the borders of Germany; obliterating the cities of Lublim and Cracow;³ and approaching the shores of the Baltic, in the battle of Lignits defeating the dukes of Silesia, the Polish palatines, and the great master of the Teutonic order, and filling nine sacks with the right ears of the slain.

From the field of Lignits, these terrible destroyers turned to the invasion of Hungary, scaled the Carpathian hills,⁴ all but depopulated the country north of the Danube, leaving only three cities and fortresses in the whole of Hungary.

¹ Gibbon, 1168. ² *Idem*, 1168. ³ *Idem*, 1169. ⁴ *Idem*, 1169.

The remote nations of the Baltic and the ocean trembled at the name of the Tartars. Never since the invasion of the Arabs in the eighth century had Europe come so near subjugation.

After laying waste the kingdoms of Servia, Bosnia, and Bulgaria, Baton, with his Tartar hordes slowly retreated from the Danube to the Volga.¹

Even the north, with its regions of frost and snow, was not exempt from the invasion of the Moguls. Sheibani Khan, brother of Baton, and another grandson of Zingis, led a horde of 15,000 families into Siberia, at Tobolskoy, where his descendants reigned above three centuries.

In these several invasions we have seen on the east China, on the south southern Asia, except Hindostan, on the west, western Asia and eastern Europe, and on the north the wilds of Siberia, overrun, ravaged, desolated, almost depopulated by the terrible Moguls.

The power of the Moguls was at its acme. Almost the whole of Asia, and no inconsiderable part of Europe, lay writhing beneath their terrible inflictions. But their empire was too extended for continuance.² Their capital, Karakorum, was situated far to the east, on that portion of the Asiatic upland bordering upon China. The distant lieutenants and rulers refused obedience, and in about one hundred and forty years after the death of Zingis, the Mogul emperors were lost in the oblivion of the desert.

In about one hundred and fifty years after Zingis commences his victorious career at the head of the Golden horde of the Mogus, appears Timour, or, as he is more generally called Tamerlane, the terrible Tartar. Humble in his origin, at one time a forlorn wanderer,³ at another plunged in a loathsome dungeon, we find him at the age of thirty-four, A.D. 1370, at a general diet, invested with imperial command, and made sovereign of Zagatai, a kingdom of about five hundred miles in length and breadth.

¹ *Gibbon*, 1169. ² *Idem*, 1170. ³ *Idem*, 1179-80.

After adding to this the countries of Carisme and Candahar, he turned his attention to Iran or Persia.

The provinces of Persia, one after another, yielded to his arms. All the countries bordering on the Tigris and Euphrates were reduced to his obedience.¹

He passes the Sihon, subdues the kingdom of Cashgar² and marches seven times into the heart of the country of the Getes. He conquers Kipsar, or western Tartary, penetrates four hundred and eighty leagues to the north-east of Samarcand, while some of his emirs penetrate into the forests of Siberia. He twice invades Kipsar with such an army that thirteen miles were required to be passed over in going from the extremity of his right to that of his left wing, defeats his enemy in a terrible battle, and pursues him so far into the provinces of Russia that Moscow trembled at his approach.

He reduced to ashes Azoph at the mouth of the Don, condemned to slavery or death the Christian inhabitants, and burnt the cities of Serai and Astracan.

In 1388 his army moved forward in three great divisions to the invasion of Hindostan. This rich and populous region of country had escaped the destructive ravages of Zingis and his successors,³ only to fall a prey at last to the more terrible Tartar. He crossed the Indus, traversed the Punjab, reduced the fortress of Batnic, and appeared before the gates of Delhi. He defeated the Sultan Mahmoud with his cuirassiers, his foot guard, and 120 elephants, on the plain before Delhi, and then entered and pillaged this ancient capital of Hindostan, massacring the inhabitants.

He advanced 100 miles beyond Delhi, passed the Ganges, fought several battles by land and water, and returned along the skirts of the northern hills.

In the year 1400, he set on foot a new expedition into the western countries of Asia. The Christians of Georgia were the first objects of the vengeance of the zealous Mussulman. They were hunted down amid their rocks

¹ Gibbon, 1180. ² *Idem*, 1181. ³ *Idem*, 1182.

and fastnesses, and compelled to become martyrs or believers in the Koran.

We next find him invading Syria, defeating the Syrian army, entering the city of Aleppo, sacking it, and piling up, according to his custom, pillars and pyramids of human heads. From thence the destroyer marched to Damascus, obtained admission by treachery, pillaged and massacred the inhabitants;¹ on his retreat delivered Aleppo to the flames, erected on the ruins of Bagdad a pyramid of ninety thousand human heads, revisited Georgia, and on the banks of the Araxes announced his determination of marching against Bajazet, the Ottoman emperor.

With an army of 800,000 men he marched through Armenia and Anatolia, passed the river Halys,² and invested Angora. Bajazet rallied an army of 400,000 men. The plains around the city of Angora are rendered memorable by being the scene of one of the most terrible battles which history has to record. The Tartar and the Turk here met upon the field of combat. It was a fearful struggle, but the Tartar triumphed. The Turkish hosts were defeated, and their commander was the prisoner of Tamerlane. It is asserted by some historians that Bajazet, after his captivity, was carried around by Tamerlane, in all his marches, in an iron cage until his death, which occurred, it is said, at an early period, owing to the severity of Tamerlane. Anatolia submitted upon the defeat and capture of Bajazet.

The triumphant Tartar now reigned from the Irtish and Volga to the Persian gulf,³ and from the Ganges to Damascus and the Archipelago. He was at the head of invincible armies, and possessed of boundless ambition. The kingdoms of the west trembled at his name. But a narrow sea rolled between Europe and Asia, and this presented an insuperable barrier to the advance of Tamerlane. He had no vessels.⁴

His career west being terminated by the sea, we find him next projecting an invasion of China. In his wars

¹ Gibbon, 1184. ² *Idem*, 1184-5. ³ *Idem*, 1187. ⁴ *Idem*, 1187.

against the Ottomans in the west of Asia he had caused the death of multitudes of Mussulmen. At this his conscience was greatly troubled, and he determined to satisfy its clamors by destroying an equal or greater number of infidels in the east.

With an immense army of veteran warriors he commenced his march from Samarcand towards the east.¹ Neither the frost of age nor the severity of winter could retard his progress. Crossing the Sihon on the ice, he marched three hundred miles from his capital, and pitched his last camp in the vicinity of Otrar. Here in the seventieth year of his age and the thirty-fifth of his reign, God in mercy removed him from a world in which he had been a most successful destroyer. China was saved from the sack of its cities, the desolation of its land, the destruction of its people, by this merciful interposition. He died, repeating the Mussulman's prayer, "There is no god but God." Thus perished the mighty Tamerlane, the wearer of twenty-seven crowns, after a reign of thirty-five years.²

After the death of Tamerlane his mighty empire fell in pieces. He left numerous descendants, who wasted their strength in destroying each other. His son Sharokh upheld for a while a fragment of his empire, but after his death, the scene is again involved in darkness.³ In less than a century the race of Tamerlane would have become extinct, had not a descendant of his in the fifth degree established himself in Hindostan, where his successors continued to reign down to the time of Aurungzebe.

East of Mongolia and directly north of China, are the Khitans, a Tartar tribe, whose descents have been principally confined to China. It was as a defense against their ravages, that the great wall in the north of China, some 1,500 miles in length, and from fifteen to twenty feet high, was built about two hundred years before the Christian era. Although an immense structure, possessing great strength, it was insufficient for their protection. They

¹ Gibbon, 1188. ² *Idem*, 1180, 1189. ³ *Idem*, 1190.

made numerous incursions into the Chinese empire, until, under the name of Manchew Tartars, about the year 1641, they conquered China, established a Tartar dynasty on the throne, which has ever since been the reigning dynasty.

We have thus noticed the principal movements of the great nomadic races. There is still another race, a great portion of which is strictly nomadic, not yet mentioned, and that is the Arabian. The location and movements of this race are so intimately connected with the history of civilized countries, and the race itself at one period possessed so many of the elements of civilization, that the consideration of it will be more appropriate in another connection.

Very little is required to be said relative to the development by the nomadic races of the great elements of humanity: Very little has been done even to separate them, with a view to carry them out into development. The industry practiced by these races is that of the hunter and shepherd.¹ The mountains abound in game. Ferocious animals, as lions and tigers, are numerous. The rivers and inland lakes are well stocked with fish. Immense prairie plains, almost entirely divested of forests, but covered with a rank vegetation, extend beyond the sensible horizon. To destroy the ferocious animals, to hunt the game, to catch the fish, to rear immense flocks and herds of sheep, cattle and horses, constitute together the industry of the nomad. Commerce is carried on only to a small extent between neighboring tribes, and that chiefly by barter. They have devised a method of manufacturing from mare's milk an intoxicating drink of which they make a very general use. The primitive religion of the nomadic races, seems to have been a pure deism.² They are now principally either Mahometans or worshipers of the lamas, who derive their origin from Fo. The doctrine of the metempsychosis is embraced in their creed. Excepting this, there is a singular resemblance between some points of the lama doctrine and Christianity, particularly

¹ *Anquetil*, v, 153. ² *Idem*, v, 158.

that part of it included under the Roman Catholic creed.¹ It teaches a life to come, purgatory, invocation of saints, worship of images, confession, absolution, use of the rosary, aspersions with water, in fact very many of the exterior ceremonies of the Catholic religion. They do not believe in the doctrine of transubstantiation, but they believe that the god Fo assumes a human form and resides in Thibet, where they offer him their adorations under the title of Grand Lama.

The representatives of the Grand Lama are scattered over various parts of the Asiatic upland. They are called Khutukthu, live in great splendor and receive the worship of the nomads. They, in their turn, are surrounded by their lamas or priests, who enjoy under them different degrees of dignity; the whole forming an hierarchy.

The Grand Lama is held to be immortal, although he occasionally disappears for a time. In the temple of the great idol a child is educated who is accustomed to divine honors from his infancy.

Almost the whole of their religious rites consist in the recitation of their liturgy, which is solemn and melodious.² They make no sacrifice or offering, but they give absolution to the people who are accustomed to demand it bareheaded,³ on their knees. The possessions of the lamas or priests consist of flocks and land,⁴ which they have the right of transmitting in succession.

In regard to the social instinct, the nomadic races are, in general, rude and unpolished in their manners, although honest and good natured. They excel in horsemanship and hunting,⁵ and are dexterous archers, whether on foot or horseback. They are of an easy, cheerful temper, never disturbed by melancholy, valuing things only for their utility, and ambitious of preserving the rank of their families. They have no difficult affairs to perplex them, no business to constrain, little to do, except to divert themselves

¹ *Modern Universal History*, IV, 310. ² *Anquetil*, v, 159. ³ *Universal History*, IV, 313. ⁴ *Anquetil*, 158. ⁵ *Universal History*, IV, 299.

with hunting, fishing and other bodily exercises. They wear drawers, wide shirts, and over them a long robe, closed to the waist with a broad girdle, half boots and small round caps.¹ The women's dress is nearly the same as that of the men, both preferring red to every other color. All over the north of Asia a red color is held in high estimation. Their arms consist mostly in the bow and arrows, the pike and sabre, with the more recent introduction of fire arms. They subsist upon their flocks and herds, these consisting of horses, camels or dromedaries, cows, broad tailed sheep and large oxen. Their food is principally confined to mutton and horse flesh, the latter being much preferred to beef,² as the milk of their mares is preferred to that of their cows. The traveling nomads, particularly the Tartars, scarcely eat any bread, but they make use of millet, with which they make their drink and pottage.³ Their meat is generally horse flesh, which they boil when at leisure, but when on the march they heat it under their saddles,⁴ and then devour it without any other sauce than the froth upon it which is made by the sweating of the horse. They are in the general practice of polygamy, and when their wives attain near the age of forty they transform them into servants to take care of the house and tend upon the young wives who succeed to their places.⁵

Children are educated in the profession of their fathers, and they pay to the father great reverential respect, considering him as a king in the family,⁶ while the mother is very little regarded. To the father is accorded as pompous a funeral as the circumstances of the family will permit, and at least once a year the devotions of the children must be paid at his tomb.

Some tribes bury, others burn their dead. In some ancient tombs are found human skeletons, accompanied with bones of horses, and sometimes with jewels of gold

¹ *Anquetil*, v, 156. ² *Idem*, v, 156. ³ *Modern Universal History*, iv, 301.

⁴ *Discourse on Manners of the Tartars*, 43. ⁵ *Idem*, iv, 303. ⁶ *Idem*, iv, 304.

and silver. They are probably the graves of the old Moguls who had returned laden with the spoils of southern Asia. Some have erected pyramids or little conic houses over the graves of the rich. Vast brick towers and stone pyramids have also been found.

The nomadic races generally dwell in tents or little movable huts.¹ The tent is round, upheld within by poles, and covered with cloth in the summer and with felt in the winter.

The tent thus presents the appearance of a broken cone with a round hole at the top to let out the smoke which ascends from the hearth, placed in the middle underneath.

The huts are round and made with poles of light wood, joined together with leather thongs, so that they can be easily fitted up and removed. These are carried on wagons with four wheels, in their removals. They are sometimes thirty feet in diameter, and drawn by a team of twenty-two oxen. A nomadic city is a camp consisting of tents and houses intersected like the different quarters of a town.² The flocks and herds after grazing through the day in the adjacent pastures, retire at night within the protection of the camp. As soon as the forage of one district is consumed the tribe or army of shepherds commences its march to another. In the summer they advance toward the north pitching their tents on the banks of a river, or in the neighborhood of a running stream; in the winter they return to the south, sheltering their camp against the northern winds behind some convenient eminence.

In relation to government the patriarchal form has been the most generally prevalent among the nomadic races. The principle of this species of government is that each father is absolute in his own family. Several families united, form a horde or tribe. Several tribes constitute a nation, under the government of a chief denominated khan, who is elected by other chiefs, usually from the tribe of him he succeeds. They preserve with great care

¹ *Mod. Univ. History*, IV, 305. ² *Gibbon*, 416.

their genealogy,¹ and mutually respect themselves and each other as the descendants of the first founder of the tribe. Their chief, as the representative of their great father, exercises the authority of a judge in peace, and of a leader in war. Various causes contributed to unite the vagrant hordes into national communities, under the command of a supreme head. In such cases the command was assumed by the most successful prince, who becomes khan by the acclamation of his equals.

Two regular taxes are levied on the tribes, each amounting to a tithe, both of their property and spoil. The one of these goes to the great khan, which, together with his own domestic riches of flocks and herds, enables him to maintain the splendor of his court and reward his followers. The other tithe goes to the tribe, or to its own peculiar chief.

The immediate jurisdiction of a khan is limited to his own tribe, and his exercise of authority has been moderated by the institution of a national council. The Coroultai or general diet, held its regular sessions in the spring and autumn in the midst of a plain. The assemblage of the princes and chiefs with their numerous trains, is on horseback, and the monarch is compelled to consult the wishes and inclinations of the people. Thus among the nomadic hordes roaming over the great Asiatic upland, we perceive traces of a system which during the middle ages² received in Europe its full growth, maturity, decline, and dissolution. This was the feudal system. The freedom ordinarily possessed and enjoyed among the nomadic hordes was often annihilated when some great conqueror, like Zingis Khan or Tamerlane, became possessed of the reins of government, and united in his own person all the elements of power.

The laws to which the nomadic nations have been subject have, in general, been simple, and adapted to the condition and manner of life they were leading. They have

¹ *Gibbon*, 417. ² *Idem*, 418.

had for their object the preservation of domestic peace, and successful exercise of foreign hostility.¹ The laws of Zingis Khan prescribed the punishment of death for the crimes of adultery, murder, perjury, and the stealing of a horse or an ox. Each officer and soldier was made responsible for the safety and honor of his companions. Peace was never granted except to a vanquished and suppliant enemy. The police established under the great conquerors was rigid and severe.² Under the dominion of Tamerlane a child, fearless and unhurt, might carry a purse of gold from one end of his empire to the other.

The arts, those especially that develop the spirit of beauty, are in vain sought among the nomadic races. The art of war would seem to have been cultivated with success by the great conquerors. The nomadic armies have always consisted of a numerous cavalry, which made the most rapid evolutions in battle. The mode of attack was almost invariably of the same character. A foremost line first advanced to the charge,³ and was supported in a just order by the squadrons of the vanguard. The eye of the great khan watched over the field, and at his command the front and rear of the right and left wings successively moved forward in their several divisions, and in a direct or oblique line. The enemy could thus be pressed by eighteen or twenty attacks, and each attack afford a chance of victory. If they all proved unsuccessful the great khan gave the signal of advance to the standard and main body, which he led in person. Each tribe marches to battle under a standard bearing its name, surmounted with the figure of some favorite animal,⁴ as a horse, camel, etc. Their arms formerly consisted of missile weapons, the bow and arrow, lance and sabre, but now they make use of arquebuses and bayonets. In battle they often wear a coat of mail and iron casque. They are unacquainted with the method of rank and file, but ride to the attack in troops, the commander at their head, and when thought to be routed and

¹ *Gibbon*, 1165. ² *Idem*, 1189. ³ *Idem*, 1185. ⁴ *Anquetil*, v, 159 - 60.

flying, return to the charge with redoubled ardor. If an enemy had broken their ranks in pursuing them, their defeat on the return charge would be almost certain.

The element of philosophy has received but small contributions from the nomadic races. The Igurs or Ouigours, a Turkish tribe that once inhabited the countries watered by the Orkhon, the Toula, and the Selenga, possessed anciently some slight degree of civilization.¹ Their language was a written language many centuries before letters were known among other nations of Central Asia, and it was the medium through which the Syrian characters were introduced extensively among the nations of the remote east of Mongolian and Tungusian origin.

As a general thing the nomadic races have given birth only to those forms of thought which are of the commonest order; and which are essential only in the simplest and humblest states and conditions of national existence. The separation and development of this crowning element of humanity seems to have been reserved for human effort where man should acquire a "local habitation and a name." From the surface of this lofty and extended upland, there has not sufficient light descended to the dwellers in the plains below, to reveal to them the history, external and internal, of their wandering inhabitants. It is only when they have descended from that benighted region into the domain of civilization, and thus have become encircled with a light which was not their own, that they have become known, and their peculiarities exposed to the searching glance of civilized man. Had they always remained in their prairie homes, the two races might have continued as ignorant of each other, almost, as if they were inhabitants of different planets. One feature about them is worthy of remark, and that is their steadfast continuance in the same manners, customs, forms, observances, ceremonies and methods of developing life, from the earliest period of their history to the present

¹ *Prichard's Researches*, IV, 311 - 313.

time. Man in Persia, Babylonia, Egypt, Phœnicia, Greece, Italy, and western Europe, has been subject to mighty changes; but on this great central plateau, nearly or quite the same living phenomena are now in actual exhibition as might have been witnessed when the sons and grandsons of Japhet first wandered with their flocks and herds on the high table land of Pamer. To them time has brought no change except what results from the practice of locomotion. It would seem that where men have ever moved in masses the intellectual, moral and spiritual powers have remained but little developed; but, on the other hand, where physical movement has been suspended, where the material man has been stationary, the powers of his mind have been active and untiring in their efforts. There are doubtless now the same causes in operation among those wandering races as have been noticed from the earliest times. There can no good reason be assigned why another Zingis Khan or Tamerlane may not again make their descents, clothed with the elements of destruction.

It is true the rapid means of communication over the civilized world would probably draw together forces that might soon overpower them, but that would be for the reason that the civilized world, and not they, had experienced a change. There is little probability that any considerable change will ever take place, unless the physical circumstances under which they exist should alter.

From the lofty plateau of Central Asia, we descend into the domain of comparative civilization, and stand upon the banks of the Araxes, the Choaspes, the Tigris and the Euphrates. Here were the seats of early culture, and Persepolis, Susa, Nineveh and Babylon present themselves in the dimness of a distant antiquity. We shall now find man the subject of change, a creature of progress, and therefore having a history.

CHAPTER IV.

CHALDÆA—ITS DESCRIPTION, HISTORY, INDUSTRY AND RELIGION.

Chaldæa.

At the foot of the great mountain chain of Kurdistan and Luristan, and stretching from thence to the Syro-Arabian desert, lies a territory which constituted the chief site of three out of five early empires of the world.¹ This the Jews called Aram — Naharaim, or “Syria of the two rivers,” and the Greeks and Romans, Mesopotamia, or “the between-river country.” As Egypt has been called the “Gift of the Nile,” so the lower Mesopotamia, the great alluvial basin, may be styled the “Gift of the two rivers,” the Tigris and the Euphrates. Along this level region, next to Egypt, perhaps the most productive in the world, the surface of which is scarcely broken by a single elevation, stretches what in ancient times was called the plain of Shinar, afterwards better known as Chaldæa and Babylonia. Here it would seem, should be found the earliest home of the race, after the subsiding of the deluge, the point from which radiates the various lines of emigration, which in time brought the then new world under subjection. Here was made the first great stand, here permanently pitched the first tents of the nomadic wanderers, and here reduced to practice the first lessons in civilization of that ancient world, whose record was now fully made up and closed. No other place could present circumstances so favorable. The between-river country was unsurpassed in fertility. Its spontaneous productions, offering to man all that his

¹ Rawlinson's *Five Monarchies*, 1, 2.

necessities craved, wooed him from a wandering life, and led him into the settled habits of a permanent civilization. Its central situation and proximity to the sea, afforded to oncoming generations, the largest facilities for emigration and distant settlement. Nothing more is here intended, but an intimation, that this may have been the region of country in which the earliest settlement around which the great events of history cluster, was first made. Armenia is supposed by many to have been the cradle of the race after the deluge. In confirmation of this idea there are still found these evidences of early industrial effort. "There are," says Mr. Marsh, "in ancient Armenia, extensive districts, which were already abandoned to desolation at the earliest historical epoch, but which, in a yet remoter antiquity, had been irrigated by a complicated and highly artificial system of canals, the lines of which can still be followed."¹

In Chaldæa, a part of the great Mesopotamian plain, is found the earliest of the five great Asiatic monarchies. This was bounded on the south by the Persian gulf, on the east by the Tigris, on the west by the Arabian desert, and on the north by Upper Mesopotamia. The great natural features of the country are the two great rivers, the Tigris and the Euphrates, rising from opposite sides of the same mountain chain, and pursuing their course southward, now nearing and then separating further from each other, until, from their ultimate union, they pour their united waters into the Persian gulf. There, with their "broad sweeps and bold reaches, their periodical changes of swell and fall, their strength, motion, and life-giving power," must have presented to the early occupants of their banks objects of intense interest. Aside from these, on all sides extends a dead uniform level, broken only by single solitary mounds, the remains of ancient temples or cities, by long lines of slightly elevated embankment marking the course of canals, ancient or recent, and towards the

¹ *Marsh's Man and Nature*, 366.

south by a few sand hills. And even these, except the last mentioned, did not disturb the vision of the primitive settlers. The Tigris is largely enriched throughout its whole course by the waters of tributary streams, and hence continues to grow in depth and strength as it nears the sea. The Euphrates, on the other hand, is peculiar in that it loses more than it gains by any fresh accessions. Hence it shrinks during the latter part of its course, and so much of it is lost by the various issues from it, and by the overflow of its banks, more especially into the Chaldæan marshes, that, with the exception of flood time, very little of its water reaches the sea. Like the Nile, both the Tigris and the Euphrates rise many feet each spring and overflow their banks in various places, thus contributing largely to the fertility of the plains of Chaldæa and Babylonia.

Chaldæa proper was the tract intervening between the two rivers, a district some three hundred miles in length, varying from twenty to one hundred, averaging perhaps eighty in breadth, and containing an area of 15,000 square miles. There was also a smaller tract between the Euphrates and Arabia.

There was originally a northern and a southern Chaldæa, the first extending south a little below Babylon, and the last reaching to the shores of the Persian gulf. In each of these there was the early predominance of four cities. In the first, or northern, we have the evidence of Scripture that "The beginning of his kingdom was Babel, and Erech, and Accad, and Calneh, in the land of Shinar."¹ In the southern there was Ur, Huruk, Nipur and Larsa or Laran-cha. Ur was situated on the Euphrates, and near its mouth, and was probably in early times the chief commercial emporium. This appears to have been early, if not originally, the Chaldæan capital. The remains of most of these cities still exist, and, as the process of disintegration has been continually operating to lower the height of

¹ Rawlinson's *Five Monarchies*, 1, 19.

the ruins, the most depressed mounds are regarded as the remains of the most ancient and longest deserted cities.

Among the natural products of this fertile region, the two that stand out the most preeminently are the wheat plant and the date-palm. The native tradition makes the former indigenous in Chaldæa. Besides these were other products, such as barley, millet, sesame, vetches, and fruits of all kinds. It was deficient in trees, except the palm and cypress. As the Chaldæan region was alluvial, there has ever been a great deficiency in mineral products. But there was an inexhaustible supply of clay, which could be moulded into bricks, and these when sunburnt or subjected to artificial heat, furnished excellent material for building.

In regard to the ethnic affinities and characteristics of that race that founded the old Chaldæan kingdom and empire there is some discrepancy of opinion. One theory identifies the race as the Aramaic or Semitic, making that race extend from the mouth of the Euphrates and Tigris to the Euxine, the river Halys, and Palestine. Another makes the early Chaldæans, Hamites, not Semites, and hence finds their affinities with the descendants of Misraim and Cush, the Egyptians and Ethiopians rather than with the descendants of Ashur and of Abraham, the Assyrians and Hebrews. This latter is in full accord with the scripture narrative, which states that Cush begat Nimrod, and the beginning of his kingdom was Babel, and Erech, and Accad and Calneh, in the land of Shinar. One difficulty seems to be that the Babylonian language of the age of Nebuchadnezzar is admitted to be almost identical with the Hebrew, but in answer to that it is held susceptible of proof from the inscriptions of the country, that between the date of the first settlement of a Chaldæan kingdom¹ and the reign of that monarch, the language of lower Mesopotamia underwent an entire change. So also tradition points to the Ethiopians as the early dwellers upon the Persian gulf,² and they were considered as occupying all the south coast both

¹ *Ruvolson*, i, 56. ² *Idem*, 58.

of Asia and Africa, as then known, and as divided by the Persian gulf into eastern and western Asiatic and African. Thus the Greeks appear to have believed in an Asiatic Ethiopia situated between Arabia and India on the shores of the Erythræan sea. Much concurring testimony goes to show that the four peoples or races, the Egyptians, Ethiopians, Libyans, and Canaanites were Hamitic in their descent,¹ and that the primitive Chaldæans were of the Ethiopic division. In regard to physical characteristics the Ethiopians were of swart complexions, a dark red brown or copper color, the hair of those of Africa being crisp or frizzled, those of Asia, straight; neither, however, being woolly like the negroes. Their figure was slender and well shaped, and their features regular.

But while we identify the early Chaldæans as Ethiopic in their ethnic character, it is quite apparent that they were far from being a homogeneous people. If we are right in the supposition that the land of Shinar, the lower Mesopotamia, the old Chaldæan alluvial was the first great resting place of the race after descending from the mountains first laid bare by the receding waters of the deluge, it would seem to follow that we might expect to find there a large mingling of races. Accordingly, the researches of George Rawlinson and others have shown from linguistic facts and other ethnic indications that the Chaldæans were not a pure, but a very mixed people; that they were a *colluvio gentium omnium*, a union of various races, and of those too that play a distinguished part in the world's history. Four elements may be here traced, viz: the Turanian, Hamitic, Semitic and Arian. It is a curious fact that the subjects of the early kings are continually designated in the inscriptions by the title of *kīprat-arbat*,² "the four nations" or *tongues*. The league of the four kings is also supposed to have reference to the same four-fold division, Chedorlaomer being Cushite or Hamitic, the preponderating elements, Tidal, king of nations, being Scythic

¹ *Rawlinson*, I, 64. ² *Idem*, I, 69.

or Turanian, and Arioeh and Amraphel respectively leading the Arian and Semitic races.

In view of the importance of language as affording evidence of ethnic diversities of race, it has been observed not only that the early kings are continually represented on the monuments as sovereigns over the *kiprat-arbat*,¹ or Four Races, but that these four races are sometimes called the *Arba Lisun* or Four Tongues. The written remains afford further evidence that the languages, in fact, belonged to the four great varieties of human speech, the Hamitic, Semitic, Arian and Turanian.

The original writing was a picture-writing, objects being themselves represented, but very coarsely, and without any curved lines. In process of time the cuneiform character came to be formed. The writing being upon clay with an instrument having a square or triangular point, much more of it could be done, and more rapid progress made, than if it were required to cut the character into the stone. Thus the old form of objects became, in all but a few cases,² very indistinct, and in process of time was lost altogether. The clay upon which the characters were impressed was in the form of bricks or tablets; the former containing royal inscriptions, not covering the whole brick but occupying a square or rectangular space towards the centre. The writing was in all cases from left to right. The tablets were small pieces of clay, shaped somewhat like a pillow, and thickly inscribed with cuneiform characters, covering usually both sides. The documents thus inscribed were generally enveloped after being baked in a cover of moist clay, thus impressing upon this cover the inscriptions, so as to present externally a duplicate of the writing within, and then the tablet in its cover was baked afresh. Thus the inner side of the envelope is made to bear a cast in relief of the inscription beneath it.

The Chaldæan characters are of three kinds, letters proper, monograms, and determinatives.³ The first have

¹ Rawlinson, I, 77. ² *Idem*, I, 83. ³ *Idem*, I, 84.

almost always a syllabic force. The monograms represent by a wedge, or a group of wedges, an entire word, often of two or three syllables. The determinatives are those that are made use of to indicate that the word which they accompany is a word of a certain class, as a god, a man, a country, a town, etc.

In reference to the chronology and early history of this country it is impossible to say what period of time may have intervened between the first settlement on the plain of Shinar, and the emerging out of the chaos of races and tongues of the old Chaldæan kingdom and Nimrod. The traditional date for the founding of this kingdom in lower Mesopotamia is B. C. 2234.¹ It extended northward at least as far as Babylon, and embraced also Erech, Accad, and Calneh, all founded by Nimrod. This name looms up in the distance, possessing a shadowy grandeur, and passed into a proverb as early as the time of Moses. He was early deified in his own nation, and comes down to us under the title of Bilu-Nipur or Bel-Nimrod — “the god of the chase,”² or “the great hunter.” The name of Nimrod has never died out of the memory of the people, and even now wherever a mound of ashes is to be found in Babylonia or the adjoining countries, the local traditions attach to it the name of *Nimrod*. Thus the name of the great Cushite is stamped upon the very features of the old Chaldæan kingdom.

The dynasty of Nimrod occupied the throne for about two centuries and a half, extending from B. C. 2234 to B. C. 1976. No monuments have come down to us that are known to be of the age of Nimrod. The first known monument builder is Urukh, or Urkham, who called himself King of Ur Kingi-Accad,³ and who is of the Nimrod dynasty and is placed from about 2093 to 2070 B. C. The structures remaining of this first great architect will come up for consideration under the subject — Chaldæan art.

The Nimrod dynasty, embracing, it is said, the reigns of eleven monarchs, was succeeded, about the year B. C. 1976,

¹ Rawlinson, I, 195. ² *Idem*, I, 196. ³ *Idem*, I, 198, 199.

by the Elamitic, which also reigned at Ur, and possessed a more extended dominion. Here we find a great conqueror, by some supposed to be the Kudur-Lagamer of the monuments, the Chedorlaomer of scripture, an Elamitic king, who exercised paramount authority over the whole of lower Mesopotamia. The old kingdom of Chaldæa now became expanded into an empire.¹ Amraphel king of Shinar, Arioch king of Larsa or Ellasar, and Tidal king of the nomadic races, are ranked among his tributaries. With the forces collected out of his own dominions and these conquests, he invaded the adjoining regions, marched an army a distance of 1,200 miles from the shores of the Persian gulf to those of the Dead sea, holding Palestine and Syria in subjection for twelve years, and thus furnished an early example to those great oriental conquerors who afterward built up vast empires in Asia, to become successively the subjects of decay and dissolution. The empire of the Chaldæans, under the sway of this enterprising monarch, extended from the Elamitic mountains on the east to the Mediterranean on the west.

We have few traces of the Chaldæan empire excepting those of the age of Chedorlaomer, but the names of some subsequent kings are to be found on the monuments. Their reigns, however, appear not to have been eventful, and little remains of them worthy of any notice. The earliest capital of the Chaldæan kings was Ur (Mugheir), and no traces of them are found further north than Niffer. A subsequent monarch is found holding his court at Erech, now Warka, twenty-five miles north of Ur, and afterward a still later king makes Babylon his capital. Thus the kingdom is found gradually extending towards the north, the same feature as will be subsequently found prevailing in Assyrian history. The Chaldæan empire included within it the land of Assyria, which was governed by viceroys deriving their authority from the Chaldæan monarchs.

¹ *Rawlinson*, I, 203.

The Chaldæan kingdom lasted a little more than seven centuries. It sank into obscurity about the year B. C. 1500. No great, or striking event marks its exit from the stage of nations. It did not go down in blood. It seems to have been the quiet extinction of sway in the children of Ham. They were environed by the descendants of Shem; east, north and west, they lay upon their borders. This was said to be an Arab conquest. It was probably so strong an attack of the Semitic stock as to overpower the native Hamitic race, and thus to enforce a change of rulers. The race thus succeeding was inferior in civilization, has left no monuments, and scarce a trace of itself in the country. The Hamitic stock having lost all its influence, died out, and the Semitic, Arabian, Assyrian, etc., took its place as a dominant race, and imposed its language upon the people. We shall, however, witness the Chaldæans, after a submission of seven centuries and a half, again revive, and in about six hundred and twenty-five years Before Christ, establish a second kingdom, known as the Babylonian monarchy, which exhibited for a time a brilliant history.

Industry.

The country of the Chaldæans by no means disposes men to nomadic habits. The vast alluvial deposit, stretching from the head of the Persian gulf far up the course of the Euphrates, naturally offered, next to Egypt, the most inviting fields for the exercise of industry. The supposition is not improbable that upon these plains were witnessed the first industrial pursuits of man after the deluge.

The three great branches of industry are agriculture, manufactures, and commerce; the first supplying the raw material, as well as much of the means of subsistence; the second working it up into useful and agreeable forms, while the third distributes them where they are the most desired, and will command the readiest market. Of these three, agriculture, in its first rude essays, was undoubtedly

the earliest, as any people, if at all numerous, cannot long subsist without the practice of it. It follows close upon the heels of the shepherd's state, as that in turn did upon the hunter's. But agriculture requires its implements, although they be ever so simple, and these again belong to manufacturing industry. Thus it was probably designed that one should stimulate the other in order that each should receive its largest share of development.

The practice of agriculture to any considerable extent requires some previous preparation of the soil, more especially in the way of drainage in a country like lower Mesopotamia where the soil becomes so thoroughly interpenetrated by water. Accordingly, we now find the remains of a system of drainage as practiced in ancient Chaldæa. These remains, however, so far as any discoveries have been yet made, appear to be confined to the drainage of tombs, by means of which not only the ornaments and utensils that were placed in tombs,¹ but also in some cases the skeletons themselves have been preserved. Whether these were so extended as to be applied to agricultural pursuits, does not seem to be clearly settled. A tradition is correct in stating that the wheat plant was indigenous in Chaldæa; it could have required but little industry in applying its products to the wants of man. The grain would be required to be separated from the ear, but that was done by spreading the sheaves on a hard, smooth place, in the open air, and then driving oxen over them until a complete separation was accomplished.² This was practiced in Egypt in the time of Moses. Even at the present day, flails are little, if at all, used in the east.

The manufacture of bread was also slow and gradual in its progress. The grain was first bruised between two stones,³ then mixed with water, formed into a kind of paste, and then baked by placing it under hot ashes, until the discovery of ovens afforded a more convenient means. Grain was also prepared by roasting, and by steeping and boiling it in water.

¹ Rawlinson, I, 113, 114. ² Goguet, I, 94. ³ *Idem*, I, 96.

The conversion of meal into bread was an early process, probably at first accomplished by means of baking by hearthstones, and subsequently by ovens. The cultivation of the vine and the manufacture of wine were among the earliest branches of agriculture. They were among the occupations of Noah. The wine press is as ancient as the time of Job. Bread and wine were among the earliest offerings made to the gods.

The early cultivation of the date palm was widely extended. Its fruit was excellent, and was eaten both fresh and dried. Its juices furnished wine,¹ which was slightly intoxicating, and which in process of time became transformed into vinegar. From its sap was also procured palm sugar. From the fibres of the bark they made ropes, while the wood was employed for building and furniture.

Among the earliest of the manufactures, or rather of the mechanic arts, must be included the architectural art. This, in a people's early history, is not a fine, but a useful art. The early abodes of the Chaldæans are supposed to have been built of reeds supported by the tall stems of growing plants bent into arches, and walled with mats of flags and sedge. The want of temples for the common worship of God required an early combination of resources for the creation of a higher style of architecture, and at this point usually the fine art emerges out of the useful. None of the earliest abodes of the Chaldæans have reached us. We have now only a single specimen of domestic architecture;² a small house disinterred at Mugheir, which stood on a platform of sun-dried bricks, paved on the top with burnt bricks. It had the general shape of a cross, although with some irregularity. Two of the doorways were arched, the arch extending through the whole thickness of the walls. The walls are inferred to have been of vast thickness, the chambers long and narrow, with the outer doors opening directly into them.

¹ Rawlinson, I, 44. ² *Idem*, I, 108.

Considerable remains of pottery have been found of the Chaldæan period. Both vases and lamps have been discovered, some of the former being roughly moulded by the hand, while other vases and also lamps have been carefully shaped by the aid of the potter's wheel. These last are formed of a finer clay than the former, having sometimes a slight glaze upon them which adds much to their beauty.¹

In the Chaldæan ruins, the implements which have been discovered are either in stone, or bronze. Iron was then unknown. In the most ancient Chaldæan mounds are found knives of flint, or chert, stone hatchets, hammers, etc., all of a rude and coarse character, a trifle more advanced than those found in the drift, but very similar to the ordinary stone celts of western and northern Europe. They possessed some knowledge of the cleavage of silicious rocks, but no power of producing even such finish as the Celts frequently exhibit.

So, also, the metallurgy of the Chaldæans, though somewhat in advance of their stone weapons, is still of a rude character, and indicates a nation just emerging from barbarism. Metals seem to have been scarce and of few kinds. There is no silver, zinc, or platinum. Copper occurs pure and also alloyed with tin, constituting bronze. This latter was of very common use, being wrought into bolts, rings, weapons, and various instruments.

The textile fabrics — products of the loom, are believed to have been a branch of industry in which the ancient Chaldæans excelled. As the vocation of the shepherd naturally precedes the more varied pursuits of agriculture, it might be expected that woolen would be of early production. In the warm climate of Chaldæa, however, linen would be likely to be in early demand, and accordingly fabrics of that material are said to have been found attached to some of the skeletons in the tombs. In later times Babylon was very celebrated for its robes and its carpets. The commencement of these manufactures is attributed to the old Chaldæans.

¹ *Rawlinson*, I, 115-16.

In regard to the third branch of industry, commerce, it would be impossible at this time to indicate with any clearness the commercial pursuits of the ancient Chaldæans. It is highly probable that the channels of commerce in the ancient world, which we may hereafter have occasion to indicate, found their origin in the Chaldæan period, but it is certain that during that period no such clearly marked progress was attained, as to justify us in attributing to the Chaldæans any great extent or variety of commercial industry.

Religion.

The wants of the soul have always manifested themselves early in the history of every people. These wants have endeavored to find their satisfaction in the act of worship. This necessarily implies an object, and the great variety of objects that have been selected, prove either a great diversity of taste and dissimilar habits of thinking and feeling among different peoples, or the different impositions which have been practiced upon the people by the priest caste from motives of self-interest and personal aggrandizement.

The religion of the Chaldæans was a polytheism of a somewhat peculiar character. In the first place there were some fifteen or sixteen principal deities who appear to have been generally worshiped by all the people. Next followed a more numerous set of inferior divinities which, although secondary were still generally recognized through the country. Then followed a host of mere local gods or genii, almost every town or village in Chaldæa having one for its own protector.

Of the principal god, IL, or RA, (the latter being the Chaldæan name, the former the Semitic equivalent, being a variant of *El*,¹ the root of the biblical *Elohim*, and the Arabic *Allah*) was a god with few peculiar attributes. He

¹ *Ravlinson*, I, 143.

was regarded rather as the fount and origin of deity too remote from man to be much known as an object of worship. Even a belief in his existence is implied rather than expressed in the Chaldæan inscriptions. It may, in this respect, have been similar to the *Neph* of the Egyptians, and "*The Unknown God*" of the Athenians. Through the abounding polytheism of the ancient world, it would seem that traces of the great God, the sovereign ruler, were never entirely effaced from the minds of men, although generally he was so very remote that mere glimpses were all that could be attained.

ANA was a God of great antiquity corresponding with the Grecian Pluto. Besides having a number of epithets marking his antiquity, as "the old Ana," "the original chief," etc., he also bore such titles as "the king of the lower world," "the lord of darkness," or "death,"¹ "the ruler of the far off city," all serving to connect him with the infernal regions. His seat of worship was Erech, the modern Warka, the city of the dead, the great Chaldæan necropolis. He was also esteemed as "the layer up of treasures," the "lord of the earth" and of the "mountains," whence are derived the precious metals, thus connecting Plutus with Pluto. There are also some grounds for thinking that he also bore the name of *Dis*, and if so, a connecting link is found to exist between the Chaldæan and Roman mythology.

ANATA, a female deity, the wife of *Ana*, represented the feminine form of the latter, being little more than the mere reflection of her husband. No personality is assigned her separate from him, much resembling Amente, the feminine Ammon of the Egyptian mythology.

BIL, or ENU, signifying "lord" has usually attached to it the qualifying word *Nipur*, signifying to "pursue;" and both together, or *Bil Nipur*, mean "the Hunter Lord,"

¹ *Ravolinson*, I, 148.

thus, it is supposed, furnishing an example of hero worship in deifying the name of Nimrod. As this kind of worship is so common in the early history of the old world it would be strange if no trace of it were to be found in the Chaldæan mythology. This god occupies about the same position as the classical Jupiter. He was regarded as "the supreme," "the father of the gods," "the lord of the world" and of "all countries." In old Assyrian times Babylon was called "the city of Bil-Nipur," and when reference is had to the founder of the empire, this appellation undoubtedly means Bel-Nimrod, that is Nimrod. The chief seat of his worship was Nipur or Calneh, where was situated his famous temple called *Khanis-Nipra*, once noted for its wealth, splendor, and antiquity. He is a god almost universally acknowledged in the invocations of the Babylonian and Assyrian kings. His worship in Chaldæa extends through the whole time of the monarchy.

BELTIS, the wife of Bel-Nimrod, strongly contrasts with *Anata*, in that she is more than the mere reflection of her husband, being a separate and very important deity. She was known as the great goddess, and in Chaldæa was called *Mulita*, which Herodotus, by a slight change, makes *Mylitta*. Her favorite title was "the mother of the gods, or the mother of the great gods." She had also the title of "the great lady," "the goddess of war and battle," and "the queen of fecundity." She thus united the attributes of the Juno, the Ceres or Demeter, the Bellona, and the Diana of the Greeks and Romans, as she was the queen of heaven, the goddess of fertility upon earth, the goddess of war and battle, and the goddess of hunting. The temples of this goddess were very numerous, and her worship very wide spread.

HEA, or HOA, has been by some, connected with the serpent of Scripture,¹ and the paradisaical traditions of the

¹ Rawlinson, I, 153.

tree of knowledge and the tree of life. He occupies the position which in the Greek and Roman mythology, is assigned to Poseidon or Neptune. He was called "the lord of the earth," "the king of the rivers," but never "the lord of the sea." He is also styled "the lord of the abyss," or "of the great deep," which was considered to be distinct from the sea. He is also the god of science and knowledge, and hence styled "the intelligent guide," or according to others, "the intelligent *fish*," "the teacher of mankind," "the lord of understanding." He has one emblem of the "wedge," or "arrowhead," the element of cuneiform writing. Another is the serpent, which is regarded as emblematic of superhuman knowledge, "a record of the primeval belief, that the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field." He was also called "the god of life," "the god of glory," and "god of giving."

DAV-KINA was the wife of Hoa, her name being thought to signify "the chief lady." Like *Anata* she was little more than the feminine reflex of her husband.

SIN, or HUSKI, was the moon-deity, the lesser luminary being more regarded among the Chaldæans than the greater. His titles are somewhat vague. He is "the chief," "the powerful," "the lord of spirits," "he who dwells in the great heaven," "the chief of the gods of heaven and earth," "the king of the gods," and even "the god of the gods." He is also called "the bright," "the shining," "the lord of the month." As presiding over buildings and architecture, he is called "the supporting architect," "the strengthener of fortifications," and "the lord of building." His ordinary symbol is the crescent or new moon, represented as large and thin. The temple of this god was at Ur, a city under his special protection. He had also shrines at Babylon and Borsippa; at Calah and Dur-Sargina. He is sometimes called the eldest son of Bel-Nimrod. His wife, the moon-goddess, is frequently associated with him and is entitled "the great lady."

SAN, or SANSI, the sun-god, is called in some places "the lord of fire," "the light of the gods," "the ruler of the day," and "he who illumines the expanse of heaven and earth." He is also called "the regent of all things," "the establisher of heaven and earth." He is regarded as the "supreme ruler who casts a favorable eye on expeditions," "the vanquisher of the king's enemies," "the breaker up of opposition." From observing the great agency of the material sun in stimulating all the functions of nature, the Chaldæans seem to have supposed that the sun-god exerted a similar influence on the minds of men, and was the great motive agent in human history. The chief seats of his worship were Larsa or Ellasar, and Sippara. In the first mentioned was erected a great temple. His symbol is either a simple circle \bigcirc , a quartered disk \oplus , or a four-rayed orb \odot .

AI, GULA, or ARRUNIT, was the wife of Sin, the female power of the sun. Her chief characteristics are that she presides over life and over fecundity. There is a "mistress of life," the special dispenser of life, and also a "mistress of the gods," who presides over births; but whether these are really distinct deities, or mere aspects of Gula, does not appear to be distinctly settled. Her emblem is the eight-rayed disk or orb; in lieu of which we have sometimes an eight-rayed star \star , and sometimes one with only six rays \ast . The eight-rayed star became, at an early period, the universal emblem of divinity.

VUL, or IVA, the god of the atmosphere, corresponds very nearly with the Greek and Roman Zeus or Jupiter, being like him the "prince of the power of the air," lord of the whirlwind and the tempest, and the wielder of the thunderbolt. He is entitled "the lord of the air," "the minister of heaven and earth," "he who makes the tempest to rage." His emblem is figured as a double or triple bolt. As the dispenser of rain he is entitled "the giver of abundance," "the lord of fecundity." He pre-

sided over canals, the great fertilizers of Babylonia. Hence he was called "the lord of canals," and "the establisher of works of irrigation."

BAZ, NIN, or NINIP, has the attributes of Hercules, the two first terms being respectively Semitic and Hamitic, signifying "lord" or "master." In the inscriptions he is termed the god of strength and courage.¹ His attributes are "the lord of the brave," "the champion," "the warrior who subdues foes," "he who strengthens the heart of his followers," "the destroyer of his enemies," "the reducer of the disobedient," "the exterminator of rebels," "he whose sword is good." He had also various other attributes, and some epithets pointing to his stellar character, such as "the light of heaven and earth," "he who, like the sun, the light of the gods, irradiates the nations." He was the son of Bel-Nimrod, and his emblem in Assyria is the man-bull, the impersonation of strength and power. He was said to guard the palaces of the Assyrian kings, was regarded as their tutelary god, and even gave his name to their capital city, Nineveh.

BEL-MERODACH is the planet Jupiter, and is called "the judge," "the old man of the gods." He was worshiped in the early Chaldean kingdom, and from a very remote time was the tutelary god of the city of Babylon. He was there styled "the great lord," "the senior of the gods," "the most ancient," "the supporter of sovereignty," and "the layer up of treasures." His great statue at Babylon, according to Diodorus, was a figure "standing and walking."

ZIR-BANIT was the wife of Bel-Merodach, having a temple at Babylon, and was probably the goddess whose worship the Babylonian settlers carried to Samaria, and who, in scripture, is called *Succoth-Benoth*.

¹ Rawlinson, I, 165-6.

NERGAL was the planet Mars, and was regarded as the god of war and of hunting. He is entitled "the king of battle," "the champion of the gods," "the storm ruler," "the strong begetter," and "the god of the chase." He was more an Assyrian than a Chaldean deity. His symbol was the man-lion.

ISHTAR, or NANA, was the planet Venus, and her general features resemble that classical goddess. She corresponds with the *Astarte* of the Phœnicians, and the *Ashtoreth* of the Hebrews. She is termed "the goddess who rejoices mankind," "the fortunate," or "the happy." She had also great and warlike epithets, as "the great goddess," "the queen of all the gods," "the goddess of war and battle," "the queen of victory," "she who arranges battles," etc. She had numerous shrines, and her worship was wide spread. Her symbol is supposed to have been the naked female figure.

NEBO represented the planet Mercury, his special function being to preside over knowledge and learning, Hence he is called "the god who possesses intelligence," "he who hears from afar," "he who teaches," and "he who teaches and instructs." He also, like Hoa, is symbolized by the wedge or arrowhead. He is also called "the supreme chief," "the sustainer," "the supporter," the "ever ready," "the lord of the constellations," "the holder of the sceptre of power," etc. He was not among the early Chaldæan deities, but his origin seems to have been Babylonian, not Assyrian. In later ages he was worshiped at Borsippa, where he had the great temple, known at present as the Birs-Nimrod.

These were the chief gods of the Chaldæans. The inferior deities were numerous, vague and shadowy, a vast number merely local, and many, probably the greater gods, disguised under rustic titles.

It will be perceived that there is much in this early religion, which serves as the germ of the later classical

mythology. It was to a certain extent, *astral*; the heaven, sun, moon and five planets, having each their representative in the Chaldæan pantheon. The astral element however, is not universal, the Chaldæan religion not being the simple worship of the "host of heaven." Again the astral bodies, as in the Greek and Roman mythology, are regarded as real persons, having a life and a history, a power and an influence, and not as a mere metaphorical representation of phenomena, attaching to the air and the heavenly bodies. Some, on the other hand, have supposed it quite possible that there may have been esoteric explanations,¹ known to the priests and more learned, which, resolving the personages of the pantheon into the powers of nature, reconcile the apparent multiplicity of gods, with monotheism. To all appearances, however, the Chaldæan worship was grossly polytheistic.

One peculiar feature of the Chaldæan religion is found in the grouping of the principal deities into triads. Thus the first triad is composed of *Ana*, *Bil* or *Belus* and *Hea* or *Hoa*,² each accompanied by his respective wife, or female principal. Then follows the second triad consisting of *Sin* or *Thurki*, *San* or *Sansi*, and *Vul*, thus uniting in one triad the moon, the sun, and the atmosphere, or the gods appropriate to each. These also have their female powers or wives. Then follows a group of five minor deities, *Nin*, or *Ninip*, *Merodach*, *Nergal*, *Ishtar*, and *Nebo*.

Although a certain amount of *relationship* was considered to exist among the Chaldæan divinities, yet they do not appear to have been connected, like the Egyptian and classical, into a single genealogical scheme. Many deities are without parentage, while with others the relationship is much confused. The great gods are regarded rather as a hierarchy of coequal powers, than as united by ties implying on the one hand preeminence, and on the other subordination.

¹ *Rawlinson*, I, 138. ² *Idem*, I, 141.

Government.

There is so little peculiar or distinctive in the development of this element in any one of the five great monarchies that succeeded each other in western Asia, that it is unnecessary to give it any consideration as applied to each monarchy. As connected with some one of these monarchies, we will by and bye consider it in its application to all.

CHAPTER V.

CHALDÆA—ITS SOCIETY, PHILOSOPHY AND ART. ASSYRIA— ITS DESCRIPTION AND HISTORY.

Society.

The early history of the Chaldæans sheds but a dim light upon the social element. Unfortunately, the Chaldæans had not the power like the Egyptians, by their sculptured and pictorial representations made upon the rock built walls of their palaces, temples and tombs, to perpetuate the knowledge of their manners and customs among the far off generations of the future. The monuments that remain of this early Asiatic people, afford but a scanty account of their general mode of life, manners and usages.

The dress of the common people among the Chaldæans usally consisted of a single garment, a short tunic,¹ tied round the waist, and reaching thence to the knees, a costume very similar to that worn by the Madan Arabs at the present day. To this was sometimes added a cloak thrown over the shoulders, and falling below the tunic, about half-way down the calf of the leg. The material of the first is supposed to have been linen, and that of the cloak, woolen. While the head was protected by a skull-cap, or a band of camel's hair, thus giving the germ of the modern turban; the feet were unprotected by either shoes, or sandals.

Among the wealthier classes, the costume was more elaborate. While the neck and arms were bare, the head was covered either with a low cap ornamented with two curved horns, or by a high mitre of a very peculiar ap-

¹ *Rawlinson*, I, 132.

pearance. The chief garment was a long gown, or robe, extending from the neck to the feet, commonly either striped, or flounced, or both, and sometimes adorned with fringe.

The beard was worn straight and long, and not as by the Assyrians in crisped curls. The hair was also worn long, and either gathered up behind, or flowing in long spiral curls on either side of the face and down the back.

The women were fond of ornaments. On female skeletons in their tombs are found bronze bangles and armlets, bracelets of rings or beads, earrings, and rings for the toes. Even gold beads are found in a few of the tombs.

The date was the chief support of the mass of the population. The practice seems to have prevailed in Chaldæa of burying with the man a quantity of the food to which he had been accustomed during life. Around the skeleton are found a number of dishes in which this food was contained. Fish have always been abundant, and the inhabitants of lower Mesopotamia have always subsisted largely on them. It is known that these were taken by hooks as these have been found in the tombs, and probably also in nets, as these are among the earliest of human inventions.

As the earliest warfare of man was with wild beasts, who were ready to dispute with him the possession of the new earth, and as Nimrod was "a mighty hunter before the Lord," there is little doubt but that hunting was among the earliest sports of the Chaldæans, but we have not as yet any hunting scenes reaching back to these early times.¹

The burial of the dead was not underneath the natural surface of the ground, but in extensive artificial mounds, each containing a vast number of coffins. These are arranged side by side, often in several layers, and occasionally separated from each other by strips of masonry, crossing each other at right angles.

¹ *Rawlinson*, I, 136.

Not much that is clearly distinctive is known of the early Chaldæan modes of life and manners and customs. The consideration of life in Babylon comes appropriately under the Babylonian monarchy.

Philosophy.

There is much difficulty in getting at the precise relations which the Chaldæans sustained to the principle of thought. The actual monuments that remain, enlighten us but little upon this subject. The early writers lead us to believe that there was a body of men called Chaldæans, Chaldees, Chasdim, who constituted a caste, or peculiar order, and who, like the priests in Egypt, were charged with the religious rites, and also with the cosmogony and philosophy, so far as the world's primitive thinking could be dignified by that term. The established fact of the existence of the priest caste in Egypt, and also in the Hebrew nation, and the agency of both in the advancement of civilization, render it extremely probable that here also a similar caste had an early existence. We shall assume therefore, as true, what is extremely probably in itself, what the early writers affirm, and what the book of Daniel plainly sanctions, viz: that there was among the Chaldæans and subsequently among the Babylonians also, a body of men in the nature of a caste, exercising the influence, clothed with the power, and performing the functions similar, although not as great, as the priest caste in Egypt. Indeed it would seem not improbable, that in the early ages of the world, and among every ancient people, there have sprung up a class of men who made a monopoly of the gifts of mind; who were alike the depositaries of the will of the gods, the secrets of knowledge, and the revelations of science. This class was almost invariably hereditary, and composed a caste by itself. To the common people it was shrouded in mystery. When it unveiled itself to their wondering vision it would be in the announcements of astrology, the wonder-workings of ne-

romancy, the incantations of magic, or the mysterious, and often gorgeous forms of idolatrous worship. All that they could glean from science, acquire from observation, or learn from reason; was hoarded up as capital upon which they could operate more and more extensively in alluring, deceiving, and imposing upon the rest of mankind. For their own protection they made a league with despotism, sustaining the throne, which in turn leaned for its support upon the altar. The knowledge they could master was not to enable them to instruct but to mislead; and the light they could derive, was employed only to dimly illuminate the paths that led others into error. The most striking examples of these are the Chaldæans of Babylonia and Assyria, the Persian magi, and the priests of Egypt. All the science, learning and knowledge they could acquire they kept to themselves. Like their offices and property, these mental acquisitions descended to their children, to be hoarded up in the same manner, and employed for the same purpose. Thus age after age, until their final extinction, beheld the same closed volume, the same mighty sepulchre of knowledge. If a voice came from within, it was only to deceive; if a ray of light found its way outward, it was only to illuminate the darkness in which it was enshrouded.

This, it is true, exhibits a melancholy picture; but nothing would be more natural on the one side than the hoarding up and preserving all the traditionary knowledge of the early world among a certain class of men, and on the other, the making use of it for their own advantage. There are supposed to have been different schools or sects in Chaldæa, but what their particular doctrines were, or in what respects they were distinguished from each other, it is impossible now to determine.

It is pretty evident that what are now called the sciences were originally derived wholly or in part from rude unpolished arts, which were practiced without theory, principles, or method. It was the gradual and long continued exercise of reflection upon the practice of these arts, that

finally resulted in the production and embodiment of laws and principles that came to constitute the more dignified name of science. In the same proportion in which the sciences became matured, they reflected back light upon the arts from which they derived their origin; and thus if science is indebted to art for its commencement, art, in its turn, is indebted to science for its perfection. Man's necessities have been largely the parent of both.

It is obvious that those sciences which are the most useful and necessary would be the first cultivated.¹ Among these we may justly rank the sciences of medicine, arithmetic, geometry and astronomy. The only ones of these in which the Chaldæans can be shown to have excelled are arithmetic and astronomy. In reference to these, the Chaldæan learning of a later age appears to have been originated,² in all its branches, by the primitive people.

The physical circumstances of Chaldæa were all favorable to the study of astronomy. The overhanging skies were unsurpassed in beauty, serenity, brightness, and quiet loveliness, except by those of Egypt, Greece and Italy. The country was a vast extended plain, open on all sides, affording an unbounded prospect extremely favorable to astronomical observations. Here men early collected themselves together in cities, and one of their earliest employments seems to have been the erection of towers far up into heaven, which may have served the purpose of observatories. Although destitute of the telescope and other instruments now deemed so essential, yet they must have early made considerable progress in astronomical knowledge. Astronomical calculations are shown to have been made by them extending back as far as B. C. 2234;³ and would therefore seem to have been commenced and carried on for many centuries by the primitive Chaldæan people. Neither does there seem to be any thing astrological in the early Chaldæan astronomy. Their public buildings, as their temples, were so placed as to face the four cardinal

¹ *Goguet*, I, 192. ² *Rawlinson*, I, 126. ³ *Idem*, I, 127.

points. They invented different kinds of dials, and divided the day into those hours which we still use. The perversion of astronomy into astrology seems to have been later, and to belong to the era of the Babylonian empire. Arithmetic, the science of number, is an essential element in the prosecution of astronomical science.

The speculative talent of the Chaldæans was developed in a somewhat curious cosmogony. According to it in the beginning all was darkness and water, in which were generated monstrous animals having strange and peculiar forms, such as men with wings and two faces, and two heads, and men with the heads of animals, etc., and there were monstrous fish, reptiles, serpents and other creatures.¹ A woman ruled them having a name meaning "the sea." Then appeared the god Belus and split the woman in twain, making of the one half heaven, and of the other the earth, causing the beasts to perish. He also split the darkness, and divided the heaven and the earth asunder, and put the world in order, all the animals perishing that could not bear the light. Then Belus seeing the earth desolate, yet teeming with productive power, caused one of the gods to cut off his own head, and to mix the blood which flowed forth with earth, and form men therewith, and beasts that could bear the light. So man was made intelligent, being a partaker of the divine wisdom. Belus also made the stars, and the sun and moon, and the five planets.

This has many points of resemblance with the Bible account of the creation. In both are the formless world, and the darkness; the existence of animals before man; and the divine element infused into man at his birth. Such resemblance has given rise to the idea that the old Babylonian legend in which the foregoing is contained, embodies a primeval tradition, common to all mankind, and which serves as the basis of the Mosaic account. The primitive Chaldæans have also traditions of the destruction of the earth by a deluge, and of the erection of the tower of Babel.

¹ *Rawlinson*, I, 180-2.

Art.

Art, in its broadest sense, embraces all that human ingenuity and intelligence are capable of achieving, by the adoption of means for the production of ends. Its division into what are called the useful and fine arts, has reference rather to the purposes they subserve, than to any essential difference in the nature of their production. The first are subservient to the common purposes of life. They appeal to man's physical nature, multiply the sources of physical enjoyment, and throw around the uses and purposes of this world, a constantly increasing interest. The second are higher in their aims. They stir the depths of a nature holding little alliance with the purely physical. They invoke the spirit of beauty, are at home in the sublime, revel amid the splendors of the ideal, and arouse and gratify feelings that derive little or no enjoyment from the scenes or enactments of every day life. The sculptured marble, the glowing canvas, the music of varied tones, are among those specimens of art, which aid in composing this element of humanity.

There is much difficulty in drawing the dividing line, and in deciding upon those which should properly be included within this element. Those that strictly come within the denomination of the useful arts, are more properly considered under the element of industry. We shall not, therefore, allude to them in the consideration of art.

The only art we have any certain knowledge of, as practiced by the Chaldæans, is that of architecture; and even of that there are very few remains. The Chaldæans did not, like the Egyptians, possess inexhaustible stone quarries, to which they could resort as material for their architectural structures. They, however, possessed the material for the manufacture of brick, which they either dried in the sun or baked in a kiln. The latter were of various size and color; their shape, generally square, and disproportionately small in thickness, the earliest

being eleven and one-quarter inches square, and two and one-quarter thick. The sun-dried varied from six inches square by two thick, to sixteen inches square by seven thick. The arch was known to this primitive people, and in the construction of it, they employed wedge shaped bricks. The cement used was of two kinds; one a coarse clay or mud, sometimes mixed with straw, the other bitumen of such excellent quality, that the bricks thus united, adhere often so firmly, that they can, with difficulty, be separated.

Little remains of the architectural art of the Chaldæans except the ruins of temples, and these, thus far, are only three in number, with a very great general resemblance between them. Although the present state of the ruins precludes the idea of a satisfactory reconstruction of the buildings,¹ yet it seems extremely probable that the early Chaldæan temple was a building in three stages, the first and second were solid masses of brick work, ascended by steps on the outside, while the third was a small house or chamber highly ornamented, containing the image and shrine of the god. Very few remains, however, have ever been found of the third story, so that its existence is not very clearly established. These temples were faced with burnt brick, and strengthened by buttresses. They had no external ornament. In one only were found the rudiments of the pillar. No fragments of architraves or capitals, no sculptured ornaments of any kind are found among the ruins. No edifices in the world are more deficient in external ornament. They exhibit only flat walls sloping inward as they ascend, with their uniformity broken only by buttresses and air holes. And yet, says Mr. Loftus, "I know of nothing more exciting or impressive than the first sight of one of these great Chaldæan piles, looming in solitary grandeur from the surrounding plains and marshes."²

The Chaldæan architecture is also exemplified in their tombs. These were of three kinds. The first, brick vaults

¹ Rawlinson, 1, 99. ² *Chaldea and Susiana*, 113.

composed of sun-dried bricks,¹ and exhibiting a remarkable form and construction of arch. The side walls slope outward as they ascend, and the arch is formed by the overlapping of each successive layer of bricks, commencing at the point where it begins, and continuing upwards till the two sides of the roof are brought so near together that the aperture may be closed by a single brick. The second were clay coffins, shaped like a dish cover, formed of a single piece of burnt clay, commonly seven feet long, by two, or three high, and effectually covering mat, skeleton, and the utensils or ornaments by which it was surrounded. The third was still more original in its conception, consisting of two large open mouthed jars averaging from two and a half to three feet in depth,² and having a diameter of about two feet. These two were sometimes of equal size, and united at their mouths by bitumen, but more generally the one slightly larger than the other, the mouth of the smaller being inserted into that of the larger for three or four inches, and surrounded by a coating of bitumen. Within the body was disposed of, with the usual accompaniments of dishes, vases, and ornaments.

Assyria.

The Assyrian monarchy held dominion in the upper portion of the Mesopotamian valley, on each side of the middle Tigris. It was enclosed within the thirty-fifth and thirty-seventh parallels of latitude, and bounded south by the lower alluvial valley, the site of Babylonia and Chaldæa, east by the mountain chain of Zagros, north by Mount Masius, and west by a variable line which may properly be extended to the Euphrates. The whole country between the Tigris and the Khabour, which flows into the Euphrates, is covered by the remains of the Assyrian people. The same feature prevails here that is found in the subsequent Babylonian, Median and Persian monarchies, and that is

¹ *Rawlinson*, I, 108-109. ² *Idem*, I, 111, 112.

that the monarchy takes its name from the province which is the site of the kingdom, while the empire which the kingdom controlled and governed, was far more extensive, and possessing limits varying with its resources and posterity.

From the north and east flow abundant streams of water, which impart to eastern Assyria, or that lying upon the eastern bank of the Tigris, a high degree of fertility; while the western, or that lying on its western bank, has but a scant supply of water, and much of it requires the labor of man to prevent its relapsing into a desert.

Here, as in Chaldæa, a special preeminence is given to four cities where Asshur is said to have "builed Nineveh,¹ and the city Rehoboth, and Calah, and Resen." And in the flourishing period of the empire we find four capitals, the native names being Ninua, Calah, Asshur and Bit-Sargina, the city of Sargon. Each of these appears to have been the capital at different times, but the greatest, although not the first, was the city of Nineveh. This city stood upon the eastern bank of the Tigris, and its present ruins indicate its shape to have been an irregular trapezium,² or a triangle with its apex abruptly cut off to the south. Its shape was oblong, the circuit of its walls being somewhat less than eight miles, and the included area eighteen hundred English acres. This is much less than the circuit and area given by Diodorus, but the dimensions of the walls as given by him, viz: one hundred feet high, and so broad that three chariots might drive side by side along the top, are, from present appearances, deemed to have been correct. These walls up to a certain height, about fifty feet, were composed of hewn blocks of fossiliferous limestone, ornamented along its top by a continuous series of battlements or gradines in the same material, and above this the material used was sun-dried brick, crowned probably by a similar ornamentation. In this wall, gates occurred at intervals, above which

¹ Rawlinson, I, 248. ² *Idem*, I, 320.

rose lofty towers. Outside this wall lay a water barrier, consisting on the west and south of natural river courses. On the north and east were artificial channels, and these were supplied with water by the Khosr, a stream which flowed through the city. Nor were these the only defenses. While on the west the city overhung the Tigris and was protected by it, on the east its most vulnerable side,¹ it was protected by five walls and three broad and deep moats; towards the north by a wall, a moat, the Khosr, and a strong outpost; and towards the south, by two moats and three lines of rampart. It is proper to mention that it is by no means universally conceded that the circumscribed city of Nineveh, here mentioned, is the "exceeding great city of three days journey," visited by Jonah, and described by Ctesias and Diodorus. And it has been suggested that the Nineveh of the ancients applies not to any single walled town, but to the cluster of cities which in succession, and in part simultaneously, were the capitals of Assyria. That the four cities, already referred to, stood not far from each other, and that there is reason to believe the intervening spaces between them were occupied by lesser towns and villages, some of them of considerable size. That the name of Nineveh should be applied to this metropolitan district—this cluster of royal cities, which rose like separate citadels, protecting and forming the angles of the great oblong within which lay these lesser towns and villages. This would give a city or rather cluster of cities, towns, and villages, corresponding in extent with that described by Ctesias and Diodorus, and also in the book of Jonah.²

The two principal ruins within the walls of Nineveh are the Kouyunjik mound and the Nebbi Yunus. The former is an irregular oval, having a flat surface with sides sloping at a steep angle, and furrowed with ravines. The greatest elevation is ninety-five feet, and the area, covered by the mound, is estimated at one hundred acres, the

¹ *Rawlinson*, I, 325. ² *Eclectic*, 1866, p. 550.

entire mass being said to contain 14,500,000 tons of earth, sufficient, by computation, to require the united labors of 20,000 men for six years to complete the structure. And on this artificial eminence were planted the palaces and temples of the Assyrian monarchs. The last named, the Nebbi Yunus, is loftier than the first, with its sides more precipitous, and covering an area of about forty acres, and raised for the same purpose. The western part of the city which overhung the Tigris, was the most fashionable part, as here were the palaces of the kings and the dwellings of the richer citizens.

The Assyrians were the descendants of Shem, their language being clearly Semitic. The two materials upon which the Assyrians principally impressed their language were stone and moist clay, the former being employed by the monarchs, and the latter by private persons, and by literary and scientific men. The clay documents when skillfully baked, have come down to us extremely legible.

Independent of their language, being cognate with that of the Hebrew, Syriac and Arabic, the sculptured effigies of the Assyrians present a striking resemblance to the Jewish physiognomy. The forehead is straight, but not high, the brow full, the eye large and almond shaped, the nose aquiline, a little coarse at the end, and unduly depressed, the mouth strong and firm, with lips somewhat thick, and the chin well formed. With these, the hair is abundant, and the beard ample, both colored as black. These traits are common to the Semitic race generally, and are the same which anciently characterized, not only the Assyrians, but also the Phœnicians, Syrians, and other minor Semitic races, and are now traceable in the Arab, the Jew, and the Chaldæan of Kurdistan. But, unlike the Jew and the Arab, the Assyrian was robust, broad-shouldered, large-limbed, thus everywhere presenting a muscular type, that has vindicated the claim of his race to be considered the "Romans of Asia."

In his mental characteristics the Assyrian was extremely Jewish. He was, in his way, intensely religious. Whatever

he does, and wherever he goes, he ascribes his successes and good fortune to the gods, and everywhere "sets up the emblems of Asshur," or of "the great god."¹ So also combined with this religious tendency there is a sensuousness which gives to that tendency a gross, material, and even voluptuous character. They are ever characterized as "a fierce people," and this is well borne out by their history. They were also a treacherous people, besides being proud and haughty. In mental power they were in the vanguard of the Semitic, and even Asiatic races. Deriving much of their early civilization from the Chaldæans they in many respects surpassed them,² and introduced improvements, giving a greatly increased value, and almost a new character, to arts previously discovered.

The Assyrian history fully vindicates the possession of these strong physical and mental characteristics. The Assyrian monarchy preceded the empire by a period of time which it is not possible now to determine. The Assyrians were probably long crystalizing into a character which finally rendered them the first great conquering power in western Asia.

In regard to their origin, we have the account that "Out of thatland," the land of Shinar, "went forth Asshur, and builded Nineveh." Thus the great alluvial plain of Chaldæa was the original home of the Assyrians, until, grown from a family into a people, they carried the arts and civilization of the Chaldæans, and planted them in their new settlement on the middle Tigris. This must have been certainly as early as B. C. 1600, as the name of Asshur, as applied to that country, is traced back to about that period, but the actual settlement was probably several centuries earlier. Like Chaldæa its capital was first located in the southern part of its territory. It was the city of Asshur on the west bank of the Tigris. This not being favorably situated for a capital, *Shalmaneser I*, in B.C. 1290, founded Calah, now known as Nimrud, further north, and

¹ *Rawlinson*, I, 300, 301. ² *Idem*, I, 306.

on the east bank of the Tigris, which was the second great Assyrian city. The names of some of the later kings of the Assyrian monarchy, especially one last mentioned, have come down to us; but the period when that budding monarchy blossomed into an empire is well settled to have been about the year B.C. 1270. That period was signalized by the accession of the first great conqueror, *Tiglath-Nin*, the son and successor of *Shalmaneser I*, who commenced the foundation of the Assyrian empire by the conquest of Babylon. Here, therefore, commenced the ascendancy of the second great power of western Asia, the Assyrian, which immediately succeeded the Chaldæan.

During almost a century and half following we know very little of Assyrian history, when we reach the reign of *Tiglath-Pileser I*, B.C. 1130, of whose reign a long document gives us a very full account. From this document, which details five campaigns of this monarch, it would seem that he carried the terror of the Assyrian name into almost all the surrounding nations, extending his empire from the outer ranges of the Zagros mountains on the east to the Niphates mountains on the north, and the river Euphrates on the west. During all this period Asshur was still the capital of the empire, and the king styles himself "king of the four regions," indicating a division of the territory into districts, thus rendering prominent the number "four" in Assyria as it had formerly been in Chaldæa, the latter containing "four cities and four tongues," and the former "four regions," and subsequently "four cities." Assyria now exhibits herself as a compact and powerful kingdom, centralized under a single monarch, and with a single great capital, but surrounded by wild tribes, seeking to maintain their own independence, sometimes, and when the danger was great, combining with each other to resist the common foe, at others resolving themselves back into their original independence. As these wild tribes and nationalities were not when conquered, absorbed into, and thus made to form a constituent part of the Assyrian empire, but were subjected to the payment of tribute, having some-

times rulers imposed upon them, and at other times being allowed to choose their own, there were frequent revolts among them from under the Assyrian sway. South also lay Babylonia and Chaldæa, centering in the city of Babylon, which had been long increasing and acquiring a growing importance, and which, although at times nominally under the Assyrian sceptre, yet much of the time was little less than independent. Thus these two kingdoms, about equally centralized, and not varying much from each other either in territory or population, lying side by side with each other, kept up a kind of balance of power between the kingdoms of western Asia, and long prevented Assyria from feeling herself the absolute mistress of the east. The conqueror, *Tiglath-Pileser I*, after five successful campaigns against provinces east, north and west, marched a large army south into Babylonia and captured the city of Babylon. On his return, however, he suffered a reverse, and the images of his gods that were taken along to protect himself and his army were all captured and taken to Babylon where they remained more than 400 years. From the time of his successor for nearly two centuries, we have no records of importance of the Assyrian empire. Then we reach the reign of *Tiglath-Nin II*, in B.C. 890. In B.C. 884, he was succeeded by *Asshur-idannipal*, whose reign was one of the most flourishing in the history of the empire. The records assign to him ten different campaigns, in the course of which the victorious arms of the Assyrians were carried along the northern flank of Lebanon to the shore of the Mediterranean sea, the principal Phœnician states, Tyre, Sidon, Byblus, and Aradus submitting to his authority. His reign was even more distinguished by the grandeur of his public buildings, the greatness of his internal improvements, and the splendor of his sculptural arts than by his victories. The Assyrian dominion had now extended so far towards the north that Asshur was not sufficiently central for its capital. This monarch accordingly removed the seat of government forty miles up the Tigris to Calah, which he enlarged and beautified, bringing

to it at an immense expense the waters of the greater Zab through a tunnel and canal constructed at an immense expense. From the time of this monarch the cities of Calah, Nineveh, and Beth-Sargina, each in succession being a further remove north, continued to rise in importance, until finally Nineveh became the great capital of the Assyrian empire.

His warlike son and successor, *Shalmaneser II*, carried still further the glory of the Assyrian arms. In his reign of thirty-five years, the longest in the Assyrian annals, he conducted in person no fewer than twenty-three military expeditions, besides three or four others that were intrusted to his generals. Babylonia, Chaldæa, Media, Armenia, upper Mesopotamia, the country about the head streams of the Tigris, the Syrians of Damascus, and the Phœnician cities, felt the force of his power. He traversed the country between the Persian gulf on the south and Mount Niphates on the north, and between the Zagros mountains on the east, and the Mediterranean sea on the west. Thus the Euphrates was no longer the western boundary of Assyria, but the authority of her great king was established over the whole of upper Syria, Phœnicia, Hamath, and Samaria, the kingdom of the Israelites. These countries still retained their own laws, administration, and native princes, but they were subject to Assyria, paying her an annual tribute, and giving a free passage to her armies through their territories. But notwithstanding the great power of this monarch, and although he carried on wars in Babylonia, and took tribute from some of the petty kings of the Chaldæan towns, yet no permanent impression seems to have been made in that quarter.

The short reign of his successor *Shamasiva* was distinguished by a campaign into Babylonia, in which a great battle was fought and the Babylonians defeated, and the country rendered for a time tributary to Assyria.

This was followed by the long reign of his son *Iva-lush IV*, of twenty-nine years from B. C. 810 to B. C. 781, during which it appears, although the records are scanty, that the Assyrian

power was still more extended, as that sceptre was now swayed over Babylonia on the south, Philistia and Edom on the west, and much of Armenia and Media on the north and east. The celebrated *Semiramis* was the wife of *Iva-lush IV*, but unfortunately the fables with which the Greeks have graced and adorned her history have found no place in the records of the Assyrian empire. From a queen of Babylon, an empress of Assyria, the conqueror of Egypt and Ethiopia, the invader of India, the builder of Babylon, the constructor of all the great works of western Asia, she dwindles down to a Babylonian princess, the principal queen of *Iva-lush IV*, and the bearing of sway conjointly with him over either the whole or a part of his dominions.¹

With *Iva-lush IV*, Assyria again disappears from history for nearly forty years, from B. C. 781 to B. C. 744, when she reappears under Tiglath-Pileser II, who marched against southern Mesopotamia, attacked and defeated several of the princes, and rendered them tributary. He also again reduced under his subjection Damascus, Samaria, Tyre, and the Arabs bordering upon Egypt. His successor, Shalmaneser IV, being employed the most of his short reign of six years in the subjugation of Samaria and the island Tyre, and thus being constantly absent from his own kingdom and capital, gave occasion to a powerful subject by the native name of *Sargon* or *Sar-gina*, meaning "the king *de facto*," to rebel, and ultimately to establish his authority over the Assyrian empire. He proved one of the greatest and most powerful of the Assyrian monarchs. His military genius shone forth very conspicuous. During the first fifteen years of his reign he was unceasingly employed in the most important military expeditions. He warred successively and successfully in Susiana, in Syria,² on the borders of Egypt, in the tract beyond Amanus, in Melitêné and southern Armenia, in Kurdistan, in Media, and in Babylonia. He seems to have been the first Assyrian monarch who came into direct conflict with the

¹ Rawlinson, II, 382, 383, 384. ² *Idem*, II, 400.

king of Egypt, thus bringing the two great powers of Asia and Africa for the first time to test their strength upon the battle field. The two armies met at Raphia, on the coast of the Mediterranean, and the Egyptians under Sabaco were entirely defeated. Egypt, after this, sustained the position of a dependent power, in her relations with the dominant power of western Asia.

The conquests of *Sargon* in the south were among the most important of his reign. He broke the power of Babylon, and firmly established the Assyrian power on the Persian gulf, so that henceforth until the close of the empire, with a few brief interruptions, the Assyrian rule was maintained over the whole of Babylonia and Chaldæa.

This monarch inaugurated, or more effectually carried out, the system of wholesale deportation of nations. The Israelites were transplanted from Samaria into Mygdonia and some of the Median cities,¹ Armenians to Hamath and Damascus, and Babylonians to Samaria. Everywhere Sargon changed the abodes of his subjects, thus weakening the stronger races by dispersion, and destroying the patriotic links which connect a people with their native land.

Sargon, after a reign of seventeen years, left his crown to the most celebrated of all the Assyrian monarchs, his son *Sennacherib*, who reigned from B. C. 704 to B. C. 680. The materials of his history are gathered from the books of the Old Testament, from the Greek records, and from the recent Mesopotamian researches into the ruins of one of his palaces. We can give no detail of his campaigns and battles. By his victories at Altaku and Khaluli he taught, by the former, Egypt and Ethiopia, and by the latter Susiana and Babylon, that even united, they were no match for the hosts of Assyria. He carried the Assyrian arms to regions into which no earlier Assyrian monarch had ever penetrated,² and adopted modes of warfare on which none of them had previously ventured. Having a firm will, a bold heart, and a fertile invention, proud, haughty, and self-

¹ *Rawlinson*, II, 423. ² *Idem*, II, 456.

confident, knowing the full extent of his resources, he wielded the whole power of Assyria in establishing and compacting an empire, the strongest hitherto known in western Asia. He triumphed on water as well as on land, defeating a Greek fleet in the Mediterranean. His numerous warlike expeditions and triumphs gave him a boundless command of the labor of others, and this he employed in the erection of splendid edifices and works of art. After a glorious reign of twenty-four years this great king, while in the act of worshiping his gods, was assassinated by two of his sons.

He was succeeded by his son *Esarhaddon*, whose reign was also a warlike one, although Assyria had probably reached the highest point of her greatness under *Sennacherib*. In an empire so extensive as the Assyrian had now become, and so oppressive upon its subject provinces, it would be natural to expect numerous revolts from her authority. Some of these provinces were remote from the capital city, and by combining with each other, could make a strong resistance. These revolts would be more likely to occur when a new sovereign ascended the throne. *Esarhaddon*, however, was not entirely occupied in quelling revolts. He also penetrated farther into Media than any former Assyrian monarch, also further into Arabia, defeated *Tirhakah*, king of Egypt, receiving the submission of that country as far as Thebes, and first deposed, and subsequently restored Manasseh, king of Judah, deporting and settling in Palestine, great numbers of men gathered from Babylon, Susa, Elymais, and Persia. The style of this monarch was "king of Assyria, Babylon, Egypt, Meroe and Ethiopia." After a reign of thirteen years he was succeeded by his son *Asshur-bani-pal*, who was at once called upon to quell the revolt of Tirhakah, king of Egypt. This he succeeded in speedily accomplishing. He also quelled several other revolts of a very formidable character, and among these that of the Babylonians and Susianians. He firmly established the Assyrian dominion over Egypt, carried the Assyrian arms beyond those of

any of his predecessors into Asia Minor, conquered Susiana in the south, and signally chastised the Arabians. He had a taste for literature and learning, and caused to be collected at Nineveh a vast collection of clay tablets — a royal Assyrian library.

This was undoubtedly one of Assyria's greatest monarchs. He subdued Egypt and Susiana, held Babylon in quiet possession, marched his armies far into Armenia; and crossed the Taurus, and subdued much of Asia Minor. In his reign, the Assyrian dominions reached their greatest extent. Assyrian art culminated, and the empire seemed likely to extend itself over all the east. And yet the very next reign witnessed the downfall of this mighty empire. Strange that from so great a height, there could be such a fearful fall. And yet this was entirely in keeping with these great empires of western Asia.

This last king was *Asshur-kinat-ili-kain*, or more commonly called *Saracus*. A power had been rising in the east, born and nurtured amid the mountain homes of Media, that was now to descend like an avalanche upon the older, more refined, but some what emasculated civilization of Assyria. Their first army, however, was defeated by the Assyrians, and their king slain. Cyaxares, his successor, led down a fresh army, defeated the Assyrian forces in the field, and closely invested Nineveh. The Median king, however, was recalled to Media to defend his own country against an irruption of the Scythians. Pouring through the passes of the Caucasus, they swarmed into upper Media, deluged the adjacent countries of Armenia and Assyria, and spreading onward to Syria and Palestine. Plundering every where, and settling nowhere, these swarms of nomads moved on, leaving cities in ruins, and the cultivated land a desert. All belligerent powers found sufficient to do against the common destroyer. After the tide had rolled on, and their countless hosts had disappeared as mysteriously as they had at first appeared, the nations could slowly return to their normal condition. This sweeping inundation probably weakened the Assyrians much more

than the Medes. A depopulated country, plundered provinces, sacked towns and cities, and impoverished people, could offer but a feeble resistance to an invader. The Medes were the first to recover themselves, their strong upland country, rocky hills and mountain chains suffering far less than the Assyrian plains.

About five years after the passage of the Caucasus by the Scythians, Cyaxares had so far recovered that he was able to collect a large Median army, with which he invaded Assyria from the east, while an army of Susianians attacked her from the south. Against the latter Saracus sent an army under Nabopolassar, who betrayed his trust, and united the forces under his command with Cyaxares. These combined forces sat down before Nineveh. The Assyrians were too feeble to offer much effectual resistance, were in no condition to oppose the Median army, and Saracus, after all means of existence were exhausted, burned himself in his palace.

Thus fell the empire of the Assyrians, and almost too in the very height of its power. Yesterday the terror of all western Asia, to-day its power is extinguished forever. Its fall was not owing to inherent weakness, nor to gradual decay, but purely to a combination of circumstances, the ravages of the Scythic irruption, and the invasion of the Medes and Susianians, and the treachery of one of its own commanders. Its extinction dates at the year B. C. 625. As an empire it had lasted six centuries and a half from, B. C. 1270 to B. C. 625, but as an independent kingdom, ruling in upper Mesopotamia upon the middle Tigris, its existence covers the space of at least a thousand years.¹

¹ *Rawlinson*, II, 523.

CHAPTER VI.

ASSYRIA — ITS INDUSTRY, RELIGION, GOVERNMENT, SOCIETY, PHILOSOPHY, AND ART.

Industry.

The civilization of the Assyrians, as embraced in their development of the six elements of humanity, is more marked and certain, and stands out in bolder relief than that of the Chaldæans. Many more of the Assyrian monuments have come down to us, and thus enabled us to speak with certainty concerning the civilization of this ancient people.

In regard to their industrial pursuits the success of their agriculture depended upon the extent and completeness with which they were enabled to irrigate their lands. As rain seldom falls in Assyria, its lack must be supplied by artificial means. The two great Mesopotamian rivers and their tributaries must be made to diffuse the means of plenty through a soil otherwise cursed with barrenness. The numerous mounds scattered over regions which are now deserts, equally with the knowledge we now have of what must have been the populousness of ancient Assyria, all go to show that the people of that country did once possess the means of imparting great fertility to their soil. This was done by subterranean aqueducts, or by an elaborate net work of canals. In the former case the Assyrians sank wells at intervals, and raised water from them by means of a bucket and rope, the latter working over a pulley. From a bank overhanging the river they used the hand-swipe and lifted the water into a tank or reservoir, whence they could distribute it over their fields. They even seem to have brought water to the tops of hills by means of aqueducts, and then through numerous small channels let it trickle down among their trees and crops.

Although the canals have been generally gradually filled up, yet there is one still remaining which is sufficient to show its principles of construction. That is the canal constructed more than twenty-five miles from a point on the Khosr, a tributary of the Zab, to the south-east corner of Calah, the present Nimrud. This was carried through the more elevated ground by tunneling, and for eight miles contrary to the natural course of every stream in the district. Sluices and dams,¹ cut sometimes in the solid rock, regulated the supply of the fluid at different seasons.²

The system of irrigation practiced in Babylonia of leading the water from its natural channel by side cuts, which was practicable on account of the low and alluvial nature of the soil could not be adopted in Assyria where the land undulates, and rises at some distance above the streams. Here, therefore, the water required to be elevated, and huge dams seem to have been thrown across the Tigris in various places, one of which still remains. It is formed of large masses of squared stone united together by cramps of iron.

By means of this general dissemination of fertility, the Assyrians were enabled to raise wheat, barley, sesame and millet. The plough they made use of was of a rude and primitive construction, much resembling that in present use in Turkey and Persia.³ The vine was also cultivated in many parts of Assyria.

In regard to the domestic architecture of the Assyrians, no specimen has yet been discovered, but the character of the Assyrian houses may be gathered from a single sculpture representing an unfortified Assyrian village. It is here observable that the houses have no windows,⁴ being probably lighted from the roof, and that the roofs consisted either of hemispherical domes, still found in the east, or of steep and high cones, seldom seen elsewhere. Both had an opening at the top for the admission of light. The doors were either square at the top or arched.

¹ Rawlinson, II, 193, 194, 195. ² *Idem*, I, 268, 270, 271. ³ *Idem*, II, 198.
⁴ *Idem*, I, 402, 403, 404.

The Assyrians manufactured for drinking and other domestic purposes, various kinds of terra-cotta vases, glazed and unglazed, comprising vases, lamps, jugs, amphoræ, jars, etc. In shape they are similar to those found both in the old Chaldæan tombs,¹ and in ordinary Roman sepulchres. The funereal are the most elegant. The glazed pottery is generally found tastefully colored. The Assyrians also manufactured bottles and bowls of glass, and understood the use of the blow pipe. Even a lens, composed of rock crystal, giving a distinct focus at the distance of four and one-half inches from the plane side,² the only object of the kind that has been found among the remains of antiquity, has been exhumed at Nimrud. The Assyrian thrones, chairs, tables, couches, etc., especially the two first mentioned, were often very elaborate and ornamented. The knowledge of these is derived mostly from the bas-reliefs. We derive from the same source a knowledge of the embroidered robes and draperies of the Assyrians.³ These were more or less patterned, and this which was of an elaborate kind, is supposed to have been the work of the needle. The draperies of some of the monarchs are minutely labored and very tasteful.

Assyria was favorably situated for commercial enterprise. She was Mesopotamia — the between-river county — lying on the middle courses of two great navigable streams.⁴ It was approachable by water from the north-west and from the south-east. It also lay on the line of land communication between the north-east and the south-west. The most important lines of land trade between Assyria and her neighbors were probably one leading from Urumiyeh basin over the Keli-shin pass, descending on Rowandit and following the course of the greater Zab to Herir, whence it crossed the plain to Nineveh. Another probably passed over the same mountain range considerably further to the south, uniting Assyria with Media. Another may have

¹ Rawlinson, i, 478, 479. ² *Idem*, i, 484, 485. ³ *Idem*, i, 490, 491. ⁴ *Idem*, ii, 179.

gone up the valley of the lesser Zab, crossing over the great Kandil range into Lajihan. Westward there were two chief lines of trade with Syria and the adjacent countries. Northward the route was up the valley of the Tigris to Til or Tilleh, and then along the Bitlis Chai to the lake of Van and the adjacent country. Armenian productions came down the Tigris, and Babylonian and Susianian came up that river and the Euphrates. From Assyrian remains, the imports are inferred to have been gold, tin, ivory, lead, stones of various kinds, cedar wood, pearls, and engraved seals. The greatest source of Assyrian wealth was probably that derived from the plunder of conquered nations, and the tribute paid by dependent monarchs. But besides this there were probably immense amounts derived from commerce, obtained probably from the Phœnicians, who derived it both from Arabia and from the west African coast, or from the Babylonians, who may have imported it by sea from India. The tin with which the Assyrians hardened their bronze was derived probably from the Phœnicians, who obtained it from Cornwall and the Scilly isles. Ivory was used extensively by the Assyrians in their furniture, and was probably also an article of export by them to the Greeks and Phœnicians. It is the product of India, and came to Assyria by the way of the Persian gulf. Or it may have been by a land traffic between Assyria and western India by the way of Cabul, Herat, the Caspian gates and Media. Hard stones and gems were imported from many quarters. Pearls must have been procured from the Persian gulf.

The Assyrian exports are of less satisfactory ascertainment. Herodotus states that the "wares of Assyria," without specifying what, were imported by the Phœnicians into Greece at a very early period. From Ezekiel (Ezek. xxvii, 23, 24), it appears that the exports to Phœnicia were textile fabrics, apparently of great value. These may have been "blue cloaks" or "embroidery," or "rich dresses." The embroidery was of the most delicate and elaborate description. There were undoubtedly a great

many other articles of export as well as of import, of which the monuments fail to inform us, and of which no writer who has come down to us has ever spoken.

Religion.

The religion of the Assyrians very much resembles that of the primitive Chaldæans, showing a probable connection originally between these two peoples. The two pantheons are polytheistic in character, give the preeminence to a single deity, followed by similar groupings of the same divinities, and then by a multitudinous pantheism, chiefly of a local character. At the head of the Assyrian pantheon, however, stands a divinity unknown to the Chaldæan, and that is the great god *Asshur*, the special tutelary deity both of the kings and of the country.¹ His usual titles are "the great lord," "the king of all the gods," "he who rules supreme over the *gods*," and sometimes "the father of the gods," though that properly belonged to Belus. The Assyrian fights in the name, and to extend the worship of Asshur, and when a country is subdued, sets up the emblems of his tutelary deity, teaching the people his laws and his worship. The Assyrians describe themselves as "the servants of Asshur," their enemies, as "the enemies of Asshur," and their religion as "the worship of Asshur." This god was undoubtedly the great progenitor of the Assyrian race — Asshur, the son of Shem, deified. He continued to the last the main object of worship, and his worship was equally diffused throughout the whole land, in no instance localized, showing him to be a national divinity.

The favorite emblem of this god was a winged circle or globe, from which a figure in a horned cap is frequently seen to issue, sometimes simply holding a bow, sometimes shooting his arrows against the enemies of Assyria. The circle typifies eternity, the wings omnipresence, and the

¹ *Rawlinson*, II, 229, 230, 231, etc.

human figure, wisdom and intelligence. Another emblem is the sacred or symbolical tree. This had various forms, and there is no evidence that it was a real tangible object. It may have been a mere type. Everything else in regard to the gods of Assyria are so nearly or so exactly like the Chaldæan pantheon, as to require no special consideration.

The Assyrians were in the habit of carrying away the gods of the countries they conquered, with the design of weakening their enemies by depriving them of their celestial protectors, and perhaps also from the expectation of aid from their divine guardians.¹ The Assyrian idols were constructed of stone, baked clay or metal.

The Assyrian mode of worship was chiefly with sacrifices and offerings. The bas-reliefs represent the bull as the special sacrificial animal.² The sacrifices resembled those of the Greeks and Romans, consisting of a selection of choice parts which were placed on the altar and burnt, while the remainder was consumed by priest or people.

The altars were of various shapes, as 1st. Square and low; 2d. Triangular and of moderate height, with a circular top; 3d. A sort of portable stand,³ narrow, but of considerable height. These latter were carried about by the Assyrians in their marches. The Assyrians had their priests, who are generally represented as beardless, but their influence in the Assyrian polity does not seem to have been very considerable. The kings seem also to have united the priestly with the regal character.

The failure of the priests to exercise a controlling influence in Assyria may have been owing to the warlike character of the people, for the religious sentiment appears to have been deep seated in the Assyrians. Their religion, however, was of an extremely sensuous character. It was a pure idol worship, without any conception of a spiritual and immaterial deity. It naturally led to a pompous ceremonial, a fondness for processional display, and the use of magnificent vestments.

¹ Rawlinson, II, 268. ² *Idem*, II, 270. ³ *Idem*, II, 273.

Government.

The history and polity of the Assyrians bring to our view a system of government interesting in itself, and not of unfrequent occurrence in early history. It was by no means confined to the Assyrians. It was said of Solomon that "he reigned over *all the kingdoms* from the river [Euphrates] unto the land of the Philistines, and unto the border of Egypt: they *brought presents*, and *served* Solomon all the days of his life."—I Kings, iv, 21. This brief record not only states the fact, but includes within it the principle upon which this species of government rests. It consists of two elements, one a fixed, and the other a floating one. The one is a compact kingdom, generally quite limited in extent; peopled by a single race—the dominant race of the empire; the government usually an hereditary despotism. Here it is the kingdom of Assyria limited to the province of that name, and peopled wholly by the Assyrian race; the other—the floating element—consists of the kingdoms or states adjoining or adjacent to that of the dominant race, and which have been reduced to a state of dependence upon that kingdom. This may be termed floating, because it is constantly varying, the states or kingdoms composing it passing under or out of subjection according as they are, or are not, favored by circumstances. It is in the relations existing between the dominant race and the subject states and kingdoms that make up the empire, that we find the peculiar principles developed in this species of government.

In the first place these states and kingdoms retain their own distinct individuality, remaining in all respects such as they were before their subjection, subject only to the new obligations contracted with the dominant race or kingdom. They preserve, for instance, their line of kings, and their law of succession; their old laws,¹ their old religion, in fine their whole internal organization and machinery. There

¹ Rawlinson, II, 528.

is, therefore, every external indication of independence and unimpaired nationality. But the new relations into which they have entered have deprived them of that essential to a state, viz: their sovereignty. They are compelled to acknowledge an external suzerainty which binds them to the performance of certain duties towards the dominant race—the head of the empire. We have thus the rudiments of the feudal system in the early governments of western Asia. The duties to which this suzerainty was understood to subject them, might generally be summed up in the two words “homage” and “tribute,” *to serve* and “bring presents.” They were bound to render acts of submission, to attend the court of their suzerain when summoned unless a reasonable excuse be rendered, to salute him as a superior, and otherwise acknowledge his rank. When subdued they had imposed upon them a regular fixed tribute, and the withholding the payment of it at any time was regarded as rebellion. They were also bound to allow the troops of their superior free passage through their dominions, and to repel any invasion by the enemies of their suzerain. There was also a corresponding obligation on the part of the dominant race to protect their dependents against foreign foes. In some cases there was the further obligation to furnish contingents to swell the armies of the dominant power. But this does not seem to have been the case with the Assyrians. Their armies appear to have been composed of the soldiers of Assyria, and not of troops levied from other powers.

Assyria exhibited fully all the strength and weakness of such a system. Under an energetic and powerful monarch, everything indicated strength and prosperity. Present and tribute were kept pouring in from the dependent states; skilled workmen were furnished to build their temples and palaces; the choicest products of each country found their way to the great capital, where, as in a great social point, were united the greatness and splendor of all the dependent kingdoms. Such was Nineveh, the great capital of the Assyrian empire. Such subsequently was

Babylon, "the beauty of the Chaldees' excellency." But let the invincibility of the dominant power be once broken, let its armies be defeated, or a weak prince mount the throne, and the subject states immediately assert their independence and rebel. The subject states having their own government, and their organization complete, are in good condition to set on foot a successful rebellion. Tributes are refused, the resources of the empire diminished, everything is at a stand, and the flourishing empire of yesterday may to-day encounter dismemberment and utter extinction.

If, however, the dominant race rally their energies, invoke their war gods, become again reanimated by their former war spirit, and defeat the armies of their former dependents, reducing them again under subjection, then follows the sack of cities, the plunder of towns, often the deposition of the reigning monarch, and the substitution of some other in his place; sometimes changes in the form of government, and occasionally the deportation of a whole people from the country and homes in which they were born and nurtured into a foreign country, and among a strange people and institutions. This latter was resorted to for the purpose of weakening and breaking the spirit of a rebellious people. Thus in Assyrian history, Chaldeans were transported into Armenia, Jews and Israelites into Assyria and Media, and Arabians, Babylonians, Susianians and Persians into Palestine. By these means the ties of country were destroyed, the spirit of the people broken, and future rebellions rendered less probable. But the empire was correspondingly weakened, and its decay and dissolution rendered more certain in the future. Thus the early aggregations of men together do not exhibit the profoundest political wisdom.

Society.

In Assyria the highest development of the social element was found in the monarch and his court. The

monuments have been fuller in their transmission to us of king and court exhibitions of this element than of any other. The peace dress of the monarch was a long flowing robe reaching to the ankles,¹ elaborately patterned and fringed, over which a broad belt was first worn, and then a species of open mantle, so contrived, that the flaps fell over the robe in front and behind, leaving the sides open, and thus exposing the under dress to view. The royal head dress was a tall mitre, or tiara, rising from the head in a gracefully curved line, and generally ornamented with a succession of bands, between which were commonly elaborate patterns. The feet were protected by sandals or shoes.

The monuments give but one representation of an Assyrian queen; her dress was a long sleeved gown reaching from the neck to the feet, flounced and trimmed at the bottom in an elaborate style, and elsewhere patterned with rosettes, over which she wore a fringed tunic or frock descending half way between the knees and the feet. There were eunuchs in the Assyrian court having a peculiar physiognomy,² having a low forehead, a nose small and rounded, lips full, chin large and double, and cheeks bloated. They appear only to have occupied menial offices about the person of the monarch, and not to have held the high positions which they have since held in the east.

The Assyrian court ceremonial was stately and imposing. The monarch does not seem to have kept himself secluded from the view of his subjects. The monuments exhibit him superintending in person his great works; riding in an open chariot in war and in the chase; and often descending from it and marching or fighting on foot.

The common people in Assyria wore for their ordinary dress a mere plain tunic,³ or shirt reaching from the neck to a little above the knee, with very short sleeves, and confined round the waist by a broad belt or girdle. Nothing was worn upon the head or feet. The former was protected by thick hair, the beard was worn long, and arranged with

¹ Rawlinson, II, 97. ² *Idem*, II, 111. ³ *Idem*, II, 199.

great care. Men of rank appear to have worn usually a long fringed robe reaching nearly to the feet, and having short sleeves barely covering the shoulder. Respectable women were dressed in sleeved gowns, less scanty than those of the men, and either striped or else patterned and fringed. The ornaments worn by the women consisted principally of earrings, necklaces, and bracelets. There are a few remains of the Assyrian toilet. Among these are, a bronze disk supposed to have been a mirror, a few combs, and small glass bottles supposed to have contained perfumed unguents or various dyes to beautify the countenance. No doubt seems to remain of the great luxury of the Assyrian women, and all that is said of "the tinkling ornaments" and other luxuries of their Jewish sisters is supposed to apply with still greater force to them.

Among the manly sports of the Assyrians, more especially of the upper classes, the chase occupies a most prominent position. The monuments are peculiarly instructive in reference to this pastime. It was the favorite occupation of the monarch when not actually engaged in warlike expeditions. With him and the chiefs among the Assyrians, the lion hunt was the most courted. The native haunts of this king of beasts were the ready coverts by the side of the canals and great streams, and in the Assyrian lion hunts he was either sought there, or he was procured beforehand, conveyed to the hunting ground, and there turned out before the hunters. The arrow and the spear are the principal weapons made use of.

The chase of the wild bull was also another favorite sport of the Assyrian monarch and his nobles. This was an animal of great strength and courage, and is represented on the monuments as even contending with the lion. Besides these two animals, the Assyrians are known to have hunted the onager or wild ass, the stag, the ibex or wild goat, the gazelle and the hare.

In regard to the food of the Assyrians, meat never seems to have been eaten to any great extent in the east. Assyria was called "a land of corn and wine, a land of bread and

vineyards, a land of olive oil and of honey." Fruits were highly prized, especially pomegranates, grapes, citrons, and pine-apples.

The vine was extensively cultivated, and the Assyrians are supposed to have drunk wine very freely. Great banquets seem to have been frequent at court in which drinking was practiced on a large scale. On the monuments, where banquet scenes occur, it is drinking and not eating that is represented. The wine cups and the huge bowl or vase are the most prominent. The arrangement at banquets is peculiar. The guests are not received at a common table, but are divided into messes of four, who sit together, two and two, facing each other, each mess having its own table, and its own attendant. Each guest, in the banquet represented on the monuments, holds in his right hand a wine cup of a most elegant shape, modeled in its lower part into the form of a lion's head. Their cups are raised to a level with their heads, and in appearance they are either pledging each other, or one and all drinking the same toast. They had a habit of introducing flowers at their feasts. As early as the time of *Sennacherib*, "hanging gardens" were known in Assyria. These were sometimes combined with an aqueduct; at other times the garden occupied the roof of a building, probably raised for the purpose, and was supported upon a number of pillars.

Philosophy.

In regard to speculative philosophy, which is that properly embraced in this element, we have no knowledge whatever of what was possessed by the Assyrians. Very little is as yet positively known of the nature and extent of their scientific knowledge. Numerous Assyrian tablets are now in the British Museum, which promise important revelations on this subject. At present, however, little is known beyond the subjects upon which the tablets treat, Among these subjects, are comparative philology, which seems to have been largely studied: chronology, geography

and history, astronomy and mythology. In regard to the scientific knowledge of the Assyrians, which was embraced in their mechanic arts, the sculptures on their monuments are very instructive. The means employed in the transport of colossal bulls from the quarry to the palace gateways, are represented in the most elaborate detail. But the mechanical agencies by which these immense masses of stone of many tons in weight, were elevated to the summit of artificial platforms, from thirty to eighty or ninety feet in height, are the most difficult of conception. Their transportation was effected by gangs of men who were attached to large tables, by means of small ropes or straps fastened to them, and passed over one shoulder and under the other, which enabled them to pull by weight as much as by muscular strength. The means by which they were elevated are not clearly apparent. The probability is, they were drawn up inclined planes, sloping gently from the natural ground to the top of the platforms. The crane and pulley, although used separately, never appear to have been used in combination. The general result of what we now know of their civilization, would create the belief that their knowledge of science was much greater than the actual evidence afforded will warrant.

Art.

On the subject of Assyrian art their exhumed remains afford important and decisive evidence. They show that this wonderful people in several of the industrial, and in some of the fine arts, made great attainments; that as embroiderers of dresses, glass blowers, workers in ivory, upholsterers, engravers, metallurgists, sculptors, designers or architects, they equaled, if they did not exceed, all other oriental nations.¹

In the architectural remains of the Assyrians, the palace stands the most conspicuous. In Egypt it was the

¹ *Rawlinson*, I, 347.

temple, while in Assyria the palace presents the culmination of the nation's art. Its position was uniformly on an artificial platform, commonly composed of undried bricks disposed in regular layers,¹ while the sides were in most cases protected by massive stone masonry carried up from the natural ground to a height exceeding the platform. The latter was generally rectangular in shape.

The palace was composed of three main elements — the court, the grand hall, and small private apartments.² Of the first there were usually two or four, either square or oblong, and varying in dimensions with the size of the palace. The court at Esar-haddon's palace, at Nimrud, was two hundred and twenty feet long and one hundred wide.

The most remarkable feature in the Assyrian palaces was the grand halls, of which each had commonly several. Their length was generally from three to five times their own width.³ In the palace of Sardanapalus I, at Nimrud, the great hall was one hundred and sixty feet long by forty broad. The palace of Sennacherib, with the same width, was one hundred and eighty feet in length. The halls were paved with sun-burnt bricks, and on their sides and ends are found those mighty and magnificent sculptured slabs that proclaim the greatness of Assyrian art. These were arranged in a single, sometimes in a double line, resting on the ground, and clothing the walls to the height of ten or twelve feet.

The third element, or chambers, either opened into the halls at their sides or ends, or were collected into groups. They are always rectangular, varying from squares to narrow oblongs. They are very numerous, generally on the ground floor forty or fifty. The great palace of Sennacherib at Nineveh contained sixty-eight. The ground plan of all the palaces exhibits throughout straight and parallel lines. No curve is ever exhibited, nor any angle but a right one. Courts, chambers and halls are exact rectangles. Except in this there is not much regularity.

¹ Rawlinson, I, 349. ² *Idem*, I, 351-2. ³ *Idem*, I, 353.

The two sides of an edifice never correspond. Room never answers to room. Doorways are rarely in the middle of walls,¹ and where a room has several doorways they are seldom opposite to each other. There are very few corridors or passages, groups of rooms to the number of ten or twelve often opening into each other, while whole sets of apartments are sometimes found, between which and the rest of the palace all communication is cut off by thick walls. At the entrance of some of the palaces were colossal human-headed bulls on either side, and also at some of the gateways immense winged bulls of gigantic size, fifteen and even nineteen feet high.

The great apartments of state consisted of a suite of ten rooms, five of them being halls of large dimensions, and lined throughout with sculptures, representing chiefly the wars of the monarch, his battles, sieges, reception of captives and of spoil. This relates more particularly to the palace of Sargon at Bit-Sargina, now Khorsabad.

All that now remains of the old Assyrian palaces are the ground plans and some sixteen feet of their elevations. The question of height, mode of lighting and roofing, and even the existence of a second story, are all matters of doubt, as no bas-relief sculptures of royal residences are to be found, and the remains and monuments throw but little light on the subject. There are no remains of a staircase, whether of stone or of wood, and no instance even of an inclined passage. Opinions are divided as to whether there was, or was not, a second story, Layard and Fergusson, being in favor, and M. Botta against such idea.

The question of roofing and lighting has also given rise to much discussion. In reference to the former, four ideas have prevailed :

1st. That the roofing was of brick and of an arched form like a vault.

2d. That the roofing was throughout done with a flat earth covered roofing of wood.

¹ *Rawlinson*, I, 356.

3d. That those immense halls were actually spanned from side to side by beams.

4th. That they were left uncovered.

One of the two last seems to be the most probable supposition. Under the last, the lighting is easily understood. On the other suppositions the light may have been introduced from the sides, by the resting of the roof, not directly on the walls, but on rows of wooden pillars placed along the edge of the walls,¹ both internally towards the apartments and externally towards the outer air, or it may have been brought in from the roof by means of wooden *louvre*s.

The temple remains indicate edifices of smaller magnitude and different arrangements. There is in them no want of regularity.² The body of it is a columnar structure, exhibiting at either corner, a broad pilaster, surmounted by a capital composed of two sets of volutes placed one over the other. Between the two pilasters are two pillars resting upon rounded bases, and crowned by capitals resembling the Corinthian. Above the pillars is a heavy cornice or entablature, projecting very considerably. There was also either another temple,³ or another feature in the Assyrian temple, which was common to it and the Babylonian, viz: the tower or *ziggurat*. This seems to have been built in stages, which probably varied in number, never exceeding seven. Besides this tower, which may have been surmounted by a chapel or shrine,⁴ there were always a number of basement chambers, in one of which was the principal shrine of the god, which was a square or slightly oblong recess at the end of an oblong apartment, raised somewhat above its level.

The ornamentation of the temples was very similar to that of the palaces, the great gateways being guarded by colossal bulls or lions accompanied by the usual sacred figures, and sometimes covered with inscriptions.⁵ The entrances, and some portions of the chambers were ornamented with

¹ Rawlinson, I, 380, 381. ² *Idem*, I, 388, 389, etc. ³ *Idem*, I, 393. ⁴ *Idem*, I, 399. ⁵ *Idem*, I, 400.

sculptured slabs, representing, however, none but religious subjects. No great proportion of the interior seems to have been covered in this way.

The Assyrians well knew the nature and value of the arch in architecture. They knew both the round arch or Roman, and the pointed or Gothic. Both were made of brick, the former both of that which is crude, and also the kiln-dried; the latter of burnt brick. They appear to have used the arch principally for doorways and gateways. They also employed it for drains, aqueducts, and narrow chambers or galleries.

The architecture of the Assyrians was not of a character calculated to be lasting. The artificial mounds which they erected as a foundation naturally settled under the weight of the superincumbent structures, and often unequally, so that the structure would in time crack and become a mass of ruins. The material itself was brick, and often sun-dried. The use of this material in Chaldæa and Babylonia was rendered necessary by the absence of stone. But in Assyria, especially in the northern cities of Calah, Nineveh, and Bit-Sargina, stone was easily obtainable, and this has given rise to the question why, under such circumstances, brick should have been preferred? and why artificial mounds should have been resorted to in an uneven country where naturally formed eminences could so easily have been found? The answer returned is that the Assyrians were emigrants from the lower Chaldæan and Babylonian plains, and that they carried with them into upper Mesopotamia the same architectural ideas and designs in respect to the material and character of their buildings which prevailed in the country from which they emigrated.

The most perfect remains of Assyrian art are to be found in the statues, bas-reliefs, metal castings, carvings in ivory, statuettes in clay, enamelings on brick, and intaglios on stones and gems; in what, in fine, constituted their mimetic art. The Assyrian statues are rare, and possess very little of the beautiful. They are coarse, clumsy, and formal in design, lacking breadth in

a side view, as if intended only to be seen in front. Otherwise the proportions of the figures are tolerably correct. There is one, however, the statue of Sardanapalus I, which exhibits a higher finish; one in which the features are majestic and well marked, the hair and beard elaborately curled, and the arms and hands well shaped and finished with care.

The clay statuettes are chiefly images of gods or genii, have frequently something grotesque in their appearance, and possess less artistic merit than their statues.

The chief wonders of Assyrian art are contained in their astonishing bas-reliefs. These are still found on the slabs which adorned the important rooms and great halls of their palaces and temples. These slabs in the great Khorsabad palace were found covering the walls to the extent of at least 4,000 feet, or nearly four-fifths of a mile,¹ while in each of the Kouyunjik palaces of Nineveh the sculptures extended to considerably more than that distance. It is these remarkable bas-reliefs that bring before us the ancient Assyrian in his wars, his triumphs, his sports and amusements, his festivities and his worship. They are to him what the full statue was to the Greek, and what painting has been to modern European nations.

The reliefs are, for the most part, low, and represent, 1st. War scenes, such as battles, sieges, naval expeditions, devastations of the country, and triumphant returns. 2d. Religious scenes, either mythical or real. 3d. Processions generally of tribute bearers, bringing to the monarch the produce of their several countries. 4th. Hunting and sporting scenes; and 5th. Scenes of ordinary life.

The ancient palaces of Calah, now Nimrud, afford the earliest specimens of Assyrian art. These go back to ten centuries before the Christian era. The figures are in low-relief, and are characterized by much spirit and variety in the design, by strength and firmness,² with a good deal of heaviness in the execution, by an utter con-

¹ Rawlinson, I, 413. ² *Idem*, I, 428.

tempt for perspective, and by the rigid preservation, in almost every case, both human and animal, of the exact profile both of figure and face. The animal are very much superior to the human forms, and this feature belongs to all stages of Assyrian art. This superiority, as also the exactness of imitation, may be, perhaps, a general characteristic of early art, before the artist has arisen to those ideal conceptions in which are found the highest style of art. One of the finest exhibitions of this period of Assyrian sculpture is to be found in the lion hunt given by Mr. Layard in his *Monuments of Nineveh*.¹ As an offset to this, the religious and processional pieces of this period are extremely stiff, and the battle scenes over-crowded and confused. An excellent style of drawing of this period is found in the figures forming the patterns or embroidery of the dresses. The bas-reliefs of this period have no back-ground, figures alone, or figures and buildings occupying the slabs.² Water is very rudely represented, and but few trees are ever met with.

The second period of Assyrian art extends from B. C. 721 to B. C. 667, and includes the reigns of the three great monarchs — Sargon, Sennacherib, and Esar-haddon, the most brilliant period in Assyrian history. The artists have here made great advances in their vegetable forms. Back-grounds are here generally introduced. The character of the countries through which the Assyrian armies march is almost always given, their trees, streams, lakes, rivers, hills and mountains.³ The fields teem with animals, the woods with birds, the waters with fish. Nature is represented in her gentler forms, and her more agreeable moods. The human form is made to exhibit a greater variety of attitude, and a greater degree of energy and life, but there is still a heaviness of outline, over muscularity, and a general clumsiness and want of grace. Animal forms are improved, and the horse is most excellently portrayed. Battles and sieges are spirited, but lack unity.

¹ Rawlinson, I, 429. ² *Idem*, I, 434. ³ *Idem*, I, 435.

Hunting scenes are tame, and the representations of the transport of colossal bulls possess great interest.¹ The manipulation is decidedly superior, the relief higher, the outline more flowing, and the finish given to the features more delicate.

The third period extends from B. C. 667 to B. C. 640, embracing the reign of Asshur-bani-pal, and exhibits the highest perfection of Assyrian art. The vegetable forms are here less conventional in type, those of animals show a wonderful freedom, spirit and variety, while human figures exhibit extreme minuteness and finish, and great delicacy in the handling. It is in the animals of this period that the best style of art is shown. In the human form there is still a heaviness and stiffness of outline.² The face wants expression; the attitude, variety and animation. There is also an almost complete disregard of perspective.

The ornamental metallurgy of the Assyrians consists: 1st. Of entire figures or parts of figures cast in a solid shape.³ 2d. Of castings in a low relief, and 3d. Of embossed work wrought mainly with the hammer and finished by the graving tool. The first of these are comparatively rare, and are small. Their embossed work is curious and artistic. The usual material wrought by the Assyrians into metallurgic forms is bronze, then and now composed of one part of tin to ten of copper. They also used for ornamentation silver and gold. They knew how to inlay one metal with another.

On the subject of *painting* as a branch of Assyrian art, we derive our knowledge principally from the enameled bricks found in the ruins of their structures. Some of these are merely patterned, while others contain designs representing men and animals. The coloring matter used by the Assyrians was derived from the mineral kingdom.⁴ They obtained opaque white from the oxide of tin; yellow from antimoniate of lead with a slight admixture of tin; blue from oxide of copper without cobalt; green from

¹ Rawlinson, i, 437. ² *Idem*, i, 443, 444. ³ *Idem*, 53. ⁴ *Idem*, i, 423.

copper; brown from iron; and red from suboxide of copper.¹ The tints vary from three to five, the more usual combinations being of four hues; for example, red, white, yellow, and black; deep yellow, brown black, white, and pale yellow; lilac, yellow, white, and green; yellow, blue, white, and brown; and yellow, blue, white, and olive green. In every case there is great harmony in the coloring. No harsh contrasts, the Assyrian seeking rather to please by the harmony of his hues than to startle by displays of bright and strongly contrasted colors. The browns and blacks, like the blues, yellows, and reds, are only used to express local color. The designs are entirely destitute of *chiaroscuro*.

A question of considerable importance has been raised and much discussed as to whether the Assyrians were in the practice of coloring their sculptures,² and if so, to what extent. The slabs now offer only the faintest occasional traces of color, but at the time of discovery, those traces were more abundant. There seems no doubt, therefore, but that the Assyrian reliefs were to some extent colored. The colors actually found upon them are four, viz: red, blue, black, and white; the first a good bright tint, far exceeding in brilliancy that of the Egyptian artists. White occurs rarely, and black is applied chiefly to the hair, beard, and eyebrows of men. The principal subject of controversy has been whether, like the Egyptians, the Assyrian artists covered the whole surface of the stone with a layer of stucco, and then painted the sculptured parts with strong colors, red, blue, yellow, white, and black; or whether, like the Greeks, they applied paint only to certain portions of their sculptures, as the hair, eyes, beard and draperies. Although both these theories have had their advocates, yet the prevailing opinion seems now to be, that the latter was nearer the Assyrian style; that their artists applied color sparingly,³ and confined it chiefly to such parts as the hair, eyes and beards of men, to the fringes of dresses, to horse trappings, and other accessory parts of the representations.

¹ Rawlinson, I, 468. ² *Idem*, I, 446. ³ *Idem*, I, 450.

The arts of design, when practiced by a people, not only prove their own existence, but also incidentally that of other arts among the same people. The Assyrian sculptures proclaim the fact that the *art of music* was known and practiced in Assyria. Some eight or nine different sorts of musical instruments were known there, some stringed, some wind, and some merely instruments of percussion. Among these the harp has a prominent position. In the early ages it was a triangular instrument, with eight, nine or ten strings, of the same thickness, made fast to a board, and tightened, or relaxed by a row of pegs inserted into the upright bar.¹ In later times it was still triangular, but the frame consisted of a rounded and hollow sounding board to which the strings were attached by the help of pegs, and then made fast to a plain bar below.² The number of strings was increased to thirteen or fourteen. They had also different varieties of the lyre; one triangular having four strings; another resembling the Egyptian, and still another larger than either, and considerably more elaborate. They had also the guitar, and the double pipe, although there is no evidence that they possessed the flute, or single pipe. The Assyrian tambourine was round, consisting of a skin stretched on a circular frame with no metal rings, or balls. The cymbals resembled those used at present in the east. There seem also to have been some instruments of anomalous appearance, admitting of no identification with any known species.

In regard to the character of their music, there is no evidence that the Assyrians understood or practiced more than two, out of the three forms of the triple symphony, viz: the harmony of instruments, and that of instruments and voices in combination; and of these two they seem to have preferred the former. Of bands of musicians the monuments exhibit every variety from one of two to one of twenty-six performers.

¹ Rawlinson, II, 151. ² *Idem*, 152.

Music appears to have been employed by the Assyrians chiefly for festive and religious purposes. In religious ceremonies the favorite instrument was the antique harp. The battle scenes represented on the monuments contain no musicians, nor are troops accompanied by any while on the march. It is, therefore, doubted whether music was made use of at all in the Assyrian armies.

The *art of war* must have been comparatively well understood by the Assyrians. The monuments fully proclaim their defensive and offensive weapons, the marches of their armies, their modes of attack and defense, more especially their assaults upon fortified towns. The head of the warrior was defended by a pointed helmet; his body by a coat of mail, in earlier times worn long, in later reaching no lower than the waist, having commonly a short sleeve, extending about half way down to the elbow. It was composed of iron scales, which were frequently embossed over their whole surface with groups of figures and fanciful ornaments. The shield was of two kinds, the one round, or oval, made of solid metal, and consequently small, not often exceeding two, or two and a half feet in diameter, and managed by means of a handle placed in its middle; the other made of wicker work, equaling, or exceeding the warrior in height,¹ and broad enough to give shelter to two, or even three men. It was rested upon the ground, and protected the archer standing behind it.

In regard to offensive weapons, those by far the most commonly seen upon the monuments are the bow and arrow, and the spear. The bows were comparatively short, and were of two kinds, curved and angular. The quivers were usually carried at the back, and were often elaborately ornamented. They were made of wood or metal, and it is uncertain which. Their arrows had great finish and completeness, the shaft composed of reed,² or of some light and tough wood, and the head of metal, either bronze or iron. The spear was of two kinds, one a comparatively short

¹ Rawlinson, II, 48. ² *Idem*, II, 58, 59.

weapon varying from five to six feet in length, carried by the foot soldiers; the other a weapon nine or ten feet long, and carried by the cavalry.¹ The shaft in both cases of wood and the head either of iron or bronze. It seems not to have been thrown like that of the Greeks, but was made use of to thrust with like a pike. The Assyrians also used the sword short and long, the dagger, and the battle axe.

The Assyrians fought in chariots, on horseback, and on foot.² The war chariot is thought to have been made of wood, was mounted from behind, where it was open, having two wheels placed far back, and was drawn by two or three horses, the trappings of the latter being highly ornamented. The cavalry was also an important arm of the Assyrian service. In number it greatly exceeded the chariots. They were well protected by defensive armor except the shield. Their offensive weapons were principally the bow and the spear. The Assyrian armies, however, were mostly composed of infantry.³ It was mainly to their solidity, valor, equipment, and discipline, that the empire was greatly indebted for its long series of victories. They carried the bow, the spear, and Sennacherib introduced the sling. He also introduced a corps of pioneers, armed with a double-headed axe or hatchet to clear the ground for the passage and movements of the army.

The Assyrian armies from the time of Sennacherib were organized into companies, and formed into distinct bodies of the spearmen, the archers, and the cavalry. Their wars consisted of annual inroads into the territories of their neighbors, the king usually leading his armies in person. The first object on entering the enemy's country was to fight a pitched battle with the inhabitants, and in this the Assyrians were always confident of success, being better armed, better disciplined, and usually of stronger frames than their neighbors. There is no evidence as to the order of battle.⁴ No quarter was given, the wounded, disarmed and unresisting, were indiscriminately massacred. The

¹ Rawlinson, II, 61, 62. ² *Idem*, II, 2. ³ *Idem*, II, 27, 28. ⁴ *Idem*, II, 75.

strongholds, or fortified towns to which the enemy might fly, have all of them similar representations on the monuments. The defenses consisted of high battlemented walls, pierced with loopholes or windows toward their upper part, and flanked at intervals along their whole course by towers. They often had two or more enceintes, or ramparts, and were entered by large gateways, most commonly arched, and closed by two huge gates or doors, which completely fill up the aperture.

The Assyrians had three ways of attacking fortified places :

1. By escalade, thrusting long ladders against different parts of the walls, upon which mounted companies of spearmen and archers, while those below are constantly discharging their arrows and stones from slings. The besieged defend themselves by hurling down stones and discharging arrows, and also by using, if occasion requires, their swords and spears.

2. By battering down the walls with the battering ram. This was a long beam of wood,¹ having a head shaped like the point of a spear, or end of a blunderbuss. They are exhibited sometimes as stationary, sometimes moving on wheels. They were attacked by fire and defended by water. The Assyrians also made use of an engine resembling the *balista*, which was of great height, and which threw large stones of irregular shape, and several at the same time.

3. The third mode of attack was the mine. This was resorted to by advancing under cover of the attack by troops and engines and perhaps scaling ladders, and with crow-bars and pickaxes ; undermining the foundations of the walls, and thus to force an entrance by their fall. The monuments always represent the Assyrians as successful in some or all of these modes of attack, and the stronghold or city once taken is given up to plunder, and the inhabitants treated with great severity. Some were usually

¹ *Rawlinson*, II, 29.

impaled, some beheaded, some enslaved, and some transported. When the country was subjugated, the Assyrian monarch erected a memorial in some conspicuous or important situation within the territory, as an enduring sign of his possession and sovereignty.

We here close our brief record of the second great monarchy. It is a more wonderful history than the Chaldæan. The Assyrians were great in all the elements of strength, power, and splendor in early civilization. They were the first among the children of Shem who distinguished themselves in the world's history. They wrested the torch of civilization from the Asiatic children of Ham, and bore it aloft over mountain and plain, valley and river, through large portions of western Asia for about five hundred years. At length their spirit also dies out, the torch seeks other hands to uphold it, and the bold Assyrian before whom nations and peoples quailed in humble submission, takes refuge in his monuments and disappears forever from history. The lesson it inculcates will be found to be again and again repeated, and still nations in their acme of wealth, power and prosperity, have never learned to heed its voice of wisdom and of warning.

CHAPTER VII.

BABYLONIA—ITS DESCRIPTION, HISTORY, INDUSTRY, RELIGION, SOCIETY, PHILOSOPHY, AND ART.

Babylonia.

Between Chaldæa on the south and Assyria on the north, lay the province of Babylonia, which was washed by the Tigris on the east, and the Euphrates on the west. It was a continuation northward of the great alluvial plain, helping to constitute lower Mesopotamia, and more than either Chaldæa or Assyria is deserving of the epithet of “the between-river country.” In the midst of this plain, and on both sides of the river Euphrates, lay the city of Babylon, which may, perhaps, rightly claim to be the first great city of the ancient world. Its foundation dates back to Nimrod, B. C. 2234. The Greek writers make Babylon the capital of the first Belus, and the biblical record asserts that the beginning of Nimrod’s kingdom was Babel.¹ The city, however, acquired no great celebrity during the continuance of the Chaldæan monarchy. We hear but little of it until sometime subsequent to the establishment of the Assyrian empire.

The history of the Chaldæan and Assyrian monarchies was that of the countries known respectively as Chaldæa and Assyria, while that of the Babylonian is little more than the history of the city of Babylon. Both the first mentioned countries had different capitals commencing near their southern limits and moving on successively towards their northern, while the city of Babylon alone was always the capital of the latter. All the moral, political, economical, and to a great extent physical forces of the empire were concentrated in this great city. There

¹ *Rawlinson*, I, 485.

were to be found all the treasures of art, of learning and of early civilization. It was the great city of the east, the theme both of sacred and profane history, and the burden of prophecy. Its history and its civilization, therefore, are not only derived from the early writers—Beosus, Herodotus, Diodorus and Ctesias, but also from the sacred volume, besides standing forth in the light of its own monuments.

A description of Babylon, in its glory, as collected from the ancient writers is the following:

Babylon stood in the midst of a plain in the land of Shinar, and was perfectly square. The river Euphrates ran through its centre, furnishing the city with full supplies of water, and filling the ditches dug around its walls.¹ Each side of the city was about fifteen miles in length, the entire circuit around it being sixty miles. The province of Babylonia produced neither stone nor wood, but there was an inexhaustible supply of clay, which when dried and burnt in kilns, became firm and durable. Naptha or bitumen was supplied in great plenty, which answered the place of lime. Between the strata of brick were laid layers of rushes and palm leaves, which have continued so perfect that specimens may even now be found there. The eastern division of the city was the most recent, and was built by the Chaldæans. The walls of the city were made of brick, cemented by bitumen, and were eighty-seven feet in thickness, and more than three hundred in height. A deep ditch surrounded the wall, filled with water from the Euphrates. On each side of the city were twenty-five gates (one hundred in all), the material of which was solid brass. From each gate to its opposite ran a wide, straight street or road, which streets, fifty in number, crossed each other at right angles, and, together with the four half streets that fronted the walls, divided the city into six hundred and seventy-six squares, each four furlongs and a half on each side, or two miles and a

¹ *Taylor*, 23; *Rollin*, 96-7.

quarter in circumference. These squares presented the appearance of separate villages, many of which were untenanted, being used as parks or pleasure grounds by the king and his great men. For the defense of the gates and corners of the walls, towers were erected, which were ten feet higher than the walls themselves.

On the west side of the river stood the old palace, thirty furlongs or three and three-quarter miles in compass. On the east side and opposite to the other, was the new palace, sixty furlongs or seven and one-half miles in compass. The two were connected by a bridge thrown over the Euphrates, which was about one furlong in length and thirty feet in breadth. They were also connected by a tunnel which ran under the river.

Within the enclosures of the new palace were the celebrated hanging gardens, which were a square of about four hundred feet on each side, and were carried up in terraces one above another higher than the walls of the city. The pile was sustained by vast arches raised upon other arches, one above another, and the whole strengthened by a wall surrounding it on every side. The different arches were well floored with cement and lead, and covered with earth. Upon this earth the most beautiful trees and shrubs were planted. In the upper terrace was an engine or pump by which water was drawn up from the river and the whole garden watered.

Another wonderful edifice on the eastern side of the river was the tower, or temple of Belus, which some suppose to have been built on the foundations of the old tower of Babel. This temple, at its foundation, was a square of a furlong on each side, making half a mile in its whole compass. It was six hundred feet in height, being higher than the loftiest of the Egyptian pyramids. It consisted of eight stories gradually diminishing in height as they ascended. There was a sloping terrace on the outside, which turning by very slow degrees in a spiral line eight times around the tower, presented the same appearance as if there had been eight towers placed one above

another. On the summit was an observatory for the Chaldæan astronomers. This temple was sacred to the god Bel, Baal, or Belus. It was adorned with golden statues, one of which was forty feet in height. The immense wealth acquired by the Babylonians, by the plunder of the east, was deposited in this temple. It stood until the time of Xerxes, who, on his return from his Grecian expedition, first plundered it of its contents and then destroyed it.

Such was Babylon "the beauty of the Chaldees' excellency." In its glory it must have stood forth the queen of cities. In regard to its present remains, it is agreed by almost all travelers that not a vestige of the great wall is to be found,¹ and even its ancient position cannot be determined except by conjecture. And although the ancients affirm that the Euphrates ran through the middle of the city, thus dividing it into two equal parts, yet but few remains can now be found on the western side within what should constitute the proper limits of Babylon. But on the eastern side is the mound of *Babil*, an oblong mass composed chiefly of unbaked brick,² rising from the plain to the height of one hundred and forty feet, with northern and southern faces about two hundred yards in length, and eastern and western respectively one hundred and eighty-two, and one hundred and thirty-six yards. This is supposed to be identified as the tower, or temple of Belus. About one mile south of this ruin extends for nearly two miles, parallel with the river, a vast and irregular labyrinth of mounds, having an average width of twelve or thirteen hundred yards,³ which it is supposed is all that remains of that group of royal residences, towers, hanging gardens, etc., which formed what was called "the palace." And then further south still is the mound of *Amram*, eleven hundred yards in length, and eight hundred in breadth, which is recognized as the remains of the ancient palace, coeval probably with Babylon itself, and

¹ Rawlinson, II, 472. ² *Idem*, II, 476. ³ *Idem*, II, 470.

which continued to be the royal residence to the time of Nabopolassar. Of these three the one secondly above mentioned, which from a fragment on its summit, is called the *Kasr* is identified as the work of Nebuchadnezzar, is the "new palace adjoining his father's," and is superior to all the rest in the wealth of its remains, furnishing the only sculptures and bas-reliefs which have as yet been discovered among the ruins. Parallel with the mound of Amram, and on both the east and west banks of the Euphrates, are remains which appear to have belonged to a second palace, situate on the west bank of the stream. So, also, on the west side of the river, and eight or nine miles from the nearest point of the ruins already mentioned, is a peculiar ruin, a huge pyramidal mound, a solitary pile rising suddenly from the vast expanse of the desert, which the Arabs call *Birs-Nimrud*. It is a curious fact that *Nimrod* is one of the few names handed down by tradition, and hence the frequency with which the term *Nimrod* occurs among the Arabs. This remarkable ruin, although within the possible limits of ancient Babylon, yet has been ascertained to be in the old town of Borsippa. This mound is an oblong square, and its angles face the four cardinal points. The north-western and south-eastern faces measure 643 feet, while the north-eastern is 420, and the south-western 376. Its height is 153 feet. It was an edifice of seven terraces, or receding stages,¹ and capped by a vitrified mass, supposed to have been the sanctum of a temple. It has disputed with the Babil mound, before mentioned, the honor of being the remains of the old tower, or temple of Belus; so, also, some have regarded it as the remains of the tower of Babel; and as the descendants of Noah were journeying eastward when "they found a plain in the land of Shinar and dwelt therein,"² they suppose that the part of Babylon west of the Euphrates was built and dwelt in before the eastern, and that the fewer remains found on the west side of the river may

¹ Rawlinson, II, 481-2. ² Heeren's Researches, II, 171.

thus be accounted for. But in its present form the *Birs* is chiefly the work of Nebuchadnezzar, as is apparent from an examination of the bricks used and the cylinders deposited at its angles. At present it is supposed to be "the stages of the seven spires of Borsippa," built by Nebuchadnezzar. Each terrace, or story, was dedicated to a planet, and stained with the color peculiarly attributed to it in the works of the Sabæan astrologers.¹ Thus the lowest terrace was colored black, in honor of Saturn; the second orange, for Jupiter, the third red, for Mars; the fourth yellow, for the Sun; the fifth green, for Venus; the sixth blue, for Mercury; and the temple on the summit white, for the Moon.

The Babylonian monarchy had a history before the destruction of the Assyrian empire. The city of Babylon seems to have been increasing in strength, magnitude, and importance during the rise and most flourishing period of Assyrian power. The mode in which the government of the Assyrian empire was conducted would easily permit the large provinces, while having a nominal dependence on Assyria, to increase under favorable circumstances both in wealth and power. And thus did Babylonia for several centuries.

We shall speak at present only of the Babylonian empire which commenced under *Nabopolassar*. The entire continuance of this empire was less than a century, but during a large portion of that period it shone forth with great brilliancy. It originated, as we have before seen, in treachery; *Nabopolassar*, the Assyrian general, uniting his forces with those of Cyaxares, the Median king, they were jointly able to take Nineveh, and destroy the empire. The Median king then gave to him his daughter in marriage, and in the division of the Assyrian empire between the two, the valley of the Euphrates, from Hit to Carchemish,² Syria, Phœnicia, Palestine, and perhaps a portion of Egypt, passed under the sceptre of the king of Babylon.

¹ *Loftus's Travels in Chaldaea and Susiana*, 28. ² *Rawlinson*, I, 409.

In addition to territory Babylon undoubtedly received a largely augmented population. As Nineveh from that period disappears from history, and is generally conceded to have been destroyed, its immense population must have been carried away captive to Babylon and other cities, thus enabling the Babylonian monarch by his enlarged command of forced labor to lay the foundation and commence the rearing of those structures which have rendered his son and successor so famous.

Nabopolassar reigned twenty-one years, and during the whole time kept up a close alliance with Media, and was engaged in two wars, one in the assistance he lent to Cyaxares against the Lydians, and the other against Necho, king of Egypt. In the latter part of his reign he sent against the Egyptians his son Nebuchadnezzar. The two opposing armies met at Carchemish on the Euphrates, and a great battle was fought, in which the Egyptians were defeated and Necho, it is said, "fled apace." The whole country, as far as "the river of Egypt," submitted to Babylon.

Nabopolassar died in B. C. 604, and his son, the famous *Nebuchadnezzar*, returned from his western expedition, and ascended the throne. This expedition had been eminently successful, and he brought back with the army numerous captives, Jews, Phœnicians, Syrians, and Egyptians, who were planted in various parts of Babylonia. It was the forced labor he extorted from these and numerous other captives which enabled him to cover his whole territory with gigantic works, some of which remain even to the present day. So great were they that he almost created anew the city of Babylon. He repaired the immense wall around the city containing 200,000,000 yards of solid masonry, twice the cubic contents of the great wall of China. He built entire a wall inside of this almost as strong, as a defense for his inner city. He erected the new palace, constructed the great canal, large enough for the navigation of ships, running from Hit to the Persian gulf, a distance of from four to five hundred miles. This

answered the grand purposes of trade, irrigation, and protection against attacks from the Arabs.¹ The bricks that are found in most of the ruins of Babylon, Borsippa, Sippara, Cutha, Teredon, Chilmad, etc., are stamped with his name, or in some way bear his impress. He formed aqueducts, constructed the wonderful hanging gardens at Babylon, and raised the huge pyramidal temples at Borsippa and Akkerkuf, which still remain in the *Birs Nimrud* and the *Nimrud-Tepasse*. He formed the reservoir near Sippara 140 miles in circumference, built quays along the shores of the Persian gulf, and beautified, if not actually rebuilt, the great temple of Belus.

While constructing these great works he was prosecuting with great vigor his military enterprises. Syria, Judea and Phœnicia having rebelled, he led a vast army against the rebels; invested Tyre, and marched against Jerusalem, which submitted. Tyre was taken after a twelve years siege. Subsequently Judea again revolted, being encouraged by Apires, the Pharaoh-Hophea of scripture, king of Egypt. Nebuchadnezzar again marched a powerful army into Judea, invested Jerusalem, raised it temporarily to meet Apires, met and defeated him in a great battle, again resumed the siege of Jerusalem, and on the third year from his first appearance then took it, burnt the city and temple, and transplanted the greater part of the inhabitants to the banks of the Euphrates. This was the Babylonish captivity of seventy years. After a respite of five years from the time Jerusalem was destroyed, we find him again leading a large army through Syria and Palestine into Egypt, and again triumphing over Apires. During the eighteen years of his reign which succeeded this last expedition, he employed, with the exception of seven, in embellishing his capital, and in the erection of those gigantic works formerly alluded to. It was during those seven years that he was incapacitated from reigning, in consequence of being afflicted by that species of madness called

¹ Rawlinson, I, 412, 413.

lycanthropy, which consists in imagining that he was a wolf, and in acting in all respects as he supposed a wolf would act.

His reign was the greatest and longest of the Babylonian monarchs, continuing forty-three years. He was succeeded by his son *Illoarudamus* or *Evil-Merodach*, who, after a brief reign, was succeeded by *Nuiglissar*. Of him little is known, except the erection of a palace of which the remains can still be traced. It was during his brief reign that the Persian empire began to gain the supremacy in western Asia. The Babylonian empire had hitherto been on terms of amity and friendship with the Median, but on the rise of the Persian power its interests carried it westward and allied it with the Lydian and Egyptian kingdoms.

He was succeeded by his son *Laborosoarchod*, who, after a reign of nine months, was slain by conspirators, who placed one of their number, *Nabonadius* upon the throne, the last of the Babylonian monarchs. The commencement of his reign dates B.C. 555, about the period of the commencement of the war between Cyrus and Cræsus. The grown power of the former, which from the beginning had been constantly increasing, had now assumed such proportions as seriously to threaten the independence of the kingdoms of western Asia; and, for their own mutual protection, those of Lydia, Egypt and Babylon entered into a confederation with each other.

Nothing, however, could effectually resist the rising power of the Arian race under Cyrus. He marched an army with great rapidity into Lydia, defeated Cræsus in a great battle, laid siege to and took his capital Sardis, took Cræsus a prisoner, ended the Lydian kingdom, and extended the Persian sway to the Argean.

Babylon trembled in the midst of her rivers. The whole of Babylonia had not only these natural barriers, but also artificial obstructions, consisting of canals, dykes and embankments with which the country was covered. But the only attempt seems to have been to save the capital. A battle was first fought, in which the Babylonians were

defeated, and then followed the siege of the city. As ample time had been allowed for preparation, and immense stores collected to provision for a siege, it was hoped that the natural and artificial defenses, superior probably to any that a city had hitherto presented, would effectually prevent any reduction by blockade.

The genius of Cyrus, however, triumphed over all obstacles. The very river Euphrates, so strongly relied upon as its defense, was converted by him into an instrument for its capture. By turning the river from its natural channel, he was enabled to march his army into the city over its dry bed, and selecting a time when a great general festival engaged the attention of the inhabitants, and the water gates leading from the river into the city were left unfastened, he became master of the city without much opposition. *Nabonadius*, the king, was absent, and had entrusted the conduct of the defense to his son, *Bil-shar-uzur*, the *Belshazzar* of Daniel, who, on that night, the last of his life, and of the life of the empire, was giving himself up to enjoyment, in a splendid feast he was enjoying with his nobles.

With the fall of the imperial city, terminated the Babylonian empire, and the independence of the great city. It revolted two or three times from the Persian sceptre, but in each case was retaken. It continued, nevertheless, a great city, the second perhaps in the Persian empire, down to the time of Alexander, who contemplated making it the capital of his great empire, but died before doing so. His vast dominions being divided among his principal generals, and no one selecting it as the seat of his government, its prestige had entirely vanished, its greatness continued to wane, until the heaps of ruins, formerly referred to, are all that now remain of the once mighty Babylon.

Industry.

There is undoubted evidence of the agricultural industry of the inhabitants of Babylonia. The system of irrigation, which they inaugurated and fully carried out, the remains

of which are still visible, afford clear inferential proof that they not only understood its importance, but that they also knew how, and did avail themselves of the fertile condition into which their lands were brought by its adoption. The dense population of Babylonia, and the armies which were raised and sustained by it, are wholly inconsistent with any other than an advanced stage in the practice of agriculture.

Nearly the same may be said of their manufactures and mechanic arts. The Babylonians, as well as the Tyrians, had their purple, which they sent into the eastern parts by way of traffic. This purple they obtained from a port called Apologus, near the Euphrates, but it is a disputed point whether the art of dyeing purple was a Babylonian discovery, or whether they obtained it from Tyre.

The various manufactures and works of art, the numerous edifices and public buildings, the splendor, luxury and magnificence of Babylon, all proclaim the extent and greatness of its industrial pursuits, and more especially that its commerce must have been varied and very extensive. Many of the materials of its manufactures must have been imported from foreign countries. It is of peculiar interest to understand the commerce of a people, as that brings directly under review the channels of intercourse through which they have communicated with each other, and to some extent the bonds by which they have become bound to each other.

The land trade of the early nations generally preceded their sea trade. The carrying on of this trade implies the previous accomplishment of several things. Independent of money as the medium of exchange, of the facilities afforded by inns and public houses, it is obvious that highways must have been constructed, that bridges must have been thrown over streams and rivers, and that beasts of burden must have been procured and broken to the work.

The beasts almost universally made use of in ancient time for land carriage, were camels. Their docility,

strength, physical peculiarities of structure, and great powers of endurance, all render them most peculiarly fitted for this purpose. The reindeer is not more necessary to the north than is the camel to the south. It has been termed with great appropriateness the "ship of the desert." In the transportation of merchandise by land, several merchants united themselves together with their camels, and thus composed what was called a caravan. It was by means of these that land trade has ever been carried on from the Ishmaelites and Midianites who rode on camels, to whom Joseph was sold, down to the present time.

The land trade of the Babylonians was prosecuted in several different directions. There were four branches of it.

- 1st. The eastern or Persico Bactrian branch of trade.
- 2d. The northern or Armenian branch.
- 3d. The western or Phœnician, and that of Asia Minor.
- 4th. The southern or Arabian.

From the first branch, the Babylonians obtained precious stones, which they used for seal rings and other purposes. These, as also many other articles, were obtained from Persian India, or the present Belurland or parts adjacent. From this part of the world were also obtained dyes, and amongst them cochineal, or Indian larva. This insect is said to be a native of the country near the sources of the Indus, and produces a red resembling cinnabar. The road through which this branch was carried on ran first in a northerly direction, until arriving at the desert between Persia and Media, it continued along the southern part of it as far as the Caspian gates, through which it proceeded to Hyrcania and Asia. Thence coursing along the foot of the Hyrcanian and Parthian mountains, it turned northward towards Bactra.

The western route ran towards the Mediterranean. A great military road ran from Susa to the royal city of Sardis in Asia Minor, having on it one hundred and eleven stations. Roads were divided into stations at convenient distances from each other for the convenience of caravans.

Another branch of Babylonian commerce had a northern direction to Armenia. One of the channels through which this commerce was conveyed was the Euphrates. Wine, and several necessaries, not produced in Babylonia, were the products of these northern regions.

The trade south came generally through the Persian gulf, the situation and nature of which eminently qualified it to be the emporium for the southern Asiatic trade, as well the Indian as the Arabian. It is a large and spacious basin, presenting few dangers to navigation, from hidden rocks, and having a small mouth to break the waves of the Indian ocean.

The Babylonians in the height of their power must have possessed a maritime navigation. They are early spoken of not only as abounding in gold and luxuries of various kinds, which must have been obtained by maritime navigation, but as a people exulting in their ships. One branch of their maritime commerce was the extensive pearl fisheries carried on in the Persian gulf near the island of Ceylon. The Bahrein islands in that gulf were, and have ever continued to be, the most frequently resorted to for pearl fisheries. Cotton was also a production of these islands much desired by the Babylonians. Here were large cotton plantations. They also obtained from these islands a species of timber which was employed for the purpose of ship building. Cinnamon was most probably obtained from the island of Ceylon or the southern part of India. Pearls were also obtained from Ceylon, although of less value than those which came from the Persian gulf. This maritime trade did not long survive the downfall of the Babylonian empire. Thus we perceive that Babylon, during the period of its greatness and glory, was a vast commercial centre, which, for a time, drew to itself the wealth of other lands, and gave back in return the products of its own industry, either manufactured within its walls, or imported from other countries.

Religion.

Both the religion and government of the Babylonians so nearly resemble the Chaldæan and Assyrian, especially the former, as to render it unnecessary to go into a particular consideration of either. The gods of the Chaldæans, as also their forms of worship and religious ideas, continued to be essentially those of the Babylonians.

Society.

The development of the social element in Babylon is better known at the present day than is that of the same element either in Chaldæa or Assyria. Babylon was so much the centre, the focus, towards which the rays, both of profane and sacred history converge, the point where prophecy and history meet in vindication of each other, that we are not left altogether in ignorance of some of the forms of social intercourse of her inhabitants. Some of the peculiar manners and customs of that ancient people have come down to us.

The institution of castes, by which the people were distributed into certain classes or orders, according to their employments, from which they could never escape, seems to have prevailed to some extent among the Babylonians.¹ The practical effect of this institution can be witnessed at the present day in India. As the division was much clearer marked in Egypt than among the Babylonians, all further consideration of the subject is deferred until we take up the Egyptians.

The customs peculiar to a people, their manner of thinking and acting, are derived in part from the climate in which they are placed, partly from the knowledge they possess, and partly from accidental and temporary causes.

The manners of a people relate more to the interior conduct,² the customs to the exterior. There is in the former

¹ *Drummond's Origines*, I, 142. ² *Spirit of Laws*, I, 445.

much more of the moral element than in the latter. The manners of a people enlighten us in regard to the judgment they are in the habit of passing upon the morality of human actions,¹ and the principles they follow with regard to vice and virtue. Customs are certain habitudes and practices in the common affairs of civil life, certain peculiarities which mark the external deportment of a people either in their public appearances, or in their domestic economy. Taken together, they display very clearly the genius of a people, so far as regards the development of the social instinct. Where the government is despotic, as was peculiarly the fact among the Babylonians, these should be more uniform, as they supply to a great extent the place of laws, and hence a change in them might produce a revolution.²

The degree of perfection in which the elements of social life are found to exist, will always bear a proportion to the progress made in the arts and sciences, and to the general advancement in civilization. In the merely savage state, little society exists except between the members of the same family. In proportion as individuals arise into a higher sphere of objects and enjoyments, they become better fitted for social intercourse, and for the enjoyments derivable from it.

Although among the primitive inhabitants of the world great simplicity must have prevailed in their intercourse with each other, yet the accounts that have reached us, in regard to the Babylonians, fully justify the belief that luxury, voluptuousness, and the whole train of sensual enjoyments entered largely into the basis upon which society was conducted, and were in fact the central points around which the social elements revolved. The southern Asiatics appear at all times to have possessed a great inclination for pomp, luxury and effeminacy. The climate of Babylon no doubt strongly conduced to this. The mighty power possessed by the Babylonian empire in the days of

¹ *Goguet*, i, 327. ² *Spirit of Laws*, i, 441.

its greatness and glory must have furnished means the most abundant for obtaining the possession of every kind of pleasure and species of enjoyment. This renowned city was also gorged with riches, and hence followed the almost inevitable effects they produce among all nations, viz: dissoluteness and corruption of manners, and luxury and effeminacy. The Babylonians were given to lewdness and to everything that could delight the sense.

They were greatly addicted to the pleasures of the table.¹ They carried their debauchery to great excesses, and were much given to wine and drunkenness.

The dress of the Babylonians consisted first of a tunic of lawn² which they wore next their skin. The tunic descended down to their feet. Second, a woolen robe; and third, a cloak or mantle of a white color. They let their hair grow, and covered their heads with a turban or tiara.³ On their feet they wore a kind of slippers very thin and light. Every one wore a signet on his finger, and bore in his hand a staff or sceptre highly wrought, and adorned at the head with some particular ensign or figure, as an apple, a rose, a lilly, an eagle, or some such badge. This was the dress of the common people.⁴ The rich were clothed in a style of splendid magnificence. They had gold and silver stuffs embellished with dyes and the most precious embroidery. Rubies, emeralds, sapphires, pearls, and other jewels added to the splendid effect, and gave new lustre to the appearance.

The Babylonians delighted in perfumes, of which they made very great use, frequently perfuming the whole body with odoriferous waters.⁵ The perfume of Babylon was renowned amongst the ancients for the excellence of its composition. They chiefly used it during their meals. They were curious in regard to their furniture,⁶ some of their articles of luxury consisting in carpets, and ornamental coverings for chairs and beds. Chariots were made use of by civilized nations from a very remote antiquity. The

¹ *Goguet*, II, 186. ² *Idem*, III, 187. ³ *Universal History*, IV, 373; *Goguet*, III, 187. ⁴ *Idem*, III, 188. ⁵ *Goguet*, III, 188. ⁶ *Idem*, III, 189.

custom of being carried in litters and other kinds of vehicles was practiced among the Babylonians.

Antiquity has transmitted to us very little in regard to the pleasures and amusements of the Babylonians.¹ Little doubt is entertained of their having a great taste for music. Among their diversions, hunting should be included, and probably dancing. They do not seem to have adopted the general practice of the eastern nations in the confinement of their women to their inner apartments. They lived familiarly with men; were present at public feasts, were even permitted to see strangers and to eat with them.

The Babylonians had some very singular customs or usages which have come down to us without, perhaps, the reasons or particular causes that gave them origin or continued them in existence. One of these was the method by which they disposed of their young women in marriage. No man seems to have had the right to dispose of his own daughters. Nor had they the right of giving their negative in a matter of so much importance to themselves.² Every year all the young women of a marriageable age were assembled together at some public place.³ The public herald put the handsomest among them up for sale, and sold each to the highest bidder, who was compelled by law to marry the young woman he had bought. Thus were all those whose beauty would insure them purchasers successively disposed of.

By these means a fund was created which was made use of to dispose of those who were less favored by nature. These were next put up by the herald, and struck off successively to those who would take them with the least amount of money. Thus he who received the most ill-favored received her with the largest portion, and the beautiful were made the instruments of disposing of the ugly or ill-favored. The last mentioned set of purchasers were obliged to give security before they were in

¹ *Goguet*, III, 190. ² *Idem*, IV, 370, 371. ³ *Drummond* I, 143, 144.

possession of the money,¹ that they would take those they had chosen. Polygamy was practiced there as among all other eastern nations.

There was another custom among the Babylonians, the reason or motive for which is not so apparent, which was that every Babylonian woman was once in her life time bound to prostitute herself to a strange man at the temple of Venus or Mylitta of the Babylonians.² Every woman on arriving at the temple of the goddess sat down having her head crowned with flowers. In that edifice there were many windings and galleries where the strangers remained whom the love of debauchery always drew there in great numbers. These were permitted to choose the woman they liked best amongst all those who came in obedience to the custom. The stranger declared his choice by throwing some pieces of money into the lap of the woman he selected, at the same time, saying "I implore for thee the goddess Mylitta."

The money, however little, could not be refused, as it was accounted sacred, nor had the woman the power of rejecting any man that accosted her in the prescribed form, but was obliged to retire with him without delay. Afterwards a sacrifice was offered to the goddess, and they were then at liberty to retire, but no woman who had once entered the temple was permitted to leave it without having fulfilled the obligation imposed on her by the custom.

This strange custom has been cited by most writers, and generally considered as evidence of the depravity and licentiousness existing at Babylon, and yet it is difficult to conceive how fathers and husbands could have given their assent to such a custom.³ A different explanation has been given to it, which certainly is deserving of much consideration. This traces it less to corruption and voluptuousness than to the ideas which the ancients entertained on the subject of the divinity. They were persuaded that

¹ *Universal History*, iv, 371. ² *Goguet*, iii, 193-5; *Universal History*, iv, 371, 372; *Drummond*, i, 145, 146. ³ *Goguet*, iii, 194, 195, 196.

this goddess took a special delight in throwing the sex into disorders and debauchery. They desired, therefore, to obtain the favor of the goddess, or at least to propitiate her resentment. Hence they contrived this sacrifice, hoping to redeem the virtue of the woman, and to insure their chastity forever, by causing them to make one deviation, with which they flattered themselves that Mylitta would content herself, and leave these victims in tranquillity, during the remainder of life. A proof of this is drawn from the language made use of by the stranger, "I implore for thee the goddess Mylitta," indicating that it was designed to be propitiatory to the goddess. It is said that a custom somewhat similar once prevailed in the island of Cyprus, and also in the ancient kingdom of Lydia.

The Babylonians were excessively credulous, superstitious, lewd and debauched.¹ They held in high veneration their Chaldæans, priests or jugglers. They were given to gross idolatry. Debauchery reigned among them without control, and to such an extent that parents and husbands sometimes exposed, for money, to their guests their very children and wives. It would seem, therefore, that they had failed to propitiate the goddess by the sacrifice made to her.

Every year, during five days of a certain month, the Babylonians celebrated a festival called soua or sauua, during which the slaves changed places with their masters, having a right to command and be served by them.² They chose one slave in every house, who, during the festival, acted as head of the family, and wore, in consequence, a distinguished habit.

Another peculiarity was to be found in their manner of treating their sick.³ It was their custom to expose them publicly in the most frequented places, that every one might see them and offer their advice, if they had any knowledge of the case either from their own experience

¹ *Universal History*, IV, 372. ² *Goguet*, III, 191, 192; *Universal History*, IV, 372. ³ *Idem*, IV, 372.

or from the experience of others. Their dead they buried in honey and wax, and mourned for them much after the manner of the Egyptians. This method of burial was probably for the purpose of preserving the body.

Philosophy.

The learning of the Babylonians, so far as we know anything of it, was confined to their priest caste, called Chaldæans or Chaldees. These must have possessed the rudiments of many of the sciences. These have been, to some extent, considered in the philosophy of the Chaldæans. It is rendered probable that the same priest caste, called Chaldæans, continued to flourish under the sway of Babylon, and thus to accumulate the observations and discoveries which the experiences of the world, but little advanced beyond its infancy, were constantly furnishing. The most important advances we are acquainted with, were made in the direction of astronomy. The same favorable circumstances, formerly mentioned, for the prosecution of this study, were found existing to a still larger extent in Babylon than in ancient Chaldæa, as the mighty city reposed under a serene sky in the midst of a vast plain, and out of its midst shot up into the walks of ether some six hundred feet, the immense tower of Belus, thus affording a splendid observatory for astronomical purposes.

“The Chaldæan Astronomers,” says Goguet,¹ “had learned that the sun and the planets had a motion proper to themselves from west to east, and that these revolutions were made with great inequalities of time, and with very different degrees of velocity. They taught that the moon is placed below all the stars, and below all the planets; that it is nearest to the earth; that its revolution is performed in less time, and that by means of the small extent of its orbit, not that its velocity was greater than that of the other planets. They knew that the moon shone with

¹ *Goguet*, III, 95.

only a borrowed light, and that its eclipses were caused by its passing within the earth's shadow."

The Chaldæans were probably the first who discovered the zodiac. They reckoned thirty-six constellations, of which twelve were in the zodiac and twenty-four without it. They distinguished those within it into northern and southern. They had divided each sign of the zodiac into thirty degrees, and each degree into sixty parts or minutes. By this method they had found the mean motion of the moon. They could determine the periodical return of that luminary with considerable exactness. They are supposed to have been the first who knew the use of sun dials. It is also asserted that they were the first who undertook to measure the length of the sun's annual revolution. Their year at first consisted of three hundred and sixty-five days. Afterwards, but at what period of time is uncertain, they added to the common year five hours and some minutes, by which the annual revolution exceeds the three hundred and sixty-five days. They had also a system in regard to comets.¹ They regarded them as planets whose revolutions were performed in orbits very eccentric to the earth, and that they became visible only in their progress through the lower part of that orbit. They had but a very imperfect idea of solar eclipses. They could not determine or foretell them.

The Chaldæans, however, made a strange use of their astronomy. They constructed out of it the pretended science of judicial astrology, which exerted a long continued and a mighty influence over the thoughts, feelings, and actions of men. It bears about the same relation to the science of astronomy that alchemy does to that of chemistry. It was the prostitution of the principles of a noble science to the practice of a false, frivolous, and pretending art.

Judicial astrology undertook to teach the effects and influences of the stars, and to foretell future events by their situation and different aspects. It assumed that the hea-

¹ *Goguet*, III, 97, 98.

venly bodies possessed and exercised a controlling influence over the physical and moral world. It embodied the first efforts of that strong desire which men have ever manifested to become masters of the future, and to wrench from it its secrets.

The Chaldæans called the planets *interpreters*, and made great account of their influence.¹ Their influence, however, was different in degree. The planet to which they attributed the greatest influence was Saturn. Next they ranked the sun. Then followed successively Mars, Venus, Mercury, and Jupiter, which were all the planets they were acquainted with. These they called interpreters, because, by their motions and aspects they proclaimed the future, and thus interpreted the will and pleasure of the gods.

Their judgments were drawn from a variety of sources; sometimes from their rising; at other times from their setting; at other times still from the color and degree of their light. From all these they pretended to predict storms of wind, of rain, excessive droughts, the appearance of comets, eclipses of the sun and moon, earthquakes, and the good or bad fortune of nations, of kings, and of private individuals.

Under the six planets they ranged thirty stars, which they called counseling gods. One-half of these were supposed to take notice of what was done under the earth, and the other half of what was done by men, or transacted in the heavens. In order that each should have the benefit of the others' observations, they taught that once in ten days one of the superior stars descended as a messenger to the inferior,² and, in return, one of the inferior ascended to the superior, in the same capacity, and that this mutual correspondence was ever kept up between them. They also taught that these counseling gods had chiefs, twelve in number, and they assigned to each a month of the year, and a whole sign of the zodiac.

The Chaldæan astrologers entertained the belief, that the heavens are one mighty volume,³ in which God has written

¹ *Universal History*, IV, 376. ² *Idem*, IV, 376. ³ *Parthenensis*, 637.

the history of the world, and in which every man may read his own fortune, and the transactions of his time. They divided the heavens into twelve parts,¹ taken, not according to the poles of the world, but to those of the zodiac. Each one of these twelve parts or portions of the heavens has its own peculiar attribute; one, for instance, having riches, another knowledge, another parentage, and so on of the others.

Each one of these parts was called *houses*. The *ascendant* was that part, or house, which was rising in the east at the moment.² This was called the first house, or house of life, and embraced the five degrees immediately above the horizon and the twenty-five beneath it. The second house was that of riches; the seventh, or angle of the west, was the house of marriage; the eighth, the house of death.

One of the most important applications of this singular science was the casting of nativities—the determining from the horoscope, or the appearance, combination, and aspect of the stars and planets, at the very instant of the child's birth,³ what would be his genius, temper, manners, the constitution of his body, his actions, all the events, and the duration of his life. This was accomplished by ascertaining which house would be in the ascendant at the moment of birth.

Many indications were drawn from the planets alone. They were divided into the propitious, the malignant, and the mixed. The aspects of these planets (which were only certain distances from one another) were likewise either happy or unhappy. The Chaldæans are said to have entertained the notion that when all the planets shall meet in Cancer the world will be consumed by fire; and that when they shall meet in Capricorn it will be destroyed by an inundation.⁴

The Chaldæans taught that the world was eternal; that it had neither beginning nor end.⁵ They, however, acknow-

¹ *Rollin*, I, 160. ² *Encyclopedia Americana*, VI, 431. ³ *Rollin*, I, 159.
⁴ *Enfield*, 21. ⁵ *Universal History*, IV, 375.

ledged a divine Providence, and held that the motions of the heavens were not directed by blind chance, or performed spontaneously, but by the guidance and direction of superior agents, or gods.

Art.

Little is required to be said on the subject of Babylonian art. The architectural remains are nothing but mounds and heaps of rubbish. This is principally owing to the materials they used in building, which were almost entirely confined to brick either sun-dried or burnt in kilns.¹ These were laid in cement, which was of two kinds, lime and bitumen, the former used in the lower, and the latter in the upper parts of their buildings.

The use of this material gave some peculiarities to their architecture. All columns were necessarily excluded.² Neither shafts nor capitals with their ornaments could be adopted. It is obvious, therefore, that architecture as a fine art could not here exhibit all its richness and power.

But the destitution of marble and stone led to another result still more unfortunate, and that is the lack of sculptures in the Babylonian ruins. These immense works of art, not only in the highest degree artistic in themselves, but also embalming in stone and sending down to the future the knowledge of many other arts, which stand forth so gloriously in the remains of the Assyrians, are sought for in vain amid the Babylonian ruins.

Statues of Babylonian workmanship are extremely rare. A few small antiques finished with the utmost care and delicacy have been disinterred, and a block of basalt roughly cut to represent a lion standing over a prostrate human figure,³ and a fragment of frieze, are stated to be the only instances of bas-reliefs hitherto discovered in the ruins of Babylon. There can be no doubt but that the

¹ *Heeren's Researches*, II, 182. ² *Idem*, II, 183. ³ *Travels in Chaldæa and Susiana*, 19.

mental arts, especially music and perhaps poetry, flourished at Babylon, but of this we know little beyond the inferences afforded by their known advances in general civilization.

We are now to leave the banks of the Tigris and the Euphrates and travel eastward. Those banks upon which flourished the great cities of the olden time now disappear from history. We now turn our attention towards the Choaspes and the Araxes, and the cities of Susa and Persepolis loom up in the distance. We have been dwelling in a land of plains ; we now go to a land of mountains.

We have been witnessing the advances made in civilization by the Semitic races, for although Chaldæa and early Babylonia were Hamitic in their population, yet the people composing the Babylonian empire were undoubtedly Semites in their characters and language. In the transfer of empire, therefore, and the travel of civilization from Assyria to Babylonia, its torch was still upheld by a Semitic people. But the torch bearer here falls back exhausted, and the torch drops into other and stronger hands. The rule of the sons of Shem, here for the present, finds its destined limit. The torch, and the insignia of empire are now to be transferred to one of the Arian races, and we move to Media and Persia.

CHAPTER VIII.

MEDO-PERSIA—ITS DESCRIPTION, HISTORY, INDUSTRY, AND RELIGION.

Media. Persia. Medo-Persian Empire.

The whole Mesopotamian region, including Chaldæa, Babylonia, Assyria and Susiana, is walled up on the north and east by ranges of mountains, which furnish the sources of its rivers, and, with few exceptions, presented an impassable barrier to the victorious arms of its mightiest monarchs. This mountain wall also constituted the northern and eastern limit of the Semitic race and language. By following up the streams which had found their way from this mountain region, we are led into the countries of Armenia on the north, and Media and Persia on the east. In these, especially the two latter, are found the original homes—the nuclei or starting point of the Medo-Persian empire. This empire in its flourishing period, extended from the Persian gulf and Indian ocean on the south, to the Caspian sea and Mount Caucasus on the north; and from the Indus and Oxus on the east and north-east, to the Tigris, the Euphrates, and even the Mediterranean sea on the west. The most striking features of the territory lying east of the great Mesopotamian plain are numerous chains of mountains, and large tracts of desert,¹ amid which are interspersed beautiful valleys and rich pasture lands. The greater part of the country is a succession of plains at the base of those ridges of hills by which it is intersected, and of table lands nearly on a level with their tops. This gives great varieties of climate, for to pass from the lower valleys to the higher, is to change the temperature of summer for that of winter.

¹ *Malcomb's Persia*, 1, 2.

The southern portion bordering on the gulf is a sandy plain, almost uninhabitable during the summer months. At a little distance from the sea the land rises into terraces, where are found rich and well-watered pastures, covered with villages and herds.¹ This is a delightful region, producing many varieties of fruit, rice, wheat, and many medicinal plants, and those yielding perfumes. The ground is enameled with flowers: jasmines, tulips, anemones, ranunculuses, jonquils, and tuberoses grow wild. Only one poisonous plant is known, the Persian name of which signifies "*the flower which poisons the wind.*"²

Towards the north the country rises into high and sterile mountains, whose summits even in summer are not unfrequently covered with snow. They enclose between their ranges some fruitful valleys, affording shelter originally to a few tribes with their flocks, but being generally incapable of tillage. Among these mountain fastnesses, including the Persian and Median, was cradled the conquerors of Asia. Inured from their infancy to hardships, surrounded by dangers, reared amidst want and privation, it is not extraordinary that they could easily overcome in conflict those whom a milder climate, more genial influences, and a more refined civilization, had rendered luxurious and effeminate.

Amidst these valleys, and scattered over these uplands, we find different races of men from those that dwelt upon the plains of Shinar, or of upper Mesopotamia. Here are the Aryan, Iranian, Indo-European or Japhetic races. It is the first time we have found them appearing in history. Hitherto we have seen only the Hamitic and Semitic. Authentic history is silent as to the place of origin of these races, and in this silence Armenia is regarded as the most probable centre from which they spread.³ While one stream is supposed to have wandered eastward, two others began also to move — the one northward across the Cauca-

¹ *Heeren's Researches*, I, 140. ² *Anquetil*, I, 209, 210, etc. ³ *Rawlinson*, I, 545.

sus, and the other westward over Asia Minor and into Europe. At a period certainly anterior to the fifteenth century before Christ, they were settled in a tract watered by the upper Indus, whence they sent out colonies eastward and westward. On the one side they advanced along the rivers of the Punjab, composing and singing the hymns of the Rig-Veda, while on the other they crossed the high chain of the Hindoo-Koosh, occupying the region watered by the upper streams of the Oxus, and having their progress marked out in the early portions of the Zenda-Veda, the sacred book of the western or Medo-Persic Arians. From the shores of the Caspian, after some period of time now unknown, the emigration again burst forth, projecting a strong Indo-European element into Armenia,¹ and at the same time turning southward along the mountain range of the Zagros, occupying Media, and thence descending to the shores of the Persian gulf, when Persia proper and Carmania formed the limits of its progress.

That the Persians belong to the Aryan race is clear from their language, which we possess in five of its stages, viz : 1st. The Zend, or language of the Zenda-Veda, the earliest type. 2d. The Achæmenian Persian, or language of the cuneiform inscriptions. 3d. The Pehlevi, known to us from rock inscriptions, and sacred books of the Parsees, to the Pasent or Parsi ; and 5th. The Persian of the present day.

There appears, however, always to have been a Scythic, or nomadic element in Persia since the first appearance of this country in history.² To this species of population the character of the country strongly inclines. Large portions of it are only habitable at certain seasons of the year. Of the ten tribes constituting, according to Herodotus, the population of Persia, four of them were nomadic in their habits and character. One of these—the *Dahi* were spread over the whole country, from the Caspian to the Persian gulf and the Tigris,³ while another, the *Mardi*, were also established in most of the mountain chains which intersected the empire.

¹ Rawlinson, I, 546. ² *Idem*, I, 204, note 7. ³ *Idem*, I, 338.

The most important tribe of the Aryan race was the *Pasargadæ*, which, as it rose to power, imposed its name on the province adjoining the Erythræan sea. This tribe enjoyed special privileges, and kept themselves distinct from the nomadic hordes by whom they were surrounded.

Their chief settlement was about forty miles north of Persepolis,¹ where Cyrus the Great established his capital, which was also called *Pasargadæ*, "the encampment of the Persians." The modern *Murg-curb* occupies its site. Other tribes, the *Maraphii* and *Maspîi*, are classed with the *Pasargadæ*, and were probably cognate races, who accompanied them in their original emigration.

The Medes were a branch of the great Aryan family, closely allied both in language and religion to the Persians. In early periods of history these constituted the two preeminent branches of the Aryan stock.² Herodotus remarks a similarity of dress between the Medes and Persians. These two have been often coupled together, as in the oft-repeated formula in the book of Daniel, "according to the laws of the *Medes and Persians*, which altereth not." Under the sway of the Persians, the Medes held high positions, occupying the first rank. The history of the two countries from the time of Cyrus, has been essentially the same.

While the Assyrian was the dominant power in western Asia, the condition of Media could hardly be said to be dependent or independent. The country throughout was governed by her own princes, each tribe or district acknowledging its own prince or chieftain,³ no single chief exercising any paramount rule. The Assyrian monarch claimed a species of sovereignty, demanding tribute, which was sometimes paid, and sometimes withheld.

The movement by which the power of the Medes was established, took place during the latter half of the seventh century, B. C., and was during the reign of *Cyaxares*. Some assert that there were two previous reigns, viz:

¹ *Rawlinson*, I, 203, note 3. ² *Idem*, I, 318. ³ *Idem*, I, 321.

those of *Deïous* and *Phraortes*, but there appears little doubt but that the empire of the Medes was founded by *Cyaxares*, and that it was reared upon the ruins of the Assyrian. The dismemberment of the latter empire gave birth to two others, the Babylonian and the Median; which, as they had successfully made common cause against the Assyrian, and were united at their origin by the ties of marriage, Nebuchadnezzar, the son of Nabopolassar, the founder of the former, marrying Amyitis or Amyhia, the daughter of Cyaxares, the founder of the latter, so they continued, during their separate existence, the friends and allies of each other.

The great Median empire is now regarded as having been first established by *Cyaxares*, about the year B. C. 625.¹ We have already seen in the history of Assyria, under what circumstances the power of that empire was destroyed and that of the Median and Babylonian founded upon its ruins. This was the account given by Herodotus. Others suppose that the Scythians, who invaded Assyria, were previous to this invasion, the nomadic wanderers in Media, and that Cyaxares and his followers issuing from Khorassan,² and passing along the mountain line south of the Caspian, proceeded due west into Media, where, after a fierce struggle, they overcame the Scyths, partly blending with them, and partly precipitating them upon the Assyrians. In either case the Scythian invasion must have had the effect very much to weaken the Assyrians.

The downfall of the Assyrian empire revolutionized the condition of western Asia. Not only did Babylon become an independent power,³ but the Medes rapidly overran and conquered the entire region between Azerbaijan and the Halys, whence they proceeded to threaten Asia Minor. There were now three great dominant powers in western Asia—the Median, the Babylonian, and the Lydian, the latter holding dominion in Asia Minor. The two first mentioned were in close alliance. As the

¹ Rawlinson, I, 324. ² *Idem*, I, 325. ³ *Idem*, I, 329.

Lydians were the only other dominant power in western Asia, the Medes under Cyaxares, aided by the Babylonians, made them the subject of attack. They were then under the rule of Alyattes. The war raged with about equal success on both sides until the sixth year, during which, while a great battle was in progress between the two, the heavens became gradually darkened until night seemed to usurp the place of day. It was a total eclipse of the sun. The combatants rested on their weapons, lost in wonderment at this phenomenon of the heavens. Some mutual friends seizing upon this remarkable occurrence, negotiated a peace between the parties, which was cemented by a marriage between Aryesis the daughter of Alyattes and Astyages the son of Cyaxares.

The Median empire had now reached its acme. It was the dominant power throughout western Asia. The Medes do not appear to have made any additional conquests for themselves, but they aided Nebuchadnezzar in his wars with the Jews and the Egyptians. Cyaxares died, and left his extensive dominions to his son *Astyages*.

A period of repose succeeded the great wars of Nebuchadnezzar. The three great monarchies of the east were now bound together by treaties and intermarriages. It was, however, only a calm that was to precede the most terrific storm that had ever yet rolled its destructive ravages over western Asia, and this brings us to the mission of Cyrus in the founding of the Persian empire.

Persia proper, or the province of Persia, extends from the frontier of Media on the north southward to the gulf which bears its name. It is separated from Babylonia by Susiana, and bounded on the east by Carmania. The character of the country has already been alluded to.

There is a wide difference between the Persian and Greek writers in regard to the antiquity of the Persian monarchy. According to the former this monarchy existed in the earliest ages of the world.¹ It was a mighty empire

¹ *Drummond's Origines*, I, 337.

extending over all Asia except India. In it science first dawned, and the arts flourished, and men first came to know their moral and religious duties. They do not admit that Persia was once a province of the great Assyrian empire, but affirm that it was governed by different dynasties, and all these they attempt to trace to a Persian origin. In the estimation of Sir William Jones, the Dabistan furnished evidence that the Iranian monarchy must have been the oldest in the world,¹ although, he added, it will remain dubious to which of the three stocks, Hindu, Arabian, or Tartar, the first kings of Iran belonged; or whether they sprang from a fourth race, distinct from any of the others. He also adds that no country but Persia seems likely to have sent forth colonies to all the kingdoms of Asia, and that the three races (Indians, Arabs, Tartars,) migrated from Iran as from their common country, "the true centre of population, of knowledge, of languages, and of arts, which, instead of traveling westward only, as it has been fancifully supposed, or eastward, as might with equal reason have been asserted, were expanded in all directions to all the regions of the world, in which the Hindu race had settled under various denominations." He must have used the Hindu race as synonymous with the Aryan, and have found the common centre in Iran instead of the plain of Shinar.

The Greeks attribute to the Persian monarchy a much more recent origin. They represent Media and Persia as both under the dominion of Assyria until the revolt of the Medes under Cyaxares, and that the Persian empire was founded by Cyrus about the year B. C. 561.² It has been suggested that the two accounts may be reconciled by supposing that both really referred to the same empire, the Assyrian, which, it is said, during many ages was denominated the Assyrian on one side of the Caspian gates, and the Iranian or Persian on the other. The accounts, however, which the Persians give us in regard to their

¹ *Dabistan*, I, cvii. ² *Drummond's Origines*, I, 339.

Iranian empire are hardly reconcilable with what we know of the Assyrian.

The Persian writers, less historians than poets, with the exception of the Dabistan, date the commencement of the Iranian monarchy from *Kaiomarth*,¹ who was the founder of what they term the *Pesh-dadian* dynasty. So called from *Pesh-dad*, lawgiver. Of this dynasty there were four kings, the fourth being the celebrated *Gem-Shid*, who divided his subjects into four classes, cultivated the arts and sciences, and instructed his subjects in religious duties. He was supposed to be contemporary with Nimrod. The Dabistan goes back to a preceding dynasty, that of *Mahabad*, asserting that he was the person left at the end of the last great cycle,² and consequently the father of the present world.

According to the Greek historians, whose accounts are now generally received, the Persian empire was founded by Cyrus. He was the grandson of Astyages, that monarch having given his daughter Mandane in marriage to Cambyses, a distinguished Persian of the family of *Achæmenidæ* and of the royal tribe of the *Pasargadæ*. From this union came the Cyrus of the Greek and the Khosran, or Khosræes of the Persian writers.

Historians are not agreed as to the events in the early age of Cyrus. He is generally considered to have been condemned to death by Astyages his grandfather, but was saved by Harpagus his prime minister.³ He was brought up in obscurity until he approached the age of manhood, when learning the secret of his birth, he rallied his countrymen around his standard of revolt, and finally succeeded in dethroning Astyages, who has been considered the Ahasuerus of scripture. It is said, however, that he submitted to the rule of Cyaxares II, during his life, who has been taken to be the "Darius the Mede" of scripture, and that at his death he succeeded him, uniting under one

¹ *Drummond's Origines*, I, 372, 373. ² *Malcolm's History of Persia*, I, 8.
³ *Taylor*, 63.

sceptre the Medes and Persians, thus founding the Medo-Persian empire. Both before and after his accession to the throne he was the principal if not the sole leader in all the great events that laid the foundation of that empire.

His first military achievement was to reduce to obedience the king of Armenia, which was accomplished without much bloodshed. Having thus secured the submission of the hardy population occupying the mountain ranges that walled in western Asia on the north and east, his next business was to pay his respects to the two great empires that held under dominion that part of Asia. These were the Babylonian and Lydian, the latter now under the sceptre of Cræsus, who had succeeded his father Alyattes. Knowing the ambitious designs of Cyrus, and fearing the power that was rising in the east, these two empires, at the suggestion of Cræsus, had entered into mutual alliance against the common enemy.

The warlike preparations of Cyrus and Cyaxeres were on a gigantic scale. All the forces of Media and Persia were drawn together, amounting,¹ it is said, to 196,000 men, infantry and cavalry, and 300 chariots armed with scythes. This army was designed to precipitate itself upon the Lydian empire. This empire, now under the sway of the wealthy Cræsus, then held dominion over the western part of Asia Minor, extending from the shores of the Ægean sea to the river Halys. This army more than twice outnumbered that of Cyrus, amounting to 420,000 men, of which 60,000 were cavalry. These immense armies engaged each other at the battle of Thymbra. The Lydian army was totally defeated, and Cræsus retreated to Sardis his capital, which was immediately invested and taken by Cyrus. Thus one of the great powers of western Asia came to an end.

There now remained the Babylonian empire, whose main forces were centered at Babylon. The celerity with which the army of Cræsus had been vanquished, the city

¹ *Rollin*, 124.

of Sardis invested and taken, and all Asia Minor overran and subdued, had allowed no time to the Babylonians to unite their forces with the Lydians, and thus with their united strength to resist the invading army of Cyrus. The latter by his unceasing activity, had accomplished the same work which other great captains have since so often done, that of striking and subduing his enemies singly and in detail, before they have succeeded in uniting their forces.

Cyrus was now ready to lay siege to Babylon, but the taking it seemed almost a forlorn hope. This great city was strongly fortified, and abundantly supplied with provisions, and all the means of defense then known. The strength of its walls and towers, and of its armed forces within, forbade its being taken by assault. Its immense amount of stores laid up against this very contingency, together with its power of annually increasing these stores by what could be raised from the immense area within its walls, seemed alike to forbid its being reduced by a siege. The latter, however, being the only course that seemed possible, was attempted, and had been prosecuted about two years with little prospect of reducing it. At the expiration of that time it was taken suddenly by stratagem in the manner already stated, and with it ended the Babylonian empire in B. C. 538, and upon the ruins of both the Babylonian and the Lydian was erected the Medo-Persian.

One of the first acts of Cyrus was to terminate the captivity of the Jews by permitting them to return to Jerusalem and rebuild the temple. This was in fulfillment of prophecy uttered more than one hundred years previous to its completion. And as such return seems absolutely indispensable to complete the mission of the Jewish nation in the ultimate production of the Messiah, it requires no very great stretch of faith to enable one to see that the outgoings of God in history were here conducted with express reference to the bringing about of this great event.

These were all the great military achievements of Cyrus. His empire was now fully established, and he was its undisputed master. He reigned from the Indus and the Oxus to the Mediterranean and the river of Egypt. It was by far the most extensive empire the world had thus far witnessed. For seven years he ruled this empire in peace and prosperity, establishing many wise regulations for its government. The manner of his death is uncertain, but it seems clear that he was buried at Passargadæ¹ his capital, where his tomb is still visible, which, in the age of Strabo, bore this inscription: "Oh man, I am Cyrus who founded the Persian empire, envy me not then the little earth that covers my remains."

Cyrus was succeeded by his son Cambyses, who, soon after his accession to the throne, invaded Egypt, took Pelusium, overthrew Psammenitus, the last of the long line of the Egyptian Pharaohs, and overran the whole country. He next started for the invasion of Ethiopia, but his army nearly all perished in the desert. He was suspicious, cruel and revengeful, and finally died from a slight wound inflicted upon himself accidentally by his own sword while mounting his horse. He had slain his brother Smerdis, and left no children himself, so that by his death the Kaianian dynasty became extinct, in B.C. 522.

The next king was Smerdis, the Magian, an impostor,² who was raised to the throne by the priest caste, as a means of restoring their own supremacy. The imposture was soon discovered, and Smerdis destroyed by a combination of Persian nobles.

Hystaspes, a Persian noble, was next raised to the throne, who took the name of Darius, and was the founder of the Hystaspid dynasty. In the early part of his reign Babylon raised the standard of revolt, but after a siege of twenty months, was taken by stratagem; a Persian noble, Zopyrus, having mutilated and disfigured himself, went over to the enemy, acquired their confidence and the command of

¹ *Taylor*, 64. ² *Idem*, 64.

an important post, by means of which he was enabled to surrender the city into the hands of Darius. He next quelled a Greek insurrection in Asia Minor, after which he undertook the invasion of Scythia. This expedition resulted disastrously, and on his return, having severely punished the Greeks of Asia Minor for a revolt, he fully resolved to execute his vengeance to their Grecian allies, and for that purpose sent his son-in-law, *Mardonius*, with a large armament into Greece. This expedition accomplished nothing, the fleet being shattered by a storm while doubling Mount Athos. Subsequently a second expedition of some 500,000 men was despatched into Greece, under Datis and Artaphanes, who were totally defeated by Miltiades at the battle of Marathon, B. C. 490. Darius, while making extensive preparations for the invasion of Greece in person, was suddenly called upon to give up his earthly possessions and died.

The reign of Xerxes, his son and successor, is much celebrated in history. His reign commenced B.C. 485. The Egyptians having rebelled, he first marched against them and completely subdued them. Inflated by this success, he next prepared to invade Greece with the largest army ever yet collected together, and with a naval force correspondingly great. The Greeks have undoubtedly greatly magnified the numbers composing this army. There is no doubt, however, but that the army and navy were both large, and that the mighty magnitude of his preparations were such as to invest the result with a lively and intense interest. It seemed as if the combined forces of Asia were precipitating themselves upon Greece. At the memorable straits of Thermopylæ the east and the west met in fearful conflict. A mere handful of men under Leonidas, a Spartan king, opposed themselves to the Persian army. Treachery finally enabled Xerxes to turn the flank of the gallant warriors, who, with one or two exceptions, all perished upon the field. The states of Greece afterwards erected on the spot a sepulchral monument, with this simple and touching epitaph: "Stranger, go and

tell at Lacedæmon that we fell here in obedience to her just laws."

Having entered Greece, the history of the campaign becomes intensely exciting, but it belongs to Grecian rather than to Persian history. The Persian fleet was dispersed in a sea fight near Salamis, and Xerxes fearing the total destruction of his vessels, left Mardonius with a large army to subdue Greece while he himself escaped into Asia. The Persian army, thus left, numbering, it is said 300,000 men, were totally defeated at the battle of Platæa in Boeotia, and on the same day the remnant of the Persian fleet was burnt at Mycale in western Asia. Thus terminated this formidable invasion, which, instead of subverting, only served to elevate Greece to an exalted rank in the family of nations. Xerxes, after experiencing a series of domestic difficulties, was murdered by Artabanus, captain of his guard, B.C. 470.

The events that occurred in the progress of Persian history during the reigns of the eight kings who successively reigned over Persia, after the death of Xerxes, are possessed of little general interest. The intrigues of the palace, murders, poisonings and assassinations constitute much of Persian history. To these should be added the revolts of the satraps or governors of provinces, thus showing the weakness of the empire, and its tendency towards dismemberment.

The last king was Darius Codomanus, a prince possessed of much goodness of disposition but of little strength of character. During his reign, Alexander the Great invaded Persia. Greece, under this mighty conqueror, rolled back upon Asia the tide of invasion. With an army of 30,000 infantry and 5,000 cavalry he sought to subdue the ruling power of Asia. The battle of the Granicus taught him the kind of enemy he had to contend with. At Issus and Arbela he successively triumphed over the numerous armies of Darius. After the loss of these three battles, the Persian king, while seeking refuge in a remote part of his empire, was murdered by the eunuch Bessus, and

all the provinces of the Persian empire fell under the dominion of Alexander. The destruction of the empire occurred in the year B. C. 336, after an existence of two hundred years.

This closes the history of ancient Persia, which is all we proposed to consider. This country has also had a modern as well as an ancient history, but with this the student of civilization has not necessarily anything to do. It is the people of ancient Persia who form an essential link in the great chain of civilization, and it is only in that character that we propose to consider nations or peoples.

Industry.

The industry of a people is necessarily governed by the character of the country they inhabit. One having a long line of coast and many large navigable rivers opening far up into its interior, strongly invites to the pursuits of commerce. One with fertile uplands and rich river valleys promises to agriculture and manufactures the most abundant harvests; while yet higher regions give encouragement to the shepherd and sometimes to the nomade. Persia combines the advantages of the two latter, but not of the first mentioned. She is a country presenting lofty uplands, and over these have roamed the shepherd wanderers of ancient and modern times. There seems always to have been a nomadic element in Persia, and its favorite residence has been amid high and inaccessible mountains.¹ Here they have enjoyed a savage independence, and looked down with contempt upon the dwellers in cities. By moving from the more elevated to lower plains they could avoid the severity of winter, and enjoy a perpetual spring.

But a large proportion of the ancient Persians in the earliest ages depended more upon agriculture than upon their flocks for support,² for they long regarded those who ate animal food with horror. Of the extent to which

¹ *Malcolm's History of Persia*, I, 269. ² *Idem*, I, 268.

manufactures or mechanic arts were carried we know little. The Persian kings could not only command the industry but also the architectonic skill of the people in the erection of their splendid edifices at Pasargadæ, Susa, and Persepolis. As the Persian rose upon the ruins of the Babylonian empire, it succeeded to all the Babylonian commerce. Although, therefore, we may well suppose that all the channels of trade were still continued open, and that the pursuits of commerce were prosecuted as formerly, yet we have no evidence that any new channels were opened, or any new pursuits originated.

Religion.

The wants of the soul have always early made themselves manifested in the history of every people. "History," says one, "may well be referred to religion, which is an ancient intellectual monument, living in the human soul from generation to generation." Nor should the depth or strength of religious feeling be measured by the outward civilization, the arts and elegancies of life which any people have succeeded in achieving. The more a people are able to surround themselves with mental and material blessings, the less grateful are their responses to the great giver of all good. Practical atheism is to be sought in the abodes of the rich, not the dwellings of the poor. Men shut God out of their minds by the very gifts which should draw them to him.

As the religion of the ancient Persians embodies also all that existed of their speculative philosophy, and exhibits one of the most interesting specimens of an ancient faith, it will require at our hands a fair amount of consideration.

According to the Dabistan the primeval religion of Persia was a firm belief in one supreme God, who made the world by his power, and governed it by his providence; a pious fear, love, and adoration of him; a reverence for parents and aged persons; a paternal affection for the whole human species; and a compassionate tenderness for the brute

creation. The traditions of the early world would naturally lead in this direction.¹ The sentiment of admiration is one that awakes early in the human breast. This would naturally be first directed to the glories of the sky. The adoration of the stars was, therefore, one of the most ancient religions. No prophet was required to proclaim it. As the "*poetry of Heaven,*" it was written in characters of fire upon the ethereal expanse. Upon its star-paved path man was conducted to the sanctuary of the supreme being. The first feeling of "the Divine" seizing the human mind with its own supernatural power, elevated it at once above the material concerns of the nether world, and thus sublime ideas of the deity, the universe, and the immortality of the soul, preceded the invention of many arts and sciences relative to the comforts of social life.

Whatever may have been the early convictions of the mind in reference to a supreme deity, this belief was followed by a worship of the host of heaven, or the celestial bodies. This embraces the substance of the sabian faith. The ancient Persians, we are told, in their adoration of the planets, represented them by images of a very extraordinary nature. That of Saturn, for instance, was of black stone, having a head like an ape, the body of a man, and the tail of a hog. That of Jupiter represented a man with a vulture's head, on which was a crown, and on the top of it were the heads of a cock and a dragon. That of Mars was of red stone, having in one hand a bloody scimeter, and in the other, an iron scourge. The sun was represented by an image of gold representing a man on horseback with two heads, and on each a seven pointed crown set with rubies.² That of Venus was of human form, and wore a crown with seven peaks or points. The image of Mercury had the body and tail of fish, with the face of a hog. The Moon was represented by an image of a man sitting upon a white cow. The explanation as to the reason why these peculiar forms or images came to be adopted, is the follow-

¹*Malcolm's History of Persia*, 1, 188. ²*Idem*, 186.

ing: Although the planets are simple bodies of a spherical form, yet the reason why these images are thus formed is, "that the planetary spirits have appeared in the world of imagination to certain prophets,¹ saints and holy sages under such forms, and that under these they are also connected with certain influences."

. In regard to the influence they exerted, the doctrine was, "that the almighty Creator has so formed the celestial bodies,² that from their motions there result certain effects in this lower world, and, without doubt, all events here depend on the movements of these elevated bodies; so that every star has relation to some event, and every mansion possesses its peculiar nature: nay every degree of each sign is endued with a distinct influence; therefore the prophets of the Lord, in conformity to his orders, and by great experience, have ascertained the properties inherent in the degrees of each celestial mansion, and the influences of the stars." Thus they maintain that whatever exists in this world, or that of formation and evanescence, depends on the influence of the stars. That

"Every form and image, which seems at present effaced,
Is securely stored up in the treasury of time —
When the same position of the heavens again recurs,
The Almighty reproduces each from behind the mysterious veil."³

Their real belief is, that forms similar to those which have passed away, and bodies resembling the primitive ones, their counterpart in figure, property and shape, shall appear, speaking and acting exactly in the same manner.

Among the ancient Persians the first creation was the intellectual principle called the *Azad Bahman*, "the first intelligence." He is also the first angel, and from him other angels or spirits proceed. Every star, every heavenly sphere has its particular intelligence and spirit or angel.⁴ In the lower region, each of the four elements owns its particular guardian. Even vegetables, animals, minerals

¹*Dabistan* I, 41. ²*Idem*, I, 44. ³*Idem*, I, 13. ⁴*Idem*, lxviii.

have their protecting angels. Not a drop of dew fell without an angel. The Persian imparadised the whole creation by making it the abode of angels.

Human souls, according to the Persian doctrine, are eternal and infinite. They come from above, and are spirits of the upper spheres.¹ If they were distinguished for knowledge and sanctity while on earth, they return above, are united with the sun, and become empyreal sovereigns; but if the proportion of their good works bore a closer affinity to any other star, they become lords of the place assigned to that star. Their stations are in conformity with the degrees of their virtue. Perfect men attain the beatific vision of the light of lights, and the cherubic hosts of the supreme lord. Vice and depravity, on the contrary, separate souls from the primitive source of light, and chain them to the abode of the elements. These become evil spirits. The imperfectly good migrate from one body to another, until, by the efficacy of good words and actions, they are finally emancipated from matter, and gain a higher rank. Those who are thoroughly depraved descend from the human form to animal bodies, to vegetables, and even to mineral substances. So the laboring under insanity, suffering distress on account of one's children, being assailed by diseases, the visitations of providence,² and all such calamities, are the retribution of actions in a former state of existence. If a person falls down or stumbles while running, even this is regarded as the retribution of past deeds. So also are the maladies of new born infants.

A very excellent mode of conveying instruction, and of educating the moral sense among the ancient Persians, was by appropriate images, and to occupy conveniently by fables, symbols, and mythical accounts,³ that first active faculty of the mind, imagination. This is most effectually done in the infancy of the race. And although those men, who, as thinkers, legislators and teachers, were elevated

¹ *Dabestan*, lxix. ² *Idem*, I, 69. ³ *Idem*, I, xciii.

above their barbarous age, could, in many points, but partake in the general imbecility and ignorance of an infant state of society, yet they have nevertheless, among seemingly childish and absurd precepts, promulgated truths, so great and luminous, that they have been the admiration of more advanced stages of civilization. The following, for instance, among the Persians, is justly referred to as one of the most beautiful personifications that ever entered into the imagination of men. The soul of the deceased meets at the bridge of eternity,¹ an apparition either of an attractive, or a repulsive form; "Who art thou?" asks the uncertain spirit, and hears for answer, "*I am thy life.*"

We have before alluded to the stars as objects of worship. It is proper to say that the earliest form of faith, as contained in the Desatir, the first four books ascribed to the first four Mahabadian prophet-kings, consisted in the purest deism. It was not until subsequent periods that planet and star worship was developed. The early traditions of the world that survived the deluge served to bind the descendants of Noah to the worship of the god of that patriarch. But man, in his natural state, has ever sought something having tangible form and shape to make an object of worship. The first of this kind that presented itself to the oriental, or Persian mind, was the host of heaven, especially the planetary orbs. But these were not at first worshiped as deities. The soul fell gradually into idolatrous worship. Worship was at first rendered to the seven planets, not as gods absolutely, themselves controlling the affairs of the universe, but simply as mediators between God and men.²

To this erroneous step succeeded another, in which the downward tendency was distinctly marked. This marked a great transfer, no less an one than from monotheism to polytheism. From being simply mediators, the planets soon came to be regarded as gods, and possessed of the powers belonging to deity. This advance downward of

¹ *Dabistan*, I, clxxvii. ² *Idem*, lxxix.

the common popular mind, probably long preceded that of the more intelligent, especially those of the priest caste, who might still pay their adorations to the planets in their mediatorial capacity.

Another descent, which was easy and natural, led to the worship of the elements, fire, earth, and water, and winds. Of these, fire became far the most prominent. Next to the precious jewel of the intellectual principle—the *Azad-Buhman*,¹ the solar ray was held to possess peculiar excellence, and to come from the essence of the light of lights. The sun, the god of day, especially as he rose in the morning, dispelling the shadows of night, and pouring his flood of light and his genial warmth over the earth, became a favorite object of worship. It was hence that the eastern nations were so prone to face the east in their attitude of worship.

From the worship of the day god, from which emanated the solar ray, the transition was easy to that of fire. It is here more especially that we find the magian faith. The veneration paid to this element led to its invocation in their sacrifices, and to its being carried before their kings in their marches. The sacred fire must be kept continually burning on their altars. It was pretended to have come down from heaven. It must be fed only with wood stripped of the bark, and must be fanned only with the pure breezes of heaven. To blow it with human breath, or with the bellows, was pollution, and punishable with death.

The priests who guarded this faith were the magi, and these, as in Egypt, and among the Jews, composed a particular caste. No marriage was permitted out of their caste, and none but the sons of priests could be ordained of their order. Like the priests of Egypt, they were the depositaries of religion and learning. They attained to great power and influence in the state, and on the death of Cambyses, succeeded in placing one of their number upon the throne. The revolution, however, that suc-

¹ *Dabistan*, I, 6.

ceeded, and resulted in the death of the magian and the elevation of Darius Hystaspes, was disastrous to the influence of their order. These early magi are described as having no temples, but as performing their devotions on the summits of mountains, or the tops of hills, in the open air, and under the broad expanse of heaven.

There is another distinct and peculiar feature that has been at times pervading the Persian religion. It is called the dualistic feature, and is embraced in the assertion that there are in the universe two great principles, the one of which has been productive of all the good, and the other of all the evil in the world. The symbol of the first was light, of the latter darkness. The first they called *Yasdan* or *Ormuzd*, the Greeks *Oromasder*. The second was called *Ahriman*, the Greeks *Arimanius*.

There seems to have been a difference of opinion in relation to these two gods, some holding each to be self-existent and others that *Ormuzd* only was eternal, and *Ahriman* created. They all concurred in the belief that there will be opposition between these gods to the end of the world, and that then the good god shall overcome the evil one.¹ After the destruction of the world, each god shall have his own peculiar world; *Ormuzd* having with him all the good, and *Ahriman* all the wicked.

A modification of this peculiar belief consisted in the introduction of a principle superior to both these — a supreme god who created both these, and out of them all other things. This doctrine was that there was one supreme, self-existent being, and that under him were two angels, the one of light, the author of good, the other of darkness the author of evil. That these two out of the mixture of light and darkness created all things. That they are in perpetual struggle with each other — good reigning where the angel of light prevails, and evil where the angel of darkness gains the ascendancy. That this struggle will continue till the end of the world. That then there shall be a

¹ *Rollin*, 1, 162.

resurrection and a day of judgment, and every one rewarded or punished according to his works; the reward of the one to dwell forever in light with the angel of light, the punishment of the other to dwell forever in darkness with the angel of darkness, and that light and darkness shall be no more mixed with each other.

Thus it would seem that there were two forms of religious belief or worship that prevailed among the Persians — the one the magian, sabian, or elemental worship; the other the dualistic feature, signalized by the reign of *Ormuzd* and *Ahriman*. The first is the only one mentioned by Herodotus and the Greek writers,¹ while the second is the only one appearing from the Persian inscriptions. The question is from whence were these two forms of worship derived, and when was each first adopted. There appears to be no trace of the dualistic form in the vedas or religious books of the eastern or Indo-Aryans, who on their separation proceeded eastward and settled in Hindostan.² On the other hand the ancient monuments of the western Aryans, or the Medes and Persians, indicate that this was a faith which they brought with them from beyond the Indus. Nothing appears plainer than that the faith of the early Achæmenian kings was mere dualism, without the slightest admixture of fire worship or elemental religion. It has, therefore, been conjectured that the elemental sabian, magian faith was derived from the Scythic nomads who in early periods inhabited large portions of Media and Persia, and that it was adopted by the western Aryan emigrants during their settlement of those countries. The dualistic heresy is supposed to have originated with the Zend or Persian branch of the Aryans before their separation, and while still beyond the Indus, and to have been the cause of their separation from their Vedic brethren and compelled them to migrate to the westward.

Another great difficulty that has presented itself in the Persian religion is to determine the mission and period of

¹ Rawlinson, i, 339. ² *Idem*, i, 340.

that distinguished personage who is known as the Persian *Zardusht*, and the Grecian *Zoroaster*. By one he is accounted the author of the magian, and by another of the dualistic faith. So much controversy has arisen relative to his mission, and to the time of his appearance, that the suggestion has been made that there were two Zoroasters, the first of whom flourished about the year of the world 2900, and the latter between the reign of Cyrus and that of Darius Hystaspes, the former being regarded as the founder, and the latter as the restorer and reformer of the Persian religion.

The most ancient superstitions have also been found connected with the Persian faith. Of these the following are enumerated in the *Dabistan*,¹ as being so ancient as to render it impossible to fix the epoch at which they originated. The eighty-four sitting postures at prayer, the suppression of the breath for the abstraction of thought, the mystical and fantastical notions upon vision and revelation, and particularly the belief that a man may attain the faculty to quit and reassume his body, or to consider it as a loose garment, which he may put off at pleasure for ascending to the world of light, and on his return be reunited with the material elements.

¹ *Dabistan*, I, lxxix.

CHAPTER IX.

MEDO-PERSIA—ITS GOVERNMENT, AND SOCIETY.

Government.

The Medo-Persian empire presents us with the most perfect system of organized government which any Asiatic system of despotism had hitherto afforded. It is, in fact, a system essentially the same as that upon which the governments of that continent have ever since been conducted. This empire came into existence in a manner nearly similar with other great dominant powers of Asia. It was the men of the mountains, the hardy nomadic shepherds and agriculturists, who invaded and overthrew the more civilized effeminate men of the plains who had congregated in cities. Thus to overthrow and subdue was the mission of Cyrus, and also of his immediate successor, Cambyses. It was during the reigns of Darius Hystaspes and his successors, that the Persian government worked into the form which the ancient writers, especially Herodotus and Xenophon, have transmitted to us. This element will be best considered under four heads, viz :

1. The modes adopted to retain the conquered kingdoms and provinces under subjection.
2. The place of deposit of all political power.
3. The means and agencies through which this power was exercised, and
4. The revenues, whence and how derived.

1st. The Persians had three modes of retaining quiet possession of the countries they had subdued. These were

1. To disarm the people, and to debar them altogether from the profession of arms,¹ unless on the occasion of

¹ *Rawlinson, I, 466.*

some grand exhibition.¹ Along with this they also compelled them to adopt habits of luxury and effeminacy. Thus the Lydians were constrained by Cyrus not only to deliver up their arms, but also to clothe themselves in effeminate apparel, and to train up their youth in habits of gaming and drinking. Thus an unwarlike temper was produced, and hence the ascendancy of the conquering Persian easily maintained.

2. The transplantation or removal of a whole people from their own country to some distant part of the empire.² This was practiced when their subjugation had been difficult,³ or they proved extremely refractory. This had been practiced before them, and the Persians extended the practice. Examples occur in almost every reign, and occasionally we meet with the remains of nations forcibly transported from Europe or Africa into the heart of Asia. Thus all local attachments and love of country were erased from the hearts of the people.

3. The raising and keeping on foot in the conquered country of large standing armies, composed, at first, entirely of native Persians, and, subsequently, partly or wholly of mercenary troops. These troops occupied all the strongholds, and were quartered in great numbers throughout the principal towns. This afforded a very effectual means of quelling revolt while the Persian armies were composed of the conquering race; but when that race had degenerated, and the standing army consisted in great part of mercenaries, such revolts were sometimes, although then not often, crowned with success. This disposition of the Persian armies was also such as generally enabled a rapid concentration of them for any purpose of quelling revolt or of foreign invasion.

2d. All political power was deposited in the person of the king. In all the great empires of Asia, the person of

¹ *Heeren's Researches*, I, 341. ² *Rawlinson*, I, 466, 467. ³ *Heeren's Researches*, I, 340.

the monarch is the central point around which everything else revolves. He is regarded not only as the ruler, but also as the master and proprietor of the lands and lives of all who are subject to his sway: The Persian is an instance of irresponsible despotism, and unmitigated except in the few instances we shall mention. Cambyses when inquiring whether the laws of the Medes and Persians permitted a man to marry his sister, received for answer that there was no law of the Medes and Persians that permitted it, but that there "was a law that the Persian king might do whatever he pleased." This expresses in a condensed form the principle of eastern despotism. It is a power that sits enthroned above every other human power. No class is secure from its oppression, no privilege beyond his control, no law safe from his infraction. The knife of the assassin may annihilate his power, but while life remains his will stands for the supreme law.

There was no regularly established council whom he was compelled to consult, and who might control his operations.¹ He could and did occasionally refer matters to the decision of the royal judges, and convened assemblies of the *grandees* for deliberation on affairs of particular importance; but nothing seems to have bound him either to call such councils, or, if he called them, to abide by their sentence. It seems probable that when a council was summoned, certain nobles had the right of attendance, but the monarch might make members of the council any persons whom he desired. There were seven great princes of Persia who have been called, *par excellence*, the king's counselors, but the monarch summoned besides "all that knew law and judgment."

The fact of polygamy and the administration of the harem created uncertainty in the succession. The customs of Persia excluded illegitimate children, and among the legitimate sons, the rule was that the eldest should inherit, especially if he was born when his father was king. The

¹ Rawlinson, II, 468.

selection among these, however, was left to the monarch, and this was usually made late in life, and often under influences unfavorable to the prosperity of the country.

It would be too much to say that the mind of the king could escape all influence. There is no human mind, but must be more or less subject to it. It is the character of the influence that is to be regarded. With the Persian king, it was that which emanated from the depths of the harem. Brought up in the midst of its intrigues and entanglements, he was mainly guided in after life by the same influences by which he was early surrounded. Affairs of public importance were discussed in the interior of the harem, under the influence of the queen-mother, the favorite wife, and the eunuchs. Even when on great occasions, as the contemplated invasion of a foreign country, if a council was called, it seems that he, who gave any advice might be obliged to answer with his head for its successful issue. It would often happen, therefore, especially during the later periods of the empire, that the real ruler of Persia was a Bagoas, or a Parysatis, in whose hands the monarch was but the merest tool to carry out their irreversible decrees.

There was, however, some limitation to the power of the monarch. The native Persians, although divested of all personal freedom, could, nevertheless claim, by custom, certain special privileges. They were exempt from tribute. They had precedence over the people of all the other provinces. They alone formed the household of the monarch. To them belonged offices and employments of importance. Except the agricultural or the pastoral, they followed the profession of arms, thus forming the soldier caste of the empire. There were also distinctions among the Persians. There was a royal house or stock to which all the monarchs belonged. This was the family of the Achæmenidæ. It belonged to the tribe of the Pasargadæ—the first among the Persian tribes. Next to the Achæmenidæ followed the families of the six conspirators who cut off the magian ruler, and these had the privilege of furnishing wives to the king.

But this privilege was not inviolable as Ahasuerus (Xerxes) married a Jewess. It was probably the representatives of these six families, and of the royal house, which was the seventh, who formed the seven princes of Persia, which saw the king's face, and sat the first in the kingdom. Beyond these there was no order of nobility.

There was also practically a limitation in reference to the subjects over whom the tyranny of the monarch was exercised. These were embraced within the narrow circle of those in his service, and by whom he was surrounded. His iron sceptre fell with all its crushing weight only on the heads of the great and powerful, and of those who immediately surrounded him and administered to his wants. The punishment of his advisers, those in charge of his harem, the instruments of his pleasures, the commanders of his armies, his satraps or the governors of his provinces, on the slightest shadow of suspicion, was always among the most ordinary occurrences. Those who owed their station to his favor, who were made by him what they were, must take the chances of the continuance of that favor, and run the risk of all the jealousies, whims and caprices to which he might be subject. The mass of the people were so far removed from his observation and knowledge, as practically to be individually beyond his reach. Toward them his own self-interest made it a maxim to observe the most rigid justice. In fact the constitution of the Persian government enabled him to exhibit himself to them as their protector. They were ground down by the relentless extortions growing out of the avarice and partiality of the satraps or governors and of their inferiors. When their cry of distress came to the ear of the monarch three motives urged his immediate action: 1. The sense of the injustice done to his people. 2. That of the wrong done in his name by his own agent. 3. The accession to his own revenues which would arise from the confiscation of the estate of the oppressor. These were sufficient. The cord or the dagger did its prompt work; the relief was immediate, the exam-

ple salutary in its effect, and that which on the historic page appears as an instance of the most unmitigated despotism is hailed by the people as an act of justice, of mercy and beneficence.

There was another limitation, having a great practical effect, which was derived from custom or usage. The habits of a people, like those of an individual, acquire the force of inexorable law. It required a hardihood which a monarch seldom possessed to do any act which directly conflicted either with the prejudices of the people, or with their settled customs or usages.

Another powerful limitation was found in religion. It was this that furnished the motives to duty and obedience—the very foundation upon which the despotism itself must necessarily rest. It felt bound, therefore, to respect and obey whatever injunctions came from that high source. In the east, government has always been, and still is, essentially modified by religion. What philosophy and political science accomplish in Europe, is, to some extent, effected by religion in Asia. Its ministers are the priest caste, and these are the assumed depositaries of a power and an authority beyond anything human. They are, therefore, looked up to with respect and reverence both by king and people. They have no other interests to subserve than their own, which may, it is true, be selfish, and those of the king under whose authority they exist. It is, however, his permanent interests that they would be likely to consult, and these are best promoted by adhering to the dictates of truth and justice. Thus although the priest caste undoubtedly never exercised the power in Persia which they did in Egypt, yet their influence was undoubtedly felt, and that beneficially, in the restraint they imposed upon irresponsible authority.

The court of the great king was a very formidable affair. Aside from the *grandees* of the empire and their attendants, it consisted: 1st. Of a large body of courtiers, of which the *grandees* composed a part, all of whom were seeking by their conduct and conversation to recommend them-

selves to the king. 2d. Quite a numerous army, principally cavalry, who surrounded the person of the king, and formed part of his retinue. 3d. His servants and attendants, who were marshaled in the same manner as the army, and divided into tens and hundreds. Even to make the king's bed, Xenophon says, required a considerable body of men. It seems also probable that the king's household was composed of the ruling tribe or horde, viz: that of the Pasargadæ, and especially of the family of the Achæmenidæ. 4th. The harem, peopled from the different provinces of the empire, and the surveillance of the whole of which was committed to eunuchs. This establishment, peculiar to the east, was divided into two sets of apartments,¹ and the new comers were transferred from the first to the second, on having been admitted to the king's chamber. It was required by Persian etiquette that a whole year should be spent in purification, by means of aromatics and costly perfumes, before the young beauty could be introduced into the presence of the king. The number of concubines was generally sufficiently great to present a new victim for every day during the year. The passions of hatred and jealousy, which are apt to become intense, in proportion as their sphere is narrowed, attained in the Persian harem an intensity of rancor of which we can form but a feeble conception. The legitimate wives of the great king, however, stood upon a different footing from his concubines. They were chosen from the family of Cyrus, the house of Achæmenidæ, wore the insignia of royalty, could alone give birth to the heir who should inherit the throne; but their mode of life was no less rigidly prescribed and limited than that of the concubines.

And yet the court, thus composed, and with all these heavy appendages, was migratory in its character. To this it was instigated in part by the great diversity of climate, in so extensive an empire, and in part, perhaps, by

¹ *Heeren's Researches*, 1, 397.

some lingering remnant of the wandering life of the nomad which still continued to inhere in the Persian character. Before the erection of Persepolis, it spent the spring in Ecbatana, the old capital of Media, the three summer months at Susa, the capital of Susiana, and the autumn and winter in Babylon, the capital of Babylonia. At each of these capitals was the king's palace, in the interior of which the king resided, seldom appearing in public, and guarding all means of access to his person. These palaces were surrounded by spacious parks, or as the Persians called them, paradises;¹ forming domains sufficiently ample to allow armies to be reviewed in them, or to assemble for the pursuit of game, of which great numbers and of every variety were collected.

The great king could only be permitted to taste the best and most costly productions of his dominions; his table was regulated by a system of etiquette, the most burdensome and oppressive; he could drink no water but that of the Choaspes,² on which was situated the city of Susa; his salt came from the neighborhood of Jupiter Ammon, in the great African desert; his wine from Chalybon, in Syria, and the wheat from which his bread was made, from Æolia.

3d. The means and agencies through which this power is exercised. We come here to the inquiry as to the manner or means by which the government of Persia enabled itself to be felt in every province of her extended empire. "The Persians," says Herodotus, "look upon all Asia as their's, and as the property of each successive king of Persia." But how shall they make the appropriation of it to themselves? The answer to this question solves the present inquiry. Here is a power which has suddenly burst its mountain barrier and rapidly prostrated beneath it the kingdoms, peoples, and provinces of western Asia. Differences of race and language have interposed no effectual

¹ *Heeren's Researches*, I, 402. ² *Idem*, I, 404.

barrier. The one great fact has been common to all—unconditional submission. But the existence of that fact has not in the least changed the character of the people. The Lydians, Assyrians, Babylonians, and Susianians, have become none the less such, because they have become subjected to the sceptre of the great king. The provinces of the empire, therefore, are not peopled by a homogeneous people. The rapidity of the conquest has caused no assimilation. The nations that have been subdued retain their languages, habits, manners, religions, customs, and laws. The empire is thus of necessity broken up into provinces. The monarch cannot personally superintend the affairs of each province. He must, therefore, send his deputy or agent, and in each province a royal officer representing the monarch, and clothed with his authority, called in the Persian government, a satrap, the province being his satrapy, bears absolute sway, and is responsible to the king for the tranquillity of his district, and bound to furnish periodically, or on demand, the supplies of men, money, or articles in kind which may be required of him, or which he may be bound to supply. These satraps were nominated by the king, and although probably originally confined to the Persians, or even to the tribe of Pasargadæ, yet they were ultimately taken from any class of his subjects, the king's favor supplying all deficiencies. They held office during the king's pleasure, and originally were charged with the civil administration only of their provinces. Their special business was to collect and remit to the king the tribute due from the inhabitants, which from the time of Darius was a fixed sum. They were also charged with the payment of the troops stationed in their satrapy, and were bound to administer justice, and to exercise a general supervision in reference both to the external safety and the internal tranquillity of their province. The great object was the tribute, but in order to secure its permanence, those other and incidental duties must also be rendered.

The king, however, very wisely made the office of the satrap generally distinct from that of the commander of

the troops within the satrapy, and also from the commandants of the garrisons within its strongholds. This was done with the view of making one a check upon the other. Both these commanders and commandants received their authority from the king, and were answerable for the defense of the territory from foes foreign or domestic.

The satrapies differed considerably from each other in their extent and importance. In some instances one was not continuous, but was made up of detached tracts of territory. This was owing to the satrapial divisions being ethnical rather than geographical, and to the local intermixture of distinct races common throughout the east. In such cases the jurisdiction of the satrap extended over the fragments of the race or races under his government, and was not confined to a single locality. This was more especially convenient as effecting the wandering tribes, who, without it, might be claimed as subjects by several satraps, and thus be rendered subject to several assessments.

Some of the satraps were very powerful, their satrapies embracing large tracts of country. They represented, and were clothed with all the powers of the king within their own government. They possessed unlimited power in levying assessments within their own territories. They appointed their own deputies, sometimes called satraps, over cities and districts within their province. All who sought favors or even justice at their hands, could never expect success without bringing gifts, sometimes of princely value. The most effectual check upon the extortion of the satrap was the fear of the wrath of the king. Where avarice was stronger than fear the accumulations of the satrap were sometimes enormous. They had their palaces; their courts framed upon the royal model; their extensive parks and hunting grounds; their household troops or body guards; their harem, eunuchs, and numerous attendants. There was one feature that tended to render all this less oppressive to the common people and that was that throughout the Persian empire the native local

authorities were for the most part left standing, the satrap dealing with them and not with the common people.

In the organization of the satrapial department of the government, two things were required to be guarded against:

1. The abuse of the royal authority in the practice of extortion upon the king's subjects. Against this there were two guards, viz: 1st. The institution of a tribunal composed of judges deriving their authority directly from the king, involving, therefore, the separation of the judicial from the administrative office; and 2d. The terrible punishment inflicted upon the satrap in case his extortions reached the ear of the king.

2. The rebellion of the satrap, from the royal authority. Some of the largest satrapies lay upon the frontiers of the empire, and in such exposed positions, that to insure their safety required a union of the civil with the military power, and hence, the satrap was put in command of the military forces. In such cases, and in all others, where there seemed a probability of danger, the following guards were resorted to:

1st. In most of the last mentioned cases, as already stated, there was a separation of the civil from the military command.

2d. The brothers, or other near kinsmen of the monarch, were often selected for the more important satrapies, while others, if selected, were sought to be attached to the interests of the crown by giving them wives from among the princesses of the royal house.

3d. The satrap in ancient Persia, was attended by a royal secretary, who received his appointment from the crown, and was bound to keep watch upon the satrap, and make his reports to the king.

4th. Royal commissioners were from time to time sent by the king to the several satrapies, to make inquiries upon the spot, and return the king an account of their condition. All these guards, however, were not always effectual, as revolts sometimes occur in Persian history.

4th. The fourth subject of inquiry relates to the revenues whence and how derived. From what has been already said in relation to the court it will be readily perceived that a large revenue must be necessary to keep the central government in operation. It was, however, only for the support of the court and all immediately connected with it that any revenue was required. Each satrapy furnished the revenue necessary for its own government. But large means were still necessary for the court, as its expenditures were on the most lavish scale.

It must not, however, be understood that the revenue was collected or applied in the manner, or for the purposes contemplated in modern governments. There was no public exchequer into which all the revenues were paid, and out of which, under a regular system, all the money to maintain armies, to remunerate public officers, etc., was disbursed. As there were no official appointments, as at present understood, all the tribute paid was really the private revenue of the king. With it he paid his own expenses, which, however, included all the expenses of his court, but it was applied to no public purposes whatever, unless it be that of conferring presents.

In another respect the revenues of Persia were entirely unlike those of modern governments. They were not payable in money. There was no such thing as coined money, until the era of Darius, it is presumed the first of that name, when the coin termed the *Daric* was struck and issued. The revenues were all payable in kind. The inhabitants of each province or satrapy were bound to furnish their proportion of the fruits and natural productions of the earth, exacted with a reference to the fertility of each soil, and its natural advantages. The best of every country was considered as the property of the king, and the streams of value that were constantly flowing into him produced an abundance and luxury that corrupted the morals of the court and induced habits of waste and sensuality which were extremely pernicious.

As each province or satrapy rendered to the king its tribute in its own natural productions, it follows that the gold and silver producing, made their returns in the precious metals. The Indians alone made their tribute in gold. The gold thus collected was stored up in ingots for the use of the king as he should have occasion.

The same kind or species of tribute that was rendered to the king was also rendered to each satrap in the empire. There also the rendition was in kind. Each satrap was a king on a small scale, and each satrapy a miniature empire. The difference was that the king's tribute was fixed and determinate, while that of the satrap might be increased at pleasure.

The king had also other sources of revenue. Among these was that derived from the rights of irrigation.¹ In the mountains, and near the sources of streams, as in the instance of the river Aces, the king would cause to be erected mighty embankments and dams, by means of which he could control the waters in their distribution. The power thus acquired was made use of to extract from their subjects an additional tribute.

Another source of revenue arose from the confiscation of the estates of the satraps and other grandees. The rule in Persia was that the loss of life was accompanied by the forfeiture of property. As the most avaricious, rapacious, and extortionary satraps are the most usually those who, under the direction of the king, are hewn down with sabres by their own guard, and their estates confiscated, the amount of revenue from this source is very considerable.

Another source still is found in the free-will offerings presented to the king. These, on certain great solemnities, such, for instance, as the king's birthday, flowed in from all parts of the empire. They consisted of money, rarities and valuables of every description. Besides these it was always the custom in the east where any favor was asked of a superior, to present a gift as a kind of equivalent.

¹ *Heeren*, 1, 411.

When we call to mind the strong desire which rapacious satraps must have possessed to stand high in the favor of the king, together with their great ability to make free-will offerings, we can readily understand the great value of this source of revenue.

From all these sources, the revenue of the great king must have been immense. His mode of disbursement was, in some cases, as peculiar as the nature of the tribute itself. The special friends and kinsmen of the king, and the great officers of the court, who, in modern governments, would receive fees or salaries from the treasury, received nothing in money, and nothing in kind directly from the king; but instead thereof, received assignments of towns and cities, which the king, as sole proprietor of the lives and property of his subjects could dispose of at his pleasure. Thus to Themistocles, was assigned the city of Magnesia, to supply him with bread, Lampsacus to furnish wine, and Myus, the side dishes of his table. The offices and assigned revenues thus attached to them, in time became hereditary in the family.

There is one remarkable governmental establishment in the Persian empire which is referred to the reign of Cyrus: that is, a system of posts and couriers, by which he could rapidly gain intelligence from any part of his extensive dominions, however distant. Having first ascertained how far a good horse with a brisk rider,¹ could travel in a day without injury, he caused stables to be built, at about equal distances from each other, through the different provinces, and had them furnished with horses and with men to take care of them. At each one of these was a post-house and a post-master, to receive the packets from the carriers as they arrived, and hand them over to others, and also to take the horses that had performed their stage and to furnish fresh ones. These post-riders and horses being changed at every post, were enabled to continue in progress night and day, in all seasons, and with great speed.

¹*Rollin*, i, 151.

By these means, intelligence could, within short periods of time, be both received and conveyed from any one part of the empire to every other. This, however, was purely an instrument of government, and made use of solely in the conveyance of dispatches to and from the emperor.

The Persian government exhibits in its structure and operation a better and more thoroughly organized system than any hitherto considered. It rested ultimately, however, upon the same principles as those which preceded it, viz: the triumph and authority of a ruling race, achieved and established over other races less strong and warlike. This contains in itself the elements of disturbance and revolts. The ruling race, reposing upon their conquests, become effeminate in their character, emasculate their manhood by pursuing sensual pleasures, and ultimately become subjected to some other race more energetic and warlike than itself.

Society.

We are chiefly indebted to Herodotus for what little we know of the manners and customs of the ancient Persians. He relates one singular practice, quite similar to one prevailing among the ancient Germans, viz: that of deliberating upon affairs of moment while under the influence of wine;¹ and then afterwards when they have become sober, of approving or disapproving of the conclusion at which they then arrived. Sometimes, however, they reversed it, being sober at their first deliberation, but always reconsidering the matter under the influence of wine. It is possible they imagined that its stimulus gave birth to more original ideas, prompted to bolder conceptions, and thus threw a more powerful, but yet unsafe element into the discussion.

The ancient Persians are said to have been athletic, strong, and of good personal appearance. To this their

¹ *Rawlinson*, 1, 211.

climate, and the character of their food both conduced. It was easy to tell their relative rank by observing their conduct on meeting each other in the street. When of equal rank, instead of speaking, they kiss each other on the lips. In case one is a little inferior to the other the kiss is given on the cheek, but where the difference is very great, the inferior prostrates himself on the ground before the other. They considered themselves as very greatly superior in all respects to the rest of mankind, and held those nations in the least esteem that were the farthest removed from them.

The old national dress of the Persians was a close-fitting tunic and trousers of leather.¹ The Lydian *Saudanis*, when endeavoring to dissuade Crœsus from going to war with the Persians, said: "Thou art about, oh king, to make war against men who wear leathern trousers, and have all their other garments of leather; who feed not on what they like, but on what they can get from a soil that is sterile and unkindly; who do not indulge in wine, but drink water; who possess no figs nor anything else that is good to eat."² They subsequently adopted the Median costume, at least the superior classes in Persia, and wore the flowing robe, which was of a nature to conceal the form, and give it an appearance of grandeur and elegance. The soldiers and persons of minor importance still continued to wear a close-fitting dress, fastened by a belt, and trousers meeting at the ankles a high shoe.

As in all conquering nations prowess in arms was regarded as the crowning virtue, and the greatest proof of manly excellence. Next to this was to be the father of many sons. Rich gifts were sent by the king every year to the man who could show the largest number. From the fifth to the twentieth year the sons were carefully instructed in three things, viz: to ride, to draw the bow, and to speak the truth. The Persian regard for truth has been questioned, but the inscriptions on the monuments, especially

¹ Rawlinson, I, 213, note 6. ² *Idem*, I, 160.

the Behistan, recently interpreted, fully sustained the position that he entertained a profound respect for the truth. The sons passed their lives with the women until their fifth year, when, for the first time, they were allowed to come into the presence of their father. This, it was said, was to prevent the father from being afflicted by the loss if the child should die young. Polygamy was very generally practiced in Persia.

The Persians had a maxim that the king should not put any one to death for a single fault, and that no Persian should visit a single fault in a slave with any extreme penalty; but that in every case the services of the offender should be set against his misdoings, and if these last outweigh the former, then a punishment should be inflicted.

The Persians held it unlawful to talk of anything which it was unlawful to do. The most disgraceful thing in the world in their estimation was to tell a lie, and the next worse thing to owe a debt, assigning for the latter among other reasons, that the debtor is obliged to tell lies. The ancient Persians entertained a great reverence for rivers, neither permitting themselves, nor allowing any one else, to defile any river with the secretions of their bodies, or even to wash their hands in one. The dead bodies were first covered with wax, and then buried in the ground. The body of a male person among the ancient Persians, it is said, was never buried until it had been torn either by a dog or a bird of prey. This was more especially a custom among the magi, and one of which it is difficult to perceive the origin or reason.

CHAPTER X.

MEDO-PERSIA — ITS PHILOSOPHY, AND ART.

Philosophy.

We have no knowledge of any speculative philosophy of the ancient Persians except what was embraced in their religion. The learned of this nation seem to have been the most distinguished for their knowledge of astrology; but whatever treasures in science and learning the ancient Persians might have possessed, are lost or destroyed.

Art.

In reference to the element of art we are more fortunate, and yet no extensive remains hitherto discovered or investigated can possess us very fully with the knowledge of the arts of ancient Persia. The most important remains of ancient Median and Persian art, together with what formerly existed and is now known only through the statements of writers, may be expected to be found in the great capitals of Media and Persia. We have before remarked that the Persian court was migratory in its character, and hence, unlike other empires, required several capitals to be in existence at the same time. We may probably enumerate as many as five great cities that served as capitals of the Medo-Persian empire at different times during the whole period of its existence, three of that number often serving as such during different portions of the same year. The names of these five were Ecbatana in Media, Pasargadæ and Persepolis in Persia, Susa in Susiana, and Babylon in Babylonia. Of the last named we have already said all that is necessary.

Of the splendid palace of the Median and Persian kings in Ecbatana nothing now remains,¹ but travelers have recognized the terraces on which it had been constructed, and one has even detected the holes in the rock, made to receive the hinges of the great gates which closed the entrance.

The city of Pasargadæ, if not originally erected by Cyrus, was undoubtedly much enlarged by him, and was the sole capital of the Persian empire during his reign and that of Cambyses. The principal ruin is a terrace of irregular shape which is added to the end of a small hill,² and of which the facing presents a very perfect specimen of masonry. This is supposed to have supported an edifice, the hall of Cyrus, but no remains of it are now to be found. At a little distance are the remains of a fire temple, and further still a square pier, and which, like many other remains, bears the inscription: "I am Cyrus the king, the Achæmenian." The most remarkable ruin, however, is the tomb of Cyrus. It had a foundation of square stones in a quadrangular form, on this was raised a stone edifice, composed of blocks of beautiful white marble five feet thick, and shaped at the top into a sloping roof.³ Internally the chamber is ten feet long,⁴ seven wide, and eight high. There are holes in the marble floor,⁵ which seem to have admitted the fastenings of a sarcophagus. On the tomb was engraven in Persian the inscription: "O man, I am Cyrus who gave the empire to the Persians, and was lord of all Asia; therefore grudge me not my sepulchre." These ruins are on the plain of Mourghaub.

It is, however, the ruins of Persepolis that proclaim in the strongest manner the arts of architecture and sculpture as practiced by the ancient Persians. These ruins are situated in a plain encompassed by mountains, called the plain of Merdasht, and on a stream anciently called the Araxes. The city is supposed to have owed its origin to Darius Hystaspes, although many additions were due to his

¹ Heeren, I, 250. ² Fergusson's *Palaces of Nineveh and Persepolis*, 209, 210. ³ Rawlinson, I, 273. ⁴ Fergusson, 214, etc. ⁵ Heeren, I, 219.

successors. While the Assyrians were accustomed to construct a mound to serve as a foundation for their public edifices, the Persians flanked the side of a hill or mountain with a platform terrace to accomplish the same object. From the foot of a mountain projecting a little beyond the range of others, overlooking the city of Persepolis,¹ a lofty platform or terrace was built out; extending north and south more than a quarter of a mile, and east and west from eight to nine hundred feet. The original platform is divided into three great terraces, the southern one being the smallest and lowest, rising from 20 to 23 feet from the plain, and its greatest breadth not exceeding 170 or 180 feet. In the centre is the great terrace measuring 770 feet north and south, and 900 east and west, and rising 45 feet above the level of the plain. There is still a third terrace to the north of this, extending north and south 550 feet, but of very irregular breadth, and about 10 feet lower than the central terrace or 35 above the plain. Upon these terraces and principally upon the great central one, but at different elevations, owing to the construction of stylobates of different heights beneath them, stand the ruins of the great public buildings of Persia.

Ascending the great flight of steps leading from the plain to the platform of Persepolis, and standing upon its northern terrace, the traveler will see immediately in his front, the Propylæum of Xerxes, consisting of four great masses of masonry, with sculptured bulls attached to them; and two pillars out of the four that once supported its roof;² beyond them lies the stair-formed stylobate of the great hall of Xerxes with its sculptured front, and on it the fifteen that remain of the seventy-two pillars that once supported its roof; through them, again, are seen the few remains that exist of the palaces of Darius and Xerxes, and on the extreme left, those of the hall of a hundred columns. The sculptured bulls are of gigantic dimensions, and have a massiveness in muscular development,

¹ *Fergusson*, 89, 297. ² *Idem*, 104.

elsewhere unequaled in animal sculpture. The palace or hall of Xerxes, called the *Chehel Minar*, or "palace of forty pillars," exhibits the glory of Persian architecture, and is one of the noblest specimens of art, that has been spared to us by time. This hall, together with the palace of Darius, are known to be the work of those monarchs, respectively, from the inscriptions that are found in or upon them. The hall of a hundred columns is much larger, although its remains indicate less of magnificence than that of Xerxes. No walls of these edifices now remain, only some of the pillars, doorways and jambs. The walls are supposed to have been of sun-dried brick, which had disappeared with time. The pillars are plain or fluted, having circular bases, and many of them double bull capitals. They are plainly Ionic in their character, and are probably the source whence the Greeks derived their Ionic order.

Eastward of Persepolis, and at a distance of about four hundred feet, is a mountain called the King's mountain,¹ in which are situated the tombs of the kings. The rock there is hewn into a multitude of chambers, which are not to be approached by any entrances made by art, but the coffins are wound up and introduced into the receptacles by means of machines. Persepolis was therefore regarded as the home of the Persian monarchs, not only during their life time, but also after their death.

The purposes answered by these splendid edifices, altogether six or seven in number, and erected upon stylobates, constructed upon the different terraces of this one mighty platform of stupendous masonry, have puzzled every inquirer. Composed, as they must have been, of vast walls, doorways, jambs, porticos and pillared halls, they clearly could never have been intended solely as the residences or palaces of the kings. Neither were they temples, for the ancient Persians had none, unless fire temples of very different structure, and much smaller di-

¹*Heeren*, i, 198, 199.

mensions. The prevailing idea throughout, seems to have been separate halls for separate purposes; some more honorable than others,¹ and giving, by their different names and usages, some variety to the general monotony of eastern ceremonial. One may have been the audience chamber, another the hall of justice, and all are conjectured to have had relation to religion and great state purposes. We have seen the Persian court migrating from Ecbatana to Susa and Babylon, and spending different periods of the year in those capitals. But the tombs of the kings were at Persepolis. The great halls of state,² the insignia of empire and of national worship were here, and hence it came to be considered as a kind of sanctuary of the nation. It was built upon Persian soil, was the work of the Persian race, and stood forth as the symbol or representative of Persian nationality. Hence Alexander, when he overthrew the empire, could save Susa and Babylon, but must destroy Persepolis.

Recent investigations at Susa have, however, tended to show that the palace there is constructed upon the same principle as that of Darius and of Xerxes at Persepolis. Susa was situated in Susiana, and upon the ancient Choaspes. The great hall at Susa, like that of Xerxes at Persepolis, consisted of several magnificent groups of columns arranged into a central phalanx of thirty-six columns (six rows of six each), flanked on the west,³ north, and east, by an equal number, and which in the hall first mentioned, are distant from them sixty-four feet two inches. The columns are quite similar to those at Persepolis. The hall at Susa was "Shushan the palace," and the columnar hall has been considered the equivalent of the modern throne room where all the most important public business was dispatched. There is an entire absence of bas-reliefs in the hall at Susa, as that city stood upon a gravel plain thirty miles from the nearest point where building stone is procurable.⁴

¹ *Fergusson*, 195. ² *Heeren*, I, 234. ³ *Loftus's Travels in Chaldæa and Susiana*, 367. ⁴ *Idem*, 376.

In regard to sculpture, I have before mentioned the sculptured bulls. There are also many other monstrous figures¹ sculptured as architectural ornaments, or as symbolical representations belonging to a mythology altogether peculiar. One pair of monsters, colossal in stature, are winged, having the body of lions,² the feet of horses, with human heads, crowned with the tiara or diadem, and with long beards artfully curled. These fabulous animals, carved in stone, proclaim a mythological system of oriental Persian, or Bactro-Indian origin. They point back to the native land of the Chimeras,³ the mountain range of the Badahshan or Cushgar, which separates Bactriana from Hindostan and China, and borders to the east and north upon the desert of Cobi. This may have been the early abode of the old Medo-Persian race.

So in regard to architecture. "The ruins of Persepolis," says Heeren,⁴ "are the noblest monuments of the most flourishing era of this empire, which has survived the lapse of ages. As solitary in their situation, as peculiar in their character, they rise above the deluge of years which for centuries has overwhelmed all the records of human grandeur around them or near them, and buried all-traces of Susa and of Babylon. Their venerable antiquity and majestic proportions do not more command our reverence, than the mystery which involves their construction awakens the curiosity of the most unobservant spectator. Pillars which belong to no known order of architecture; inscriptions in an alphabet, which continued until recently an enigma; fabulous animals which stand as guards at the entrance; the multiplicity of allegorical figures which decorate the walls—all conspire to carry us back to ages of the most remote antiquity, over which the traditions of the east shed but a doubtful and a wandering light."

These ruins so highly interesting and peculiar in their character, transport us into an entirely new region, and

¹ Heeren, I, 150. ² *Idem*, I, 154, 155. ³ *Idem*, I, 151. ⁴ *Idem*, I, 141.

introduce us to a new set of ideas. There are proofs here that architecture must have attained, when these edifices were erected, a wonderful degree of excellence in its mechanical department. It borrowed nothing from Chaldæan, Assyrian, Babylonian, Egyptian or Grecian art. The Egyptian may have been anterior in point of time, but its style proclaims a wide difference of origin. The Egyptian is low, massive, grotto-like, indicating a people accustomed to a sort of troglodyte life, in caverns and hollows of the rock. Her gigantic temples are imitations of excavated rocks. "On the other hand the remains of Persepolis indicate a people not in the habit of occupying the bosom of their hills,¹ but accustomed to wander free and unconstrained over their heights and among their forests, and who, when they forsook their nomad life, sought to retain in their new habitations, all that was possible of their original liberty." "Those terrace foundations," says Heeren,² "which appear like a continuation of the mountain, those groves of columns, those basins once, no doubt, sparkling with refreshing fountains, those flights of steps, which the loaded camel of the Arab ascends with the same ease as his conductor, forming a sort of highway for the nations whose images are sculptured there: all these particulars are as much in unison with the character of that joyous land which the industry of the Persians converted into an earthly paradise, as the gigantic temples of Egypt are appropriate memorials of their old grottos in the rocks. The columns of Persepolis shoot upward with a slender, yet firm elevation, conveying a fit image of the stems of the lotus and palm, from which they were probably copied. As in Egypt every thing is closely covered, and as it were oppressed by a roof, so here is everything free and unconfined, in admirable harmony with the religion of the nation, whose sole objects of worship were the sun, the elements and the open vault of heaven."

¹Heeren, I, 236. ²Idem, I, 236, 237.

The sculpture seems here formed on the habits of an oriental court. We feel the seclusion of the harem.¹ No female or naked figure is to be found. No male figure is portrayed in any violent or constrained attitude. No attitude was admissible which was not sanctioned by court etiquette. It was not the feeling of the beautiful, but of veneration, which the artist sought to excite. The architecture and sculpture were in harmony with each other. The first was lofty and grand, while the last was characterized by a high degree of simplicity. Everything was copied from nature except the fabulous animals, and the range of observation of the artist would seem to have been extensive. He has distinguished with exactness the features and profiles of different nations, the thick lips and woolly hair of the negro being no less accurately marked than the limbs of the half naked Indian. There is a surprising degree of accuracy in all the details of execution. We may still count the nails in the wheels of the chariot in the great relieve;² and the hair of the negro is so carefully wrought, that it is impossible to confound it with that of the Asiatics. The same scrupulous care marks also all the inscriptions, and this seems ever to have characterized, among all people, the infancy of art. It is first the faithful imitation of nature even in her defects as well as beauties, but as soon as the artist catches a glimpse of ideal beauty in pursuit of it he ceases to regard the perfect imitation.

Another source from which some knowledge of Persian art is gathered, as well as of the history of the ancient Persian kings, is found in the bas-reliefs and inscriptions found amidst the ruins of Persepolis, on the tombs near the ancient city, and on the surface of a huge rock at Behistan, or the Bisutun, and Hamadan, in Media. This is a precipitous rock 1,700 feet high, forming a portion of the great chain of Zagros which separates the high plateau of Iran from the valleys of the Tigris and the Euphrates. The execution of this specimen of ancient art is very superior,

¹ *Heeren*, 1, 237. ² *Idem*, 1, 239.

the varied expression in the different faces being regarded as almost equal to anything of the kind done by the chisel.¹ This is supposed to belong to the same era as those at Persepolis, the same progress in anatomical knowledge being manifested in the exposed limbs of two of the figures. The inscription is engraven at the height of three hundred feet from the base of the rock, and can only be reached with much exertion and difficulty.² It is trilingual; one transcript is in the ancient Persian, one in Babylonian, the other in a Scythic or Tartar dialect. These inscriptions have recently become an object of study, and are now being decyphered. The first efforts were made at the Persian,³ with the design of ascending from the Persic form of the arrow-headed character, and of the old Persic language through the intervening Median, with its peculiar alphabet and conjectured language, up to the Babylonian, with its still more difficult, complicated and varied character, and its almost lost or forgotten language. So far as the old Persic language is concerned, the difficulties seem to have been overcome, and the rocks of Behistan, and the ruins of Persepolis, like the monuments of Egypt, are compelled to yield up their storied secrets to the inquiring spirit of the present age. The ancient kings of Persia, particularly Darius Hystaspes and Xerxes, are heard proclaiming from these rocks and ruins, their titles, history, and the nations over whom they ruled.

We know nothing of the arts, of painting, music, poetry, or oratory, as practiced by the ancient Persians. Of their military affairs, and the art of war we have some knowledge.

The Persians in their conquests and methods of holding them, exhibit the same general phenomena, as other nomadic conquering nations. They swept like an avalanche over the country, defeating and scattering its armies, taking by assault, siege, or stratagem its fenced cities, and

¹ *Forster's Monuments of Assyria*, 232, note. ² *Rawlinson*, II, 490, note.
³ *London Quarterly, American edition*, xxvii, No. 2, March, 222.

thus reducing everything under their subjection. They then kept up in every province two descriptions of forces, those which occupied the open country, and those which kept possession of the cities as garrisons. These were distinct and commanded by different generals. The principal strength of the first class consisted in cavalry; but there were also bowmen, slingers, and heavy armed infantry.

In time of war all the Persians, unless actually disabled by age or otherwise, were bound to appear under their respective standards,¹ and to attend the king in his expeditions. At the end of the war they returned home with no other pay than their share of the plunder. The manner of declaring war was to send heralds or ambassadors to demand earth and water, the giving of these being considered as tokens of unqualified submission. If refused, they proceeded to march into the province an invading army.

The Persian armor, whether defensive, or offensive, differs little from the Assyrian, already described. There was, however, one instrument occasionally made use of in their battles by the eastern nations, of which no mention has yet been made, viz: the chariot armed with scythes. This was gradually brought to perfection, but in its most perfect form was composed of strong wheels and axletrees² at each end of which scythes three feet in length were attached ranged horizontally. Other scythes were also similarly attached, but having their edges turned towards the ground to cut in pieces men and horses that might be overturned. Long spikes of iron were added to the end of the pole to pierce whatever came in their way. They were also defended from behind with several rows of sharp knives.

These chariots were at one time looked upon as constituting an important part in the constitution of an army, and were valued from the consternation and terror they spread through the opposing ranks. It is obvious, how-

¹ *Universal History*, v, 131. ² *Rollin*, i, 154.

ever, that little, or no benefit, could be derived from them, unless the battle field was an extensive plain destitute alike of hillocks, woods, gullies and rivulets. In proportion as the military art improved, several methods were devised and put in practice, to render them useless, if not injurious. One of these was to cut a ditch in their way, by which their course was immediately stopped. Another was to pour in a storm of stones, arrows and lances upon them, and, at the same time, to raise so terrible a shout from the whole army, as to frighten the horses, and make them turn upon their own forces. On one occasion this fright and route were created by loud peals of laughter sent forth simultaneously from the whole army. As their strength and execution depended much on their velocity, which was acquired by the space run over, another method was to march over the intervening space which separated the two armies with great swiftness, and thus fall upon the enemy before their chariots could be fairly got in motion.

Cyrus introduced among his troops an excellent system of discipline,¹ a judicious distribution of rewards and punishments, frequent exercises, laborious occupations, mock engagements to enure them to hardships and prepare them for real contests. The Persians afterwards greatly degenerated. It was a very general, if not universal custom among all the eastern nations to take their wives, mothers and children on their warlike expeditions,² under the pretense that their presence would tend to inspire them with courage in the day of battle. In their marches, their provisions and baggage were carried on camels, the soldiers carrying nothing but their arms. They knew not the number of their dead, until the end of the campaign, when it was arrived at in the following manner: When they took the field the whole army passed in review before the king, or commander-in-chief, each soldier throwing an arrow into a basket. The baskets were then sealed up until the close of the campaign, when the army again

¹ *Rollin*, I, 154. ² *Universal History*, v, 134.

passed in review, each soldier taking an arrow out of the same baskets.¹ The number remaining being counted, would give the number of their dead.

In describing their order of battle, we may take as an instance the famous battle of Thynebra, that being the battle in which Cyrus overthrew the Lydian king, Crœsus, and established the Persian empire. The infantry was arranged in the centre, and the cavalry, consisting chiefly of cuirassiers, were placed on the two wings of the army.² This protected the flanks of the infantry, and at the same time left the wings at liberty, to extend themselves as much as circumstances should render necessary. In this manner, provision was made against being outflanked, and thus attacked in flank and rear at the same time as in front.

Another precaution was also required to be taken, and that was so to strengthen the centre or main body as to prevent its being pierced or broken through, in which event the army would be quickly dispersed. To effect this the centre was drawn out into several lines in depth, in order that they might mutually sustain and support each other.

The first line was of infantry heavily armed, and this line was twelve men deep. In the commencement of the battle this line made use of the half pike, and afterwards when the fronts of the two armies came together engaged with swords or cimeters.

The second line arranged behind the first, consisted of soldiers more lightly armed, who flung their javelins over the heads of the first. These javelins were made of heavy wood, pointed with iron or some other metal, and could be hurled with great violence. The object of this arrangement was to put the enemy into disorder, before they came to close fight.

Behind this was the third line, which consisted of archers, whose bows bent with great force, and carried their arrows over the two preceding lines, and thus produced great annoyance to the enemy. Among these archers were

¹ *Universal History*, v, 133. ² *Rollin*, I, 153.

usually placed slingers, who slung great stones with a terrible force.

A fourth line still was posted behind these three, forming the rear of the main body, and consisting of soldiers heavy armed like those composing the first line. The object of this was two fold. First, to support the other lines, and keep them to their duty in-case they manifested a disposition to give way. Second, to form a rear guard and constitute a *corps-de-reserve*, who, in case the others gave way, could arrest the advance of the enemy, stay their progress until the scattered troops could rally, or at least cover their retreat, if they could not be again rallied, to renew the contest.

Behind all these, and in the rear of the whole army, were moving towers placed upon huge wagons, drawn by a number of oxen, in each of which were posted twenty men to discharge stones and javelins, these serving to support the troops, and assist them in again rallying when thrown into disorder. The chariots armed with scythes were generally placed in the front of the battle, some being occasionally stationed on the flanks of the army, especially when they had reason to fear being out-flanked and surrounded.¹ The place for the king or commander was in the centre of the army. The signal for the onset was given by the sound of trumpets, and succeeded by a shout from the whole army. Watchwords, it appears, were in use among the ancient Persians. The royal banner was a golden eagle carried on the point of a long spear. They never fought in the night unless attacked by the enemy,² nor marched before the sun had risen. They practiced fighting duels or single combats.

It is apparent from the order of battle, just detailed, that the Persians had made very considerable progress in the art of war. And yet with all their advancement in the knowledge and practice of this art there were a great many things in which they were singularly deficient.

¹ *Universal History*, v, 138. ² *Idem*, v, 136.

They seem to have been deficient in the skill displayed in selecting advantageous posts, in seizing a favorable spot, and compelling the enemy to retreat or enter into an engagement under a disadvantage.¹ They made little use of defiles and narrow passes either to attack the enemy or defend themselves. We find them seldom or never laying the artful ambuscade. They never protract a campaign by wise and judicious delays. We do not find them taking such positions as that an enemy superior in numbers cannot compel them to an engagement, and thus of compelling him to prey upon himself for want of forage and provisions. Nor do we discover that they understood the placing an army in such a position as to have the right and left protected by rivers, marshes or mountains; thus enabling a small army to present an equal front with one much more numerous, and putting it out of the power of the enemy, although superior in numbers, to outflank or surround them.

Another fact must strike us in the art of war as practiced by that people; and that is, that we meet with little else than field fights. There appears to have been but few fortified places. The reduction of a nation was not slowly accomplished by taking one city after another until all had in turn been subdued. Great armies met on the battle-field, and, without seeking benefits from advantageous positions, fairly fought it out, depending on arrangement, numbers and valor. The gaining of a single pitched battle was often attended with the entire conquest of a whole kingdom. In these regular battles Cyrus discovered the importance of cavalry, and took great pains to introduce large bodies of it into the Persian armies. This ever after continued to be an important element in the composition of a Persian army.

It will be obvious to the reader of Persian history that their wars varied from the present, not less by the methods by which they were conducted, than in the instruments

¹ *Rollin*, I, 155.

and weapons of warfare that were made use of. One of the great objects contemplated was the destruction of life and property. That destruction was indiscriminate. Nothing was spared. A terrible slaughter marked the progress of the conqueror. No system of exchanging prisoners had been introduced. Those that escaped death upon the battle-field, were doomed to spend the remainder of their lives in slavery.

We are now to bid adieu to the banks of the Araxes, the Choaspes, the Tigris, and the Euphrates, on which were situated the ancient cities of Persepolis, of Susa, of Nineveh, and of Babylon, those seats of an early and an almost forgotten civilization, to trace our course westward among other and different people.

It is a fact, not a little curious, that the course of empire, of progress, of civilization, has been almost uniformly westward from their place of commencement in the east. It is observable that one great movement of the atmosphere, that all-sustaining principle of life, has ever been from east to west. In the same direction are the mighty movements of that majestic ocean, "that has once been the cradle of our globe, and may yet be its grave." The mental and moral movements of man, the rise and fall of empires, the march of civilization, the progressive principle of humanity, have been in the same direction.

Were we to follow simply the course of empire we should go next to Greece. We have already seen that people, young in years but old in wisdom, first teaching the dwellers in Asia to dread the battle-fields of Europe; rolling back the tide of Persian invasion to its original sources; and finally, under the Macedonian monarch, spreading desolation over the fairest portions of Asia, visiting with destruction the venerable structures of Persepolis and totally annihilating the government and power of Persia. The next regular empire that succeeds the Persian is the Grecian or Macedonian.

Before visiting Greece, however, we have yet long to linger on the eastern shore of the Mediterranean. We

have there to gather many and important contributions, to swell the increasing tide of an ever advancing civilization. Upon the south-eastern and eastern shores of that sea, were, in the earliest times, found located four peculiar peoples, who have each exerted an influence upon human progress and destiny, which will continue to be felt and appreciated down to the latest generations.

These different peoples were in the occupation of regions of country bordering upon each other, having, with one exception, the Mediterranean sea a common boundary. Beginning on the south-eastern shore of that sea, we have 1st. The Egyptians. 2d. The Arabians. 3d. The Hebrews. 4th. The Phœnicians, including the ancient Syrians.

Of these four peoples, three of them, viz: the Arabians, Hebrews and Phœnicians belong to the same national family, the Semitic race, speaking kindred dialects of the Aramean language. But although obviously derived from the same parent stock, and although they all, except the Arabians, together with the Egyptians, border in common on the Mediterranean sea, and although there exists between them no natural boundaries, such as rivers or mountains, to interpose as barriers to their mutual intercourse, yet they are ever presented to our view, as people differing from each other in their pursuits, their character, their history, their civilization and destiny.

Each one of these people seems to have been charged with a particular mission, which they were sent to accomplish. The mission of the Egyptians was to develop more perfectly the pagan forms of worship; to commence the separation and partial development of the element of industry, more especially of that part of it that embraces the pursuits of agriculture, and also to commence the separation and development of the element of the arts, including more especially the arts of design. Their mission then, was three fold: having reference to religion, to industry in its agricultural pursuits, and to the arts, especially those of design.

The mission of the Arabians was more simple. It was to originate and develop the Mahometan religion.

The mission of the Hebrews was equally simple. It was to originate and develop the Christian religion.

The mission of the Phœnicians was to commence the separation and partial development of those parts of the element of industry that are embraced in commerce and manufactures.

Well and faithfully did these different peoples perform the missions with which they were respectively charged. This will be rendered clearer and more apparent, the more we examine the facts of their history, and the phenomena of their civilization. The progress of civilization connects itself directly with these four different peoples, and hence the importance of rightly understanding their history, their civilization, and the mission confided to each. We commence with the Egyptians.

CHAPTER XI.

EGYPT—ITS DESCRIPTION, AND HISTORY.

Egypt.

There are few, if any, localities upon the surface of our globe, that have attracted to them a deeper degree of interest than that of Egypt. It is a land of monuments, of mummies, and of Mamelukes; a land of the pyramid and the palace, of the temple and the tomb; a land where secrecy and silence, and marvel and mystery, so long maintained their sway amongst the living, that when nothing remained of Egypt, but its mummies and monuments, they still claimed a dominion undisturbed, and apparently perpetual. Century after century have those mighty monuments, having long outlived the memory of the heads that planned, and the hands that reared them, stood forth the gigantic records of a by-gone age, resisting alike successfully, the fierce action of the elements, and the slower assaults of time. They have been standing but voiceless witnesses; their stupendous structures proclaiming the might of man, but no direct, or cross-examination could wrench from them their history, or the secret of their origin.

The pyramid lifted its giant form into the heavens, but no voice came from its recesses. The palace and the temple met the inquiring eye of man, and filled him with wonder and astonishment; but from the one issued no sound of revelry, and from the other ascended no anthem of praise. The mighty Memnon, it is true, continued for a while to strike his lyre, and to greet the sun at his rising; but even his notes, like those of the expiring swan, were but the dirge of his own dissolution. And then all was still.

But there were connected with them still other mysteries. On their walls the chisel of the sculptor and the pencil of the painter had been busy. Living forms and living scenes were there portrayed. And there was the handwriting on the wall, but like that that met the eye of Babylon's revellers on the night of Babylon's ruin, it was in an unknown character. Hieroglyphics of every form and figure were profusely scattered over those rocky tablets, and although every eye could see them, yet no mind could read them. They might embody the lessons and wisdom of Hermes and of Trismegistus, but no one seemed likely ever to learn the one or to profit by the other.

Centuries passed on, and still no interpreter appeared to explain these mysterious characters. The enigma only seemed to deepen, and the problem to become more difficult of solution, as years and ages hurried on in continuous succession. At length, however, within the last half century, by means of the Rosetta stone, the key has been discovered that will unlock this ancient store house. The efforts of Young and Champollion have been crowned with abundant success. The seal of silence that for over fifteen centuries had been affixed to these ancient monuments, has been removed. Their dumb mouths are beginning to open; and out of their "stony lips" is even now issuing the "language of the Pharaohs." It is indeed extraordinary, that the eldest sister of an elder world, should, after an unbroken silence of fifteen centuries, be found whispering into the ear of its youngest sister the primitive facts of human history, and the original conceptions of the human mind.

Is there not some deep design, some profound moral purpose, enveloped within these apparently singular allotments of providence? Why otherwise should these primitive fathers of human industry and art, find themselves irresistibly prompted in the world's early youth, at an incredible labor and expense, to pile up the pyramid, erect the palace and temple, scoop out the catacomb, and shoot up the statue and obelisk, and to write them all over with

characters, and in a language known only to themselves? And why should those written tablets remain for so many centuries, a closed volume to every beholder? And why at last is the seal of silence broken, the veil removed, and the secrets disinterred from their stony sepulchres? Is it not that the world in its infancy might be enabled to speak to the world in its maturity? And may we not expect revelations to be made corresponding in importance with the means and agencies by which their origin, concealment, and disclosure have already been, or are yet to be effected? These, and other remarkable facts, render everything relating to Egypt a matter of deep and abiding interest.

Egypt is a country relatively of small extent.¹ Its superficial contents would not probably exceed 6,000 square miles. Within its contracted limits it exhibits great variety. We have here the highest degree of fertility bordering immediately on the desert. Here extend rich plains covered with a variety of vegetation,² and immediately encircling them are barren sand-hills and rugged mountains. Egypt is a long valley of varying width through which runs the river Nile. This valley at its southern end finds a natural termination in the cataracts of the Nile.³ Here was the ancient Syene. From this point to the mouth of the Nile is a distance of over 500 miles. The Nile continues to flow in an undivided stream through this valley until it reaches the city of Cercasorus about 60 miles from its mouth. At this point it divides, and forms the fertile part of the Lower Egypt called the Delta.⁴ This part has been supposed by many to have been gradually formed in the course of ages by the mud and slime borne along and annually deposited by the Nile. Egypt was divided into Upper, Middle and Lower. The first extended from the ancient Syene down the Nile to the city of Chemmis.⁵ It was anciently called the Thebais. Its principal city was the royal Thebes. Middle Egypt

¹ *Heeren's Reflections*, II, 57. ² *Idem*, II, 58. ³ *Egyptian Antiq.*, I, 6.
⁴ *Heeren*, II, 61. ⁵ *Idem*, II, 68, 69.

extended from Chemmis to the city of Cercasorus the point where the Nile divided. Its principal city was the ancient Memphis. Lower Egypt was the part termed Delta, so called from the Greek letter Delta which it resembled in form, being triangular. This part of Egypt has always possessed great fertility, and was anciently full of cities, including Sais, Bubastis, Pelusium, Canopus and others.

From Syene to the commencement of Lower Egypt, the Nile pursues an uninterrupted course almost due north,¹ through a valley varying in width from nine to twelve miles. Below the city of Cercasorus the valley continues to widen, until it borders on the Mediterranean with a width of about one hundred and fifty miles. The mouths of the Nile have varied at different periods. The ancients numbered seven of them, the Pelusiatic being the eastern, and the Canopic the western. At present there are but two, that of Rosetta and Damietta.

That portion of the basin of the Nile,² which constitutes Egypt, is bounded on the west by a chain of hills, which rise sometimes to the height of one thousand feet above the bed of the river. This range separates it from the Lybian desert. In some places, and particularly in some parts of Upper Egypt,³ it presses so close to the river that when there is an inundation the water reaches its base. There is, however, generally even in Middle Egypt, a barren sandy strip, varying in breadth from one mile to two and a half, which intervenes between the foot of the chain, and the highest point reached by the inundation.

This range serves to protect the valley from the sand of the desert, which, but for this barrier, might long since have overwhelmed it.⁴ The western side of it slopes off into the great Lybian desert. Its protection has not been perfectly effectual, as the sandy waste has in some places gradually usurped the domain of fertility. This range is diminished in height, as it continues north, and forms, in

¹ Heeren, II, 61. ² *Egyptian Antiquities*, I, 6. ³ Heeren, II, 62. ⁴ *Idem*, II, 64.

the neighborhood of Ghizeh,¹ a natural terrace, on which are situated the great pyramids, after which it skirts the western edge of the Delta.

On the eastern side of Egypt, between the Nile and the Red sea, runs another range of hills, which in the northern part and in the neighborhood of Cairo sink down, and make a sweep eastward to Suez. This range runs nearer the river than the western. It is intersected by many defiles, some of lines of communication between the river and the trading towns on the coast. For about the distance of forty miles from Syene, the river runs nearly in the middle of the valley. In advancing northward the western range retires further from the river, leaving an intervening space of some eight, ten, or fifteen miles.

A glance at the geological structure of these eastern and western ranges is interesting in connection with the monuments. The geological character of the two ranges is not identically the same,² but sufficiently so to come under a general description.

These rock ranges may be distributed into three districts, each having its own geological structure and corresponding monuments.³ At the southern extremity, in the neighborhood of the ancient Syene,⁴ is found the oriental granite mixed with hornblende, called Syenite from its locality. From the quarries of this rock the Egyptians obtained the enormous masses required for their monoliths or monuments, of one piece, such as their obelisks and colossi. There are still to be seen there a half formed obelisk, between seventy and eighty feet in length, unfinished columns, sarcophagi, and marks of immense blocks that have been removed from the rock.

The second, which may be termed the middle district, extends from the neighborhood of Syene to the neighborhood of Esneh and Edfou. This is composed of sandstone of various colors, grey, yellowish, pure white, and some-

¹ *Egyptian Antiquities*, I, 6, 7. ² *Idem*, I, 11. ³ *Idem*, I, 10, 11. ⁴ *Heeren*, II, 66, 67.

times variegated. The palaces and temples of Upper Egypt are built of this stone. This stone is not very hard, and therefore more easily admitted the numerous sculptures that were made upon its walls. The buildings made of this stone generally appear white or gray.

The third or northern district, extending beyond Thebes, and embracing the ranges on both sides, is a limestone formation in which shells are occasionally found. This is the region of the pyramids, and those stupendous structures are mostly composed of this stone. It is worked without much difficulty.

Egypt has not inappropriately been called the "gift of the Nile." So far as its fertility and physical resources are concerned this is undoubtedly true. It seems to be the destiny of Egypt to be, in many respects, unlike any other country.¹ That fertility of soil, which in other countries depends upon the descent of rain or snow from the clouds,² in Egypt is caused by the overflowing of the Nile.

It seldom rains in Egypt. It is said that under the serene sky of Thebes, the whole period of man's life may pass away without the earth being refreshed from above with more than a moist dew. On the coast there are occasional rains, but very unfrequent. The surface of Egypt is dry, and hence ill adapted to attract moisture. Clouds, charged with aqueous vapor, are attracted around the summits of mountains, so that the descending rains gathering into rills and streams, acquire sufficient velocity in running down their steep ascents. The hilly ranges constituting the eastern and western boundaries of Egypt, are of insufficient height to serve as centres of attraction for the clouds. During a portion of the year the winds blow regularly from the north towards the south, so that the clouds and mists from the Mediterranean are carried over Egypt, and meet with nothing to arrest their progress until they reach the mountains of Abyssinia. These are of sufficient height to attract them around their summits.

¹ *Heeren*, II, 58, 59. ² *Egyptian Antiq.*, I, 13, 14.

The result is, that heavy rains descend upon these mountains, which swell the streams and rivers, the whole of which discharge themselves into the Nile, the common reservoir that drains off all that region. The wet season in Abyssinia or Upper Ethiopia, is from May till September.

The accumulated waters caused by these rains, begin to enter Egypt about the middle of June, the time of the summer solstice. The banks of the river in Upper Egypt, are usually from thirty to thirty-five feet above the level of the water. The river continues gradually rising till near the end of July,² although it still remains confined within its channel. During the first half of August, the river commences overflowing its banks, and inundating the neighboring territory. "Perhaps there is not," says Mr. Osborne, "in nature a more exhilarating sight,³ or one more strongly exciting to confidence in God, than the rise of the Nile. Day by day, and night by night, its turbid tide sweeps onward majestically over the parched sands of the waste, howling wilderness. Almost hourly, as we slowly ascended it before the Etesian winds, we heard the thundering fall of some mud bank, and saw by the rush of all animated nature to the spot, that the Nile had overleaped another obstruction, and that its bounding waters were diffusing life and joy through another desert. There are few impressions I have ever received, upon the remembrance of which I dwell with more pleasure, than that of seeing the first burst of the Nile, into one of the great channels of its annual overflow. All nature shouts for joy. The men, the children, the buffaloes, gambol in its refreshing waters, the broad waves sparkle with shoals of fish, and fowl of every wing flutter over them in clouds. Nor is this jubilee of nature confined to the higher orders of creation. The moment the sand becomes moistened by the approach of the fertilizing waters, it is literally alive with insects innumerable. It is impossible to stand by the

¹ Heeren, II, 63. ² *Idem*, II, 60. ³ *Monumental History of Egypt*, I, 12, 13.

side of one of these noble streams, to see it every moment sweeping away some obstruction to its majestic course, and widening as it flows, without feeling the breast expand with love and joy and confidence in the great Author of this annual miracle of mercy." The Nile increases until September. On the ceasing of the rainy season in September, the Nile begins gradually to fall, but so slowly, that nearly all Egypt remains under water until the commencement of October, towards the end of which, the waters have so far subsided, that they are confined to the channel of the river.

The period of inundation continues from the middle of August to the end of October, during which time Egypt has the appearance of a vast lake, the whole valley of the Nile being covered with water.¹ The soil of Egypt is rendered fruitful as far as this inundation reaches, or can by any means be made to reach. The river bears along a fat slime which is deposited on the lands which its waters have overflowed, communicating to them a great degree of fertility.

So extremely desirable is it that the waters should be spread all over Egypt, and retained as long as possible, that many artificial means were resorted to for the accomplishment of these purposes. One of these artificial means was canals, which led out from the river to the extremities of the Nilotic valley.² There were also numerous reservoirs, particularly in Upper Egypt, designed to collect and retain the water. The waters of the Nile were not allowed to be let into the canals and reservoirs until the river had reached a certain height, nor then into all of them at the same time. Were they to do this the lands in Upper and Lower Egypt would be unequally overflowed. They began in Upper Egypt, and extended gradually down into Lower Egypt. By this means they were enabled to irrigate more or less thoroughly all Egypt, except the high lands. These were supplied with water by spiral pumps turned by oxen,

¹ *Heeren*, II, 60. ² *Rollin*, I, 5.

thus forcing the water into pipes which conveyed it to these lands.

The height of an inundation is measured by an instrument called the Nilometer, which is a pillar on which are marked the degrees of the Nile's increase.¹ The first height of an inundation, according to Pliny, is sixteen cubits, a cubit being a foot and an half measure. When it rises no higher than twelve or thirteen cubits there is danger of a famine. The rising of the Nile to the height of an ordinary inundation has ever been attended with universal rejoicing throughout all Egypt. So intimately connected is the inundation with the fertility of the soil, that the tribute paid to the grand seignior for the lands has been regulated by its extent and completeness.

After the retiring of the waters little remains to be done to prepare the soil for agricultural purposes. It is now well soaked, manured with a fat mud or slime, and only requires to be turned up so as to be opened, and tempered with a little sand. It is then sown, and in the course of about two months is covered with corn and pulse. The sowing is usually done in October and November, according as the waters retire, and the harvesting in March and April. A double crop is usually grown every year.²

To an observer on the summit of the largest pyramid, Egypt at two different seasons of the year would present two different appearances. In August he would look upon a vast inland sea,³ with towns and villages dotting its surface like so many islands. These appear interspersed with groves of fruit trees, the tops of which only are visible. On the east and west the prospect is bounded by the mountain ranges, the one of which separates this sea from the Lybian desert, and the other from the Red sea.

In January and February, when such large portions of the globe are chilled with the frosts and snows of winter, Egypt presents a scene of life and beauty. Extensive meadows clothed with the richest verdure, and enameled

¹ *Rollin*, I, 5. ² *Heeren*, II, 61. ³ *Rollin*, I, 6.

with flowers, charm the eye. Flocks and herds are seen dispersed over the plains, and husbandmen and gardeners everywhere at work. The blossom of the orange, lemon and citron perfume the air, and Egypt, in all but its inhabitants, might seem a fairy land.

Egypt, in its topography, its situation, its physical circumstances, in most of those physical influences that give fertility to its soil, and character to its people, is unlike any other country upon earth. This tends to invest with interest all investigations in regard to it.

History.

Here a problem is presented of difficult solution. Who were the ancient Egyptians? Whence did they come? and whither have they gone?

In order to present this problem properly, a few facts should be stated.

1. The Delta, or Lower Egypt, has generally been supposed by the Greek writers (from whom our information, until quite recently, has been mainly derived), to have been formed by successive depositions from the waters of the Nile, and thus at the period of time, when the first migrations of man occurred, to have presented only an inland sea, or at best an uninhabitable marsh. If such were the fact it interposed a serious obstacle to any emigration from Asia through the isthmus of Suez.

2. The valley of the Nile does not terminate at the lower cataracts, the ancient Syene, the southern boundary of Egypt. That is more a political than a natural boundary. The Nilotic valley still continues, narrower, it is true, and occasionally interrupted by cataracts and deserts, far south into the region of ancient Ethiopia, the present countries of Nubia and Abyssinia. The ancient Meroe, the Ethiopian capital, is found some fifteen hundred miles from the mouth of the Nile.

3. The entire distance from Meroe to Memphis, all along the course of the Nilotic valley, are to be found at varying

intervals, monuments, so similar in their general character, as to give rise to the inference that they originated in the same motive, subserved the same purpose, and were reared by the same race,¹ Pyramids, although of smaller dimensions, rock sepulchres, temples of the gods, colossi, almost every species of Egyptian architecture, except obelisks, are all found occurring at intervals, along the valley of the Nile, from Meroe to the southern boundary of Egypt, and all resembling the same kind of structures that are to be found at Thebes and Upper Egypt. It has been stated, that there is a gradual improvement in these monuments, as we descend the Nile, from Meroe to Thebes. The monuments of the Upper Nile are also found to be sculptured over, and to bear upon them the hieroglyphic character similar to those of Upper Egypt. It is stated by Lepsius, that while at Meroe, he became satisfied that he had before him there, on the most celebrated spot of ancient Ethiopia,² nothing but the ruins of comparatively recent art. That he had already judged from the monuments of Ferlini, that they were certainly produced in Ethiopia, but not in any case earlier than the first century before the Christian era. That the representations and inscriptions leave not the least doubt on the subject, and that it will be forever in vain to attempt the support of the much loved idea of an ancient Meroe, glorious and famous, the inhabitants of which were the predecessors and teachers of the Egyptians in civilization, by referring to its monumental remains.

4. The ancient temples of some parts of India, especially the rock temples at Elephanta-Ellora, and Salsette, are found to be very similar to many of the temples and excavations found in the valley of the Nile, and the institution of castes anciently prevailed in Egypt, and now prevails among the Hindoos. Based upon these, and some other facts, we have four different hypotheses in reference to the ancient Egyptians, who they were and whence they came :

¹ *Heeren's Reflections*, I, 336, *et seq.* ² *Lepsius's Discoveries in Egypt*, 159, 160, 161.

1. The first asserts that they came from India, or that the Hindoos came from Egypt. That these two were originally the same race.

2. The second claims that they were Ethiopians. That the ancient Meroe was the first settlement and centre of civilization. That from that point colonization commenced, following the course of the Nile, and successively appropriating the most eligible locations along its fruitful valley until it reached its mouth. That thus Lower Egypt was the last reached, and the last colonized. This is the doctrine supported by Heeren. But the more recent investigations and discoveries have tended to silence the advocates of this theory.

3. The third maintains that the ancient Egyptians were of the Caucasian variety of the race. That they emigrated from the west of Asia, crossing the isthmus of Suez, peopling first the Delta or Lower Egypt, gradually extending themselves up the valley of the Nile.

4. That the Egyptians were never emigrants from western Asia or any other region, but were the indigenous and aboriginal inhabitants of the valley of the Nile, that they were the autocthones of the country, and the authors of their own civilization.¹ This, however, can only be regarded as a part of a more general doctrine which denies that the human race were derived from one pair, but asserts a derivation from a plurality of centres, and that these original creations, or springs into existence, were, in all cases, in those parts of the world best adapted to their physical nature.

Without entering into any discussions in regard to the solution of this problem, or assigning any reasons, the following appear to be the conclusions sustained by the proofs as they are now exhibited.

1. The Delta has not been the gift of the Nile in the sense stated,² but has existed from the earliest periods of time in nearly or quite its present form.³

¹ *Types of Mankind*, 232. ² *Drummond's Origines*, II, 31, 32, 33. ³ *Gliddon's Ancient Egypt*, 43.

2. The comparative ease and facility of access to Egypt; the great advance made in civilization by the early inhabitants of that valley; the human form, and especially the head, as sculptured and painted upon the monuments, and as actually exhibited in the exhumed mummy, all unite in proclaiming that the ancient Egyptians were of the Caucasian variety of the human species, that they came to Egypt through the isthmus of Suez, migrating from western Asia and probably from beyond the Euphrates. Other testimony, especially the scriptures, declare them to have been the descendants of Ham, who was the son of Noah, and the brother of Shem and Japhet. There seems little doubt but that Misraim, the son of Ham, colonized Egypt at a very early period.¹ The early monuments exhibit a style of head from which we can infer what constituted the Egyptian type. The head is low and elongated, the forehead not amply developed, the nose short and thick, the lip full and large, and the chin short and receding. Lepsius claims that Egypt had possessed an African population, and a Nilotic language, before the foundation of the old empire; and that various disturbing causes superimposed gradually an Asiatic type and Semitic dialects upon the anterior people of the lower Nile, without obliterating the aboriginal frame work which, as well in type of man as in speech, was exclusively African. The easy access to Egypt, through the isthmus of Suez, probably led very early to a mingling of races, more especially of those that were Hamitic and Semitic in their origin.²

3. The descendants of the ancient Egyptians are the modern Fellahs.³ These are also called Arab-Egyptians.⁴ They are the principal cultivators of the soil, and are everywhere found in the Nilotic valley. They are a mixture of Arab and ancient Egyptian. In Upper Egypt they are said still to present a strong resemblance to the sculptures and paintings on the monuments.

¹ *Types of Mankind*, 244. ² *Idem*, 235. ³ *Crania Egyptiaca*, 66. ⁴ *Idem*, 42.

Egyptian history is best comprehended when divided into five periods :

I. The first extends from the first settlement of the valley of the Nile to the conquest of Egypt by Cambyses, the successor of Cyrus on the Persian throne B. C. 525.¹ Within this is included the dominion of the Pharaohs.

II. The second from B. C. 525 to the occupation of Egypt by the Macedonians, on the overthrow of the Persian empire, B. C. 332, including a period of 193 years. During this time Egypt was a province of the Persian empire.

III. The third includes the dynasty of the Macedonian kings, commencing B. C. 323, and continuing until Egypt became a province of the Roman empire, B. C. 30. This includes the dominion of the Ptolemies, the race of the Lagidæ, so called from Ptolemy, son of Lagus the first of the line.

IV. This comprises the history of Egypt as a Roman province, and as an appendage of the eastern empire till the invasion of the Arabs or Saracens A. D. 638.

V. The fifth period includes the events of Egyptian history from the year A.D. 638 to the present time.

Of these five periods the first is the only one of much importance, as that alone presents us with developments that are purely Egyptian. All the others exhibit the Egyptian more or less modified by foreign influence. All the contributions furnished by Egypt proper, as Egyptian in character, to the advancing course of civilization, are derived from the first period. That, therefore, is the only one that can present here much claim for consideration. The first period, embracing the Pharaonic sway in Egypt, has been subdivided into three comprehensive periods, of which the first embraces the old empire founded by Menes down to its subversion by the Hyksos, or shepherd kings, as they were called. The second included the middle empire, covering the period during which Egypt was tri-

¹ *Egyptian Antiq.*, I, 21, 22.

butary to the Hyksos who reigned at Memphis; while the third is called the new empire, and extends from the eighteenth dynasty, which expelled the Hyksos, down to the time of its subversion by the Persians. This is a very convenient division, and is that followed by Bunsen in his *Egypt's Place in Universal History*.

Misraim, the son of Ham, is reputed to have led the first colony into Egypt. In the hieroglyphics, Egypt itself is styled Kheme, "the land of Ham." The period at which this colony emigrated from the plains of Shinar, and whether it was prior or subsequent to the confusion of tongues and dispersion of mankind is unknown.

This colony coming from the banks of the Euphrates, must have entered Egypt through the isthmus of Suez. This isthmus, has, in fact, been the great highway over which intercourse has ever been kept up between Asia and Africa. The invaders of Egypt,¹ the Hyksos or shepherd kings, the Persians, the Macedonians, the Saracens, the Ottomans, have all entered through the isthmus of Suez. It was the route for the military expedition of the Pharaohs and Ptolemies, as well as for commercial intercourse with Asia. The Delta or Lower Egypt, including the city of Memphis, now in Middle Egypt, was the first settled. This was a region the best adapted to agriculture.² Here arose the first cities, Pelusium, Bubastis, On or Heliopolis, Sais, Memphis. Here were erected the first monuments, the pyramids of Memphis.

The amazing fertility of the soil; the early introduction of the arts of life, and the pursuits of agriculture; the development of those powers in man which give him a command over external nature, and enable him to master the world's physical resources; all naturally led to an abundant population, which rapidly extended up the valley of the Nile, covering the Thebaid with cities and monuments, and staying not its progress until it stamped upon the distant Meroe, the impress of its mighty march.

¹ *Gliddon*, 47. ² *Idem*, 46.

The proper understanding of early Egyptian history, considered as a chronological succession of events, is attended with difficulties almost insurmountable. The original sources of information are the monuments, and the inscriptions contained on them; the tablet of Tuthmosis or series of kings of Karnac; the tablet of Rameses, or series of kings of Abydos; the royal papyrus, now in the museum of Turin; the history of Egypt, by Manetho, the Sebennyte priest, written about three hundred years B.C., and which professes to derive its authority from the monuments and the writings of the priests, but which, unfortunately, was lost, and only parts of it have been preserved; the list of kings, compiled or made out by Eratosthenes; the statements of Herodotus, Diodorus, and other more modern writers. The difficulty with the monuments is, that they are without any general date as to the time of their erection, and give only the name of the king during whose reign they were erected, giving also the year of the reigning sovereign, counted from that current year in which he came to the throne, which was called his first year. All that remains of Manetho's historical work consists of a list of the Egyptian dynasties and two considerable fragments, one relating to the shepherds, the other to a tale of the exodus. As these sources of information fail to agree among themselves, it can surprise no one that there is so little unanimity among writers on the subject of Egyptian chronology.

All appear to agree in calling the first king *Menes*, and it is a fact of some significance that the first lawgiver among the Hindoos was *Menu*, the first among the Cretans was *Minos*, and the first among Egyptians *Menes*. This resemblance seems to be too close to be accidental.

Many remarkable things are attributed to this first on the long list of the Pharaohs. He is generally regarded as the founder of Memphis, then in Lower Egypt, and the capital of all Egypt. He is also celebrated as a warrior, although nothing definite has descended to us of his heroic exploits. He turned the river Nile into a new channel,

raising a formidable dyke to prevent its overflowing the city of Memphis. He was the first of the Thinite dynasty, so called from the city of Thin. Like all other founders of dynasties he possessed energy and capacity.

Attention has been called to the fact that from all that can be gathered, the birth of Egyptian civilization must date back to a period long anterior to Menes; that there must have been separate provinces or nomes prior to his reign, and that the priesthood and influence of the priests seems to have then been in full operation; that the mighty works ascribed to Menes are consistent only with a very advanced degree of civilization. But laying aside the vagueness and uncertainty that must necessarily characterize all knowledge of that period, it may well be conceded that the early colonies from the plain of Shinar may have brought to Egypt much of the civilization that prevailed in the old world anterior to the deluge.

But what was the era of Menes? How far back into a remote antiquity are we to place the period of his reign? This is a point which has much divided Egyptologists. Manetho has given a list of dynasties, twenty-seven in number down to the Persian conquest, and thirty down to and including that of Sebennytus. This latter brings it down to a known period of history. Supposing these dynasties, with the reigns included within them, to have been successive, then all agree that the commencement of the first would run back to a very remote antiquity, and must be placed some 5000 years B. C. This is an antiquity that no one contends for. The two great investigators, Lepsius and Bunsen, although they would carry back the commencement of Egyptian history to a very remote antiquity, the former to some 3892 years B.C., and the latter some two hundred years less, yet both admit that if the dynasties were successive, it must go back much further, and that they can only limit it to that period, by supposing that some of the kings contained in these dynasties, were reigning contemporaneously over different portions of Egypt. We know there was an Upper

Egyptian monuments that have come down to us. In these massive structures we are therefore to seek and find the earliest monuments of this ancient empire. They will come up more particularly for consideration under the element of art.

These pyramids proclaim the glory of the fourth or Memphite dynasty, dating according to some in the year B. C. 2450. It would seem that the great Egyptian dynasties took each its name from the city or country in which it had its origin. Thus the chief city of the Thinite nome furnished Menes. But the third and fourth dynasties are Memphite, ruling in Memphis. The Pharaohs of the fifth dynasty, which are rendered the best known to us both by the monuments and by ancient writers, are Suphis (Cheops), and Suphis II (or Sensuphis, a "brother of Suphis,") which are the *Shufu* and *Non-Shufu* of the monuments, and Mencheres or Mycerinus — the *Men-ka-re* of the monuments. The two *Shufus* were the builders of the great pyramid, and are inferred to have reigned together from the number of years ascribed to their reigns, by their being on the sculptured walls of the same tomb, behind the great pyramid, and by this pyramid having two funereal chambers, one for each. In the third pyramid is found the name of *Men-ka-re*, Mencheres, Mycerinus.

Mencheres is reputed to have been a great religious reformer, who accomplished important changes in Egyptian idolatry. Prior to his reign Egyptian worship was localized, each nome of much importance having its own local deity.¹ This Pharaoh elevated Osiris, the local god of Busiris in the Delta, to the rank of god in all Egypt, the special office being assigned to him of god, king of Hades and its inhabitants. That led to the recording of his name in that most ancient of documents "the book of the dead," no other mortal king of Egypt having attained that honor.

In coming down to the twelfth dynasty we reach the *Osirtasens* and *Amenemes* who were powerful Pharaohs,

¹ *Osburn*, i. 324.

B.C. 2020. The first *Osirtasen*, as is shown by the remains of the temples he founded, ruled over all Egypt from the Delta to the second cataract. Former dynasties had been frequently contemporaneous, but he united all the Egypts under his sceptre, and even extended his conquests into Ethiopia. The third of that name is treated as a god by some of the kings of the eighteenth dynasty, and is supposed by some to have been the early and original *Sesostris*; of the *Amenemes* the third of that name, or *Amuntimæus*, enjoyed a long and very successful reign. It was preeminently prosperous. To him is attributed the erection, in the Zayoum, of that gorgeous palace called the *Labyrinth*, which has been styled even a greater wonder than the pyramids. It was a suite of vast halls such as few other buildings on earth can parallel. This is also supposed to be the Pharaoh whose grand hydraulic works ennobled the name of Moeris. That the Pharaohs of this dynasty ruled in central Egypt is apparent from the fact of their appointing the governors of its nomes.

We have also now arrived at what by many is considered the era of the *Hyksos*, or shepherd kings as they have been termed, a very interesting and puzzling part of Egyptian history. Who were the Hyksos? Whence came they? What was their mission to Egypt? To what extent and how long did they rule over it? When, how, by whom expelled, and what became of them? As to the first question, their occupation should not be lost sight of as a means of identification. They were shepherds, but unfortunately that, as an occupation of the primitive people of the world, is not very distinctive. It is pretty certain that they were not Egyptians, although one writer, Mr. Osburn, maintains that they were a faction of Egyptians, that acquired the ascendancy. The Egyptians tell us that they were not a people from a distant country, but they were neighboring tribes, and are supposed to have been from the north-east of Egypt,¹ and to have been Canaanites, associated very

¹ *Bunsen's Egypt's Place in Universal History*, II, 421.

probably with the Bedouins of northern Arabia and the peninsula of Sinai. Neither were they an ancient people, but tribes or hordes who grew into a people afterwards in Egypt. The *Shepherd Philition* spoken of by Herodotus are supposed to have meant the shepherd races of the Philistines, that is the Palestinians. A little variation from this would lead us to adopt the opinion of Bryant who claims that they were Arabian shepherds, all the primitive Arabians being nomades or shepherds. He finds, however, in these a distinctive class, which he calls *Cuseans*, *Cushans*, descendants of *Cush*. These Cuseans before seizing upon Lower Egypt dwelt in the land of *Cushan*, *Gushan*, *Goshen*, and in confirmation of this the land of Goshen, according to the modern view, lay between the eastern part of the ancient Delta and the western border of Palestine. It was scarcely a part of Egypt proper, was inhabited to a large extent by foreigners, and was at one period in its geographical nomes rather Semitic than Egyptian. It was a large pasture land, especially suited to a shepherd people. In addition to all this the name *Hyk-sos* may be translated "shepherd," or "Arab, kings," *Hyk* being the common title "king" or "ruler," given even to the Pharaohs on the monuments, and *shos*, signifying shepherd, or answering to *Sharo*, "Arabs."

But whoever they were, or whence, their mission to Egypt seems to have been that of the destroyer. They spared not even the monuments, those dumb orators of the past, always excepting those that, like the pyramids, were alike impervious to the fire of heaven and the steel of man. They had no respect for the religion of the Egyptians, but endeavored as far as possible to subvert her religious institutions. But while thus at war with the monuments and many of the Egyptian institutions, they set up the Pharaonic sway in Lower Egypt, and their monarchs compose the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth dynasties.

In regard to the extent of their rule. That they did not subvert Egyptian life and manners is evident from the

fact that although tributary, the great part of Egypt, especially the upper portion of it, still continued to obey its native princes. They held possession of Memphis, ruling there, and from thence holding the Egyptians in subjection, and taking tribute of their princes.¹ There were at the same time Theban princes who continued to exercise the sovereignty in the Thebaid, and also the Xoites in the Delta. The period of time during which their rule extended over Egypt is variously estimated. Bunsen puts it down at 922 years, but the larger number of writers set it at 511 years.

The expulsion of the shepherds was accomplished by Amosis, the first king of the eighteenth dynasty. Egypt had long been in a course of preparation to free itself from their yoke. The united forces of the Thebaid and of Ethiopia, placed themselves under the energetic guidance of Amosis, and the shepherds, weakened by successive defeats, were finally driven to their last stronghold at Avaris, where they held for some time, a fortified camp. They finally disappeared about as mysteriously as they at first appeared, and no very distinct traces of them are afterwards to be found. Their rule constitutes what Manetho and Bunsen call the middle empire of Egypt, the old empire having gone out as they came in.

Authors are not agreed as to the period which was signalized by the rule of Joseph, and the settlement of the Israelites in Egypt. Bunsen is of the opinion that it occurred during the reign of the first *Sesostris*, who was one of the Pharaohs of the twelfth dynasty, while others, as Osburn, place it in the reign of Phiops Apappus, or Apophis, who was one of the shepherd kings. All agree that it was during a period of great external prosperity, when a vast amount of forced labor was at the command of her princes and nobles. Whoever was the Pharaoh under whom his administration took place, a great change must have been wrought by it in the polity of Egypt. The

¹ *Bunsen*, II, 422.

effect of it was to transfer all the lands of the Egyptians, excepting those of the priests, directly to Pharaoh, and thus to render him sovereign lord over Egypt. The fruits of this policy were more especially developed, when the real Pharaonic sway was restored by Amosis, who signalized the advent of the new empire by the expulsion of the Hyksos, and founded the eighteenth or great Theban dynasty, B. C. 1520. With this dynasty commences a more continuous monumental history of Egypt. The names of the kings of this dynasty, as proclaimed from the monuments, agree very well with those of Manetho.

The expulsion of the Hyksos, and the union of all Egypt under one Pharaoh, restored peace and prosperity to the country, and introduced the idea of making foreign conquests. The contests with those invaders, which had thus resulted in a successful termination, had trained the Egyptians to war, and thus kindled in them a martial spirit. This enabled Amunoph I, the successor of Amosis, B. C. 1498, to extend his dominions beyond the frontier, and thus opened the way for succeeding kings of this dynasty to make conquests both in Africa and Asia. The policy of the Pharaohs had been hitherto, with few exceptions, a domestic one. The great object was to develop Egyptian resources, and to advance in every possible way, Egyptian civilization. That line of effort thus persisted in for centuries had not only enabled the Pharaohs to pile up their monumental records, but had also accumulated such an amount of power and force as to render the dwellers in the Nile valley formidable to foreign countries.

The successors of Amunoph I, known as Thothmer I, II, and III, particularly the latter, added to the monuments of Egypt, and also made foreign conquests.¹ The two last mentioned were associated on the throne with Queen *Amun-nou-het* who appears to have enjoyed far greater consideration than either of them, probably owing to her exercising the office of regent. It is worthy of

¹ *Ravlinson*, II, 299.

remark that both in Egypt and Ethiopia from very early periods we find queens occasionally exercising the rights of sovereign rulers.¹

Thothmes III appears to have extended his arms far into Asia, from which he received a large tribute. His victories over the people of Asia are recorded in the great temple of Karnac. Many of the Egyptian cities were beautified by his architecture, and he seems to have left more monuments than any Pharaoh except the second Rameses.

The eighteenth, or Theban dynasty, lasted from about the middle of the sixteenth to the middle of the fourteenth century, B. C. The nineteenth dynasty commenced with Rameses I, whose reign was of short duration, and whose chief importance results from his being the head of the house of Rameses. His son *Sethi I*, or *Sethos*, made many foreign conquests, extending far into Asia, and at home as a more enduring monument, he erected the great hypostyle hall of Karnac, and recorded his successes in a series of bas-reliefs on its northern wall. His long reign and life ended suddenly, as the extra chamber which he had ordered, added to his tomb, was never finished, the figures in it being left in outline. The Egyptian Pharaohs seem to have had a curious habit, each one of commencing and carrying on the construction of his tomb during his life; but all work upon it was arrested at his death, and on the deposit therein of his body, it was sealed up until the resurrection. The completeness, therefore, of the sepulchre would depend much upon the length of his reign.

His son Rameses II, or the great Rameses, was the most illustrious of the Pharaohs. He has left behind him more monumental remains than any other Pharaoh. He has not only covered Egypt and Nubia with temples and other monuments, but has also inscribed upon their walls the record of his many victories. He is undoubtedly the great Sesostris of the Greek writers. The record of his victories is more especially found in the great temples of

¹ *Rawlinson*, II, 300.

Karnac and Luxor, and in the Memnonium. This record is particularly interesting in regard to the art of war, as understood and practiced during that period. He also attended to things useful as well as ornamental. He opened a canal from the Nile to the Red sea, which from the monuments on its banks was undoubtedly finished by him. He also fitted out a fleet to protect the trade of the Red sea, thus opened by this canal. He erected a wall at the edge of the cultivated land, quite a distance on both sides of the Nile valley, to protect it from the wandering Arabs. To accomplish all these immense works, his command over forced labor must have been immense, and the bondage of Israel may have largely contributed to these great results. His successor, *Pthahmen*, is supposed to have been the Pharaoh, who "knew not Joseph," and under whom the exodus occurred. The remaining Pharaohs of this dynasty fail to attain much distinction. The Augustan age of Egypt passed away with the great Rameses. The resources of the kingdom were probably well nigh exhausted; the exodus of Israel withdrew vast amounts of productive labor, and Egypt might for a time repose upon her laurels.

In the twentieth dynasty, Sethi II, B. C. 1232, added the chambers and the avenue of sphinxes to the great temple of Karnac, but it remained for Rameses III, B. C. 1219, to extend the arms of Egypt abroad, while he was adding to her massive architecture at home. The temple at Medeenet Haboo is a monument of the latter, the battle scenes on the walls of which proclaim his numerous victories. His march is represented through several countries; as traversing a jungle abounding in lions; and as attacking several fortified towns surrounded by water, and defended by double walls. With him closes the glorious era of Egyptian history, and although Rameses VIII made some additions to the great temple of Karnac, and also maintained the conquests of Egypt abroad, yet towards the close of the twenty-first dynasty, the sceptre passed into the hands of military pontiffs, the names of several of

whom occur in a small lateral temple belonging to the great pile of Karnac. They were succeeded by the Sheshonks, supposed by some to have been Assyrians, who may have succeeded, in virtue of intermarriages of foreign princes with Egyptian princesses. The first of that name, the Shishak of scripture, was also the first Pharaoh of the twenty-second dynasty, and was the contemporary of Solomon, B. C. 990. He invaded Judea with a large army, and having taken its walled cities, entered Jerusalem, pillaged the temple and house of the king. The record of this campaign is still proclaimed from the outside wall of the great temple of Karnac.

Bocchoris the wise, B. C. 734, the sole king of the twenty-fourth dynasty, was more famed as a legislator than a warrior. To him succeeded the twenty-fifth or Ethiopian dynasty, the Sabacos or *Shebeeks* of the monuments. One of these, but it is uncertain which, was the So of the scriptures, who made the treaty with Hosea, king of Israel, which resulted in the refusal of the latter to pay tribute to the king of Assyria, and led to the captivity of the ten tribes.

There was a brief revival of the power of old Egypt under Tehrak, the Tirhakah of the scriptures, who succeeded the Sabacos, who left behind him monumental record of his victories in Asia over the Assyrians, which occurred during the reign of Sennacherib, on the threatened invasion of Lower Egypt. Psammetichus I, his successor, introduced the twenty-sixth dynasty; and inaugurated a course of policy different from his predecessors in his measures to secure the south-eastern frontiers of Egypt from foreign aggression. All the preceding sovereigns had relied upon the native troops, the soldier caste, for all the purposes of aggressive or defensive warfare. He accepted the services of the Greeks, and gave them the post of honor on the right, placing the native troops on the left. The decided preference thus given in various ways to his Grecian allies so operated on the minds of the native troops that they finally left Egypt in a body and emigrated

to Ethiopia, where certain lands were allotted to them by the Ethiopian king for settlement beyond Meroe. The course of policy thus pursued by Psammetichus had the effect of opening up Egypt to foreigners, and of introducing Greek ideas and Greek influence into the valley of the Nile. The laws of Egypt were for the first time relaxed against foreigners. Egyptian children were taught Greek, and from these the interpreters were descended in the days of Herodotus. Psammetichus also turned his attention towards Egyptian art, and made great additions to the temples in Thebes, Memphis, and other Egyptian cities. This period has been called the "renaissance" of Egyptian art.

He was succeeded by his son Neco or Necho, the Pharaoh-Nechoh of scripture, whose first care was to improve the commercial prosperity of Egypt. He fitted out ships to discover if Africa was circumnavigable, and engaged for this purpose the services of certain Phœnician mariners. This fleet actually ascertained that the African continent was peninsular in form, about twenty one centuries before the second discovery by Bartolomeo Dia and Vasco de Gama. He also sought to reestablish the influence of Egypt in western Asia, and marching an army into Syria encountered Josiah, king of Judah, in the valley of Megiddo, defeated and slew him, and subjected Judea to tribute. But three years afterward Nebuchadnezzar deprived him of all his Syrian and Judean possessions, and again shut him up in the valley of the Nile.

After the brief reign of Psammetichus II, who made several additions to the temple of Karnac at Thebes, and others in Lower Egypt, he was succeeded by Apries who was the Pharaoh-Hophra of scripture, who was at first very successful in his warlike expeditions. He besieged and took Gaza and Sidon, defeated the king of Tyre, and obliged the Chaldæans that were besieging Jerusalem to retire. His good fortune afterwards deserted him, and a formidable revolt of his subjects was headed by Amasis. Advancing to attack the insurgents with what forces he

could muster, the two armies met at Momemphis, where Apries was defeated and carried a prisoner to Sais, at which place he was afterwards slain. Amasis succeeded, and had a long and prosperous reign, during which Egypt, according to Herodotus, had 20,000 well inhabited cities. He erected monuments throughout the country from the cataracts to the Delta. He also developed the military resources of Egypt, taking Cyprus and rendering it tributary. He perfected the Egyptian phalanx, which consisted of a body of 10,000 men, each armed with huge shields, covering the soldier from head to foot, and also having long spears and swords. This was probably the origin of what afterwards became so celebrated as the Macedonian phalanx.

Amasis took also a part in general politics, and beheld with alarm the rising power of Persia, under Cyrus. He saw that power moving westward to overwhelm Cræsus, king of Lydia. With this latter he entered into a treaty, sending him, as is stated, a body of 120,000 troops. The fortunes of Cyrus, however, were in the ascendant, Lydia was subdued, and preparations were set on foot for the invasion of Egypt. In the midst of them Cyrus died, but Cambyses, his son and successor, carried out the designs of his father and invaded Egypt with a great army. Amasis died before the invading hosts reached Egypt, and was succeeded by his son Psammenitus, who was unable to resist the Persians, and all Egypt was compelled to submit to the Persian yoke in the year B.C. 525.

The twenty-seventh dynasty which came in with Cambyses, was a Persian dynasty, Egypt having now become a conquered province. It was governed by a Persian satrap. The Egyptians, although mildly dealt with, grew impatient of foreign rule, and revolted from the Persians in the year before the death of Darius, and succeeded in expelling them from the country. But Xerxes, the successor of Darius, succeeded in again reducing them to subjection, and made his brother Achæmenes governor of the country.

Other revolts continued to follow until finally about the year B.C., 411 the Egyptians revolted and succeeded in

completely freeing their country from the Persian yoke. Amyrtæus became sovereign lord of Egypt, his reign constituting the twenty-eighth dynasty. He entered into a treaty with the Arabians, by which he secured his north-eastern frontier from aggression, so that the sceptre passed without interruption into the hands of his successors, the four Mendesian kings, composing the twenty-ninth dynasty, B.C. 405.

The thirtieth dynasty was introduced by Nectanebo in B.C. 369, during whose reign the Persians again resorted to mighty efforts to regain possession of Egypt. A large force under Pharnabazus and Iphicrates was sent for that purpose, but the precautions taken by Nectanebo to secure the defenses of the country, the dissensions between the two Persian generals, and the entanglement of their forces amidst the waters of the rising Nile finally led to a retreat and abandonment of the enterprise. Being now left free from foreign interruption he proceeded, like many of his predecessors, to adorn the temples of Egypt, and he was probably the last of the Pharaohs who erected an obelisk.

The Persians, however, never seemed to have abandoned their design of ultimate dominion over Egypt. Accordingly preparations were set on foot by Artaxerxes to recover Egypt, but he, dying in B.C., 363 was succeeded by Ochus, whose attempts at recovery were at first unsuccessful; but afterwards he put himself at the head of a formidable army, and having overran Phœnicia, invaded Egypt. Nectanebo, at the head of 100,000 men, was prepared to repel the invader, but getting panic-struck on seeing the Persians occupy an unguarded point in their attack upon Pelusium, he fled to Memphis. The Persians then took all the fortified places in Lower Egypt, Nectanebo retired into Ethiopia, and Egypt once more became a Persian province.

The thirty-first dynasty was introduced by Ochus in B. C. 343, whose reign was cruel and oppressive, persecuting the people and insulting their religion. He even

went so far in the latter as to order the sacred bull, Apis, to be roasted and eaten, a thing the most abhorrent to the Egyptians. This dynasty was terminated by Alexander's conquest of Persia, B. C. 332, and the consequent introduction of the rule of the Macedonian kings. The Egyptians, ever restive under the Persian yoke, were happy to exchange it for the Grecian. Alexander, therefore, found no obstacle in the way of his conquest of Egypt. He founded the city of Alexandria; and thus evinced a far reaching sagacity in selecting with such wisdom and foresight, a location so admirably fitted to be the site of a great commercial metropolis.

On the dismemberment of the empire, which Alexander had so hastily reared upon the ruins of the Persian, and which crumbled to pieces at his death, Egypt fortunately fell to the share of Ptolemy, surnamed Soter, the son of Lagus, the wisest and most prudent of the successors of Alexander. From him was derived the thirty-second, or Ptolemaic dynasty, the race of Lagidæ, which commenced B. C. 323, and ended B. C. 44, having reigned over Egypt for almost the period of three hundred years.

The founder of this new dynasty evinced his wisdom by withdrawing himself as much as possible from the wars of that period,¹ and bestowing his attention upon his new subjects, fostering among them the elements of prosperity. A reign of almost forty years of comparative peace and quiet, whilst the rest of the civilized world was desolated by perpetual storms, was in itself well calculated to give permanency and prosperity to the affairs of Egypt. Ptolemy respected the ancient civilization of Egypt, restored to her, as far as was consistent with the new order of things, her ancient forms; reinstated the priest caste in a portion of its former rights and privileges; renewed the division of the country into nomes; made Memphis the nominal capital, where the kings were crowned, and its temple, Phtha, the great national sanctuary.

¹ *Heeren's Ancient History*, 254-8; *Taylor*, 158, 159, 160.

The city of Alexandria was nevertheless the real capital of Egypt, and the history of Egypt from this period, so far as its civilization is concerned,¹ is but little more than the history of this city. During the most flourishing period of the Ptolemaic era, this great city was the centre of the world's commerce and science. It was the one narrow strait through which was passing the thought and commercial activity of the world, while everywhere else was commotion and bloodshed. The crowning work of the first Ptolemy, and that which most of all commends him to posterity, was the erection of the museum,² or college of philosophy.³ Teachers and professors were here supported out of the public income. The encouragement given here, made it the centre of attraction, and the science, literature and art of the world were here collected together. Here was laid the foundation of a great public library, which, however, was greatly increased under the son and successor of the first Ptolemy. The beneficial results flowing from the erections and institutions of the first Ptolemy were more manifest during the reign of his successor than his own.

Ptolemy Soter was succeeded by his son, Ptolemy Philadelphus, whose reign was still more undisturbed and peaceful than that of his father. During his reign the wealth and refinement of the Egyptians continued to increase, but unfortunately luxury, with all its attendant evils, also correspondingly increased. The king, too, readily adopted the habits of the eastern despots, became effeminate,⁴ and led the way in the forming of intermarriages between near relations. He repudiated his first wife and married his own sister Arsinoe. It is not at all surprising that such a custom led to the deterioration, and final destruction, of the race of the Ptolemies. During the reign of this Ptolemy Egypt entered into political relations with the Roman republic, which was then fast growing into importance.⁵ These relations were of a friendly character

¹ *Heeren*, 254. ² *Idem*, 259. ³ *Taylor*, 159. ⁴ *Idem*, 160. ⁵ *Idem*, 160.

as appear almost uniformly to have been those which always subsisted between the Egyptians and Romans.

On his death he was succeeded by Ptolemy, surnamed Euergetes, his son by his first wife. To a taste for the arts of peace, he added the possession of warlike propensities, and thirst for conquest. In his wars with Seleucus II, he carried his arms into Asia, even as far as Bactria. There was, however, no permanent acquisition of territory, and little gained except plunder. He also subdued a portion of the Arabian peninsula,¹ besides a greater part of ancient Ethiopia. With him ended the glory of the Ptolemies, B.C. 221. Egypt was fortunate in having had three great kings,² whose reigns altogether extended through a whole century.

The student of political history will derive little additional instruction from any further consideration of Egypt. The effeminate habits, luxurious enjoyments, cruelties, and family dissensions that make up the remaining history of the race of the Ptolemies, offer little to interest, to enlighten, or to instruct. In the last two thousand years, Egypt has presented nothing but a succession of servitudes, and even these have had little about them to interest, much less to attract or impart knowledge.

The long list of the Ptolemies finally found its termination in the celebrated Cleopatra, whose personal charms were as irresistible as the conquests effected by them were complete and satisfactory. The great Julius Cæsar was first smitten down by them. Mark Antony afterwards proved a more permanent conquest. When he fell before the rising fortunes of Augustus, she attempted to throw over the victor of Artium, the toils of her strange fascination. Here for the first time she found her arts unavailing, gave her arm to the asp, and fell a self-destroyer. On her death, B. C. 44, Egypt became a province of the Roman empire.

Egypt for some 670 years remained in the hands of the Romans.³ After the division of the great Roman empire,

¹ *Taylor*, 160. ² *Heeren*, 264. ³ *Cyclopædia Americana*, iv, 422.

in the time of Theodosius, into the western and eastern empires, Egypt became a province of the latter, and sunk deeper and deeper in barbarism and weakness. During all this period, however, from its immense fertility,¹ it was the granary of Rome and Byzantium.

On the rise of the Arabian power under the stimulus of the Mahometan faith, about the year A.D. 640,² Egypt fell a prey to the Saracens, their general, Amur, under the Caliph Omar, taking Alexandria, the capital, by assault. While a province of the caliphs, Egypt was under the government of the celebrated Abbasides³ — Harun-al-Raschid, and Al-Mamon, and that of the heroic Sultan Saladin.

About the year A.D. 1250, the Mamelukes, a band of Circassian slaves, who had been trained to war,⁴ drove the sultan, Muleh Al Salah, from the throne, and usurped the government. They attempted to perpetuate their power by purchasing Christian slaves, chiefly from Circassia, training them to the use of arms, placing them in garrisons, in different parts of the country to enforce obedience. These, termed Borghites, soon became more powerful than their proprietors; deposed them and assumed, in their turn, the government of Egypt. They preserved their authority upward of two hundred years. Under these formidable despots, the last shadow of former greatness and civilization disappeared.

Selim, sultan of the Turks in the year 1516, overcame the Mamelukes, and Egypt became a Turkish province.⁵ He, however, only abolished the monarchical form of government of the Mamelukes, allowing an aristocracy of twenty-four beys to remain, subjected to a stated tribute. In about two centuries and a half succeeding this period, Egypt was the theatre of divisions, feuds and internal wars between the Turkish authorities and Mameluke beys, the latter of whom at times, became virtually independent, especially under Ali Bey in 1766. The Turks regained a

¹ *Malte Brun*, IV, 63. ² *Cyclopædia Americana*, IV, 422. ³ *Idem*, IV, 422. ⁴ *Bell's Geography*, III, 299. ⁵ *Idem*, III, 299; *Malte Brun*, IV, 63.

partial possession under Hassan Pasha in 1786, but a state of intestine commotion prevailed until 1798, when the French under Bonaparte made themselves masters of the whole of Egypt, and abolished the Mameluke aristocracy. In 1801, the French were compelled to evacuate Egypt, and barbarism again returned. Perfidious assassinations and merciless massacres again signalized the contests between the Turkish government and the Mamelukes. Under the vigorous government of Mohammed Ali Pasha comparative order was restored, and a desire manifested for laying aside old prejudices, adopting European models for imitation, and reestablishing the kingdom of the Ptolemies.

Industry.

It has been before remarked that a part of the mission of the ancient Egyptians was to develop, to a great extent, that portion of the element of industry which is embraced in the pursuits of agriculture. It was fitting that agriculture should be the branch of industry the earliest developed. It was, therefore, rightly confided to the ancient Egyptians. Agricultural industry may be well regarded as lying at the foundation of all civilization. Its agency will be apparent from the following considerations :

1. It presupposes that men have fixed habitations; that they have passed the barrier of mere nomadic life; and that they have entered upon something that is permanent. They have acquired a certain stability, which the passions and caprices of the hour cannot shake.

2. It originates a more definite idea of property, and that of a different character from the personality. Hence it enlarges the sphere of ideas and adds variety.

3. It necessarily leads to the adoption of different legal principles from those that regulate the ownership, transfer and descent of personal property. It throws upon men the necessity of tasking their reason and ingenuity to devise new rules and principles to meet this exigency.

4. It no less necessarily tasks the genius and inventive powers of man, to call into existence all those principles in mathematical science which can run the lines, settle the boundaries and determine the quantity of real estate in a given lot or farm. It is essential that such rules shall be observed as will enable parties to identify the same piece of real estate.

5. It attaches men to the soil; adds a new element to human existence; opens new sources of sympathy; unseals new fountains of enjoyment, and inspires new feelings of patriotism; because, in truth, man cannot be said to have a country, until he commences the cultivation of one.

6. It furnishes more certainly and steadily the means of subsistence, and thus throws over the future a greater degree of moral certainty. It enables men better to appreciate futurity, to appropriate it; to bring it into their plans and purposes, and thus add it to their past and present.

7. It inures men to a regular systematic course of labor. This must have the effect to draw successively upon all their physical resources. It thus leads to a more perfect development of the muscular system, the enjoyment of better health, and gives a higher relish to all kinds of pleasures.

8. It tends to create in men, habits of regular application, and gives them perseverance and persistency of purpose. They are more likely to acquire regular methods of living, and also regularity in the employment of their time.

9. When regularly and systematically pursued, it almost invariably results in producing a surplus over and above that which is required for mere subsistence. This surplus is on hand for disposition, and leads, therefore, the most naturally, to embarking in commercial, and other industrial pursuits, such as will secure its distribution and consumption.

10. It cannot be successfully prosecuted without the aid of the mechanic arts, which furnish it with its instruments and implements. It, therefore, stimulates human inge-

nunity to devise and invent all these essential and necessary aids to its successful prosecution; hence agriculture can never long pursue its steady labors without awaking manufactures and commerce into life and activity.

From reflections like these it will be easy to perceive that agricultural industry may very naturally have been placed in the van of civilization. Egypt, of all other places on the globe, offered to man the greatest facilities and the highest inducements to embark in this kind of industry. Its soil was of surpassing fertility. It rewarded, with an almost boundless liberality, the labors of the agriculturist. The spontaneous productiveness of those portions over which the Nile rolled his waters, was on a scale so magnificent as to expel all doubt of success in further attempts to increase it. The valley of the Nile was, in ancient times, the garden of the world. Its supplies not only contributed to feed the Romans in the times of their highest glory, but afterwards became equally, if not more essential, to the sustenance of the people of Constantinople.

Egypt, too, was a country unique, peculiar, isolated; having few links that would naturally connect it with the rest of the world. Butting on the sea, and flanked by deserts, or mountain ranges that separated it from them, it stood forth alone, a smiling spot amid the eternal wastes that surrounded it.

It was in many other respects distinctive, and in none, perhaps, more so than in that which gave it its fertility. It looked not to the skies for its supplies of moisture, so essential to the life of its vegetation; but relied upon the periodical inundations of its bountiful river, which imparted to the soil its element of fertility. In its situation, soil, climate, means of fertility, and various physical relations, it seemed almost as peculiar and distinctive as if it had strayed from some other planet, and appeared here as the herald of a new order of things.

Its ancient inhabitants seem to have profited by the lesson their country taught them. They also had their peculiar and distinctive character. This was manifested in

nothing more strongly than in the strict lines of separation which they drew between themselves and all other people, and the consequent solitude and isolated condition in which the nation lived and labored, until its life was spent, and its labors ceased. Until some of the last years of the Pharaonic sway, the Egyptians kept themselves from the rest of the world. They made no permanent conquests, they permitted few commercial relations to spring up between themselves and other nations. They lived within themselves; were born, reared up, labored and died upon the banks of their slimy river. They were probably the first cultivators of the soil; the first to avail themselves of the aids of science in that cultivation; the first to establish gorgeous forms of religious worship; the first to uprear, on a gigantic scale, the wonderful productions of art; and they have bequeathed to us their monuments to demonstrate what human thought could devise, and human power execute; and have sent down to us their mummies to show that they possessed the one and could exercise the other.

The evidences of Egyptian development in the element of industry are derived principally from three sources. These are

1. The accounts of ancient writers: Herodotus, Diodorus, Manetho and others.

2. The actual remains still existing: lakes, canals, wells, dykes, tanks, monuments of various kinds.

3. The sculptures and paintings found upon the monuments, chiefly the palaces, temples and tombs, representing the various occupations of the Egyptians, and the industrial pursuits which they followed.

These proofs, differing from each other both in their nature, and in the sources whence they are derived; presenting to us their results independent of each other, thus enabling us to supply deficiencies, and to correct the one by the other or others; afford on the whole a very complete body of satisfactory evidence, and give us, in most cases, that assurance of certainty upon which the mind finds it so delightful to repose. Nor is it in the element of

industry alone, that these proofs, so various and complete, come to our aid. We rely on them, with an equal degree of confidence, to declare to us the extent and variety of Egyptian development in the other elements of humanity, and go to them as our teachers in the civilization of the ancient Egyptians.

Egyptian development in the element of industry, may be considered under the following heads :

1. The labors and scientific aids rendered and furnished in reference to the inundations of the Nile, with the view to retain and distribute its waters.
2. The agricultural industry of the Egyptians.
3. The industry of the shepherd.
4. The manufactures of the Egyptians.
5. Their commerce.
6. Their industry in the erection of buildings and monuments.

The ancient Egyptians were early indoctrinated into one branch of industry which was peculiar to them, and which, therefore, served to distinguish them from all other people. This branch had reference entirely to the annual inundation of the Nile. The Nilotic valley possessed its fertility subject to one condition, that its soil should be irrigated by the waters of its river. Whatever portions of it were overflowed by the ordinary natural rise of that river, or could be submerged by artificial means, were rendered extremely productive. The Nile was the great instrument of fertility; and, like all other instruments, the benefits it conferred must be dependent on the most judicious manner of using it. Hence the earliest development of thought among the Egyptians, was probably directed to the devising of means, agencies and instrumentalities by which two objects, that seemed almost equally desirable, could be effected, viz: the irrigation of the largest surface, and the retention of the waters for the longest period of time. It should be remarked in the first place, that the natural effect of the inundation, and deposit of mud and slime on the recession of the waters, would be the slow but gradual

rise of all those lands that were overflowed. Two other effects might be expected, the one that the parts highest up being first overflowed, would be the longest subjected to the inundating process, and would hence become the most raised; the other that the banks of the river, for the same reason, as also by reason of their greater cultivation, would be raised higher than those portions of country more remote. All these effects are to be observed in Egypt. The southern part of the Nilotic valley, near Syene, has been observed to have been raised about nine feet in 1700 years,¹ while at Thebes the rise has been about seven feet during the same period, and in a less degree still towards the Delta and the mouths of the Nile.

It is also remarked that in that part of Egypt lying to the south of the Delta, the banks of the Nile are so much more elevated than the land of the interior at a distance from the river, that they are seldom quite covered with water during the highest inundation.² These banks, therefore, serve as elevated roads, by which communication may be kept up by land between one village and another during an inundation. The early industry of the Egyptian is attested by the remarkable fact that prior to the historic era it was successfully directed to the effecting all those arrangements which were necessary to secure the greatest possible benefit from the inundations of the Nile. One of the most magnificent of the arrangements was the change effected in the river itself. Prior to the reign of Menes, it swept along the Lybian range of mountains,³ that is along the western margin of the Egyptian valley. A new channel was formed near the centre of the valley, along which its current was directed,⁴ in order that both sides might have the benefit of its inundation.

The devices by which the waters of the Nile, during an inundation, were distributed, retained, and sometimes again distributed, were a resort to canals, dykes, lakes,

¹ *Wilkinson's Manners and Customs*, I, 106. ² *Idem*, I, 106. ³ *Evbank's Hydraulics and Mechanics*, 86. ⁴ *Wilkinson's Manners and Customs*, I, 8.

and tanks. Artificial canals are scattered in great profusion over Egypt. Some of these are very large and of great extent. The Bahr Youssouf, or canal of Joseph,¹ supposed to have been commenced by Menes, and completed by Moeris, is a large canal running parallel with the Nile on its western side,² for a distance of over one hundred miles. This canal may have been originally a natural channel, and was subsequently enlarged by art, and was probably cut from the Nile, through the opening into the vale of Faioum, for the purpose of regulating the inundation. This canal terminates in the celebrated lake Moeris. The old writers, Herodotus and Diodorus, describe this as an immense artificial lake, the work of King Moeris.³ It is some thirty miles long by six broad, having a depth of three hundred feet. Its great magnitude must preclude the idea of its being altogether an artificial work, but it was probably originally a valley, having a deep gorge on its south-west part,⁴ the damming up of which transformed it into a lake. During the height of the inundation, the waters flowing through the canal of Joseph, would be received into this lake, which was sufficiently capacious to retain an immense quantity. They could not flow back again into the Nile, but might be made use of for the purpose of irrigation, whenever they were wanted. There is some controversy in relation to this lake. By many it has been taken to be the present *Birket el Keroun*. But that is obviously not artificial, but a natural lake. It has no utility, not even favoring the vegetation on its shores. It is, also, too deep to allow a drop of the water that flows into it to flow out again. A modern traveler, Linaut, has discovered mighty mile long dams, of ancient solid construction, which form the boundary between the upper part of the shell-formed convex basin of the Zagoum, and the more remote and less elevated portion. These he conceives could only be intended

¹ *Heeren's Reflections*, II, 74. ² *Egyptian Antiquities*, I, 53. ³ *Bell's*
y, III, 321. ⁴ *Heeren*, II, 75.

to contain an artificially constructed lake, which, however, now lies perfectly dry, the dams having long since been broken through. This he considers as lake Moeris. This view is the one now the more generally adopted. The construction of it was the conversion of a natural swampy lake into an original basin, which was effected by bringing into it the arm of the Nile, and the erection of dams and sluices for that purpose. This is supposed to have been the work of *Amenemha* IV, of the twelfth dynasty, the term *Moeris*, having been given to that king by the Greeks from *mere*, the water that formed the lake. Besides this canal there was one connecting the Nile with the Red sea, a distance of about seventy-five miles, commenced by *Sesostris*, continued by *Psammetichus* II, and completed by *Darius*. This was probably originally designed for the purpose of commerce, but is now made use of for irrigation.¹

The canals in Egypt appropriated to the distribution of the waters of the river to the different parts of the country are very numerous.² Travelers disagree very much in regard to their number. One gives six thousand as the number in Upper Egypt alone.³ Another enumerates only ninety large canals, viz.: forty in Upper Egypt, twenty-eight in the Delta, eleven in the eastern, and thirteen in the western provinces.⁴ This discrepancy probably arises from one including all the ramifications and branches, and the other limiting his enumeration to the large ones that are regularly kept up. It must be obvious, however, that the number is very considerable.

These canals were made use of to convey the waters of the river into different parts of the country. When the waters attained a certain fixed height, the dam of earth which separated the bed of the canal from the Nile was cut away, and thus the waters were introduced into the interior.⁵ This was allegorically construed into the union

¹ *Wilkinson*, 320. ² *Malte Brun*, IV, 33. ³ *Bell*, III, 321. ⁴ *Malte Brun*, IV, 33. ⁵ *Wilkinson's Manners and Customs*, I, 8, 9.

of Osiris and Isis, and was celebrated throughout Egypt with grand festivities.

These canals were not opened all at once. They commenced with Upper Egypt, and descended the Nile.¹ Having introduced the waters into the interior, the next object was to retain them as long as possible, and husband them in the best possible manner. They were retained principally in large tanks constructed for the purpose, in lakes made to receive them, or by means of dykes or mounds of earth, confining them within certain portions of country. The object of the first was to retain the waters for the purposes of bathing and culinary use,² and remains of them are generally found in the vicinity of temples and public buildings. The second was to receive and retain the surplus, and the drainage from higher grounds; while by means of the dykes the waters might be retained upon higher grounds so as to equalize the benefits conferred by the inundation. From the lakes, and often from the dykes, sluice-ways were constructed, by which, after the general recession, these waters could be drawn off and made to irrigate lower portions of country.³ Thus was realized, as far as possible, the idea of retaining in Egypt all the waters which overflowed the banks of the Nile, or were conducted from it by canals; first retaining them on the higher grounds, then conducting them by sluices on to the lower, and thus using them entirely up in successively irrigating different parts of the country. So effectually has this system been carried out, and so great is the evaporation caused by the intense heat of the sun, that of all the waters which flow into Egypt during the months of June, July and August, it has been estimated that not a tenth part reaches the sea.⁴

Another means resorted to for the purpose of insuring supplies of water in Egypt was the digging of wells. One of these, in particular, called Joseph's well, at Cairo, is a

¹ *Rollin*, I, 5. ² *Egyptian Antiquities*, II, 150. ³ *Wilkinson's Manners and Customs*, I, 7, 8. ⁴ *Rollin*, I, 5.

great curiosity.¹ It was hewn in the solid rock by the ancient Egyptians, in this respect resembling the tanks on the hill behind the citadel of Cairo.² It consists of two parts, the upper and lower well, and a winding staircase leads to the bottom, a depth of about two hundred and sixty feet. The ancient Egyptians irrigated the borders of the desert above the reach of the Nile's inundations, from wells which they dug for that purpose.³ They also made use of spiral pumps which were turned by oxen in order to bring the water into pipes, by means of which it was conveyed to these elevated lands.⁴ It was in reference to these various means and instrumentalities by which the waters of the Nile were distributed over Egypt, that agriculture amongst them was defined to consist chiefly "in having suitable machines for raising water."⁵

2. The agricultural industry of the Egyptians. A people who were so early capable of directing their industry to the right management of an agent, like the Nile, so powerful in bestowing the elements of fertility upon the soil of Egypt, could not do otherwise than successfully prosecute the labors of agriculture. The sources of evidence in relation to Egyptian agriculture are principally two, viz: the accounts of ancient authors, and the sculptures and paintings upon the monuments. From what has been already said it will be apparent that as the fertility of the Egyptian soil depended upon irrigation, so the labors of agriculture would be confined to the portions irrigated.⁶ There were also other peculiarities attending Egyptian agriculture. It was limited as to times and seasons, as well as to space. During the Nile's inundation the labors of agriculture were suspended. For some time immediately previous, the soil, parched up and full of chasms from the effect of the sun's heat, offered no inducement to labor. For a considerable period of time, therefore, during each

¹ *Wilkinson's Thebes*, 306. ² *Evbank's Hydraulics, etc.*, 45-7. ³ *Idem*, 28.
⁴ *Rollin*, I, 5. ⁵ *Evbank*, 69. ⁶ *Heeren*, II, 344.

year, Egyptian agriculture rested from its labors. In the time intervening between sowing and reaping, labor was seldom if ever required. There were very few weeds in Egypt. These long intervals of leisure undoubtedly exerted an influence upon the character of the people. The occupation of the husbandman depended considerably upon the kind of crop he had determined to rear.¹ If it was wheat, he had little more to do after the sowing, than to await the time of harvest. But many other crops stood in need of more attention, and some required frequent artificial irrigation. The wheat crop was sown in November, and reaped in the beginning of April; most of the other crops were earlier reaped. The following were the principal productions grown by the ancient Egyptians; Wheat, barley, doora, peas, beans, lentils, hommos, gilban, carthamus, lupins, bamia, simsim, indigo,² sinapis or mustard, origanum, succory, flax, cotton, cassia, senna, colocnth, cummin, coriander, cucumbers, melons, leeks, onions, garlic, lotus, nelumbium, cyperus esculentus, and and papyrus. Many of these were wild plants.

The labors of the husbandman commenced with the recession of the waters. When the levels were low, and the waters had remained a long time on the land,³ all that was generally necessary was to break the ground with hoes, or drag the moist mud with bushes, or a kind of harrow, to prepare it for sowing the seed. There never was any system of manuring practiced in Egypt. It was unnecessary. The seed was thrown upon the surface, and cattle, asses, pigs, sheep or goats drove over the field to tread in the grain.

Where the soil had a greater degree of consistence, having been less exposed to the action of the overflowing Nile,⁴ they made use of the plough, tracing with it very slight furrows on the surface of the land. These were but a few inches in depth. When the soil possessed much tenacity, the plough was followed by laborers with wooden

¹ *Wilkinson*, I, 52, 53. ² *Idem*, I, 61, 62. ³ *Idem*, 39. ⁴ *Idem*, 41.

hoes to break the clods. The plough made use of by the ancient Egyptians was entirely of wood, and very simple in its structure.¹ It consisted of a share, two handles, and a pole or beam. It had no coulter, no wheels. The point was probably shod with a metal sock, either of bronze or iron. It was drawn by two oxen, the ploughman guiding and driving them with a goad, without reins. Sometimes the plough was held by one, and the animals driven by another.

The yoke was made of wood, and was a cross-bar some five feet in length, fastened by a strap lashed backwards and forwards over a prominence projecting from its centre, to the pole of the plough, which, at its end, had a corresponding peg or knob.² The ends were generally so constructed as to make the draught from the shoulder of the animal, but it was sometimes from the head, the yoke being tied to the base of the horns.

The hoe was of wood, and in form very much resembled the letter A,³ one limb being shorter than the other, and curving inwards. The longer limb was the handle, which was bound to the blade part with a twisted rope about the centre. There seems to have been no authenticated instance in which they had metal blades, and the sheathing the ploughshare with metal does not appear to rest on sufficient proof. The Egyptian axe had a metal blade, either bronze or iron, most probably the former.

The seed was generally brought in a basket which the sower held in his left hand, or suspended from his arm while he scattered the seed with his right.⁴ He is often represented as following the plough.

The agricultural scenes on the monuments represent the manner of sowing as broadcast, the seed being scattered loosely over the surface,⁵ whether it had been ploughed or remained unbroken. Neither harrow, as now made, nor rake seem to have been known in Egypt, nor did they use

¹ *Wilkinson's Manners and Customs*, 41 42. ² *Idem*, 43. ³ *Idem*, 45. ⁴ *Idem*, 47. ⁵ *Idem*, 1, 49.

the spade. In regard to the exact period when the seed was put into the ground,¹ as well as the length of time each crop took to come to maturity, much depended on the duration of the inundation, state of the soil, and other circumstances.

The diet of the ancient Egyptians partook largely of vegetable ingredients,² and herbs and esculent roots were cultivated by them in great abundance. Among these there were three kinds of lotus in the low lands of the Delta,³ which afforded, during the inundation, a gratuitous aliment to the peasants. The lotus has, from the earliest times, been celebrated in Egypt. It is found in low, marshy places, particularly in Lower Egypt or the Delta. The seeds of two out of the three kinds, viz: the nymphæa and cœrulea, were pounded and formed into cakes, which, being baked, served for bread. Their roots were eaten either crude, baked or boiled. The nymphæa nelumbo, or faba Ægyptaica was the third kind, the fruit and roots of which served as an article of food to those who lived in the vicinity of the marshes. The byblus, from which was manufactured the papyrus,⁴ was also an esculent plant which served for food.⁵ Neither this nor the lotus was found in the Nile itself, but in the marshes and lakes during an inundation.

In regard to the trees of ancient Egypt,⁶ the paintings in the tombs represent the date, clove, sycamore, pomegranate, perseæ, tamarisk and periflora secamone. The fruit, seeds, or leaves of the nebk, vine, fig, olive, mokhayt, kharoob or locust tree, palma christi, or cici, sont or acanthus, bay and egleeg or balanites have been found in the tombs of Thebes.

Egypt never abounded in woods or forests.⁷ Some sycamores and tamarisks are found there,⁸ and the ancient perseæ or sacred tree occurs on the monuments.

¹Wilkinson's *Manners and Customs*, 58. ²*Idem*, 59. ³Wilkinson's *Thebes*, 205. ⁴*Idem*, 206, 207. ⁵Heeren, II, 349. ⁶Wilkinson, I, 76. ⁷*Idem*, 79. ⁸Heeren, II, 351.

The sculptures represent various flowers,¹ some of which may still be recognized, and many flowers and shrubs were grown in pots or wooden boxes, in the gardens, or the walks near the houses of the ancient Egyptians. In the gardens were also raised bees, which were kept in hives very similar to what they are at present.

Gardening formed a part of the industrial occupations of the ancient Egyptians. Their garden was divided into the vineyard, orchard, date and clove grove.² Besides these, they had their flower garden, intersected by walks, shaded with rows of various trees, trimmed into a rounded form. The vineyard was an object of great care and solicitude. It was watered by the pole and bucket,³ or by pails filled from the tank, and carried by a yoke on the shoulders of men. The wine press was of two kinds: the one consisted of a large trough, in which the grapes were pressed by the feet; the other was a machine composed of levers,⁴ twisting and compressing a sack which contained the fruit; the juice in both discharging itself into a vase beneath. Wine was universally used by the rich throughout Upper and Lower Egypt, as the process of its manufacture is found represented in the tombs from the pyramids to the extremity of Upper Egypt. They also manufactured barley into beer, which was used pretty extensively in Egypt, especially among the common people.⁵

Barley and wheat were extensively cultivated in every part of Egypt. The first was cut in four and the other in about five months.⁶ The wheat crop claimed particularly the attention of the ancient Egyptians. The wheat was of the bearded kind. It was cut a very little below the ear, with a toothed sickle, and carried to the threshing floor in wicker baskets upon asses, or in rope nets, the gleaners following to collect the fallen ears in hand baskets. The rope net was borne on a pole by two men. The threshing floor was a circular area,⁷ near the field, or

¹ *Wilkinson*, I, 80, 81. ² *Idem*, 202. ³ *Idem*, 202. ⁴ *Idem*, 203. ⁵ *Idem*, 204. ⁶ *Idem*, I, 85. ⁷ *Idem*, I, 88.

granary, which was first well swept, after which the wheat was deposited, and then cattle were driven over it to tread out the grain. While thus occupied, the peasant was accustomed to chant a song, which has been discovered in hieroglyphics by Champollion le Jeune, and by him translated,¹ and which reads as follows :

Tread ye out for yourselves,
Tread ye out for yourselves
 O oxen.
Tread ye out for yourselves,
Tread ye out for yourselves
 the straw ;
For men, who are your masters,
 the grain.

Or paraphrased :

Hie along oxen ! tread the corn faster,
The straw for yourselves, the grain for your master.

The singing of this song was of a date prior to B. C. 1500.

After the grain was thus trodden out,² they winnowed it with wooden shovels. It was then carried to the granary in sacks, a scribe noting down the number as called by the teller, who superintended its removal.

It was not the usual custom of the Egyptians to bind up the wheat when cut into sheaves,³ but they put it loose into baskets, or rope nets, in which they carried it to the threshing floor. The stubble was afterwards collected from the field, and served as provender to feed the horses and cattle. The wheat crop was not the only one the soil was capable of producing during a season.⁴ That crop having been first gathered, their business was to prepare the land for whatever produce they next intended to rear. For this purpose the field was sometimes inundated by

¹ *Gliddon*, 28. ² *Wilkinson's Manners and Customs*, I, 91. ³ *Idem*,
⁴ *Idem*, 96.

artificial means, ploughed and sowed. The same was repeated as often as they raised successive crops. In many instances, instead of wheat they reared clover, or leguminous herbs, which were sown as soon as the water began to subside, which was generally about the commencement of October. The principles that guided the ancient Egyptians in their choice of crops to be reared, were the advantages obtainable from certain kinds of produce,¹ the time required for their succession, or the benefit resulting to the land from the effects of change. The great principle of rotation in crops seems not to have been lost sight of by the Egyptians.

The wheat crop is not the only one found represented by the paintings on the tombs. The doora crop is also there represented. This was not reaped by a sickle like wheat and barley, but was plucked up by the roots by men and sometimes by women. The earth adhering to the roots was then struck off with their hands, after which it was bound in sheaves and carried to the threshing floor, where the grain was stripped off by its being drawn through an instrument armed at the summit with metal spikes.²

Flax was extensively cultivated in Egypt, and the various processes of watering it,³ beating the stalks when gathered, making it into twine, and also into cloth are all represented in the paintings.

3. The industry of the shepherd.

The rearing of animals formed an important part of the occupations of the Egyptian peasantry.⁴ It seems highly probable that parts of Egypt, peculiarly adapted for pasture, were inhabited by large bodies of native shepherds,⁵ whose sole occupation was the rearing of flocks and herds. Besides these, however, the rich proprietors of land among the ancient Egyptians possessed generally large flocks of sheep and goats, and herds of cattle, which were reared

¹ *Wilkinson's Manners and Customs*, 97. ² *Idem*, 98. ³ *Idem*, 98. ⁴ *Idem*, 125. ⁵ *Idem*, 127.

with great care on their estates. Great attention was also bestowed on the breed of horses, asses and other beasts of burden.¹ The care of rearing these flocks and herds, and of bestowing this attention, was confided to a particular class of men.² These were the pastors, shepherds, swineherds, a class held in extreme disrepute by the ancient Egyptians, probably for two reasons, one growing out of the nature of their occupation, the other derived from the feeling existing against them by the remembrance of cruelties exercised upon their country during the reign of the Hyksos or shepherd kings. The swineherds in particular were regarded with abhorrence. It was those who had the immediate care of the flocks and herds upon whom these social evils rested. To show the contempt in which they were held, the Egyptian artists often exercised their ingenuity in representing them lame, deformed, dirty, unshaven, or exhibiting some ludicrous appearance. The condition of this class or caste was extremely humble. They lived in sheds made of reeds,³ which could be easily moved from one place to another as occasion might require.

These tenders of the flocks and herds were in general overlooked by other persons connected with the estate. The cultivator of the land was responsible for their proper maintenance,⁴ and for rendering an account of the quantity of food they consumed. He attended at stated times, to report to the scribes belonging to the estate, and by them it was submitted to the steward. The steward was responsible to the owner of the estate. The choice of the shepherds or tenders of the herds and flock was confided to the steward. The cattle were brought into a court attached to the steward's house, or into a farm yard, and counted by the superintendent in the presence of the scribes. Any attempt at the perpetration of a fraud was generally detected, and the bastinado administered as a corrective. An account of the geese and other fowl was

¹ *Wilkinson's Manners and Customs*, 125. ² *Idem*, 125-6. ³ *Idem*, 127.

⁴ *Idem*, 1, 127.

also brought to the steward at the same time. Everything of any importance in Egypt was reduced to writing.¹ All bargains made between private individuals, as well as those of public interest, were in a condition to be proved by the production of the written document.

The religion of Egypt undoubtedly exercised considerable influence on the rearing of cattle, sheep and goats;² as animal worship prevailed more or less extensively among its people. The domestic animal the most generally held sacred, and therefore protected from destruction, was the cow, which, for that reason, could be raised in greater numbers. The bull Apis was an object of worship, but that applied only to a single beast. The sheep in some nomes was sacred, and in others the goat. Great care was bestowed by the Egyptian shepherd on the rearing of sheep.³ They were twice shorn, and twice brought forth lambs in the course of a year. Swine were held altogether unclean throughout all Egypt.⁴ The ox was used both for food and labor. The breeding of horses was common in Egypt, so much so that they formed an article of trade with foreign nations. They do not seem to have been used for riding, or in the operations of husbandry, but for carriages, both in peace and war. Great industry and no small ingenuity was exercised by the Egyptians in the rearing of fowls and geese.⁵ They had a method, which is still practiced in Egypt, of hatching eggs by the application of heat, by which they were enabled to multiply fowls to almost any extent.

4. The industry of the mechanic or manufacturer. The sources of evidence in reference to this branch of industry are the same as the last, excepting, perhaps, that the sculptures and paintings on the monuments, particularly the tombs, are more explicit and satisfactory.⁶ It is evi-

¹ *Wilkinson's Manners and Customs*, I, 132. ² *Heeren's Reflections*, II, 351.

³ *Wilkinson*, I, 138. ⁴ *Heeren*, II, 352. ⁵ *Wilkinson*, I, 133; *Wilkinson's Thebes*, 245, 246. ⁶ *Heeren's Reflections*, II, 355.

dent from these that many of the useful, industrial arts were carried to great perfection in ancient Egypt.

The working in metals and the fabrication of glass are both important to be considered. When a nation has made considerable progress¹ in the working of one for domestic use, and the manufacture of the other for purposes of convenience and ornament, it may be safely assumed that the useful arts, in general, have attained a high degree of perfection.² The metallurgic arts in Egypt are certainly of a very ancient date. In the mountainous range, running between the Nile and Red sea, mines of gold, copper, iron, and lead were worked at a very early date. The gold leaf, frequently found about the mummy cases of high antiquity, proves not only the early supply of that metal, but also an acquaintance with the art of gilding. Some of these ancient mines seem to have been worked before the use of iron was discovered, as we still find copper chisels or implements in the galleries, and also skeletons of the wretched beings who lost their lives in the passages of the mine.

Copper was in frequent use in Egypt, as it supplied a material for paint and for other domestic uses. This metal, hardened by an alloy of tin, thus constituting what was termed bronze,³ was used for the construction of arms, vases, statues, instruments and implements of various kinds, articles of furniture, and even chisels for cutting stone, as well as carpenter's tools and knives. This bronze, or compound of copper and tin, was probably known and in use long before the discovery of iron. It does not seem now possible to determine when iron first came into use. It is perhaps more universally diffused over the world than any other metal, but is less easily recognized in its crude state than almost any other, and there is great difficulty in working it. But its great utility, especially when hardened and modified in the form of steel, might have prompted its early discovery, and would have led to its general use when discovered.

¹ *Egyptian Antiquities*, II, 320. ² *Idem*, 321. ³ *Wilkinson*, III, 241.

The blue color of the blades of butcher's knives, as represented in the sepulchres of Thebes, and also the distinction maintained between the bronze and steel weapons in the tomb of Rameses III,¹ about B.C. 1565, the one being painted red and the other blue, leave little doubt but that the use of iron was known at a very early period in Egypt.

The perfection of the sculptures upon the granitic monuments of Egypt seems of difficult attainment without the use of highly tempered steel instruments.² It is pretty certain, however, that bronze chisels were made use of not only for sculpturing, but also for working stone in the quarries. How they were rendered fit for such use is now a very great puzzle. We are acquainted with no means of tempering copper under any form,³ or united with any alloy, that will make it sufficiently hard for that purpose, without at the same time, rendering it brittle. Whether they sheathed the point with steel or with some other metal, or possessed a secret of hardening or tempering bronze that we are unacquainted with, we know not. They certainly possessed great skill in compounding metals, as appears by the vases, mirrors, arms, and implements of bronze,⁴ discovered at Thebes and other parts of Egypt; and they could also, by the admixture of alloys, vary the composition of bronze. They could even give to bronze or brass blades a certain degree of elasticity.

The success of the Egyptians in the management of different alloys is evidence of the skill they early possessed in the working of metals.⁵ The use of gold for jewelry and articles of luxury, dates from remote ages. Golden ornaments, rings, bracelets, armlets, necklaces, earrings, and other trinkets, of the times of the Pharaohs, who were the contemporaries of Moses and of Joseph, are found in Egypt.⁶

The tombs at Beni-Hassan were constructed about six hundred years after the era usually attributed to the deluge,

¹ *Wilkinson*, III, 247. ² *Idem*, 249. ³ *Idem*, 252. ⁴ *Idem*, 253. ⁵ *Idem*, 220. ⁶ *Idem*, 225.

and in them are found represented many of the arts and manners of a highly civilized people.¹ Among other things there are to be seen the process of washing the ore; that of smelting or fusing the metal by the aid of the blow-pipe;² the fashioning it for ornamental purposes, the weighing it and taking an account of the quantity so made up, and various other occupations of the goldsmith.

The art or process of soldering metals was early known in Egypt. Gold and bronze vases soldered are found represented at Thebes in sculptures executed during the reign of Thothmes III, some 1490 years B. C.

The great ductility of gold early led to its being drawn out into thin plates, and to the process of gilding. That this process was known in Egypt during the sojourn of the Israelites³ is evident from the mention made of it in the Bible, in the fact that Moses overlaid the ark with pure gold. Various substances in Egypt are found which were overlaid with fine gold leaf, at the earliest periods even in the time of Osirtasen I, B. C. 2186.

The working of the mines was carried on principally by captives taken in war, and men condemned to that occupation, in consequence of some crime or of offenses committed against government.⁴ They were bound in fetters, obliged to work day and night, and cut off from all hope of escape by the vigilance of guards. The manufacture of glass was carried on in Egypt as early as the first Osirtasen,⁵ the date of whose reign according to some is 1740,⁶ according to others 2186 years B. C.⁷ The different operations of glass blowing are distinctly represented in the paintings of Beni-Hassan,⁸ executed during the reign of that monarch, and his immediate successors. They are also represented in the paintings of tombs in other parts of Egypt, and of various epochs. Images of glazed pottery were common at the same period,⁹ and glass ornaments were made shortly after. Many glass bottles and

¹ *Wilkinson*, 261. ² *Idem*, 226. ³ *Idem*, 234, 235. ⁴ *Idem*, 230. ⁵ *Idem*, 88. ⁶ *Idem*, 43. ⁷ *Gliddon*, 64. ⁸ *Wilkinson*, III, 88, 89. ⁹ *Idem*, III, 89, 90.

glass objects of various forms have been found in the tombs of Upper and Lower Egypt, and in the Theban paintings are represented glass vases used for holding wine as early at least as the exodus of the Hebrews.¹ The Egyptians had also the art of staining glass of various hues,² so that they counterfeited with success the amethyst and other precious stones. This is sufficiently proved by the fragments found in the tombs at Thebes.³ The principal use to which glass was applied was for the manufacture of bugles and beads which were much used for necklaces,⁴ and also in the making of bottles, vases, and other utensils. It seems never to have been used for windows.⁵

The ancient Egyptians also manufactured porcelain, which might be termed glass porcelain, and was generally of one homogeneous quality or hue,⁶ either blue or green, traversed in every direction by lines or devices of other colors, such as red, white, yellow, black, green, light or dark blue, and these were not always confined to the surface, like the Chinese, but would frequently penetrate considerably into the fused substance. They must have been acquainted with metallic oxides, and even with the influence of acids upon color.⁷ They early cast glass in a mould, and were acquainted with the art of cutting it, in the time of the eighteenth dynasty, as is evident from the hieroglyphics and other devices found engraved upon vases and beads.⁸

The manufacture of cloth has always possessed an interest corresponding to its importance, in all countries. The products of the loom are among the early specimens of Egyptian industry.⁹ Fine linen, embroidered work, yarn and woolen stuffs are frequently mentioned, and were highly esteemed. The woolen garments were principally in use among the lower orders. Immense quantities of

¹ *Wilkinson*, III, 91. ² *Idem*, III, 93. ³ *Idem*, 99. ⁴ *Idem*, III, 101, 102. ⁵ *Idem*, 92. ⁶ *Idem*, III, 103. ⁷ *Idem*, III, 104. ⁸ *Idem*, III, 104, 105. ⁹ *Idem*, III, 113-4.

linen were manufactured.¹ Not only were articles of dress composed very frequently of linen, but it was also extensively used for mummy envelopes. Cotton cloth was manufactured in Egypt, and cotton garments were worn by all classes,² but it seems to have been much less frequently used for mummy envelopes than was formerly supposed. It was also made use of for coverings of chairs and couches, and various other purposes. Colored dresses are represented in the Egyptian paintings, as worn by women of rank and by the deities.³ These, in the style of their patterns, much resemble our modern chintzes, but were generally of linen instead of calico.

The method of spinning yarn among the Egyptians was entirely by the hand, as the spindle is always found in the pictures representing the manufacture of cloth.⁴ Spinning appears to have been principally the occupation of the women, but was sometimes followed by men, as was also the working of the loom.

The spindles were generally about one foot and three inches in length, and made of wood.⁵ The loom was of rude construction and sometimes horizontal. The woof, instead of being pushed upwards, as generally practiced by other nations, was pressed down by the Egyptians.⁶ The carpets of the Egyptians were manufactured out of wool.⁷

The ancient Egyptians manufactured paper out of papyrus,⁸ a plant which grew mostly in the marshy grounds of Lower Egypt. The interior of the stalk was first cut into thin slices in the direction of their length, which being laid upon a flat board, similar slices were placed over them at right angles, their surfaces being cemented together with a kind of glue.⁹ They were then subjected to pressure and dried.¹⁰ Paper, thus manufactured, was used in the remotest periods; and a similar mode of

¹ *Wilkinson*, III, 114. ² *Idem*, III, 116. ³ *Idem*, III, 130. ⁴ *Idem*, III, 133. ⁵ *Idem*, III, 136. ⁶ *Idem*, III, 134. ⁷ *Idem*, III, 141. ⁸ *Idem*, III, 146. ⁹ *Idem*, III, 148. ¹⁰ *Idem*, III, 150.

writing on them appears from the sculptures to have been common in the age of Suphis or Cheops, the builder of the great pyramid. It continued in occasional use to the end of the seventh century, when it was superseded by parchment, which had been invented some 250 years B. C. by Eumenes, king of Pergamus.¹

Another branch of manufacture carried on by the ancient Egyptians, was the tanning and preparation of leather,² the cutting and applying it to various uses or purposes. Many of the occupations growing out of this art, are portrayed on the painted walls of the tombs at Thebes. They made shoes, sandals, coverings and seats of chairs and sofas, bow-cases, harps, shields, and much ornamental furniture of the chariot.

The process of curing the skins is, in part, introduced in the sculptures,³ and the fact of dyeing them is mentioned in Exodus, xxv, 5, besides appearing from the sculptures. The mode of stretching, or bending the leather over a form is often represented at Thebes, and it is matter of no little curiosity that the very semicircular knife used by the ancient Egyptians nearly four thousand years ago,⁴ was precisely similar to that used by our modern curriers.

In the shop of the shoemaker, or currier were to be found the semicircular knife, a sort of chisel, the common awl,⁵ a stone for polishing leather, the cutting table, the bending form, the horn, and a few other utensils. For tanning they used the pods of the acacia, which was cultivated in many parts of Egypt.⁶

The occupations of the fuller are very clearly portrayed in the sculptures and paintings,⁷ but those who were engaged in those occupations form probably only a subdivision of the dyers. The art of dyeing made great progress among the ancient Egyptians. Various colors, white, yellow, red, blue, green and black, are met with in great perfection.⁸ The material made use of for dyeing is not so

¹ *Wilkinson*, III, 151. ² *Idem*, 155. ³ *Idem*, 156. ⁴ *Idem*, 157. ⁵ *Idem*, 158. ⁶ *Idem*, 162. ⁷ *Idem*, 162. ⁸ *Heeren*, II, 358.

clearly ascertained, or whether it was indigenous to Egypt, or imported. There is little doubt, but that indigo was known and made use of by them.¹

Another class of occupations frequently found represented in Egypt, embrace the business of the potter. All the various processes of mixing the clay,² and of turning, baking and polishing the vases are portrayed in the tombs of Thebes and Beni-Hassan. They kneaded the clay with their feet, and then formed it into masses of convenient size with the hand, and placed it on the wheel. The invention of the potter's wheel is of unknown antiquity. It meets us at the earliest epoch of Egyptian history, of which the sculptures have been preserved, and must have been known and used prior to the arrival of Joseph in Egypt.³

Another numerous class of operatives were the carpenters and cabinet makers.⁴ The tools they are represented on the sculptures and paintings as having employed were the axe, adz, hand-saw, chisels, drill, planes, one of which acted as a rasp, ruler, plummet, right angle, leather bag containing nails, a hone, and horn of oil.⁵

Egypt was little productive of wood. Except the date and dom palms,⁶ the sycamore, tamarisk, and acacias, there were few trees of native growth, affording timber either for building or ornamental purposes. For boxes, coffins, tables, doors, and such like objects, they used the sycamore, which was extensively cultivated;⁷ for the handles of tools, wooden shoes, and other things requiring a hard, compact wood, the tamarisk; for planks and masts of boats, handles of offensive weapons of war, and various articles of furniture, the acacia, of which large groves were cultivated in Egypt.

They also imported foreign woods principally for ornamental purposes. Cedar and deal were obtained from Syria, ebony and other rare woods from Ethiopia and Asia.

¹ *Wilkinson*, III, 124. ² *Idem*, 163. ³ *Idem*, 165. ⁴ *Idem*, 167. ⁵ *Idem*, 169. ⁶ *Idem*, 167. ⁷ *Idem*, 168.

Boxes, chairs, tables, sofas, and other articles of furniture, were frequently made of ebony, inlaid with ivory.¹

In the earliest Pharaonic ages they practiced the art of dovetailing,² and also the mode of applying two planks together in the same plane, by means of broad pins, or tongues of hard wood.

The adze seems to have been the principal tool they employed in fashioning the wood after its reduction to a proper size by the saw.³ The blades of their instruments were generally of bronze. They had no double saw, and cut every piece of wood, however large, single handed.⁴ The practice of veneering, as appears from the sculptures of Thebes, was as early as the third Thothmes, supposed to have been the Pharaoh of the exodus.⁵ The invention of glue is clearly of a date more than 3,300 years ago.

Besides carpenters and cabinet makers, there were also wheelwrights and coopers, showing a division of labor consistent only with a considerably advanced civilization.⁶ The Egyptian chariot was made of wood, and had only two wheels. It was drawn by horses. The plaustrum, or traveling car, was somewhat similar to it in its construction, lighter, and drawn by a pair of oxen.⁷

The builders of boats were either carpenters or basket makers,⁸ who were weavers of rushes and osiers. The latter class made a light sort of canoe, used principally for fishing, which consisted merely of water plants or osiers, bound together with bands of a species of papyrus, not, however, the kind used in the manufacture of paper.

The boats of burden were made of a thorn wood,⁹ similar to the lotus of Cyrene, from which they cut planks with saws and hatchets, and afterwards fastened them together with nails and pins,¹⁰ and these were furnished with spacious cabins. These boats of burden appear from the sculptures to have been in use at the era of the first Osirtasen, the supposed contemporary of Joseph,¹¹ and in the tombs near

¹ *Wilkinson*, 169. ² *Idem*, 170. ³ *Idem*, 171. ⁴ *Idem*, 172. ⁵ *Idem*, 173. ⁶ *Idem*, 178. ⁷ *Idem*, 179. ⁸ *Idem*, 184. ⁹ *Idem*, 187. ¹⁰ *Idem*, 187-9. ¹¹ *Idem*, 191.

the pyramids, they occur of an epoch prior to the sixteenth dynasty.

Their boats had either one or two rudders at the stern.¹ The oars were long, round, wooden shafts, to which was fastened a flat board of oval or circular form. They were built with ribs like those of the present day. The sails appear to have been always square,² with a yard above and below. The cabins were lofty and spacious, and occupied the centre, the rowers sitting on either side.³

There was still another style of vessel, the galley or ship of war. Through the whole length of these was constructed a wooden bulwark, rising considerably above the gunnel, which sheltered the rowers from the missiles of the enemy.⁴ Some of them were of great size. One of cedar wood, dedicated by Sesostris to the god of Thebes, was four hundred and twenty feet long. Many of the sails were painted with rich colors, or embroidered with fanciful devices. Some were adorned with cheques and others were striped; when necessary they could be easily reefed by means of ropes running in pulleys or loops upon the yard.

5. The industry of the ancient Egyptians as developed in the pursuits of commerce. The successful prosecution of commercial pursuits is always more or less dependent upon certain conditions. A large navigable river, running through a country of great fertility, is a condition essential to a lively home trade; while a location on a sea coast indented with numerous harbors, is equally necessary for foreign commerce. Thus nature herself affords clear indications of a nation's destiny, so far as relates to a large portion of its industrial pursuits. In accordance with these indications, Egypt should be the home of internal trade; Phœnicia, of foreign commerce. To the one belonged the river Nile, with its five hundred miles of unbroken navigation through a country unsurpassed in

¹ *Wilkinson*, 198. ² *Idem*, 199. ³ *Idem*, 200. ⁴ *Idem*, 211.

fertility; to the other, the eastern coast of the Mediterranean, with its multitude of bays and harbors. Neither people seem to have been unmindful of nature's indications. Internal commerce is more the work of the nation itself than that which is foreign. It grows with its growth, strengthens with its strength, and declines with its waning energies. It may, therefore, be well regarded as a true barometer of its industrial prosperity.

The ships of burden first used for transportation and commercial purposes were mere rafts,¹ made of the trunks of trees bound together, over which planks were fastened. Ships, as we have already seen, were early invented, but the raft continued, nevertheless, to be used for the carriage of goods long afterwards.

The river Nile was not the only avenue through which might be successfully prosecuted the home trade. As already remarked, there were multitudes of canals in Egypt, especially on the western side of the Nile,² which afforded innumerable facilities for carrying on internal exchanges of commodities. During the annual overflow, much of the intercourse between the Egyptians was carried on in boats. The early commercial pursuits of the Egyptians were doubtless all, or nearly all, summed up in their home trade. They were a people who cared to have little intercourse with foreigners. Indeed,³ those who were the pioneers in foreign commerce, especially on the coasts of the Mediterranean, were little less than pirates; who, while they affected to exchange commodities, kidnapped men and women to sell for slaves. There was, besides, much difficulty in procuring wood fit for building vessels for the sea. We are ignorant where the early Pharaohs obtained it.⁴ The successors of Psammetichus and the Ptolemies obtained the command of forests in Phœnicia sufficient for that purpose.

Whatever doubt may be thrown over the early foreign commerce of the Egyptians carried on in vessels, there is

¹ *Wilkinson*, III, 212. ² *Heeren*, II, 362. ³ *Idem*, II, 375. ⁴ *Idem*, 364.

no doubt but that it was the centre of a great caravan trade. The advantages offered by Egypt,¹ especially that part of it called the Thebaid, early secured, and long retained it. Located at the north-eastern extremity of the desert, it naturally became the emporium for the produce of the interior of Africa; and the productive gold mines in its neighborhood, early gave it a medium of exchange. The African caravans then were, as they ever have been, chiefly composed of nomadic shepherds,² who were employed as carriers, and not of the inhabitants of cities, or of people who had fixed habitations. The great trading routes for these caravans from South Africa and Asia, ran through Egypt;³ which rendered it the great thoroughfare of commerce, and enabled its inhabitants to follow their own industrial pursuits at home, especially their agriculture, and yet to carry on an active trade with many other nations.

From Ethiopia the caravans brought gold, ivory and slaves.⁴ There are still to be seen the remains of an ancient road leading from the southern extremity of Upper Egypt, up the Nilotic valley to where lay the ancient Ethiopia.⁵

From Arabia was obtained incense, which was necessary to the proper performance of their religious ceremonies. Greece and Phœnicia sent their supplies of wine, while fine salt was procured in abundance from the African deserts.

In exchange for all these, Egypt offered the necessary of life, her inexhaustible supplies of corn.⁶ In her infancy she was the granary of all the surrounding countries. Arabia had its corn from Egypt, and hence the early efforts of the Egyptians to connect the Nile with the Arabian gulf by means of a canal.

Egypt not only exported her corn, but also a variety of her manufactures, particularly linen and cotton fabrics,⁷ as her inhabitants early excelled in the art of weaving. Even the productions of India were not unknown in Egypt.

¹ *Heeren*, 366. ² *Idem*, 372. ³ *Idem*, 371. ⁴ *Idem*, 368. ⁵ *Idem*, note 73
⁶ *Idem*, 369, 370. ⁷ *Idem*, 369.

From that rich country she obtained a variety of spices.¹ What must certainly strike the mind, as a fact, not less strange than curious, is that bottles of Chinese manufacture, and presenting inscriptions in that peculiar language,² have been found in the tombs of Thebes. Not one instance of these alone, but several, have occurred; and they have been discovered in various Thebian tombs; one of these, described by Professor Rosellini, was found in a previously unopened tomb, of uncertain date, but which, from the style of its sculptures he supposes referable to a Pharaonic period, not much later than the eighteenth dynasty which ended 1476 years B.C. On several of these is found on one side a flower, and on the other an inscription containing the following beautiful sentiment :

“The flower opens, and lo! another year.”

These bottles, which were inferior to the porcelain then manufactured in Egypt, were probably obtained from India, and imported with their contents, to which, and not to the bottles, was attached the value.

Bottles of various kinds, glass, porcelain, alabaster, and other materials, appear anciently to have been exported from Egypt to other countries,³ particularly Greece and Etruria. In the tombs of the ancient Etruscans are repeatedly found small alabaster and porcelain bottles which have, in their structure and composition, all the character of the Egyptian.

Thus the bonds of intercourse appear to have been established between different nations of the primitive world, which must have had a great effect in diffusing more universally the first essays of art. The fruits of early thought, and the original seeds of a progressive civilization, the wealth that meets our view in Egypt, when she first emerges from obscurity, need not excite our wonder. It came not from the spoils of conquered countries, nor was it ground out by excess of taxation. It was the natural

¹ *Heeren*, 368. ² *Wilkinson*, III, 106–108; ³ *Idem*, III, 110, 111.

result of those stirring activities, which, developing themselves in the various pursuits of industry, early rendered Egypt the wonder of the world. Hence her mighty system of canals; her massive architecture; her giant specimens of art, her royal Thebes, the ancient world's great storehouse, and, perhaps, earliest market.

Egypt became greatly changed near the close of the Pharaonic sway.¹ Amasis, the eighth king of the twenty-sixth dynasty, who reigned about 569 years B.C.,² effected a complete revolution in the commercial policy of Egypt. He opened the mouths of the Nile to foreign merchants. The city of Naucratis, on the Canopian arm of the Nile in Lower Egypt, was assigned to such foreign merchants, particularly Greeks, who desired to settle in the country for the purposes of trade.

The effects of this change soon became apparent throughout Egypt.³ Capital, which had been long accumulating there, was embarked in commercial adventure. The introduction of new wares from abroad created new wants. New ideas came to prevail, and old ones grew obsolete. Egypt lost its peculiar nationality, and became a part of the great world around it, as it slid from the dominion of the Pharaohs, nor has it ever since reappeared. The river, the soil, the mummy and the monument are still there, but the spirit of ancient Egypt has long since departed. Its mission was fully performed, and its important contributions to humanity were completed, when the last of its long line of native monarchs bowed beneath the dominion of the Persian.

It is true its great city, Alexandria, which, like a Phœnix arose from its ashes, and was founded upon the ruin of all that constituted Egypt, was long afterwards the seat of art, of learning, and of a world wide commerce. In the last respect, particularly, it fully equaled the hopes and expectations of its founder, Alexander. Erected soon after the destruction of Tyre, B. C. 332, it succeeded that queen of the

¹ *Gliddon*, 65. ² *Heeren*, II, 372, 373. ³ *Idem*, 374, 375.

Phœnician cities in becoming the centre of the East Indian trade. In succeeding to the commerce, it also succeeded to the opulence of Tyre; and became one of the wealthiest and most splendid cities of the world. All the life of Egypt became centered in Alexandria, under the Ptolemies, under the Romans, and even under the Saracen caliphs. It was the point of union between the eastern and western worlds. When Europe awoke from the slumber of the middle ages, and Venice led off in the pursuits of commerce, this city again became a great mart through which the trade with the east was carried on. It is, therefore, an important and necessary link in the general history of commerce, but its great commercial importance and prosperity grew out of its position, the wants and circumstances of the times, and had little to do with the industry of Egypt. That importance and prosperity was thrown upon it by general causes, and had no Egyptian derivation. Its reduction under the Turkish dominion, and the discovery of a passage round the Cape of Good Hope by the Portuguese in the year 1499, struck a fatal blow to Alexandrian commerce, and the city has since fallen into a decay from which it is probably never destined to recover.

6. The industry of the ancient Egyptians in the erection of buildings and monuments.¹ The tomb was regarded by the ancient Egyptians as their everlasting habitation, and hence the immense amount of labor expended in its erection and adornment. The palace of the king and the temples of the gods were public edifices,² constructed of stone, of gigantic proportions, and are now among the monumental remains.³ The private houses were almost universally constructed of crude brick, wood not being obtainable, and stone being either too expensive, or reserved for public buildings. This was a material well suited to the climate, and easily and cheaply made. Its manufacture was a royal

¹ *Wilkinson*, II, 93, 94. ² *Idem*, 96. ³ *Topography*, 197, 198.

monopoly,¹ and from it was derived a handsome revenue. Captives and slaves were generally employed in this kind of labor. All its different processes are proclaimed from Theban sculptures and paintings.² Crude bricks were not only employed in the construction of dwelling houses, but also in inclosures of gardens and granaries, sacred circuits, and fortifications.³

The ancient Egyptians do not appear to have preferred lofty houses. They rarely exceeded two stories in height,⁴ and many consisted only of a ground floor, and an upper set of rooms. Houses of a small size were usually connected together, and formed the continuous sides of streets. They were stuccoed within and without, and divided into a series of apartments,⁵ arranged according to the taste of the individual. Their granaries were also laid out in a regular manner, frequently attached to the house, or only separated from it by an avenue of trees.⁶

Besides the town houses, the Egyptians often had villas, which, with a very commodious mansion,⁷ had spacious gardens attached to it, watered by canals communicating with the Nile.

There has been no small amount of controversy in relation to the knowledge which the ancient Egyptians had of the arch, and of their use of it in the construction of their buildings. By many all knowledge of it has been confidently denied. This is a question of some importance, and little doubt is now entertained but that they had the knowledge and the use of it.⁸ At Saggara a stone arch still exists of the era of Psamaticus II, 600 years B. C. An examination of the style of its construction justifies the inference that the Egyptians had been long accustomed to the construction of stone vaults. It has been supposed that the small quantity of wood in Egypt, and the difficulty and great expense of procuring it in sufficient quantity for roofing, led to its invention. It was evidently used in the

¹ *Wilkinson*, II, 96, 97. ² *Idem*, 99. ³ *Idem*, 96. ⁴ *Idem*, 100. ⁵ *Topography*, 197. ⁶ *Wilkinson*, II, 107. ⁷ *Idem*, II, 127. ⁸ *Idem*, 116.

construction of their tombs as early as the commencement of the eighteenth dynasty. And some evidence is derived from the drawings in the tombs at Beni-Hassan, that it was known in the time of Osirtasen I, whom some suppose the contemporary with Joseph. The properties of the arch were, therefore, early understood, and the art of vaulting, wherever it was required, practiced by the Egyptians.

It has excited no little wonder and surprise in looking upon the results of Egyptian industry in the erection of the colossus, and construction of the palace and temple, to arrive at the means by which such immense bodies could be transported from considerable distances, and elevated so as to occupy their present positions. In one of the quarries at El Maasara, the mode of transportation is represented.¹ The stone is placed on a sledge, drawn by oxen, and is supposed to be on its way to the inclined plane that led to the river. The vestiges of this plane are still to be seen a little south of the village. Not unfrequently men were employed to remove blocks of stone, especially when they were large, and one representation has been found of a colossus, which a number of men are occupied in dragging with ropes. This is of the early age of Osirtasen II, about 2000 years B. C., one hundred and seventy-two men in four rows, of forty-three each, pull the ropes attached to the front of the sledge, and a liquid,² probably grease, is poured from a vase, by a person standing on the pedestal of the statue to facilitate its progress.

The skill of the Egyptians was not confined to the mere moving of immense weights. Their knowledge of mechanism is more fully shown in the erection of obelisks and colossi,³ and in the position of large stones, raised to a considerable height, and adjusted with the utmost precision. The paintings and sculptures unfortunately give no insight into the secrets of their mechanical knowledge,⁴ and we accordingly know nothing of their use of mechanical powers, beyond those embraced in the lever, and a

¹ *Wilkinson*, III, 324. ² *Idem*, 325. ³ *Idem*, 331. ⁴ *Idem*, 334.

species of crane. From the results actually accomplished, we are led almost necessarily to the conclusion that they understood and applied to a great extent the power of mechanism.

Religion.

Few subjects of antiquity have been of more difficult investigation, or the subject of greater misapprehension and misconstruction than the religion of the Egyptians. The property of a caste, which was essentially the ruling caste in Egypt, was retained with a firmer and a stronger grasp than that with which the miser seeks to secure his hoarded treasure. This will cease to be matter of wonder when we reflect that it gave to that caste a principle of union; that it furnished them with wealth, and enabled them to enjoy worldly comforts and luxuries; that it contributed to give them standing and influence in all the concerns of life; and invested them with a real power over king, soldier, and subject, that neither knew nor felt hardly any limitation. A class of men that monopolize the religion of a community; that are the sole directors as to the manner in which approaches to the deity can be made; that are the dispensers of his bounty to men, and profess to be armed with his power in regulating the affairs of the world, cannot but possess the elements of immense power. Nor will they lightly regard the instrument or agent by which these important results are effected. The priestly hierarchy found in religion the secret of their strength. They appropriated the outgoings of the heart to God, and that was sufficient for their purpose. They controlled the nation's conscience, and then they cared not who commanded its armies.

All religious knowledge was confined entirely to the priest caste. They had mysteries, but their performance met no vulgar eye; and secrets, but they reached no uninitiated ear. All the knowledge of the then infant world was theirs, and they kept it with most scrupulous fidelity.

They monopolized the teachings of God, and nature, and wisdom, and dispensed to each one such measure only, as would tend to advance their own interests. Enter their pantheon, and your eye would fall upon the god Harpocrates, with his finger upon his lips as the signal of silence. They had even invented a language the more effectually to conceal their ideas; and while their hieroglyphics and hieratic character served as a means of communication between themselves, they also answered the more valuable purpose of excluding the rest of the world from all participation in the matters they were designed to convey. They knew too well the importance of the secret they possessed to reveal it in the slightest degree to others.

Under these circumstances we have very little knowledge of the Egyptian religion derived directly from the priests, who alone properly understood it. It is true, many of their gorgeous forms of worship; their processions of priests; festivals, sacrifices, methods of supplicating and propitiating their deities; all having been performed in public, have in many instances been transmitted to us by historians, and are also publicly proclaimed upon the monuments. In relation to these there was no concealment. There was rather the desire of publicity. They were designed for the public gaze. They were intended to attract, interest, and intensely occupy the minds of the people. The difficulty lies not so much in obtaining a knowledge of these, as of the kinds and degrees of belief that went to constitute their religion. This can be little more than a mere matter of inference.

Another difficulty presents itself, and that is that the Egyptian was a mixed, not a pure, simple faith. Their doctrine was in part metaphysical, in which intellect had done much to symbolize and refine; and, in part, it was the old doctrine of sabianism, in which adoration was paid directly to the sun, moon and host of heaven. This renders it difficult properly to discriminate and rightly to understand the nature, functions, and offices of their different deities.

Another, and perhaps, greater difficulty, arises from the point of view from which the religion of the Egyptians

is considered. Animal worship prevailed very extensively in Egypt. Should our attention be turned to the great mass of the people, and should we witness only the revolting spectacle they present in their worship of the bull, the cat, the crocodile, and others of that character, we should be inclined to believe that the religion of Egypt was the lowest kind of feticism, in which animals, birds and reptiles were worshiped as gods, and adored as the arbiters of human destiny. This has been the view taken by many, who look upon the religion of Egypt as exhibiting the very worst form of heathenish idolatry.

But should we look at the priests rather than the people, and regard them as the possessors of knowledge, and as the originators of a doctrine highly metaphysical and symbolical in its nature, we might regard this animal worship as rather devised by them for the very purpose of occupying and filling the vulgar mind, while they regarded these animals not as deities and therefore objects of worship, but as representing or symbolizing deities to whom really their adoration was rendered.

Thus compounded of mysticism, metaphysical refinement, sabianism, and feticism; affording something to the loftiest, and much to the lowest wants and aspirations of the human soul; we cannot but regard the religion of ancient Egypt with an interest that deepens in view of its antiquity, its veil of mystery, and its symbolical garniture. As the earliest dawn of history, as well as the proofs from the monuments, show the Egyptian priesthood possessed of knowledge and power, and having already devised and organized a system of religious faith as remarkable in its character as it has been influential in the world, it is hardly to be doubted but that some of the truths revealed at the creation of the world must have come down to them among the traditions of the olden time.

The Egyptians claim to have originated most of the sacred institutions afterwards common to other people;¹

¹ *Wilkinson's Manners and Customs*, I, 142.

and in this manner to have furnished the foundation for most of the religious beliefs afterward entertained in the pagan world. They claimed that they were the first who consecrated each month and day to a particular deity. That they were the first to regulate the calendar upon the principle still adapted; and that judicial astrology, or the casting of nativities from the aspects of the stars, had its birth in Egypt, although this last may be doubtful.

The Egyptians resorted to the inspection of the entrails of victims,¹ the study of omens, and other varied and fanciful means for divining future events. They even observed with great care the prattle of children at play, supposing that it might, especially if in a sacred place, furnish some presage of future events. Their omens of good and evil were numerous, and they were extremely superstitious in their observance.

The pagan world is also indebted to the priests of Egypt for the establishment of oracles.² The principal oracles in Egypt were those of the Theban Jupiter, of Hercules, Apollo, Minerva, Diana, Mars, and Latona in the city of Buto,³ which the Egyptians held in the highest veneration. The ancient oracle of Dodona was of Egyptian origin, and so also was that of the Lybian Ammon. To the former of these, the oracles of Diospolis or Thebes bore a strong resemblance. It is to be observed that the method of divining by the different oracles differed from each other, and also that the power of giving oracular answers was not general, but confined to certain deities.

The oracles at Abydus and Heliopolis were consulted in the following manner: Questions in writing prepared according to a proper formula, were carried by certain persons, deputed for the purpose,⁴ who deposited them sealed in the temple of the deity. The answers of the oracle were returned in the same secret and ceremonious manner.

¹ *Wilkinson's Manners and Customs*, I, 144. ² *Idem*, I, 147. ³ *Idem*, I, 150.
⁴ *Idem*, I, 151.

Oracles were resorted to on most occasions of importance, and sometimes, without being consulted,¹ they sent spontaneously messages to those whom they intended to advise in the form of warnings against an approaching calamity, or as an indication of the divine will. They were, also, like the magicians of the present day, consulted in cases of theft.

The art of predicting future events was derived from the Egyptians, and they were the first people who established festivals,² public assemblies, processions, and the mode of approaching and communing with the deity.

There is little doubt now remaining, but that the Egyptian priests had arisen to the comprehension of one God, who was omnipotent, omniscient,³ the creator and sustainer of all things. Whether this idea was derived from tradition, which had handed down some of the primitive revelations of God, or whether it was arrived at by the right use of that primitive reason, which is the common inheritance of all men, is a question of difficult, or impossible decision. There is some evidence that even among the Greeks, in very ancient times, there was an elder theogony,⁴ according to which there was only one eternal God, from whom all the other deities were produced.

It is doubtful whether the Egyptians represented, under any form, their idea of the unity of the deity.⁵ They might, like the Jews, have regarded his name with such profound respect, as never to give it utterance. They might have deemed him unapproachable, except under some one, or more, of his deified attributes.

The Egyptians deified the attributes of the great and only God. These attributes, such as intellect, power, goodness,⁶ might, and such like qualities, they worshiped as gods. Some of these, which belonged to the divinity himself, were considered the great gods of the Egyptian pantheon, and occupied the first class⁷ among their deities.

¹ *Wilkinson's Manners and Customs*, I, 152. ² *Idem*, 154. ³ *Idem*, 176
⁴ *Idem*, 177. ⁵ *Idem*, 178. ⁶ *Idem*, 179. ⁷ *Idem*, 180.

They had, also, a second class, which were emanations from the same source. They had, also, minor divinities of various grades, which were representatives of inferior powers, and sometimes of physical objects and abstract ideas. In addition to all these there were mere deifications of physical objects,¹ an animal, and even a plant being raised by superstition to the rank of sacred.

The Egyptians divided their gods into different classes or grades.² In the first class was included their great gods, in the second those of inferior rank. These great gods, composing the first class, were Neph, Amun, Pthah, Khem, Saté Maut or Buto, Bubastis and Neith.³

The god Neph was particularly worshiped at the island of Elephantine in Ethiopia, and in the Thebaid,⁴ at least the southern part of it. The attribute of deity, worshiped under the name of Neph, was the spirit, that which "moved upon the face of the waters."

The manner in which the god Neph was represented was with a ram's head, sometimes surmounted by an asp or vase, which last as a hieroglyphic was the initial of his name. His figure was that of man with the head of a ram, frequently of a green color.⁵ The asp was sacred to Neph, and so also were sheep, particularly so. One consequence of which was that the people of the Thebaid, in their sacrifices, selected goats, never sheep. The sculptures of Thebes never represent sheep either immolated on the altars of the gods or slaughtered for the table. This judicious policy led to the raising of large flocks of sheep in the Thebaid entirely for their wool,⁶ which enabled that part of Egypt to take the lead in woollen manufactures and in the wool trade. Neph was the oldest deity of Upper Egypt.

The next mentioned was Amun or Amun-re or *Ra*. The figure of this god was that of a man with a head dress surmounted by two long feathers.⁷ The color of his body was light blue, to indicate his peculiarly exalted and heavenly

¹ *Wilkinson's Manners and Customs*, I, 180. ² *Idem*, 180. ³ *Idem*, 185. ⁴ *Idem*, 235, 236. ⁵ *Idem*, 241. ⁶ *Idem*, 242. ⁷ *Idem*, 246.

nature. He was long supposed by the Greeks and Romans to be figured with the head, or under the form of a ram, but this was peculiar to the god Neph.

It is a feature rather peculiar to the Egyptian theogony that some of their gods occasionally took the form of other deities, which, perhaps may be most satisfactorily accounted for from the fact,¹ that each deity whose form was assumed was in truth only an emanation or deified attribute of the same great being, to whom they ascribed as many various characters or attributes as they supposed he had several offices to perform. These several deities being nothing more than attributes of the same great deity, might exchange with each other forms, functions and offices, without disturbing the general harmony. That god, for instance, that represented the deified attribute of the intellect of deity, might assume the form and emblem of another that represented his almighty power, without in the least degree changing the essential character of the deity himself. Intellect was as much a part of the same deity as almighty power, and the mere exchange of emblems between them made no real difference.

This deity had the title of "king of the gods," and was considered by the Greeks the same as their Jupiter.² Amun represented the intellect of deity. He was the intellectual sun, distinct from Re or Ra, the real physical orb. He was therefore represented under the human, which was the noblest form, that made after the image of its creator. He is sometimes found invested with the characters of other deities, as of Khem, Re and Neph,³ and even the attributes of Osiris.

At Thebes "the king of the gods" seems to act in two distinct characters, viz: as Amun-re and as Amunre-Generator; in the last assuming the form and attributes of Khem,⁴ the god of generation. He was then styled by the Greeks the "Pan of Thebes."

¹ *Wilkinson's Manners and Customs*, I, 245. ² *Idem*, I, 246. ³ *Idem*, I, 244.

⁴ *Idem*, I, 247.

The oracle of this deity at Thebes was very much celebrated. The divine gift was imparted to a priestess as she slept in the temple,¹ where the deity was also believed to pass the night. The Lybian oracle of Ammon was generally supposed to be derived from the Thebaid.² The same origin has been attributed to the oracle of Dodona.

Another of the great deities of Egypt was Pthah or Phthah.³ He represented the demiurge, or creative power of the deity. He is accompanied by the goddess of truth, and is himself styled the "the lord of truth," in his hieroglyphic legend. This shows a connection between the creative power and truth in the Egyptian system. He was said to have sprung from an egg,⁴ produced from the mouth of Neph, who was therefore considered his father. The Scarabæus, or beetle, was sacred to him, and signified the world or all creation.

This god was the Vulcan of the Greek theogony, but the Greeks degraded him by reducing him to the level of a mere physical agent.

The form under which this deity was represented is generally a mummy, holding in his hands the emblems of life and stability, with the staff of purity,⁵ the last being common to the Egyptian gods and to many of their goddesses. His ordinary head dress is a close cap without any ornament.

Pthah-Sokar-Osiris was that form of Pthah, or Vulcan, particularly worshiped at Memphis.⁶ He had a pigmy figure, and out of respect to him dwarfs and deformed persons were said to be held in consideration in that part of Egypt.⁷

Toré, or Pthah Toré, was another form of Pthah, represented by a human figure with the head of a man,⁸ wearing the globe of the sun, and an asp, the emblem of kingly or divine majesty. Still another form of this god was Batrachocephalus or the frog-headed deity.

¹ *Wilkinson's Manners and Customs*, I, 248. ² *Idem*, I, 249. ³ *Idem*, I, 249.
⁴ *Idem*, I, 250. ⁵ *Idem*, I, 252. ⁶ *Idem*, I, 253. ⁷ *Idem*, I, 254. ⁸ *Idem*, I, 256.

The next in order of the great deities, was Khem, who was worshiped particularly at Chemmis or Panopolis, but was treated with great reverence by all the Egyptians. This was another of the deified attributes of the Almighty Ruler,¹ and represented the generative principle. It was his proper function, not only to preside over the continuation of the human species, but also to embrace the vegetable kingdom.² He was considered the generating influence of the sun, and hence he is sometimes found connected with Amun-Re. He was the generating principle of nature itself, and answered to the Pan of the Grecian theogony.³

Next occurs the goddess Saté, who answers to the Juno of the Greek theogony,⁴ although she appears to have played a less important part in Egyptian mythology. She accompanies Neph, and was represented as a female figure, wearing on her head the cap or crown of the upper country, from which projected the horns of a cow,⁵ and in her hand she holds the usual sceptre of the Egyptian goddesses.

Another goddess was Maut, which signifies mother,⁶ and is supposed to have represented nature, the mother of all. She is represented as a female figure, wearing on her head the pshent or double crown of the upper and lower countries, placed upon a cap ornamented with the head,⁷ body and wings of a vulture. Sometimes she appears with the head of a lion or a cat.

Another goddess was Pasht, or Bubastis, answering to the Greek Diana, who was worshiped principally in the Delta and Lower Egypt,⁸ particularly in the city of Bubastis, where she had a beautiful temple. She was represented with the head of a lioness or a cat, and to her the latter was peculiarly sacred. The Egyptians were accustomed to hold a great festival at Bubastis, in honor of Pasht, in which large quantities of wine were consumed, and great

¹ *Wilkinson's Manners and Customs*, I, 257. ² *Idem*, I, 264. ³ *Idem*, I, 265. ⁴ *Idem*, I, 266, etc. ⁵ *Idem*, I, 270. ⁶ *Idem*, I, 271. ⁷ *Idem*, I, 276. ⁸ *Idem*, I, 277.

numbers of victims sacrificed. According to their own accounts, 700,000 persons were present at these festivals.¹

The last of the eight great gods of the Egyptians, was the goddess Neith,² the Grecian Minerva, who was particularly worshiped at Sais, in the Delta. She was to Sais, what Amun was to Thebes.³ She was represented as a female, wearing the crown of the lower country, and holding in her hand the hooked staff of the gods, or the usual flower-headed sceptre of the goddesses, sometimes with the addition of a bow and arrows, being the goddess of war as well as of philosophy. She was sometimes styled the mother of the gods, and the priests established her sanctuary in the open air.⁴

It will be unnecessary to particularize the gods of the second and lower orders. Allusion will only be made to a few of the most important. The worship of Re, or Ra, the physical sun,⁵ appears to have been universal throughout Egypt. This is probably a remnant of the sabian mode of worship,⁶ the earliest that was adopted by many of the inhabitants of the east. According to that mode, the sun might well hold the first place in their pantheon. Whether the sabian was the primitive form of worship of the Egyptians, or a corruption subsequently introduced into their metaphysical religion, is now a question of difficult or impossible determination. It is quite clear, however, that in the days of Egypt's greatest glory,⁷ physical agents did not constitute the principal deities of the Egyptians. The planets were dedicated to, and called after certain deities, a practice afterwards imitated by the Greeks, although they differed in the names assigned.⁸

The god Re or Ra was usually represented as a man, with a hawk's head surmounted by a globe or disk of the sun, from which the Uræus asp issued. He corresponded to the Assyrian god Belus or Baal,⁹ a name implying

¹ *Wilkinson's Manners and Customs*, I, 279. ² *Idem*, I, 283. ³ *Idem*, I, 285. ⁴ *Idem*, I, 286. ⁵ *Idem*, I, 287. ⁶ *Idem*, I, 291. ⁷ *Idem*, I, 292. ⁸ *Idem*, I, 293. ⁹ *Idem*, I, 299.

Lord, hence Baalbek, the city of the sun. The Egyptians appear to have made of the sun several distinct deities, as the intellectual sun, the physical orb, the cause of heat, the author of light, the power of the sun, the vivifying cause, the sun in the firmament, and the sun in his resting place. The worship of Re was peculiarly adopted at Heliopolis, the On of scripture, a small but celebrated city of Lower Egypt. The priests of this form of worship were celebrated for their learning; and hither resorted Plato, Eudoxus, and other Greek sages to imbue their minds with "the wisdom of the Egyptians."¹ This city was the university of Egypt, and near it was an observatory which afforded a commanding view of the heavens.

Seb, the father of Osiris and Isis had the title of "Father of the gods," and was the same as the Grecian Saturn. His wife was Netpe.

Of all the gods worshiped in Egypt, whether of the first, second or lower classes, the most important in many respects was Osiris. In his worship was centered at once the mysterious, the metaphysical, the emblematical and the animal. There were peculiar mysteries connected with his worship, which were never revealed except to the initiated.² They were divided into the greater and less mysteries. Before admission could be obtained into the greater it was necessary that the candidate should have passed through all the gradations of the less. But in order to be admitted to this high honor so much was required, that many even of the priesthood were unable to obtain it. They required, among other qualifications, proofs of a virtuous life, and the admission to all the grades of the higher mysteries was the highest attainable honor. It was from these that the mysteries of Eleusis were borrowed. So little is really known of these mysteries, both greater and less, that nothing can be stated of them with any degree of certainty.

Osiris was called the "manifestor of good," or the "opener of truth,"³ and was said to be full of goodness

¹ *Wilkinson's Manners and Customs*, I, 302. ² *Idem*, 327. ³ *Idem*, 320.

and truth. He was a deification of that attribute of deity¹ which signified divine goodness. A peculiar, and somewhat extraordinary feature in the Egyptian mythology is to be found in the doctrine not alone that Osiris represented the goodness of deity,² but that in him was a personal manifestation of the deity on earth. That in that manifestation the deity assumed the human form, but the precise manner of it was a profound secret revealed only to those who were initiated into the higher order of mysteries. It is well settled, however, that they did not believe him a human being, who was deified after death, for the Egyptians, unlike the Greeks, did not believe that any of their deities had ever been mere human beings. They supposed him to have appeared on earth to benefit mankind,³ and after having performed the duties he had come to fulfill, he fell a sacrifice to Typho, the evil principle, and was slain. He afterwards rose again to a new life, and, through his influence, after leaving the world, the evil principle was finally overcome. The office of Osiris after rising to his new life was to judge mankind in a future state. They believed that the dead also, after having passed their final ordeal and been absolved from sin,⁴ obtained in his name, which they then took, the blessings of eternal felicity. It would seem from this that the great idea of the advent of the Saviour, and of his mission of love, was among the first of divine revelations, took early possession of the human mind, and was distinctly embodied in this probably earliest form of religious faith. In the avatars of the Indian Vishnoo are to be found traces of the same idea.

In exercising his office, judging the dead, and ruling over the kingdom where the souls of good men were admitted to eternal felicity,⁵ he is represented as seated on his throne, accompanied by Isis and Nephthys with the four genii of Amenti standing on a lotus in the centre of the

¹ *Wilkinson's Manners and Customs*, I, 317. ² *Idem*, 317. ³ *Idem*, 320. ⁴ *Idem*, 320. ⁵ *Idem*, 314, 315.

divine abode. Here he receives the account of the actions of the deceased as they have been recorded by Thoth. The tablet, containing this record, is first to be weighed in the scales of truth. This duty is assigned to Anubis, who is styled the "director of the weight," and who is assisted by Horus, the son of Osiris and Isis.

In one scale is placed the father, or the figure of Thmei, the goddess of truth, and in the other a vase emblematic of the virtuous actions of the deceased. A cynocephalus, the emblem of the Ibis-headed god, sits on the upper part of the balance, and Cerberus, the guardian of the palace of Osiris is also present. The deceased is introduced into the presence of Osiris by his son Horus, who brings with him the tablet of Thoth, after the weighing of his actions in the scales of truth.

Those who were not found wanting, but were fully justified, were admitted into the presence of Osiris. To all such,¹ whether men or women, was given after death the name of Osiris.

The Egyptians held that the souls of men were emanations of the divine soul, which pervaded and governed the universe, and constituted the deity. That each soul on its leaving the body returned to its divine origin provided the virtuous course of life it had led on earth, showed it to be sufficiently pure to unite with the immaculate nature of the deity. But there would be many whom the delements of sin would render unfit for such an union. What was the destiny of such? Some method must be devised by which these plague spots of the soul can be erased. The Egyptians found this method in the metempsychosis or transmigration of the soul. They believed that those souls which had been guilty of sin were doomed to pass through the bodies of different animals,² in order so to purify them that they might be rendered worthy again to mix with the great parent soul from which they emanated. The number and duration of these transmigrations, and the kind of animals through

¹ *Wilkinson's Manners and Customs*, 1, 316. ² *Idem*, 316.

which they were doomed to pass, depended on the extent of their impieties, and the consequent necessity of a greater or less degree of purification. A very wicked soul they supposed returned to earth in the body of a pig.

The Greeks identified Osiris with Bacchus,¹ partly in consequence of his reputed conquest of India, but he seems more nearly to have filled the office of Pluto.

The Egyptians had an allegorical fable in relation to Osiris, Typho, Isis and Horus, in which they represented Osiris as being induced by the deception of Typho to place himself in a chest in which he was confined by Typho and his conspirators,² and the chest containing his body was afterwards committed to the waves which transported it to Byblos, where it became enclosed within the growing branches of a tamarisk bush, within which it was obtained by Isis, who was both his sister and wife. Notwithstanding the caution of Isis, the body was found by Typho, the representative of the evil principle, who tore it into fourteen pieces, and scattered them up and down in different parts of the country. Isis, on being apprised of this, set herself to work to collect the scattered members of her husband's body, and succeeded in recovering all except one which had been devoured by a species of fish ever after held in abhorrence by the Egyptians. To supply this deficiency, she consecrated the Phallus, and instituted a solemn festival to its memory. Two successive battles were afterwards fought between Typho and Horus, the son of Osiris and Isis, in which the former was defeated.

It is said that Osiris is here intended to represent the inundation of the Nile; Isis, the land irrigated; and Horus, the product born from the conjunction of these two,³ that is, a just and seasonable temperature which preserves and nourishes all things. Typho represented the force and power of drought, the shutting up Osiris in the chest; the withdrawing of the Nile within its own banks,

¹ *Wilkinson's Manners and Customs*, I, 324. ² *Idem*, I, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333. ³ *Idem*, I, 333, 334.

and the victories of Horus the power possessed by the clouds in causing the successive inundations of the Nile.

Others have given a different construction to this fable. They recognize in Osiris and Horus the embodiment of good, and in Typho of evil; and in the contests between them,¹ the conflict between all the good of this world and all its evil. From the principle of good were all things generated and produced, and from that of evil arose a correspondingly extensive corruption. The good principle prevailed over the bad, yet not sufficiently to cause its destruction. It was always fated to exist in sublunary bodies, and would ever resist and oppose the good. The reduction of all the active agencies in the universe into two parties composing the one a good, the other an evil principle, ever in conflict with each other, was a favorite doctrine of the east. We have seen it prevailing in the religion of Persia. It was the Manichæan heresy, which, at different times, has made great ravages in the church.

The Egyptians even carried the allegory into psychology, physiology and astronomy. They considered Osiris to be in the world what reason and thought is in man, whereas Typho represented the passions which are at war with reason. In a human body the good temperament came from Osiris, and diseases and indisposition from Typho.² In the heavens and elements, whatever preserved order, regularity and equal motion, represented Osiris; but whatever caused disorder, irregularity, and unequal motion, was the image of Typho. Of this latter kind were eclipses of the sun and moon, tempests, inundations, earthquakes, and whatever tended to disturb the usual order of things.

These allegorical fables may have been mere fanciful speculations, and were undoubtedly designed either to convey truths under the form of allegory,³ or to amuse the ignorant and satisfy the people with a plausible story. The animal worship of Osiris occurred in the adoration

¹ *Montfaucon*, II, 172, 173. ² *Idem*, II, 173. ³ *Wilkinson's Manners and Customs*, I, 329.

paid to him under the form of Apis, the sacred bull of Memphis, sometimes called Apis-Osiris. He must first be made known by peculiar marks.¹ His color must be black. On his forehead is a white triangular spot, on his back an eagle, under his tongue a beetle, and the hair of his tail must be double. To these some have added a white spot in the form of a crescent, found upon his right side.

Apis was kept in the city of Memphis where his worship was particularly observed.² He was not merely looked upon as an emblem, but actually deemed a god by the Egyptians. On the celebration of the festival in honor of the god, a large concourse of people assembled at Memphis.³ It lasted seven days, during which the priests led him in solemn procession, all the people coming out from their houses to welcome him as he passed, and the children who were fortunate enough to smell his breath were thought to be thereby gifted with the power of predicting future events.

After the time prescribed in the sacred books, supposed to have been twenty-five years, was fulfilled, the bull Apis, if he lived so long, was taken to the fountain of the priests and there drowned with much ceremony. The death, however brought about, was productive of great lamentations, and a splendid funeral. The lamentations were public, and the same as if Osiris himself had died.⁴ They continued until the finding of another Apis by the signs before mentioned, and then commenced their rejoicings, which were as immoderate as had been their lamentations. The new god was then, after passing through many forms and ceremonies, installed with great solemnity, and placed in possession of his apartments and pleasure grounds, and amid female companions of his own species the most beautiful that could be found.⁵

The Egyptians consulted the god Apis as an oracle, and drew from his actions good or bad omens. When they

¹ *Wilkinson's Manners and Customs*, I, 347, 348. ² *Idem*, 350. ³ *Idem*, 351. ⁴ *Wilkinson*, 354. ⁵ *Idem*, 355.

desired a question answered, they gave him some kind of food with the hand. If he received it the answer was deemed favorable, if he refused, unfavorable. They also drew omens respecting the welfare of their country, from the stable in which he happened to be. There were two of these to which he had free access, the one foreboding good, the other evil, and his choice was thought to determine the one or the other. Another method of consulting him was first to burn incense on the altar,¹ fill the lamps lighted there with oil, deposit a piece of money on the altar, and then placing their mouth near his ear, they asked whatever question they wished. They then covered both their ears until they were outside the temple, and there listening to the first expression any one uttered, received that as the response of the oracle.

In connection with Osiris, should also be considered his sister and wife, the goddess Isis.² From her numerous attributes she has been confounded with many other deities and obtained the title of Myrionymus, or "with ten thousand names." She has been supposed the same as Neith, Athyr, Ceres, Proserpine, the Moon, and "the beginning," as opposed to Nephthys, "the end." The real object of worship among the Egyptians under the name and form of Isis,³ was most probably the matter of the earth, the feminine part of nature, or that property which renders her a fit subject for the production of all other beings.

The numerous characters this goddess bore, arose from the various combinations into which she entered.⁴ She was ranked as matter in reference to the intellect of the deity, which operated upon it in the creation. If we take the nuptial diagram of Plato, a right angled triangle, in which the perpendicular indicates the masculine nature, the base, the feminine, and the hypotenuse, the offspring of both, we should have Osiris representing the first, Isis the second, and Horus the last. The first would be the prime cause; the second, the receptive power, and the third, the

¹ *Wilkinson*, I, 357. ² *Idem*, I, 366. ³ *Idem*, 368. ⁴ *Idem*, 369.

common effect of the other two. She is identified with Proserpine because she presided with Osiris in Amenti,¹ and the hieroglyphics also identify her with Hecate.

The worship of Isis was universal throughout Egypt at all times, as appears also to have been that of Osiris. The Egyptians in their sacrifices were never allowed to immolate heifers,² because these were sacred to Isis, who was sometimes represented in her statues under the form of a woman with horns. The general form was that of a female with a throne upon her head,³ particularly in her capacity of presiding goddess of Amenti.

She was the sister and wife of Osiris, and this undoubtedly originated, or at least sanctioned,⁴ a custom long prevalent in Egypt of permitting brothers and sisters to marry with each other.

It was worshiped in the sacred island of Philæ, where her principal temple was situated, and also at Sais and Busiris. Her festivals were magnificent, and celebrated with much pomp and magnificence.⁵

The allegorical fables in relation to Osiris and Isis, are incomplete without the introduction of Horus their son.⁶ On the death of his father he stood forth as his avenger, defeating Typho in several battles. He is identified with the Greek Apollo, the story of whose combat with the serpent Pytho is evidently derived from Egyptian mythology. In this most ancient of mythologies the genius of evil or adversary of all good, is frequently figured under the form of a snake,⁷ whose head Horus is seen piercing with a spear. It is a curious fact that this idea is found to have prevailed among other ancient mythologies. The same fable, in substance, occurs in the religion of India, where the malignant serpent Caliya is slain by Vishnoo, in his avatar or manifestation on earth, of the god Crishna. In the north of Europe the Scandinavian deity Thor was said to have bruised the head of the great

¹ *Wilkinson*, I, 360. ² *Idem*, 380. ³ *Idem*, 383. ⁴ *Idem*, 385. ⁵ *Idem*, 385, 386. ⁶ *Idem*, 395. ⁷ *Idem*, 395.

serpent with his mace. It is thus that one of the earliest events embraced in the Bible narrative, descending by tradition, has been seized upon by nations widely separated from each other, and interwoven into the texture of their mythologies, thus constituting a part of their religious belief.

Horus is represented with the head of a hawk, crowned with the pshent, or double crown of Upper and Lower Egypt.¹ One of his principal duties was to assist Anubis in weighing and ascertaining the quantum of merit or demerit to which the dead had entitled themselves by their conduct during life.² If found worthy of entrance into the blessed regions of Amenti, it then devolved upon Horus to introduce the soul into the presence of Osiris, after it had passed the ordeal of its final judgment.

Harpocrates was another son of Isis born after the death of Osiris.³ He is represented as an infant nursed by Isis, or with his finger to his mouth, having a lock of hair falling from the side of his head. He may have been designed to represent youth in general, and when seated before Osiris, the judge of Amenti,⁴ or in the sepulchral chambers containing the sarcophagi of the dead, he is the symbol of resuscitation, or new birth.

This undoubtedly alludes to the change of state which death produces, purporting that dissolution is only the cause of reproduction, that nothing perishes which had once existed; and that things which appear to be destroyed, only change their natures and pass into another form.

Hor-Hat, or Hat, was the good genius, under whose protection the persons of the kings,⁵ and temples of the gods were placed.

Athor, the Egyptian Venus or Aphrodite, is frequently represented with the attributes of Isis,⁶ and in one of her characters she so nearly resembles her, as to be with difficulty distinguished.

¹ *Wilkinson*, I, 398. ² *Idem*, 401. ³ *Idem*, 405. ⁴ *Idem*, 407. ⁵ *Idem*, 412. ⁶ *Idem*, 386.

She is frequently figured under the form of a spotted cow,¹ and was thought to live behind the western mountain of Thebes. It was into her arms that the setting sun, as it retired behind the mountain, was thought to be received, and in this character she answered to night who presided over the west, but she was distinct from that primeval night from which all things were supposed to proceed into existence. She is generally represented as a female with a head dress surmounted with long horns, and a solar disk;² and between the horns of a spotted cow, her emblem, are the same disk and two feathers. The head of Athor with cows' ears form the capitals of many of the columns in the Egyptian temples, and many shrines,³ arks, and sacred emblems are thus ornamented.

Under the name Ombte, or Ombo, the Egyptians worshiped the evil being.⁴ Looking upon the bad as a necessary part of the general system, and inherent in all things equally with the good,⁵ they treated the evil being with divine honors, and sought to propitiate him with prayers and sacrifices. It was not until they came to consider the bad distinctly separate from the good,⁶ in a positive and literal sense, that Typho was treated as the enemy of man.

It appears that the divine honors paid to the evil being was in the early times, and that they were discontinued from some calamity befalling the country,⁷ or from the good and bad being made entirely distinct.

The emblems of Typho were the hippopotamus and crocodile, except at those places where they happened to be worshiped.⁸ It appears that the Egyptian mythology acknowledged two deities, who answered to the description given by the Greeks of Typho, one who was Ombte the son of Netpe,⁹ and was opposed to his brother Osiris, as the bad to the good principle; the other bearing the name of Typho, and answering to that part of his character which represents him as the opponent of Horus.

¹ *Wilkinson*, I, 387. ² *Idem*, 391. ³ *Idem*, 392. ⁴ *Idem*, 414. ⁵ *Idem*, 423. ⁶ *Idem*, 426. ⁷ *Idem*, 427. ⁸ *Idem*, 430. ⁹ *Idem*, 418.

Nephthys, the sister of Isis, and youngest daughter of Netpe is placed in funeral subjects in opposition to Isis.¹ Isis standing at the head, and Nephthys at the feet of the deceased. She represented the end, as Isis the beginning, of all things. The dead were supposed, through the influence of Nephthys, to pass into the future state.²

Anubis was the son of Osiris and Isis,³ and one of the principal deities of Amenti. He has been generally represented as having the head of a dog, but this seems to be a mistake. It is the head of a jackal. His office was to superintend the passage of souls from this life to a future state.⁴ He was the "usher of souls," and thus corresponded to the Mercury of the Greeks. He presided over tombs, and at the final judgment weighed the good actions of the deceased in the scales of truth, and came from thence to be styled "director of the weight." He seems to superintend the departure of the soul from the body,⁵ which is indicated by a small bird with a human head and hands, holding the sign of life, and a sail, the symbol of transmigration, or of its flight from the body. In regard to mankind he may be considered to answer to death, in a good sense, as the departure of the soul from the body on its way to a better state. The evil being was also introduced into Egyptian mythology in the character of Aphis, in which we recognize the serpent, the enemy of mankind, and from which was derived the Pytho of the Grecian mythology.

Thoth, or Hermes, was the god of letters,⁶ and had various characters according to the functions he was supposed to fulfill. He overlooked and registered the actions and life of man while on earth, and had the office of scribe in the lower regions, where he noted down the actions of the dead, and presented or read them to Osiris, the judge of Amenti.

The ibis was particularly sacred to him, and he is usually represented as a human figure with the head of that bird,

¹ *Wilkinson*, I, 436-7. ² *Idem*, 439. ³ *Idem*, 440. ⁴ *Idem*, 441-2. ⁵ *Idem*, 442. ⁶ *Idem*, II, 2.

holding a tablet and a pen and a palm branch in his hands. It was through this deity that all mental gifts were imparted to man.¹ He was a deification of the abstract idea of the intellect, or a personification of the intellect of the deity.

Mandoo was the Egyptian deity which corresponded to Mars Ultor, "the avenger," of the Grecian mythology.² He represented a divine attribute, the avenging power of the deity.

The four genii, or gods of Amenti, perform a conspicuous part in the ceremonies of the dead.³ They were present before Osiris while presiding in judgment, and every individual who passed into a future state was protected by their influence.⁴ The first was represented with the head of a man, the second with that of a Cynocephalus ape, the third of a jackal, and the fourth of a hawk. Amenti, the region of the dead, signified "the receiver and giver," from which and other circumstances it is inferred that they looked upon it merely as a temporary abode, from which after a certain period, the soul would again return to earth.

Cerberus was supposed to be the guardian of the lower regions, or the accusing spirit, more probably the former.⁵ He had the form of a hippopotamus, a peculiarly Typhonian animal, and was seated at the entrance of Amenti, menacing with its hideous head and angry looks the wicked who dared to approach the holy mansion of Osiris.

The assessors, as they were termed, who attended at the final judgment, were forty-two in number.⁶ They are frequently found on sarcophagi tombs, and papyri. These, with their president,⁷ or arch-judge Osiris, pronounced their acquittal or condemnation of the soul. When it sought admittance to the region of the blessed, they were represented in a human form with different heads. The first had the head of a hawk, the second of a man, the third of a hare, the fourth of a hippopotamus, the fifth of a man,

¹ *Wilkinson*, II, 9. ² *Idem*, 34. ³ *Idem*, 70. ⁴ *Idem*, 71. ⁵ *Idem*, 77. ⁶ *Idem*, 75. ⁷ *Idem*, 76.

the sixth of a hawk, the seventh of a fox, and so of others according to their peculiar character. They are supposed to represent the forty-two crimes,¹ from which a virtuous man was expected to be free, or, more strictly, they were the accusing spirits, each of whom examined if the deceased was guilty of the peculiar crime which it was his province to avenge.

It would be attended with no practical good to enumerate all the Egyptian deities. Nor can their number be said to be correctly ascertained. So very numerous were they according to the Egyptian system, that even the hours as they measured off time were not suffered to pass without deification. Each was considered a peculiar genius in itself, a minute fraction of the divine essence which pervaded it; and if not worshiped with the same honors as the superior gods, prayers were addressed to them with the hope of rendering them favorable to the individual who invoked their aid.

From certain manuscripts found by M. Champollion, it would appear that the different members of the body were supposed to be under the influence of particular deities. From a great funeral ritual, a book of manifestation,² and by a careful collation of manuscripts, he has been able to form a kind of table of theological anatomy, the substance of which is as follows:

The hair belongs to Pemoon (the celestial Nile, the god of the primordial waters).

The head to Re, the sun.

The eyes to Athor, the Egyptian Venus.

The ears to Macedo, god with the head of a jackal.

The left temple to the living spirit in the sun.

The right temple to the spirit of Atmoo, in the dwelling of Sion.

The nose and lips to Anubis, in the dwelling of Sakhem.

The teeth to the goddess Selk.

The beard to Macedo.

¹ *Wilkinson*, II, 76. ² *Pettigrew*, 148.

The neck to Isis.

The arms to Osiris.

The knees to Neith.

The elbows to the god of the region of Ghel or Gher.

The back to Sischo.

The genitals to Osiris and the goddess Koht.

Thighs to Bal-hor (the eye of Horus).

The legs to the Goddess Netpe, the wife of Sel (the Egyptian Rhæa).

The feet to Pthah or Pthah.

The fingers to Uræus.

Before remarking upon another class of deities, or deified objects,¹ it will be proper to notice one peculiar feature in Egyptian theology, and that is the arrangement of their gods in their different cities and temples by triads or threes. "If," remarks a writer upon the manners and customs of the ancient Egyptians, "in every town or district of Egypt the principal temple had been preserved, we might discover the nature of the triad worshiped there, as well as the name of the chief deity who presided in it, and thus become better acquainted with the character of the great gods, and of most of the persons composing the numerous Egyptian triads."

This arrangement in triads is more distinctly traceable in Upper Egypt than in Lower,² as the monuments upon which they are found are more numerous and perfect in the former than the latter.

In some places there are found two triads, the greater and the lesser.

The following are instances of triadic arrangement :

At Thebes there are two triads. The great consisted of Amun or Amun-Re, Maut, and Khonso. The lesser of Amun-Generator, Tamun and Harka.

At Syene, Elephantine and the Cataracts is presented the triad of Neph, Sáté and Anóuké.

At Philæ — Osiris, Isis, and Horus or Harpocrates.

At Edfoo—Hor-Hat, Athor, and Hor-Sened-To.

At Esneh—Neph, Nêbou (a form of Neith), and Haké.

At Silsilis—Re, Phthal and Nilus, the sun, creative power and river. Also Amun-Re, Re and Savak.

Near Mahsara—Thoth, Nehimeou, and Horus.

At Ombos, the great triad, Savak, Athor and Khonso. The lesser, Horus, Tson-t-nofre, and Pnêb-to.

At Hermonthis—Mandoo, Reto, and their child, Hor-piré.

The funereal triad, composed of Osiris, Isis, and Nephthys, occurs in all the tombs throughout the country.

A stone has been found on which a triad has been represented, consisting of Re, Agathodæmon or a winged asp, and a goddess with a frog's head.¹ On the reverse is a Greek inscription as follows:

“One Bait, one Athor, and one Akori: hail, father of the world! hail, triformous God!”

The great triads have very generally been found composed of the principal deities,² and the law of their arrangement seems to be, that the first two are of equal rank, and the third, which proceeded from the first by the second, was subordinate to the others. Thus of the triads already enumerated, one consisted of Osiris, Isis and Horus; and another of Amun, Maut and Khonso, intellect, mother, and created things.³ Other triads were formed of deities of an inferior class. A triad very frequently found in the tombs, consists of Isis, Nephthys, and Harpocrates, signifying the beginning, the end, and reproduction after death.⁴ There is also found in the regions of Amenti, a triad, consisting of Osiris, Isis and Nephthys.⁵

In this, as in the Hindoo trinity of Brahma, Siva and Vishnoo, the creator, destroyer and preserver, is clearly seen the first attempts of the human mind to grasp the idea of the triune God. It is not a little singular that while this idea of the trinity is found interwoven into the earliest forms of religious faith known to have existed in the

¹ *Wilkinson*, I, 232. ² *Idem*, 233. ³ *Idem*, 248. ⁴ *Idem*, 408. ⁵ *Idem*, 437.

world, Moses, the legislator of the Hebrews, in whom revelation was superadded to the "wisdom of the Egyptians," embodies the same great idea in the opening verse of the Bible.¹ The name given by him to deity in the act of creation, is not the singular *Ihôah*, but the plural *Elohim*, the gods, and this continues to be used until the creation is complete. And to show that a plurality of gods was not intended, a singular verb is made use of to express the action of *Elohim*, thus distinctly embracing the idea of unity in plurality.

One remarkable feature in the religion of Egypt was the worship of animals, and even of plants. We should be careful, however, to make this distinction,² that some were regarded merely as emblems of the gods, while others were worshiped as deities.

Another observation in relation to their partial worship is more applicable to them than to the greater deities, the worship of some being general throughout Egypt, while that of others is confined to particular districts. It is a singular fact that the same animal which was in the reception of divine honors in one part of the country was often the object of execration and abhorrence in another.

The feeding of the sacred animals was provided for by law, and certain persons of both sexes were appointed to take care of each kind. Each had a piece of land assigned to it, from the income of which its maintenance was derived.³ The expense incurred for this maintenance was immense, as imaginary luxuries were procured at great cost,⁴ which the animals could neither understand nor enjoy. After death peculiar sepulchres were frequently set apart for certain species,⁵ in which were placed their bodies after being expensively embalmed. Some were buried in the district where they died, while others were transported to the nome or city where they were particularly sacred.⁶

¹ *Wilkinson*, I, 186. ² *Idem*, II, 90. ³ *Idem*, 92. ⁴ *Idem*, 93. ⁵ *Idem*, 99.
⁶ *Idem*, 100.

Among the animals which were the objects of worship, were the Cynocephalus ape, which was particularly sacred to Thoth, and was worshiped as the type of the god of letters, and of the moon.¹ In Thermopolis, or the city of Thoth, he was particularly sacred.

The shrew-mouse was the emblem of Buto, the Grecian Latona, and received divine honors, it is said, from being blind, and hence looked upon as a proper emblem of darkness, which was regarded as being more ancient than light.

The dog was held in great veneration in many parts of Egypt, particularly in the city of Cynopolis, where it was treated with divine honors. It was not an object of universal worship.

The ichneumon was worshiped particularly by the Heracleopolites, because of its hostility to the crocodile, the eggs of which it very generally destroyed.

The cat enjoyed higher honors in Egypt as a god than almost any other sacred animal. Its worship was the most marked and peculiar at Bubastis,² but it was also universally established throughout Egypt. Whenever one happened to die, all the inmates of the house shaved their eyebrows in token of mourning, embalmed and buried the body with great pomp. Numerous embalmed cats are found in tombs at Thebes, and other places in Upper and Lower Egypt. Even the accidental killing of a cat was visited with death. The origin of the respect and veneration paid to the cat is supposed to have been owing to the benefits it was thought to confer on mankind, by destroying various noxious reptiles.³

The lion was especially worshiped at Leontopolis, and other cities adored him as the emblem of more than one deity.⁴ He was regarded as the symbol of strength, and therefore typical of the Egyptian Hercules. According to some he was typical of the sun.

The hippopotamus was sacred to the god Mars, and worshiped at Papremis.⁵ It was not, however, held in

¹ *Wilkinson*, II, 128. ² *Idem*, 161. ³ *Idem*, 166. ⁴ *Idem*, 169. ⁵ *Idem*, 177.

the same respect in other parts of Egypt, and was reckoned by some among the animals emblematic of the evil being. The pig was also the emblem of the same being.¹

The ass enjoyed the favor of being considered as sacred to Typho, and as connected with it the distinction of being sometimes thrown down a precipice by the Coptites,² who looked upon it as unclean and impure.

The goat was sacred in the Mendesian home,³ where great honors were paid to it. Other parts of Egypt do not seem to have participated in the bestowment of these honors, and in the Thebaid they were sacrificed. When a he goat died the whole Mendesian nome went into mourning.

While the goat was thus esteemed sacred in Lower Egypt and sacrificed in Upper, it was not directly the reverse with the sheep. That was both sacrificed and eaten at Lycopolis,⁴ and also in the Mendesian nome, but was held sacred in the Thebaid, and considered not merely as an emblem, but ranked among the most sacred of all animals. It was there dedicated to Neph. Numerous mummies of it are found at Thebes.

The ox and cow were both admitted among the sacred animals of Egypt.⁵ The worship of the bull is supposed to have originated from the aid he rendered to the labors of agriculture, which he typified, as well as the earth itself. He was, also, chosen as the emblem of Osiris, who was the abstract idea of the divine goodness.

The large Egyptian vulture was emblematic of Neith, or Minerva, and it was obviously connected with more than one deity. It was sacred to the Egyptian Lucina,⁶ and is often represented, protecting the king by overshadowing him with its wings. Mummies of it have been found embalmed at Thebes.

The hawk was regarded as the emblem of the deity,⁷ and was particularly sacred to the god Re, or the sun. It is also

¹ *Wilkinson*, II, 183. ² *Idem*, 184, 185. ³ *Idem*, 190. ⁴ *Idem*, 191. ⁵ *Idem*, 98. ⁶ *Idem*, 202, 203. ⁷ *Idem*, 205, 206.

shown by the monuments to have belonged to a number of other deities. It was worshiped at Heliopolis as the sacred bird,¹ and representative of the sun, the deity of the place. It also received divine honors at Hieracon, and at Hieraconpolis,² or the city of the hawks. The great and universal respect paid to the gods, of whom it was the type or emblem, rendered the honors paid to it common to all Egypt. A hawk with a human head was the emblem of a human soul.³ This, and all other sacred birds, were maintained at the public expense.⁴ Numerous hawk mummies have been found in different parts of Egypt.

Another bird held in particular adoration in Egypt, was the ibis.⁵ This was sacred to Thoth, who was reported to have eluded the pursuit of Typho under its form. It was held in great reverence in every part of Egypt, and was particularly worshiped at Hermopolis, the city of Thoth. To kill an ibis, even involuntarily subjected the offender to the pain of death.⁶ It destroyed many venomous reptiles, locusts, serpents, scorpions, and other noxious creatures, which infested the country.

There is no animal of which so many mummies have been found, particularly at Thebes, Memphis,⁷ and Hermopolis Magna as the ibis.

The crocodile was peculiarly sacred to the god Savak, Its worship was not universal over Egypt.⁸ In some places it was considered as the representative of the evil being, and treated with hostility. It enjoyed great honors at Coptos, Ombos, and Crocodilopolis in the Thebaid. In Lower Egypt it was sacred at Arsinoe. In places where they were worshiped their numbers increased to an enormous extent. They are said to be a defense against the robbers of Arabia and Africa. The mummies of crocodiles are found at Thebes and other places.⁹

The asp was the emblem of Neph, and the symbol of royalty. It was sacred throughout Egypt, but enjoyed the

¹ *Wilkinson*, II, 207. ² *Idem*, 208. ³ *Idem*, 209. ⁴ *Idem*, 210. ⁵ *Idem*, 217. ⁶ *Idem*, 218. ⁷ *Idem*, 223. ⁸ *Idem*, 229. ⁹ *Idem*, 237.

greatest honors in the places where the deities of whom it was the emblem were the special objects of worship.¹ Mummies of the asp are discovered in the necropolis of Thebes.²

The frog was an emblem of man in embryo. There was a frog-headed god and goddess, and the importance attached to it in some parts of Egypt is shown by its having been embalmed and honored with sepulture in the tombs of Thebes.³

Neither the finny nor insect tribes were exempt from furnishing types or emblems of deity.⁴ Among the former the most sacred were the Oxyrhinchus,⁵ the Phagrus or eel sacred at Syene and the cataracts, the Latus worshiped at Latopolis,⁶ and the Mæotis sacred at Elephantine.

Among the latter was the Scarabæus or beetle, which both the sculptures and ancient writers concur in presenting as one of the gods of the country and worshiped as such in a great portion of Egypt.⁷ One of the reasons assigned for this worship is both curious and extraordinary. It is that "in this insect there is some resemblance to the operations of the sun." It was therefore considered an emblem of the sun to which it was particularly sacred. Besides this it was also thought to be emblematical of Pthah,⁸ the creative power, of Pthah-Sokari-Osiris, and of the world, and was also connected with astronomical subjects, and with funereal rites. It was venerated when alive, and embalmed after death. It received the greatest honors in the cities of Memphis and Heliopolis.

Even some vegetables were esteemed sacred. The Persea was sacred to Athor and the Sycamore to Netpe.⁹ The tamarisk was a holy tree, the lotus celebrated through Egypt, and even garlic and onions according to Pliny were treated as gods by the Egyptians when taking an oath. There is, however, no direct evidence from the monuments of their being held sacred.¹⁰

¹ *Wilkinson*, II, 238. ² *Idem* 242. ³ *Idem*, 247. ⁴ *Idem*, 248. ⁵ *Idem*, 251. ⁶ *Idem*, 253, ⁷ *Idem*, 255. ⁸ *Idem*, 25. ⁹ *Idem*, 261. ¹⁰ *Idem*, 264.

Of animal worship it may be remarked :

1. That it was in general local. There is no recorded instance of the same animals being worshiped with the same amount of zeal and devotedness all over Egypt; although there are a few instances in which it was worshiped in different degrees, throughout Egypt. This, in relation to some of them, may have been owing to the fact that they were emblems of deities who either were not worshiped all over Egypt, or were not worshiped everywhere with the same ardor and devotion.¹ Another, although a somewhat conjectural reason, has attributed it to the artifice of a crafty prince, who, fearing that the Egyptians while united would prove too difficult to govern, contrived to divide them and scatter among them the seeds of dissention, by attaching them to the worship of different deities, and thus wedding them to varying superstitions.

2. Some animals were considered sacred in themselves, and regarded really as gods, as in the case of the bull Apis, while many were adored simply as representatives of the deities to whom they were sacred, and others still were only looked upon as emblems of deities.²

3. A contrast the most striking is often presented between the god and the temple in which he resides. The latter was often the most splendid in exhibition. Passing through halls adorned with numerous columns; surrounded with walls brilliant in color,³ and splendid with rare stones; you would approach the sanctuary shining with gold, silver, and amber, and glittering with stones from India or Ethiopia, and enter the adytum, or the holy of holies, hung with curtains of golden tissue. Amid this magnificence of scenery, profusion of ornament, and gorgeousness of display, your eye in its restless seeking after the god of this terrestrial paradise, would at length be compelled to rest upon a cat, a crocodile, a serpent or some such animal, in the selection of which as an object of worship would be most singularly manifested the "wisdom of the Egyptians."

¹ *Wilkinson*, II, 106, 107, 108. ² *Idem*; 113. ³ *Idem*, 97.

4. The origin of animal worship, or the reasons which led to its adoption. Of these several are assigned:

1. The first is fabulous. The gods, it is said, in early ages,¹ fearing the numbers and wickedness of mankind, in order to secure themselves against their oppression, assumed the forms of different animals, and having at length established their dominion, decreed in gratitude that those animals should be revered, adored and worshipped.

2. The second reason assigned is that the Egyptians were once engaged in a war in which they encountered several signal defeats,² arising from confusion and want of discipline in the army. At length they devised the plan of selecting the figures of animals, and elevating them upon spears to serve as standards and rallying points for the soldiers, by observing and following which, they were enabled to maintain their ranks amid the confusion of battle. This secured their success, and in gratitude to the animals whose figures they had selected, they ever after treated them with religious veneration.

3. The utility of certain animals. The ox, the cow, the sheep, have been in the highest degree useful to mankind in all ages. The dog was useful as a guard and in the chase;³ the cat to protect against reptiles; the ichneumon to war with the crocodile and destroy its eggs; the hawk to destroy scorpions and noxious creatures that endanger human life. Besides these, many other animals had their peculiar methods of being useful.

4. The doctrine of emanation. Every animated creature was supposed to be an emanation from one great soul,⁴ to which its spiritual essence again returned after having been sufficiently purified from the contamination of earth. This gave to every animated thing a property of deity. If, thought they, nature itself be but a mirror, in which the divinity, that glorious sun, paints himself with his glorious attributes, how much truer does this hold of the animated part of creation; and what statue,⁵ even of the

¹ *Wilkinson*, II, 104. ² *Idem*, 104. ³ *Idem*, 105. ⁴ *Idem*, 111. ⁵ *Mayo*, II, 77.

most exquisite workmanship, was ever capable of representing the supreme being to better advantage than the smallest organized body.

5. It was supposed by the Egyptians that certain intermediary agents and demons inhabited the bodies of certain animals,¹ in which they visited the earth; hence the numerous genii of the Egyptian pantheon were figured with the heads of different animals, distinct from the deities to whom those animals were peculiarly sacred. When they designed to represent the intellect of deity,² they assigned the human form, as that which more especially bore the stamp of the mind of the creator. In adding the heads of particular animals, they probably alluded to certain properties, of which they were deemed suitable emblems.

The Egyptian form of worship was of a character well calculated to make an impression upon the popular mind. Pomp, parade and ceremony were the constant attendants upon their forms of worship. Grand processions would be formed to commemorate some trifling event, and a variety of exhibitions were ever ready to meet the view of the Egyptians.³ In all the processions, forms, ceremonies and observances, the priest caste occupied the most prominent position.

One important ceremony was the procession of shrines, which is frequently represented on the walls of the temples.⁴ One of these was a sort of canopy, the other an ark or sacred boat, which may be termed the great shrine. The number of shrines, as well as the splendor of the ceremony, depended on the particular festival they intended to commemorate.⁵

The dedicatory offerings made by the king to the gods were carried with great ceremony and pomp to their respective temples, the king and all the priests attending the procession clad in their robes of ceremony.⁶

¹ *Wilkinson's Manners and Customs*, II, 113. ² *Idem*, 113. ³ *Idem*, 270. ⁴ *Idem*, 271. ⁵ *Idem*, 272. ⁶ *Idem*, 277.

In the solemn pomps of the Egyptian ceremonial, the singer usually goes first, bearing one of the symbols of music.¹ He is followed by the horoscopus, bearing in his hand the hour-glass, the measure of time, and the palm, the symbols of astrology. Next, the hierogrammat, or sacred scribe, bearing a papyrus book, with a palette, in which is ink and a reed for writing. Then follows the stolistes, bearing the cubit of justice and the cup of libation. Last of all comes the prophet, carrying in his bosom a water-jar, followed by persons bearing loaves of bread.

An imposing ceremony represented in the temples was the bestowment by the gods of a blessing upon the king,² at the moment of his assuming the reins of government. The blessing was conferred by the laying on of hands and the presentation of the sacred tree,³ the sign or symbol of life, which is usually found in the hands of the gods. It bore so great a resemblance to a cross that the early Christians of Egypt adopted it in lieu of that instrument of death.

A great anniversary festival among the Egyptians was the Niloa, or invocation of the blessings of the inundation,⁴ offered to the tutelary deity of the Nile. It occurred about the summer solstice, and was attended with music and dancing, with appropriate hymns, and with all the accompaniments of a grand festivity.

Games were celebrated in honor of certain gods, in which wrestling and other gymnastic exercises were practiced.⁵ Many of the religious festivals were indicative of some peculiar attribute or supposed property of the deity in whose honor they were celebrated. (One was emblematic of the generative principle,⁶ another was in honor of Osiris and held on the new moon.⁷) Many fetes were held at different seasons of the year, such as that of the goddess Pasht kept at the city of Bubastis,⁸ that of Isis at Busiris, that of Neith at Sais, and that of the sun at Heliopolis. The first was celebrated by sacrifices, wine

¹ *Wilkinson's Manners and Customs*, II, 278. ² *Idem*, 282. ³ *Idem*, 283. ⁴ *Idem*, 291. ⁵ *Idem*, 292. ⁶ *Idem*, 299. ⁷ *Idem*, 302. ⁸ *Idem*, 303.

drinking, music and merry making. The second was performed with great magnificence, the votaries of the goddess having previously prepared themselves by fasting and prayers. The third, or that of Neith, was performed on a particular night,¹ in which a number of lamps were required to be lit and kept burning in the open air around the house. It was called the festival of burning lamps, and was not performed at Sais alone, but every Egyptian whether in city or country was required to join in it. A similar one is observed in China which has been kept up from the earliest times.² Most of their fetes seem to have been celebrated at the new or the full moon.³

There were several festivals in honor of the sun. They paid great veneration to this luminary, burning incense three times a day,⁴ viz: resin at its rising, myrrh when in the meridian, and a mixture called kuphi at its setting.

During the feasts and festivals the statues of the gods were clothed with the sacred vestments,⁵ and the priests ministered to them three times in the course of the day according to certain regulations ordained by law. Each deity had its particular emblems, and its own proper dress of a form and character prescribed in the sacred books.

Incense was offered to all the gods, and introduced on every grand occasion whenever a complete offering was made.⁶ There were also various sacrifices offered to the gods. There was an order of priests to whom was assigned the duty of examining and selecting the victim.⁷ Red oxen were selected for the sacrifice, because that was the color attributed to Typho, and the Egyptians entertained the idea that sacrifices must be made of such things as were not agreeable to the gods.⁸ Some have asserted that at a period of time anterior to their civilization, they offered their captives as sacrifices to their gods,⁹ but of this there seems to be no sufficient evidence.

¹ *Wilkinson's Manners and Customs*, II, 308. ² *Idem*, 309. ³ *Idem*, 311. ⁴ *Idem*, 315. ⁵ *Idem*, 333. ⁶ *Idem*, 338. ⁷ *Idem*, 340. ⁸ *Idem*, 341. ⁹ *Idem*, 342.

The offering of a holocaust was commenced with a libation of wine which was poured upon the altar, after which the victim was slain, usually by cutting its throat.¹ They first removed the head and skin, then took out the stomach leaving only the entrails and the fat, after which they cut off in succession the upper part of the haunches, the shoulders and the neck. Then filling the body with cakes of pure flour, honey-dried raisins, figs, incense, myrrh, and other odoriferous substances, they burnt it on the fire, pouring over it a quantity of oil. Those portions that were not consumed were afterwards given to the votaries who were present on the occasion.

One peculiar method of sacrifice is mentioned by Herodotus. Having lighted a fire they poured a libation of wine upon the table, and about the prostrate animal,² and, invoking the deity, slew it. They then cut off the head, and removed the skin from the body, and solemnly loading the former with all manner of imprecations, they prayed the gods to avert all the evils that might have happened to their country or themselves, and to make them fall upon that head. After this they either sold it to foreigners or threw it into the Nile. This reminds one strongly of the scape-goat of the Jews, and seems to have been an early conception of vicarious suffering, and an atoning sacrifice. Many of the religious rites of the Jews bear a striking resemblance to those of Egypt,³ particularly the manner in which the sacrifices were performed.

The sculptures afford evidence of other offerings made to the gods besides the sacrifices of animals.⁴ Wine, oil, beer, milk, cakes, grain, ointment, flowers, fruit, vegetables, and various productions of the soil, were offered to their different deities.

Thus checkered with features of good and ill was the religion of the Egyptians. While we discern in it traces of a pure faith, and catch occasional glimpses of doctrines

¹ *Wilkinson's Manners and Customs*, II, 357. ² *Idem*, 350. ³ *Idem*, 358. ⁴ *Idem*, 362, 363.

that lie at the foundation of all true religion, we are surprised that minds that could entertain such conceptions, could also mingle with them fantastic notions, errors and superstitions so exceedingly strange, singular and revolting. It may well be regarded as evidence of the great truth, that man's nature is a fallen nature; and that, however clear and bright may have been the revelation of God to the human mind in its early origin, yet when left to itself, and abandoned to its own distempered fancies, it has fallen to such depths, and wandered into so many devious paths of error, as to furnish matter for most profound astonishment even to itself when it awakes to reflection.

It is the characteristic of a fallen nature to sink lower and lower the longer it is left to itself. We can here almost trace the successive steps, or stages, of its downward progress. From the great supreme, first worshiped, it fell to the deification of his attributes. This was the first point of departure, the first step downwards. But we find it weaving around these many traces of primitive truth. It established between them certain relations, arranged them in triads, and assigned to one an office and mission in some degree analogous to that of the mediator of the new covenant.

The next step downwards was taken when they sought and found among the ancient and vegetable tribes, those which they could select as emblems of these different deified attributes. This was an irreparable error. It was a kind of appeal from spirit to sense. It was laying hold of the things of sense to aid them in their conceptions of spirit. It testified to the weakness of the spirit and the strength of sense. But these were, as yet, regarded only as emblems, and invoked simply as aids to enable them more effectually to worship the various deities of which they were emblematical.

Another step, and they were led to regard many of these emblems as representatives of different deities. Here they were first clothed with power; but it was a power not their own; a power derived, conferred, and which,

therefore, might be withdrawn. The great source of power yet lay with the different deities, which were thus supposed to be represented on earth.

There was but one more step to take. It only remained to elevate the representative into the constituent; to find in it the deity of which it had been first the emblem, and then the representative. This was the lowest depth, and rendered the fall complete. When they came to worship the bull, the cat, the crocodile, as gods, they arrived at the *ne plus ultra* of fallen humanity. Human nature had been left to itself, and it had fallen to the lowest depth its capacity would admit of.

Society.

Among the ancient Egyptians, is undoubtedly to be found the earliest well authenticated form of civilized social intercourse. The development of the social instinct among them, becomes, therefore, a subject of interesting inquiry.

Society, in ancient Egypt, was, undoubtedly, much influenced and modified by the institution of caste. How far, however, that influence or modification extended, or in what particular departments it was exerted, we have now little or no information. The forms of social intercourse with which we have become acquainted, were probably, most of them, those of the priest caste, or those of the priest and soldier caste.

In the construction of their houses, the Egyptians usually arranged their rooms round an open area,¹ or on either side of a long passage, to which an entrance court led from the street. A court was not unfrequently common to several houses, while some large mansions stood detached, having several doors of entrance on two or three different sides. Before the front door was a portico or porch, about twelve or fifteen feet in height, supported on columns.²

¹Wilkinson, II, 101. ²*Idem*, 103.

The entrance through this was into an open court, containing a receiving room for visitors. In the distribution of the apartments, numerous and different modes were adopted, according to circumstances.¹ In general, however, the large mansions seem to have consisted of a court and corridors, with a set of rooms on either side, similar to many of those now built in oriental and tropical countries.

The rooms on the ground floor of an Egyptian house, were chiefly used for stores,² furniture, and goods of different kinds, while on the top they constructed a terrace, which served both for exercise and repose,³ since the sun was excluded, and a refreshing stream of air passed through it. Here also they slept during the night in the summer season,⁴ trusting to the current of wind passing over them, or to their mosquito net, to protect them from that troublesome insect.

The name of the occupant was sometimes painted on the lintel or imposts of the door,⁵ and besides that they occasionally wrote over the entrance of the house, some lucky sentence for a favorable omen,⁶ such as "the good abode," or something of a similar kind. The openings of the windows were small, as they were willing to deprive themselves of an excess of light,⁷ provided they could, at the same time, exclude the heat. The walls and ceilings were richly painted,⁸ being laid out in compartments, each having a pattern with an appropriate border, and the whole frequently arranged with admirable taste.

The trading shops were many of them, open stalls, being open in front with the goods exposed on shelves, or hanging from the inner wall, and the poulterers suspended geese and other birds from a pole in front of the shop.⁹ Many no doubt, as at the present day, sat and sold in the streets.

The wealthier Egyptians entrusted to their stewards the superintendence of the house and grounds.¹⁰ These stew-

¹ *Wilkinson*, II, 106. ² *Idem*, 109. ³ *Idem*, 119. ⁴ *Idem*, 120. ⁵ *Idem*, 102. ⁶ *Idem*, 123, 124. ⁷ *Idem*, 124. ⁸ *Idem*, 125. ⁹ *Idem*, 127. ¹⁰ *Idem*, 135.

ards regulated the tillage of the land, and received the avails of all sales of produce, overlooked the returns made to them of cattle and stock, settled all the accounts, and condemned to the punishment of the bastinado the delinquent peasants. One had the household affairs under his superintendence, another the culture of the fields. Their duties were various, depending much on the wealth and will of the employer.

The wealthy Egyptians had gardens laid out with great taste and beauty.¹ They divided them into different parts, as the vineyard, orchard, kitchen and flower garden. They had avenues of shady trees, and a great variety of aromatic plants and ornamental flowers. They are supposed to have spent much time in their cool and shady retirement, entertaining their friends there during the summer season. Sometimes a park was added, in which the pleasures of the chase could be indulged; and not unfrequently their grounds included fish ponds, in which they could also amuse themselves by angling, and spearing fish.²

Those apartments in the houses of the Egyptians which were particularly appropriated to the reception of company were sometimes on the ground floor,³ and at others on the first story. The furniture of the sitting rooms consisted of chairs and fauteuils, sometimes very splendid in appearance. Their chairs were generally calculated for one person only, but occasionally they had those for two, and such were most frequently occupied by the master and mistress of the house.

They occasionally used stools and low seats,⁴ raised very little above the ground, and some sat cross-legged, or on one knee, upon mats or carpets. The men and women were generally apart, although in the same room. While occupied in conversation they did not, like the eastern people of the present day, recline upon divans.⁵ Their chairs, as represented in the sculptures and paintings, were of various forms, of about the ordinary height of those now

¹ *Wilkinson*, II, 187. ² *Idem*, 128. ³ *Idem*, 190. ⁴ *Idem*, 190. ⁵ *Idem*, 191.

in use, and the legs were fashioned in imitation of those of some wild animal, most generally the lion, and so early even as the era of Joseph¹ the necessity of uniting them together with bars had ceased to exist. Their stools, ottomans, and fauteuils were often constructed in a style of great elegance, and their couches also evinced great taste.² But upon their last they do not appear to have reclined more frequently than modern Europeans. They were accustomed to sit at their meals,³ and not, like the ancient Romans, lie in a recumbent position⁴ on a couch or triclinium. Their tables were round, square, or oblong. The first was generally used at their meals, and was supported on a single shaft, or leg,⁵ in the centre, or by the figure of a man intending to represent a captive. The common people either sat cross-legged, as the modern Asiatics, or crouched on the ground.⁶

Their entertainments were served up in a style of great elegance. A dinner party collected together about mid-day,⁷ the guests arriving successively in chariots, palanquins, or on foot. To those coming from a distance, or who desired it, water was brought for washing, previous to entering the festive chamber. It was also customary for a servant to attend every guest as he seated himself, and to anoint his head,⁸ and this was regarded as a token of welcome. The ointment was sweet-scented, and its materials were such, and so perfectly amalgamated, that it has been known to maintain its scent for several hundred years.⁹ This ceremony over, a lotus flower was presented to each guest, who held it in his hand during the entertainment. A garland of flowers was also frequently put round the head. On these occasions the Egyptians seem not to have varied their ordinary attire, although they probably abstained from dresses of a gloomy hue.¹⁰

The dinner, or entertainment, consisted of a considerable number of dishes, and as they were a long time in

¹ *Wilkinson*, II, 195. ² *Idem*, 200, 201. ³ *Idem*, 201. ⁴ *Idem*, 191. ⁵ *Idem*, 202. ⁶ *Idem*, 208. ⁷ *Idem*, 207. ⁸ *Idem*, 213. ⁹ *Idem*, 214. ¹⁰ *Idem*, 219.

preparing¹ (the meat itself having been killed for the occasion), there was no small interval of time elapsed before everything was in perfect readiness. This was occupied variously, in conversation, or in attending to music and the dance. Opportunity seems to have been given to both sexes to indulge in conversation with each other. At times the men and women are represented as entertained separately, in a different part of the same room.² At such times the master and mistress of the house are found seated together at the upper end of it, each guest, as he arrives, presenting himself to receive their congratulatory welcome.³ At other times the men and women are found sitting together, both strangers as well as members of the same family.⁴ The topics of conversation are not, at the present time, so easily arrived at; although, from a painting found in a tomb at Thebes, representing the ladies talking about their ear-rings,⁵ at least one of its great branches lies plainly within the region of conjecture.

Dancing among the ancient Egyptians was performed either by men and women at the same time, or in separate parties, and consisted mostly of a succession of figures in which the performers endeavored to exhibit a great variety of gesture.⁶ Some danced to slow airs, adapting the movement to the air, others preferred a lively step, regulated by an appropriate tune. The women exhibited the most grace of movement; the men the most spirit. The women were generally preferred, as graceful attitudes and gestulation were the general style of the dance, although that was constantly varied according to the rank of the employer, or the skill of the dancer.

Among the Egyptians dancing was a profession, and was followed by those who made their livelihood by attending parties and festive meetings to practice it.⁷ There were also those in the lower ranks of society who danced,

¹ *Wilkinson*, II, 365. ² *Idem*, 388. ³ *Idem*, 388, 389. ⁴ *Idem*, 389. ⁵ *Idem*, 367. ⁶ *Idem*, 328. ⁷ *Idem*, 329, 330.

but the upper orders seem never to have been accustomed to indulge in this amusement. Although originally an innocent recreation,¹ yet it too often became corrupting in its influence upon the mind, and hence it was forbidden to the higher classes to learn it as an accomplishment, or to practice it as an amusement, and by rendering it a professional pursuit they could partake of its diversion without subjecting themselves to its demoralizing tendencies.

As grace in posture and in movement was the chief object of those employed at the assemblies of the rich,² there was little in attitude or gesture to transgress the rules of decency or decorum. Many of their postures resembled those of the modern ballet, and the pirouette was the delight of an Egyptian party nearly four thousand years ago.

Music seems to have been a necessary accompaniment to dancing. The dresses of the female dancers were light, and of the finest texture, showing, by their transparent quality the forms and movement of the limbs. Both music and dancing were taught to slaves, and they, as well as the free professional Egyptians, practiced both at the houses of the rich.³ Dancing appears sometimes to have been done by pairs, holding each others' hands while others went through a succession of steps alone. Various feats of agility and strength were frequently exhibited by the dancers;⁴ some whirling round at arm's length in opposite directions, and some lifting each other off the ground in various difficult attitudes; but these, and other such like exhibitions, more frequently accompanied the celebration of games than the diversions of a party or festival.

Besides the pirouette, there was a favorite figure dance, in which the two partners advanced towards each other, or stood face to face upon one leg,⁵ and having performed a series of movements, retired again in opposite directions, continuing to hold by one hand, and concluding by turning each other round. In another, they struck the ground

¹ *Wilkinson*, II, 331. ² *Idem*, 233. ³ *Idem*, 334. ⁴ *Idem*, 334. ⁵ *Idem*, 338.

with the heel, standing on one foot, and changing alternately from the right to the left. An object of great and paramount importance was to manage the hand skillfully, and with grace.¹

While the guests were thus enlivened by conversation, music and dancing,² the kitchen was presenting a scene not less animated. The monuments have not failed to initiate us even into its mysteries. From the slaughter of the animal and the careful preservation of its blood, to the different processes of cooking, and ultimate preparation for the table, the sculptures and paintings exhibit every thing to the eye as if it were but the work of yesterday.

Beef and goose appear to have constituted the principal part of the animal food consumed in Egypt.³ These were their favorite meats, although the ibex, gazelle, and oryx, seem also to have been in great request.⁴

The first process was the slaughtering the ox, and cutting up the joints, the blood being frequently caught in a vase for the purpose of cookery.⁵ The joints made choice of for cooking, were boiled in a large caldron, placed over the fire on a metal stand or tripod. One servant superintended the fire, another the cooking, while a third was pounding salt, pepper, or other ingredients, in a large mortar. A bellows was early invented to blow the fire, and a siphon to throw off superfluous liquids.

A large department attached to the kitchen, was that for the manufacture of pastry,⁶ and this appears as much or even more varied than that of the cook.

The first thing that seems to have been presented to the guests on being seated, was wine.⁷ This was offered as well to the ladies, both matrons and virgins, as to the gentlemen, women not being debarred,⁸ as they were among the Romans, from its use. The practice of introducing it so early in their entertainments, prevails among the Chinese at the present day.⁹ The drinking cups of the

¹ *Wilkinson*, II, 339. ² *Idem*, 367. ³ *Idem*, 368. ⁴ *Idem*, 380. ⁵ *Idem*, 384. ⁶ *Idem*, 384-6. ⁷ *Idem*, 219. ⁸ *Idem*, 165, 166. ⁹ *Idem*, 221, 222.

Egyptians were of gold, silver, glass, porcelain, alabaster, bronze and earthenware.¹

The Egyptians of both sexes, as appears from the sculptures and paintings, committed occasional excesses,² and men were sometimes unable to walk from the feast, and were sometimes carried home by servants. At the tables of the rich, stimulants were frequently introduced to excite the palate before drinking,³ and cabbage is one of the vegetables mentioned as having been used by them for that purpose.

The table at which the guests were placed for dinner, was a small stool, raised upon a single leg, and supporting a round tray on which the dishes were placed.⁴ The tables were occasionally brought in and removed with the dishes on them.⁵ The dishes consisted generally of fish; meat boiled, roasted, and dressed in various ways; game, poultry, and a profusion of vegetables and fruit, particularly figs and grapes, and soup or pottage of lentils.⁶ Sometimes each joint was served up separately, and in the more fashionable circles, the fruit deposited in a plate or trencher, succeeded the meat at the close of dinner.⁷

For the purpose of soups or liquids, spoons of various forms and sizes, variously ornamented, and composed generally of ivory, bone, wood or bronze, and other metals, were made use of at the table.⁸

They sat around the table on the ground, or on stools and chairs; and having neither knives and forks, nor any instrument like the chopstick among the Chinese,⁹ to answer as a substitute for them, they ate with their fingers, and always with the right hand.

They probably washed after dinner as well as before,¹⁰ but there is no evidence that they ever had any knowledge of soap.¹¹ They had a custom of saying grace before meals.¹²

They had another custom very remarkable. Either during their repasts or immediately upon their conclusion,

¹ *Wilkinson*, II, 398. ² *Idem*, 168. ³ *Idem*, 169. ⁴ *Idem*, 392. ⁵ *Idem*, 399. ⁶ *Idem*, 400. ⁷ *Idem*, 399. ⁸ *Idem*, 402. ⁹ *Idem*, 401, 402. ¹⁰ *Idem*, 405. ¹¹ *Idem*, 407. ¹² *Idem*, 408.

they introduced and showed to each guest, a human mummy made of wood, from one foot and a half to three feet in height,¹ and either standing erect, or in a case, or lying on a bier. This was done for the purpose of warning each one of his mortality, and of the transitory nature of human pleasures; that while in the actual enjoyment of the world's blessings, it was wise to bear in remembrance, that existence was precarious, and that death inevitably succeeded the enjoyment of life.

How different the social habits of nations. At the present day, and among civilized nations, the introduction, at such a time, and by such means, of a moral idea, would meet with a strange reception. But the ancients, and especially the Egyptians, looked upon death with different eyes from the moderns. They regarded the idea as less revolting, and as one with which they would do well to become familiar. They did not even object to the introduction of the mummy of a deceased relative at their parties,² and to the placing it at table as one of the regular guests. Thus, with them, death was held to form a part of the great system of life, nor in thus regarding it did they manifest any very remarkable want of wisdom.

After dinner was concluded, music and singing were again resumed. Various feats of agility were performed by men and women swinging each other round by the hand, throwing up and catching the ball, and other such like performances.³ Games and tricks of jugglers were also introduced, both in the house and out of doors, for the amusement of the company.

The most usual games played within doors were odd and even, mora, and draughts. In the first, bones, beans, nuts, almonds and coins were used.⁴ The second was played by two persons, who each simultaneously threw out the fingers of one hand, while one party guessed the sum of both. This existed in the earliest period in Egypt, even in the time of the first Osirtasen,⁵ some two thousand

¹ *Wilkinson*, II, 409. ² *Idem*, 414. ³ *Idem*, 414. ⁴ *Idem*, 417. ⁵ *Idem*, 418.

years before Christ. It is now in use among the lower Italians, from whom the name is derived.

The game of draughts also lays claim to the same antiquity. This game had a great resemblance to chess,¹ but was not the same. The men, or pieces, were of equal size upon the same board, one set black, the other white or red, standing on opposite sides, and each player, raising them with his finger and thumb,² advanced them towards those of his opponent. This seems to have been a game common to the rich and the poor, and even the great Rameses is portrayed on the walls of his palace as actually engaged in the playing of it.³ This was some 1500 years B. C.

Another game, similar in its principle to the odd and even, was where two players held a number of shells or dice in their closed hands over a third person, who knelt between them, with his face towards the ground, and who was obliged to guess the combined number before he could be released from this position.⁴

Another game consisted in endeavoring to snatch from each other a small hoop, by means of hooked rods, which were most probably of metal. The success of the player depended on extricating his own from his adversary's rod, and then snatching up the hoop before he had time to stop it.⁵

Dice have been discovered at Thebes and other places, but not in situations, or under circumstances, by which the era of their introduction can be ascertained. The early invention, or introduction of this game into use, by the Egyptians, has been insisted upon from the fact, that prior even to the birth of Osiris,⁶ according to one of the oldest mythological fables, Mercury is represented as playing at dice with the moon, and winning from her the five days of the epact, which were added to complete the three hundred and sixty-five days of the year.

¹ *Wilkinson*, II, 418. ² *Idem*, 419. ³ *Idem*, 420. ⁴ *Idem*, 422. ⁵ *Idem*, 422. ⁶ *Idem*, 424.

The Egyptians had probably many other games of chance which are not preserved upon the monuments, as human ingenuity would be early exercised in devising methods of drawing from fortuitous combinations, admonitions of failure or promises of success. The custom of drawing or casting lots, to decide a disputed question,¹ was common at least as early as the exodus of the Hebrews. From all that we can learn the ancient Egyptians were superstitious observers of accidental occurrences, and were in the habit of noting down in writing any event that happened of an extraordinary character, and then of paying particular attention to the events which followed it,² upon the assumption, that if a similar extraordinary event again transpired, it would be again succeeded by a similar train or succession of events.

The amusements of children were such as were calculated to afford exercise to the body and diversion to the mind. Throwing and catching the ball,³ sometimes three or more in succession, the hands occasionally crossed over the breast, running, leaping, and similar feats, were early introduced and encouraged. They had also dolls painted, and so constructed that their arms and legs could be made to assume various positions by means of strings.⁴ They excelled in the performance of several feats of strength and dexterity. One of these was performed by two men standing together, and, placing one arm forward and another behind them,⁵ held the hands of two women, who reclined backwards, in opposite directions, with their whole weight pressed against each others' feet, and in this position were whirled round.⁶ Sometimes two men, seated back to back on the ground, and passing the elbows of the opposite arms within each other, endeavored to rise in that position, with touching the ground with the hand that was disengaged. They had also a game of cups in which a ball was put, while the

¹ *Wilkinson*, II, 425. ² *Idem*, 425, 426. ³ *Idem*, 426, 429. ⁴ *Idem*, 426. ⁵ *Idem*, 433. ⁶ *Idem*, 434, 435.

opposite party guessed under which of four it was concealed.¹

The lower orders celebrated games, in which were often displayed feats of great agility and strength.² One of them was wrestling. All the varied attitudes of which this exercise is susceptible, and the modes of attack and defense it admits of,³ are proclaimed from the paintings of the grottoes at Beni-Hassan. In approaching each other the combatants held their arms in an inclined position before the body, each endeavoring to seize⁴ his adversary in the manner best suited to his mode of attack. The body, head, neck, or legs might be seized hold of in the attack.

They also fought with a single stick, the hand being protected by a kind of guard,⁵ and on the left arm was a straight piece of wood, bound on with straps, to serve as a shield. They also lifted weights, raising a bag full of sand with one hand from the ground, and carrying it with a straight arm over the head,⁶ and holding it in that position. Mock fights was an amusement often indulged in, particularly among the military caste.⁷ The methods of attacking and defending a fortress are frequently exhibited. Crews of boats are sometimes represented attacking each other with the earnestness of real strife. Among their other sports we find the bull fight, in which bulls are sometimes exhibited fighting with each other, and sometimes men have displayed their courage and dexterity in attacking a bull single handed⁸ and baffling his attacks. Even the higher classes seem sometimes to have encouraged bull fights, and they were exhibited in the avenues leading to the large temples. The animals were trained for the purpose with great care,⁹ and prizes were awarded to the owner of the victorious combatant. This amusement seems to have been of Egyptian origin, and to have dated from a very early period.

¹ *Wilkinson*, II, 435. ² *Idem*, 436. ³ *Idem*, 436. ⁴ *Idem*, 437. ⁵ *Idem*, 437, 438. ⁶ *Idem*, 439, 440. ⁷ *Idem*, 440. ⁸ *Idem*, 444, 445. ⁹ *Idem*, 446.

The dress of the ancient Egyptians was of a character that corresponded to their climate.¹ The lower orders wore a kind of apron or kelt, which frequently was simply bound round the loins, lapping over in front. Others had short drawers extending half way to the knee. The higher orders wore over the same kind of apron a dress of fine linen, reaching to the ankles, and provided with large sleeves. The apron was fastened by a girdle or sash, tied in front in a bow or knot. Some of the poor classes wore simply a roll of linen passed between the legs from the back to the front of the girdle.

The dress varied somewhat among the different castes. That of the priests and persons of rank consisted of an under garment, similar to the apron already spoken of,² and a loose upper robe with full sleeves, secured by a girdle round the loins, or of the apron, and a shirt with short tight sleeves, over which was thrown a loose robe, leaving the right arm exposed. The costume of the sacred scribe consisted of a large kelt or apron,³ either tied in front, or wound round the lower part of the body; and also a loose upper robe with full sleeves, which was of the finest linen. Those bearing the sacred emblems wore a long full apron reaching to the ankles, tied in front with long bands, and a strap, also of linen, passed over the shoulder to support it; but they wore no upper robe.

The princes wore a dress very similar to that of the sacred scribe,⁴ but they wore as their distinguishing mark a peculiar badge at the side of the head, which descended to the shoulder, and was frequently adorned and terminated with a gold fringe.

The dress worn by the king varied with the occasion. When acting as high priest it resembled that of the head of the sacerdotal caste.⁵ On state occasions his head dress was the crown of the upper or of the lower country, or the pschent, the union of the two. This last was put on at the coronation after the sovereignty of the Thebaid and Lower Egypt had become vested in the same person. On other

¹ *Wilkinson*, III, 344, 345. ² *Idem*, 347. ³ *Idem*, 348. ⁴ *Idem*, 350. ⁵ *Idem*, 351.

occasions he was permitted to wear each separately,¹ and he is usually represented as wearing one even in the heat of battle. Wigs were worn both within the house and without,² like the turban of the present day; and a priest might even officiate on some occasions in his wig. The ancient Egyptians always seem to have kept their hair cut and beard shaved except when they were in mourning,³ and then both were permitted to grow. The priests were remarkable for cleanliness, shaving the whole body every three days,⁴ and performing frequent daily ablutions. Nor was it confined to the priest caste. Every Egyptian cultivated habits of cleanliness. Egyptian children generally had their hair shaved off close, and were much exposed to the action of the sun. That is the reason assigned for the hardness of the Egyptian crania,⁵ as it was said to be very easy distinguishing a Persian from an Egyptian skull on the battle-field by the great softness of the one and the hardness of the other. The Persians wore soft caps, thus keeping the head enveloped and withdrawn from the influence of the sun. The ancient Egyptians also, it is said, were never bald, at least that there were fewer bald people in Egypt than in any other country. Persons of all classes occasionally wore caps, some of which were large, while others fitted tightly to the head.⁶ Women always wore their own hair, and were never shaved even in mourning. The dress worn by children of the lower classes was extremely simple,⁷ and the whole expense of rearing them up very small. Those of the higher orders were often dressed like grown persons, with a loose robe, reaching to the ankles and sandals. Infants were not swaddled,⁸ but were carried in a shawl, suspended before or at the back of the mother.

On the feet were worn sandals made of palm leaves and papyrus stalks, and sometimes of leather,⁹ some having a sharp, flat point, while others were nearly round.

¹ *Wilkinson*, III, 353. ² *Idem*, 356. ³ *Idem*, 357. ⁴ *Idem*, 358. ⁵ *Idem*, 360. ⁶ *Idem*, 361. ⁷ *Idem*, 362. ⁸ *Idem*, 363. ⁹ *Idem*, 366.

The dress of women consisted often of a loose robe or shirt, reaching to the ankles, with tight or full sleeves, and fastened at the neck with a string, similar to those of the men.¹ Over this they wore a sort of petticoat, secured at the waist by a girdle. This, while in mourning, was frequently their only dress. A petticoat or gown, secured at the waist by a colored sash, or by straps over the shoulders, was generally worn by the higher orders.² Above this was a large loose robe, made of the finest linen, with full sleeves, and tied in front below the breasts.

They did not permit slaves or servants to wear the same dress as the Egyptian ladies, and their mode of dressing the hair was also different.³ Ladies wore their hair long and plaited.⁴ It was generally plaited in a triple plait, the ends being left loose; or, more frequently, two or three plaits were fastened together at the extremity by a woollen string.

The Egyptian ladies wore earrings from an inch and an half to two inches and one-third in diameter,⁵ being large, round, single hoops of gold.⁶ They also wore many rings, sometimes two and three on the same finger. The fingers of the left hand were considered privileged in this respect, and the third finger was the ring finger. Some rings were simple in their structure, others were made with a scarabæus or an engraved stone. They were mostly of gold,⁷ and often made after some fancy device, resembling a snail, a knot, a snake, etc.

Both men and women wore richly ornamented necklaces, which constituted a very striking feature in their dress.⁸ They consisted of gold, or of beads of various qualities and shapes, to suit their various fancies. They generally had a large drop, or figure, in the centre.

At Thebes and other places are found various objects of the toilet,⁹ the principal of which are bottles, or vases, for holding ointment, collyrium for the eyes, mirrors, combs,

¹ *Wilkinson*, III, 367. ² *Idem*, 368, ³ *Idem*, 369. ⁴ *Idem*, 370. ⁵ *Idem*, 370. ⁶ *Idem*, 371. ⁷ *Idem*, 372. ⁸ *Idem*, 375. ⁹ *Idem*, 378.

and small boxes, spoons and saucers. The custom of anointing the body is usual in hot climates, and contributes greatly to comfort. The Egyptian combs for their hair were usually of wood, and double, one side having large, the other small teeth.¹ They were about four inches long and six deep. The Egyptians, from the earliest times, had a custom of staining the eyelids and brows with a moistened powder of a black color.² It is retained in the east to the present day.

Pins and needles are occasionally found in the tombs.³ The first are long with large gold heads; some tapering gradually to a point, merely bound with gold at the upper end, without any projecting head, seven or eight inches in length, and appear to have been intended for arranging the plaits or curls of hair.

The mirror was also among the principal objects of the toilet.⁴ It was of mixed metal, chiefly copper, most carefully wrought and highly polished. It was nearly round, and inserted into a handle of wood, stone, or metal; the form of which varied according to the taste of the owner.

It is not a little remarkable that the sculptures and paintings upon the monuments, which are so full in proclaiming the manners and customs of the ancient Egyptians, nowhere exhibit their marriage ceremonies.⁵ Neither are they stated by any writer of authority. Of these, therefore, we are necessarily ignorant.

Polygamy was permitted to be practiced by the Egyptians, except to the priesthood, who were by law confined to one consort.⁶ In practice, however, the Egyptians appear generally to have restricted themselves to one wife.⁷ They had, nevertheless, like other eastern people, other inmates of the harem. They appear to have been mostly foreigners either taken in war, or brought to Egypt to be sold as slaves. They were of different colors, white and black. The latter were employed merely as domestics in the

¹ *Wilkinson*, III, 380. ² *Idem*, 380. ³ *Idem*, 383. ⁴ *Idem*, 384. ⁵ *Idem*, II, 58. ⁶ *Idem*, 62. ⁷ *Idem*, 63, 64.

family. Many of the former officiated as servants, although holding a higher rank. They many times became members of the family, ranking next to the wives and children, and probably sharing some part of the property on the decease of the owner.

It is singular that the institution of slavery meets our view among the first social institutions that emerge from darkness into the light of history.¹ In Egypt, as well as among all the other nations of antiquity, it was one of the conditions imposed upon a conquered people. Many, if not most, of their stupendous monuments were undoubtedly the work of slaves. The slave trade in Africa was in active operation when history commenced its record. The practice of kidnapping in the interior for their own use, or for sale in foreign markets, was then practiced by the nations on its north and north-eastern coast, particularly by the Carthaginians and Egyptians.² This trade was mainly directed to females who commanded a much higher price in the market than males.³

Mummies of negroes, as well as the negroid type of head, are frequently to be found in Egypt. Dr. Morton estimates that within the last thirty-five centuries,⁴ more than ten millions of negroes have been brought into Egypt as slaves. It is not, therefore, surprising that traces of negro organization are so frequently to be found in the valley of the Nile. One fact, however, is here worthy of particular notice, and that is, that the children followed the condition of the father, not that of the mother.⁵ Hence no distinction was made between offspring by a wife or any other woman — all equally enjoyed the inheritance.

The treatment of women has always furnished a very good criterion to test the progress of civilization. In the early ages, and among pastoral tribes, they drew water, kept the sheep, and superintended the herds as well as flocks.⁶ To them it belonged to prepare the furniture,

¹ *Morton's Crania Egyptiaca*, 59. ² *Heeren's Reflections*, 179, 180. ³ *Idem*, 237. ⁴ *Crania Egyptiaca*, 60. ⁵ *Wilkinson*, II, 64. ⁶ *Idem*, 59.

and the stuff of which the tents were made. Among rude and savage people, woman has been the slave of man, but in proportion as civilization has advanced, she has ceased to be his servant, and has become his partner, his companion, his equal.

Applying this test to Egyptian civilization, it will be found to have made a great progress. The Egyptian ladies probably occupied much of their time in needlework and embroidery. The sculptures on the monuments sometimes exhibit them weaving and using the distaff. They were not kept in a state of seclusion as has been almost the uniform practice in eastern countries. Even among the Greeks, they had their own apartments in the house,¹ which were the most remote from the hall of entrance, and generally in the uppermost part of the building, and they were not allowed to go out of doors without a veil.

Both the accounts of ancient writers and the sculptures unite in testifying that the Egyptian women enjoyed a great degree of freedom. They attended many of the public festivals, not alone, but accompanied by their husbands and relations. To them the exercise of political power was even attainable. No salic law, similar to that which has prevailed in France, excluded them from the throne. Manetho informs us that the law leaving the succession to the crown open to the female, dated as early as the reign of Binotheris,² the third monarch of the second dynasty. Egyptian history furnishes us with examples of queens, particularly one called Nitocris, who reigned as early as the sixth dynasty, who was considered as the most beautiful woman of her time,³ having a florid complexion and flaxen hair. She built the third pyramid.

Particular care was taken in the education of their children,⁴ especially in the habits they were permitted to acquire. The verses and songs they were suffered either to hear or learn, were such as were deemed calculated to

¹ *Wilkinson*, II, 60. ² *Idem*, 59. ³ *Idem*, I, 28. ⁴ *Idem*, II, 66, 67.

inspire them with virtue. The dances in which they indulged were subject to certain regulations. They were especially taught to respect age; to give place to their superiors in years; and, if seated, to rise on their approach.

In a more particular manner did they reverence age when they met it in the persons of their parents. The honors paid to them ceased not with the termination of life. Their memory was revered through succeeding generations. Their tombs were maintained with the greatest respect, and liturgies were long performed by their children, or by priests at their expense.

When a death occurred among the ancient Egyptians, all the females of the family, having covered their heads and faces with mud, and left the body in the house,¹ ran through the streets, with their bosoms exposed, striking themselves, and uttering loud lamentations. Their friends and relatives united with them, thus increasing the mass of mourners, and exhibiting more clamorous demonstrations of grief. When the deceased was a person of consequence many strangers also accompanied them, out of respect to his memory. They had the custom of hiring mourners,² who, by their feigned demonstrations of grief, appeared to heighten the show of respect paid to the deceased. The greater number of mourners consisted of women, although the occasions were frequent when the men also, girding their dress below their waist, went through the town smiting their breasts, and throwing dust and mud upon their heads.

After these demonstrations were completed, the body was conveyed to the embalmers for the purpose of being embalmed.³ For the seventy-two days during which this process generally continued, the afflicted family continued their lamentations at home, singing the funeral dirge, and fulfilling all the duties required both by custom and their own feelings on the mournful occasion.

¹ *Wilkinson*, v, 402. ² *Idem*, 403. ³ *Idem*, 424.

Offerings were made to the dead, similar in character to the ordinary oblations in honor of the gods. This was not a form of worship paid to the deceased, as a man translated to the order of the gods.¹ It was an adoration addressed to that particular portion of the divine essence which they supposed to have constituted the soul of the deceased; and which, at dissolution, had returned back again to deity.

Every one who had lived a virtuous life on earth, was supposed entitled, at death, to enter the regions of the blessed,² to be again united to the deity, of whom he was an emanation. Being then judged or justified, he received the holy name of Osiris. His body was so bound up as to resemble the mysterious ruler of Amenti, bearing some of the emblems peculiar to him, particularly in the form of the beard, in token of the assumption of the character of that deity.

Various ceremonies were performed, and sacrifices made to Osiris, Anubis, and other gods connected with Amenti. Incense and libation were presented, and a prayer sometimes read, the relatives and friends being present as mourners.³ They joined their prayers to those of the priest; and, embracing the mummy, bathed its feet with their tears, uttering those expressions of grief, and praises of the deceased, which were dictated by their feelings on the occasion.

The mummies, after being returned by the embalmers, were often kept by the friends and relatives out of their regard and affection, and their extreme reluctance to part with the remains of those they held so dear in life.⁴ A room in the house was set apart for its reception, where it was placed upright against the wall. Here it was often kept for several months, sometimes until a tomb could be prepared; and sometimes a wife or husband would retain the body of a beloved consort until both could be deposited together in their final resting place.

¹ *Wilkinson*, v, 381. ² *Idem*, 382. ³ *Idem*, 383, 384. ⁴ *Idem*, 389, 390.

During this period, liturgies were performed before the mummy, and feasts were held in honor of the dead,¹ to which the friends or relations were invited. These were occasions of great festivity, the guests being anointed and decked with flowers, and presented with other tokens of welcome. At these festivities, it is said, they even attempted to make the mummy a partaker,² by introducing it at the table with the other guests.

Before, however, the deceased could enter the empire of death,³ it was necessary that the body should be deposited in the tomb. But this deposit was not a matter of course. At the entrance of the tomb, we meet with the tribunal of death; an institution peculiar, and in itself well calculated to exert a powerful influence upon all Egyptian life and character.

To have a correct understanding of the place where this tribunal was held,⁴ it is necessary previously to remark that every large city, or considerable place in ancient Egypt had its lake, which was the lake of the nome, to which the funeral procession of all who died within the jurisdiction of the nomarch was obliged to repair.

Those who from their poverty were unable to procure a place of burial, when denied the privilege of passing the sacred lake,⁵ were interred on the shores they were forbidden to leave. In other cases, the mummy case was deposited in the hearse, and drawn upon a sledge to the sacred lake of the nome,⁶ a public announcement having been made of the day, and previous notice given to the judges. Forty-two judges, corresponding in number to the assessors,⁷ of whom they were the type, were arranged in a semicircle near the banks of the lake. A boat, provided expressly for the occasion, and under the direction of a boatman called, in the Egyptian language, Charon, was brought up for the reception of the mummy.

¹ *Wilkinson*, v, 390, 391. ² *Idem*, 389, 391. ³ *Heeren*, II, 196. ⁴ *Wilkinson*, v, 430. ⁵ *Idem*, 430. ⁶ *Idem*, 426. ⁷ *Idem*, 75.

Here was a pause, and before the mummy case could be deposited in the boat, any person was at liberty to bring forward his accusation against the deceased.¹ If an accuser presented himself he was bound to sustain his accusation, and if he failed he was subject to the severest penalties. If he succeeded, and it was proved that the deceased had led an evil life, the judges gave their judgment of condemnation, the penalty for which was the depriving the body of its rights of sepulture. When it is considered that this judgment not only amounted to a public open exposure of the vicious course of life of the deceased, thus overwhelming his surviving relatives with shame and mortification, and affording to their enemies the most signal triumph,² but that, in addition to all that, it fell with a heavy weight upon the soul of the deceased, and forever excluded it from the mansions of the blessed, its awful severity will be adequately felt and appreciated. It was not, therefore, until it was clearly ascertained that there was no accuser, or if one appeared,³ until he had failed to make good his accusation, or it was disproved, that the relations ceased from their lamentations, and commenced pronouncing encomiums on the deceased. Then it was that his education and studies were related, his piety, justice, temperance, and other virtues praised, and the gods below supplicated to receive him as the companion of the pious. To all this the assembled multitude assented, and in token thereof, united in sending up their acclamations. The priest, in pronouncing the judgment of acquittal makes the deceased enumerate all the sins forbidden by the Egyptian law,⁴ supposed to have been forty-two in number, equal to the number of the assessors, and to assert his innocence of each. The body was then taken to the family catacomb, and placed in the repository allotted to it.⁵

This tremendous ordeal was applied to the high as well as to the low. It was a tribunal that sat in judgment

¹ *Wilkinson*, v, 426. ² *Idem*, 428. ³ *Idem*, 427. ⁴ *Idem*, 429, 430. ⁵ *Idem*, 427.

upon a deceased Pharaoh, as well as upon the poorest of his subjects. Arrived at the vestibule of the tomb,¹ his character was doomed to undergo the same test; and if his injustice or impiety, or vicious course of life, was established upon sufficient proofs, he also was denied the usual funeral obsequies. Any one could present himself as an accuser. Or, as the high priest eulogized his character, enumerating his noble actions, and dwelling upon his merits, the assembled thousands of the people, if they felt those praises to be just, responded with their favorable acclamations. If his life had been stained with vice or injustice, a mingled murmur arose as the sign of their disapprobation. The instances are not unfrequent of a deceased Pharaoh being deprived of the customary public funeral by the opposing voice of the people.

All the legitimate tendencies exerted by this singular institution were obviously for good. It sent forth from the very entrance of the tomb a most powerful persuasive to live a life of virtue. It appealed to some of the strongest of human motives, and enforced that appeal by the severest of all sanctions, the exclusion of the body from its sepulchre, and of the soul from the abodes of the blessed. It is not a little singular that a custom apparently so salutary, and so early introduced, should not afterwards have been adopted by other nations.

Government.

There are various criteria by which the perfection of political organization among a people may be tested. One is the amount of liberty, or freedom of thought, speech, and act, which each member of the community is allowed to enjoy. Another is the celerity with which all those who compose the organization may be compelled to concentrate their forces, and the energy and effect with which they can be made to act in the bringing about of any result. If we

¹ *Wilkinson*, v, 435.

adopt the latter we shall find no difficulty in assigning to the political organization of the ancient Egyptians a high degree of perfection, which must have been early attained. The very existence of those massy structures, so profusely scattered along the banks of the Nile, is utterly inconsistent with any political organization at the time they were reared, other than such as could command all the sources of power, lay its resistless hand upon all the physical energies of the community, and apply them to the accomplishment of a given object with a steady aim and the certainty of success. As these structures are older than history, and found in existence when that commences its record of human thought and action, it is obvious that the political organization of the Egyptians must have been among the elder born of human governments.

To understand this aright we must first take a brief view of one of the earliest and most peculiar forms of social or civil organization. I allude to the institution of castes. By this is meant a division of all the members of the community into separate and distinct classes, grades or ranks; each of which is hereditary, and separated from every other by an insurmountable barrier. To each caste was appropriated some profession, business or calling, to which all who belonged to it were specially attached. The origin of this institution is anterior to the period of history,¹ and is therefore veiled by an obscurity which mere conjecture can never undertake to penetrate. It was perhaps thought, and with some degree of reason, that the rigid separation of professions would ensure to each its preservation, perfection and further extension. It might possibly have tended to produce that result, but along with it was the further effect of subjecting the mental and moral growth of man to be limited entirely to this "bed of Procrustes." The number of castes has been variously stated by different authors.² Strabo reduces them to three: priests, military and husbandmen. Diodorus includes them in five: priests,

¹ *Heeren*, II, 97. ² *Topography*, 229, 230.

military, shepherds, husbandmen and artificers. Plato divides them into six: priests, soldiers, artificers, shepherds, huntsmen and husbandmen; while Herodotus enumerates seven: priests, military, shepherds, swineherds, tradesmen, interpreters and boatmen. All have probably had in view the same general distinctions, but one has adopted the main comprehensive divisions, while the others have subdivided them into their minor branches.

Every Egyptian was required to follow the profession of his father. This principle is embraced in the formation and perpetuation of castes.¹ To render this a living and active principle, every one was compelled to give an account of his mode of life, and the employment by which he gained his livelihood. A severe punishment was inflicted upon any one making a false statement.

The caste which attained the earliest, and held the longest, the first position in the social, civil, and political affairs of the Egyptians was the sacerdotal. Like the heart in the human body it was the first that by its movements infused life into the old system of Egyptian polity, and like that also it was the last that surrendered to death, when that polity had performed its mission and was passing away. The organization of this caste was peculiar. Every priest must enter into the service of some god,² or rather must belong to some particular temple. It was the temple in which the worship was conducted that formed the great central point in the priestly hierarchy. It had large estates belonging to it, the revenues of which were drawn by its priests. It was their inheritance. It would follow as a natural, if not necessary, consequence, that each great temple, or the deity residing in it, had its own family or college of priests, the number of which was never fixed, nor could it be, as the priesthood descended in families, the number of which must have been constantly varying. It was not only the fact that the priest caste was *generally* hereditary, it was *especially* so with the priest-

¹ *Topography*, 231. ² *Heeren*, II, 123.

hood of every particular deity which was worshiped in a great temple.

The sacerdotal caste was composed of pontiffs of various grades, prophets, judges, hierogrammats, embalmers, doctors, hierophants, and several inferior functionaries.¹ The priesthood belonging to each temple had an organization among themselves.² They had a high priest, whose office was hereditary, and one of the first and highest in the state. The organization of the inferior priesthood varied in different cities, according to the size and wants of the locality. It must not be supposed that the priest caste was exclusively devoted to the service of the gods.³ They were the depositaries of all the knowledge, science and wisdom then existing in the world. They were masters of the resources of this world as well as of that which is to come. They were not only priests, but prophets, judges, physicians, soothsayers, embalmers, architects; in fine, everything in which any species of scientific knowledge was required.

Every great city in Egypt had within it one principal temple, with which was connected a college of priests.⁴ Thus at Memphis were what the Greeks called the priests of Vulcan; at Thebes, of the Theban Jupiter; at Sais, of Minerva; and at On, of the sun.

In regard to the means of support of this numerous caste, it has been erroneously supposed by some that they were paid by the king or state. They were in no way dependent on the throne for their maintenance. They were landed proprietors.⁵ They shared with the king and soldier caste in the ownership of all the lands of Egypt. To each large temple were attached extensive estates, which formed the original territory of the settlement, and therefore belonged in common to the whole body of priests connected with it. These estates were farmed out at moderate rents, and the income formed the common treasury of the temple, out of which the priests and their

¹ *Topography of Thebes*, 230. ² *Heeren*, II, 124. ³ *Idem*, 125. ⁴ *Idem*, 126.

⁵ *Idem*, 127.

families were supported.¹ Besides these, each priest or family of priests possessed, or had a right to possess, private estates, and means of their own. They were, in fact, a highly privileged nobility. They carried on many of the most profitable branches of business. The king, if not originally taken from their order, was obliged to become a member of it on assuming the sovereignty.² They were his counselors, and had a large share in the management of affairs of state. He conformed to their rules, and subserved their interests; and they, in return, lent their all-powerful aid in sustaining and strengthening the throne. Simple, but imposing in their dress; abstaining from certain meats and indulging sparingly, if at all, in wine; shaving often, and bathing twice a day; attending strictly to their duties, both public and private; making a show of great self-denial, they obtained credit for purity of body and mind; were venerated for their piety, revered for their learning, and obtained an entire ascendancy over the minds of the superstitious Egyptians. Such was the nature and such the powers and privileges of a caste, the branches of which were spread all over Egypt.³ Every large Egyptian city had its temple and native priesthood belonging to it;⁴ but the great cities, which formerly had been the capitals of the Egyptian kingdoms, Memphis, Thebes, Heliopolis, and Sais, still continued their principal seats.

The next in rank, power and privilege to the priest, was the soldier caste.⁵ The Egyptian warriors constituted a race, or caste, and one of the most distinguished of the nation. They were divided into Hermotybi and Culasiri, each possessing certain nomes, or districts. In the most flourishing period of Egyptian history, the former numbered 160,000, and the latter 250,000 men. It must not, however, be supposed that this immense force was always kept employed,⁶ or even in pay. A portion, sufficient to

¹ *Heeren*, II, 128. ² *Topography*, 232. ³ *Heeren*, II, 123. ⁴ *Idem*, 123. ⁵ *Idem*, 131. ⁶ *Topography*, 236.

form the king's body guard, and, also, to garrison the different posts, was kept in actual service, while the rest constituted a kind of militia, who were to be always in readiness when called upon. Those constituting the king's body guard, being two thousand in number, drew daily rations sufficient for their support. The settlements of this caste were principally confined to Lower Egypt,¹ probably for the reason that the invasions of Egypt generally being from Asia, were the most likely to reach and assail the Egyptian territory, the first at that point. Of the organization of this caste we have but little knowledge. Those composing it were inured to the fatigues of war, by the occupations of the chase,² and by games and gymnastic exercises. These consisted in wrestling, cudgeling, throwing and catching the ball, leaping, racing, and in mock fights, and feats of strength. Many of these were more or less common to all the Egyptians.

The occupations of the great body of the soldier caste, during peace, were principally agricultural.³ The mechanical trades were interdicted, because they were thought to be detrimental to his physical force,⁴ and were also considered as debasing. Each soldier was entitled to nine and a half acres of land,⁵ which was exempt from every charge and tribute. This, he was at liberty to cultivate himself, or to follow the example of the king and priests in farming it out.

These two were the principal, and ruling castes in Egypt. In addition to these were the husbandmen, who were, by some, all included in one caste, and by others, variously divided into shepherds, artificers, tradesmen, etc., according to the actual divisions of them found in society. Here, also, the principal, or hereditary descent obtained,⁶ the son being bound to carry on the trade of his father and that alone.

The landed property was in the hands of the king,⁷ priests and warriors, but on what conditions the lower castes

¹ Heeren, II, 133. ² *Topography*, 237. ³ *Idem*, 236. ⁴ Heeren, II, 134. ⁵ *Topography*, 235. ⁶ Heeren, II, 137. ⁷ *Idem*, 137, 138.

worked the land is not so well understood. The object had in view, in investigating the subject of caste in this connection, is to ascertain wherein the governing element in Egypt resided. There is little doubt but that it existed originally in the priest caste.

The method or manner in which civil polity first became established among the Egyptians, under which they were enabled to extend their settlements along the banks of the Nile, is, in part, founded on historical evidence, and, in part, depends upon conjecture.

Egypt, at the earliest historical period, is found divided into nomes or districts,¹ the exact number of which is not now ascertainable. Strabo enumerates thirty-six; D'Anville collects on his map, fifty-three, which does not include all that are mentioned by Herodotus. This division was political, and was in a particular manner connected with the objects and form of worship in various parts of Egypt.² Thus it is said that those belonging to the Theban nomes, worshiped in the sanctuary of the Theban Jupiter, slaughtered goats, but deemed the sheep sacred; while those inhabiting the Mendean nomes, on the contrary, slaughtered the sheep, but protected the goat as a sacred animal.

These nomes were undoubtedly, at their origin, appended to the temples.³ There were so many new settlements of the priest caste, every such nome being distinguished from the others, by the form of worship introduced into it, which was everywhere modeled according to local circumstances. It is thus that the original settlements were made by the priest caste, who were the first to accustom the inhabitants to fixed dwellings, and to the practice of agriculture, which they accomplished mainly by the introduction of a religious worship, formed according to the locality, and supported by local circumstances.

The central point was always the temple, around which the city in time became formed.⁴ The term nome is understood to be a name given by the Egyptians to a city,

¹ *Heeren*, II, 108, 109. ² *Idem*, 110. ³ *Idem*, 110, 111. ⁴ *Idem*, 112.

with its surrounding territory, and the villages therein included.

This method of extending settlements over Egypt would have the effect to divide the whole country up into separate districts; thus creating a large number of petty states all independent, although possessing similar political organizations. These several states were under the influence and control, not of a king or governor, but of a priesthood, the priesthood of the temple which was the centre of the district or nome.

The first form of government, therefore, established among the Egyptians was a priestly hierarchy; a species of theocracy, in which the priesthood superadded to the duties enjoined by religion, those also required for the purpose of civil rule. This is probably in its nature more despotic than any other, because a precept, command or injunction professing to come from deity, must necessarily partake of his nature so far as to be perfect and irreversible. Hence the intrinsic absolutism of a theocratic government, although the priesthood might, and most probably did, exercise their sway in a manner mild and benignant. In what particular manner this government was constituted; on what form or fashion it was modeled; what were its sanctions; or how it was exercised, we have little or no real knowledge. Neither do we know the period of time during which this form of government flourished. Finding man rude and uncultivated, with passions too strong for his intelligence and reason, it was undoubtedly the best calculated to awaken in him the sense of himself; to arouse him to the contemplation of objects beyond mere sensual gratification; to stimulate him to the peaceful pursuits of industry; to render him the centre of domestic, civil and social relations; and finally to probe the depth of his moral and spiritual nature, restore to him his conscience and the deity that arms it with its tremendous sanctions. Man in his rude and savage state may disregard and despise all human law that places any restraint upon his passions; but there is something in his nature even when

most debased, that respects and reverences the commands of God, and the authority of those who profess to be his vicegerents on earth. Hence the mission of the priest has ever been clothed with the highest degree of importance, and the message he has delivered in the name of deity, has always received respectful attention. Like every other human institution it has been liable to abuses, but these should not render us insensible to the great amount of good it has accomplished.

It was probably owing to this early government of the priesthood that the Egyptians, in the infancy of time, became possessed of the elements of a character, whose displays have ever been the wonder of the world. It was hence that they were essentially peaceful; that they first successfully developed the element of industry; that their habits were devotional; and that among them a flame, comparatively brilliant, was so early kindled at the shrine of art.

But the priesthood, in their exercise of government, were at length compelled to receive a partner, if not a master. We have seen that the two ruling castes were the priest, and the military. The lines that separated these castes from each other, as well as their relative importance, would naturally become more marked and greater in proportion as the necessities of the public required of them the services they were respectively enabled to render. In the earlier ages of Egyptian history, the predominating influence of the priest caste originated and perpetuated that peaceful policy which seems to have been generally effectual in preserving a good understanding among the Egyptians themselves. Although Egypt was originally divided into a great number of independent nomes or districts, many of them differing from each other even in the very deities they worshiped, yet we hear little of any intestine wars or commotions prevailing among them. This fact of itself proves how strong was the influence exercised by the priest caste among the Egyptians.

But Egypt, like every other country, was exposed to invasion from without. The immense fertility of its soil,

its industry and its arts, only rendered it a more desirable prey to the foreign invader. The Hyksos, or shepherd kings, were among the first to disturb the state of repose of the Egyptians. They were, at different periods of time, succeeded by the Ethiopian and the Persian. These foreign invasions were beyond the control of the priest caste. Another and a different power was invoked to meet, and if possible, repel these invasions by foreigners. That power was found embodied in the soldier caste, the native Egyptian warriors. These to be effective required a leader, and from Menes to Napoleon the road from victory to the throne has ever been easily and quickly traveled over.

It is not, therefore, difficult to understand the necessity that originated the monarchical power in Egypt. That power, once in existence, was only enabled to perpetuate itself on one condition, that of allying its destinies with those of the priest caste. It was not a transfer of the Egyptians from a religious to a military despotism; it was rather an amalgamation of the two. The throne and the altar lent to each other mutual aid, to the end that each might become more firmly established.

The general name of the monarch was Pharaoh. The crown was hereditary, passing in the order of primogeniture to his male children; or to his daughters, if he had no sons, or to his brothers or sisters, if he left no lineal descendants.

There appears to have been no salic law in Egypt excluding females from the succession,¹ but the instances in which queens reigned over that country appear to have been very few. They are mentioned in the annals of Manetho, and one, Nitocris,² by Herodotus, but their names do not appear in the lists of sovereigns sculptured in the temples of Thebes and Abydos.

The king could be taken only from the sacerdotal or soldier caste, and if originally from the latter, he was required, before ascending the throne, to be admitted into

¹ *Gliddon*, 48. ² *Wilkinson*, I, 246.

the former,¹ and instructed in all the secret learning of the priests. Regular successions from father to son, for several generations, are found recorded on the monuments,² so that, although some historians mention that in early times the kings of Egypt were elected, yet that probably occurred only when there was a want of legal heirs, or some difficulty about the succession.

The Egyptian Pharaoh had not the arbitrary power which was generally exercised by eastern despots. There were certain great maxims of government in obedience to which he reigned. He was considered an officer of state; not as reigning for his own benefit, but for that of the nation;³ and bound to serve as well as govern. He rather belonged to the nation than the nation to him. What was certainly very remarkable, and furnishes high evidence of their political wisdom, this ancient people, even in the infancy of time, adopted the maxim that the king should be exonerated from blame,⁴ while the injurious consequences of his acts were laid upon his ministers and advisers.

The king's coronation was an imposing ceremony.⁵ It is represented in sculpture and painting upon the palaces or temples, and was magnificent in its display. One of the solemnities consisted in the anointing of the king, and in the presentation to him of the emblems of majesty by the gods.⁶ The gods are also represented as bestowing their blessing upon him at the moment of his assuming the reins of government.⁷ The sacred tau, or sign of life, was presented to him, which, together with the sceptre of purity, is usually found in the hands of the gods.⁸ These were deemed the greatest gifts that could be bestowed by the deity on man. This representation of the interference of the gods with the head of the state was calculated to impress strongly on the Egyptian mind the magnitude and importance of the kingly office.

¹ *Wilkinson*, I, 245. ² *Idem*, 247. ³ *Idem*, 250. ⁴ *Idem*, 252. ⁵ *Wilkinson*, v, 277. ⁶ *Idem*, 279. ⁷ *Idem*, 282. ⁸ *Idem*, 283.

There was in Egypt an intimate union between church and state. The elements of religion and government were in close companionship.¹ The point of union was the king, who was the chief of the religion as well as the head of the state. As chief of religion, it was his duty to regulate the sacrifices in the temples, and he enjoyed the peculiar right of offering them to the gods upon grand occasions. He alone was "president of the assemblies,"² and as such had the superintendence of the feasts and festivals in honor of the deities.

As head of the state he possessed the right of proclaiming peace and war. He was the sole commander of the armies of Egypt, and as incidental to the exercise of that power, he dispensed rewards and punishments among the soldiers in such a manner as he supposed best calculated to promote the interests of the soldier caste.

It was the great, and almost the peculiar blessing of Egypt, to become in very early times a land of law.³ The laws formed a very considerable portion of their sacred books, which were acknowledged to be of divine origin, and were regarded with superstitious reverence. The supremacy claimed for them was not alone upon the ground of their utility as human institutions, but because they also bore upon them the stamp and impress of divinity. To dispute or disobey them was rebellion against the deity, and superadded, therefore, impiety to the commission of crime. To these laws all castes, and all orders of the state were subject. The king could claim no exemption. He could not, like the eastern despots, generally indulge in acts of arbitrary will,⁴ but was content to submit to the rules of public duty, and even of private life. The laws in relation to the king were exceedingly minute and particular.⁵ His daily and nightly occupations were regulated by the rules they prescribed. In obedience to them every hour might be said to have its employment, and every employment its hour.

¹ *Wilkinson*, I, 245. ² *Idem*, 246. ³ *Idem*, 248. ⁴ *Idem*, 249. ⁵ *Idem*, 250.

A time was set for the performance of every duty, and a systematic method of transacting business was introduced, which was found productive of very beneficial results.

The early daybreak was fixed upon for the commencement of public business. Then all the epistolary correspondence was examined, and the subject of each letter considered with attention. Next were required the performance of ablutions, after which the king put on his robes of ceremony, and, attended by proper officers, with the insignia of royalty, repaired to the temple to superintend the sacrifices to the gods. There, after the victims were brought to the altar, the high priests offered up to the gods public prayers for the monarch. A kind of oration was there pronounced by the high priest, in which the virtues of the king were descanted on, the good qualities of kings generally discussed, their conduct reviewed, and their faults pointed out.

After this, the king examined the entrails of the victim,¹ and performed the usual ceremonies of sacrifice, the sacred scribe, called the hierogrammateus, reading those extracts from the holy writings which recorded the deeds and sayings of the most celebrated men.

But the laws not only presided over and regulated the king's conduct in public,² but also descended into the details of his private life, and there subjected every action to the severest scrutiny. "The hours for washing, walking, and all the amusements and occupations of the day, were settled with precision, and the quantity as well as quality of his food, were regulated by law. Simplicity was required both in eating and drinking, and the quantity of wine was limited with scrupulous exactitude." The great object was to enforce temperance both in eating and drinking, with the view not only to secure health of body, but also to give to the mental constitution that firmness, solidity and peculiar character, that would render it proof against the

¹ *Wilkinson*, I, 252. ² *Idem*, 253.

predominance of passion, and always ensure the exercise of cool and deliberate judgment. Under the Pharaonic sway we are probably presented with a fair sample of the old patriarchal form of government, such as early prevailed in the east, and is still witnessed in China. It is the oldest form of civil polity; and when conducted upon right principles, under proper restraints, and in subjection to salutary laws, it is, in certain stages of human progress, a form the best calculated to secure the great ends of government. In its true principle, the bond existing between the king and subject is that of love. The respect and reverence paid him while living amounts to little short of adoration.

But the wisdom of the Egyptians embraced the things of death as well as those of life. The death of a Pharaoh was a remarkable event, and signalized by remarkable transactions. All Egypt went into mourning for the space of seventy-two days.¹ Sacrifices ceased to be offered; the temples were closed; and no feasts or festivals could lift up their voice of joy and rejoicing. Companies of people of both sexes, two or three hundred in number, would meet together, tear their garments, cover their heads with dust and mud, and, forming a procession, would sing the funeral dirge. A general fast was proclaimed, and they would taste neither meat nor wheat bread, and abstained from wine and every kind of luxury. The body having been embalmed in the most perfect and costly manner, on the last day was placed in state within the vestibule of the tomb. Here, in common with the meanest subject,² it was subjected to the tribunal of death, an institution which seems to have been peculiar to Egypt, and has already been considered under the social forms and habits of the Egyptians. It was a dread ordeal, which had an all-powerful effect upon the life and conduct of the monarch. Any one present might come forward as an accuser. All the flagrant acts of his life might be arrayed

¹ *Wilkinson*, I, 255, 256. ² *Idem*, 257.

against him in judgment; and if found guilty he was deprived of the customary funeral obsequies. Thus the judgment after death was either a just tribute to his virtues or a severe punishment of his crimes.

The king, although sovereign over Egypt, was not the only immediate agent through whom power was exercised or privilege dispensed.¹ Egypt was divided into provinces or districts, and over these were placed nomarchs or governors. The office of the nomarch was always of the highest importance,² as the management of the lands was committed to his charge, and also all matters relating to the internal administration of the district. He regulated the assessment and levying of the taxes, and the surveying of the lands. He superintended the opening of the canals, and had a general supervision over the agricultural interests of the country. His residence was in the chief town of the nome, and all causes respecting landed property, and other accidental disputes, were referred to him, and adjusted before his tribunal.

The laws of the ancient Egyptians had a fabled derivation from the gods.³ They were accredited to Hermes or Mercury, the Thoth of the Egyptians. They were handed down from the earliest times, and regarded with the highest degree of reverence.

An accusation which turned out to be false subjected the accuser to the same punishment which would have been inflicted upon the accused had it proved to be true. But a false accusation sustained by perjury was deemed a crime of the blackest dye,⁴ as it, in fact, involved two crimes: a contempt of the gods, and a violation of good faith towards man. Its punishment was death. A calumniator of the dead was condemned to a severe punishment. The willful murder of a freeman, and even of a slave, was punished with death.⁵ In awarding death to the murderer of a slave, the laws of the Egyptians were far in advance of those of other ancient people, and would almost justify

¹ *Wilkinson*, II, 72. ² *Idem*, 75. ³ *Idem*, 31. ⁴ *Idem*, 32. ⁵ *Idem*, 35.

the alleged divinity of their origin. So high a crime did they consider the deprivation of life, that to be even the accidental witness of an attempt to murder, without endeavoring to prevent it, was deemed a capital offense,¹ and only palliated by proving an inability to act. To be present when any personal injury was inflicted upon another, without interfering, was tantamount to being a party, and punishable accordingly.² Every one who witnessed a robbery was bound either to arrest, or to prosecute the offenders. The pardoning power was, in all cases, vested in the king, who could exert the royal prerogative in favor of the criminal.

A custom or law prevailed in Egypt by which every one was required, at certain times, to present himself before the magistrates or provincial governors,³ and give his name, place of abode, profession or employment, and the mode and means by which he gained his livelihood. The official scribes registered all these particulars. At the time fixed, they proceeded in bodies to the appointed office, marching under their respective banners, each one being introduced singly to the registering clerks, to give in his account.

If this examination resulted in furnishing evidence that the individual followed an irregular mode of life, which led to the commission of excesses,⁴ they were sentenced to the bastinado. But the rendition of a false statement, or the engagement in unlawful pursuits, subjected to the punishment of a capital crime.

They did not, like many of the ancient nations, allow the parent any right over the life of his offspring, but held child murder to be an odious, but not a capital crime.⁵ The punishment they ordained for the commission of this crime was singular. The corpse of the dead child was fastened to the neck of its parent, and he was obliged to pass three whole days and nights in its embrace.

The crime of parricide was visited with the most cruel of chastisements. The criminal was first lacerated with

¹ *Wilkinson*, II, 36. ² *Idem*, 37. ³ *Idem*, 32. ⁴ *Idem*, 35. ⁵ *Idem*, 38.

sharpened reeds,¹ and after being thrown on thorns, was burnt to death.

When a woman was convicted of a capital offense, and was found to be in a state of pregnancy, her punishment was suspended until after the birth of the child,² because her execution while in that state would destroy the innocent equally with the guilty, and deprive the father of a right which he had in his offspring.

A woman who had committed adultery was condemned to lose her nose,³ as it was supposed that the loss of that prominent feature would be the most severely felt. The man was condemned to receive a bastinado of one thousand blows. But if he had used force against a free woman, he was doomed to a cruel and inhuman punishment.

The kind of punishment which appears to have been the most frequently administered among the ancient Egyptians, was the bastinado.⁴ It was inflicted on both sexes. Men and boys lay prostrate on the ground, and were often held by the hands and feet, while the punishment was inflicting. Women were punished as they sat, receiving the stripes on their backs.

Adulterators of money, falsifiers of weights and measures, forgers of seals or signatures were condemned to the loss of both their hands.⁵ Thefts, breach of trust, and petty frauds were punished with the bastinado, but robbery and house breaking were sometimes considered capital crimes and punished with death. The mode of punishment the most generally adopted when the crime was capital, was that of hanging.

There was a singular custom prevailing among the ancient Egyptians, in relation to the practice of theft as a profession. An association was formed, and all those composing it gave in their names to their chief,⁶ agreeing to inform him truly of everything they might steal as

¹ *Wilkinson*, II, 39. ² *Idem*, 39. ³ *Idem*, 39. ⁴ *Idem*, 40, 41. ⁵ *Idem*, 45.
⁶ *Idem*, 47.

soon as it came into their possession. The chief was known to the public, and any one losing goods made application to him, stating the day and hour when they were stolen, and describing them with such particularity that they could be identified. Upon payment of one-fourth of their value they were restored to the applicant. The chief was a respectable citizen, and a man of integrity and honor. This, in general, secured the loser against the loss of any more than a fourth; because if they were stolen by any one not belonging to the profession, all those who did belong to it were interested in finding the offender and in bringing him to punishment, in which they would generally succeed.

The practice of usury was strongly condemned by the Egyptian laws.¹ Under no circumstances was interest ever allowed to increase to more than double the original sum. The creditor could not seize the debtor's person, but could only obtain out of his property the satisfaction of his debt. The accumulation of debt was prevented, and the interests of the creditor were secured by a remarkable law that rendered it illegal for any one to borrow money² without giving in pledge for its repayment, the body of his father, or his nearest relative. The neglect to redeem this pledge not only rendered the debtor infamous while living, but at his death, deprived him of funeral obsequies, and even of burial. Neither could his children nor any of his family enjoy the right of sepulture, while the debt remained unpaid, as the creditor was put in possession of the family tomb.

A remarkable feature in Egyptian law was its uniformity. The fabled derivation from the gods, it was sustained by the higher sanctions of religion, and could not be changed without the commission of impiety.³ Hence few innovations were introduced and few changes occur during the lapse of many successive ages.

The king was the agent through whom the laws were promulgated.⁴ The affairs both of religion, and of the

¹ *Wilkinson*, II, 50. ² *Idem*, 51. ³ *Idem*, 69. ⁴ *Idem*, 22.

state, acknowledged him as their common head. It was through him also, aided by the counsel and advice of the most able and distinguished members of the priestly order, that justice was administered on those questions that came under his immediate cognizance. The king's edicts appear to have been issued in the form of a firman, or written order, as has ever been the almost uniform practice of all oriental countries.

Common causes, which were of ordinary occurrence, were heard and decided by judges who were men of known character and respectability. Ten only were selected from each one of the three cities, Thebes, Memphis and Heliopolis. These thirty constituted the bench, and at their first meeting, the most distinguished among them was selected for their president, who had the title of arch-judge. They all received ample allowances from the king, but the salary of the arch-judge was greater than that of the others as his office was the more important. One striking feature of their judicial system was that justice was gratuitously administered,¹ and hence equally accessible to the poor as to the rich.

The method of proceeding was very simple. The plaintiff stated his case with all its particulars in writing. The defendant put in a written answer; the plaintiff a written reply; and if no witnesses could be produced, the cause was decided upon the papers and depositions of the parties.² This was deemed better than to have the cause managed by pleaders or advocates. The judgment was pronounced by the arch-judge, which was done by touching the party who had gained the cause with the figure of truth.

Besides these thirty judges returned by the three chief cities, who probably accompanied the court, and performed many of the duties of a senate,³ each city or capital of a nome, had no doubt its own court for the trial of minor and local offenses.

¹ *Wilkinson*, II, 26. ² *Idem*, 29, 30. ³ *Idem*, 28, 29.

Philosophy.

We have less positive knowledge of the development of the Egyptians in this element, than in any other of the elements of humanity. We know that to be "learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians" was accounted the highest of human attainments. We also know that the great advancement early made by that people in all, or many, of the various departments of civilization, imply necessarily the possession of much scientific truth, an ample exercise of the power of thinking. But what were their actual attainments in science, or the systems of philosophy most current amongst them, or their general habits or forms of thought, we have really but a very imperfect knowledge.

One reason for this is, that we are seeking for the treasures of thought far back in the infancy of time. We can hardly expect that many of them will have survived the devastations of war; the awfully destructive agencies that have occasionally been put in exercise; or the mighty changes that have repeatedly swept over the face of human affairs. When the Saracen, true to his faith, consigned to the flames the immense library at Alexandria, he extinguished the sun in the firmament of the old world's thought, and left nothing but a dubious starlight to excite the curiosity, or satisfy the inquiries of its future generations.

Another reason is, that all these treasures were locked up in the priest caste. They alone possessed them, and they knew too well their value to disseminate or render them the common property of man. Like the Persian magi, and the Assyrian and Babylonian Chaldæans, they were the depositaries of light and knowledge, and kept the rest of the world shrouded in darkness.

The more effectually to conceal these treasures, they expressed them in a peculiar written character, understood probably at the time by none but themselves. The ancient Egyptians used three kinds of characters. These

were the hieroglyphic, hieratic, and enchorial.¹ The hieratic was confined more particularly to the priests. The other two were known to all who received a good education. The enchorial character was the latest adopted, the earliest inscriptions in it not dating back earlier than the age of the Ptolemies. The hieratic is of higher antiquity, although that appears to have been in transition state in the age of Darius. This was originally taken from the hieroglyphic, which was the earliest written character made use of by the Egyptians, and was probably the sole mode of writing known to them in the earliest periods of their history.

The three kinds or classes, then, may be thus characterized :

1. The most recent, the enchorial, sometimes styled the demotic,² was the most expeditious method of writing, and was written from right to left. This has also been termed the epistolographic, and was usually the first learned.

2. The hieratic, or sacerdotal, which seems to have been an abbreviative method, and a derivative from the hieroglyphic. This was used by the scribes and priests in their literary pursuits, and appears to be traceable as high as 1500 B. C., and was also written from right to left.

3. The hieroglyphic, or sacred sculptured characters, which is the language inscribed upon the monuments, was the original and primitive written character, and dates back to a remote antiquity.³ This method of writing continued down to the emperor Caracalla, about A. D. 215. The key to it was soon afterwards lost, and it continued to be an unknown character until within the last quarter of a century the efforts of Young and Champollion have been successful in discovering a method of decyphering this hitherto strange language, and thus of restoring to mind what, for so many ages, had been considered as utterly lost.

¹ *Wilkinson*, II, 13. ² *Gliddon*, 20. ³ *Idem*, 48.

From this discovery, however, as yet very little has been obtained that could enlighten in reference to the philosophy of the ancient Egyptians. Indeed it could hardly be expected that any extended system of thought would be cut in their stony tablets, and no ancient papyri have yet been discovered that would throw much light upon these recondite subjects. Possibly hereafter something more important may be brought to light.¹

We have few remains of early writers that treat of Egypt's ancient philosophy. Of Chæremon and Manetho only a few fragments preserved in other authors have reached us. We are therefore compelled to rely pretty exclusively upon what foreign writers, Herodotus, Diodorus Siculus, and Plutarch, have transmitted to us, and that with means and opportunities comparatively small, of becoming acquainted with the subjects upon which they respectively have treated.

A fact that somewhat embarrasses the accounts of these writers is, that different dogmas, if not systems, of philosophy, were taught in the different schools of Thebes,² Memphis, and other places; and these they have either confounded together, or they have caused great diversity in their accounts.

The invention of letters, institution of religious rites, and the teaching of astronomy, music and other arts, are all attributed to Thoth,³ who is regarded as the author of Egyptian learning. He is the same who was styled by the Greeks, Hermes, and by the Romans, Mercury. The Egyptians named after him the first month of the year. Of him very little is really known. He was probably a man of superior genius, who in Egypt's early infancy, and long before the age of Moses, or even of Joseph, invented many useful arts,⁴ taught the first rudiments of science, and engraved, in emblematical figures, his instructions upon tables or columns of stone, and dispersed them over the country. Hence the inscriptions upon the columns of Thoth, or Hermes, are regarded with great reverence, not

¹ *Enfield*, 37. ² *Idem*, 36. ³ *Idem*, 37. ⁴ *Idem*, 38.

only as teaching the doctrines of religion, but also as embodying the maxims of political and moral wisdom. There was also a second Hermes, or Mercury, who appeared at a much later period, whose chief merit consists in reviving arithmetic, geometry, and the arts, and in restoring the ancient and then forgotten learning of the first Hermes. He is often called Trismegistus. He recovered the monuments of the elder Hermes,¹ which in the course of civil revolutions or convulsions of nature, had become neglected or lost. He interpreted the symbols inscribed upon the ancient columns, and wrote an incredible number of books of commentaries and explanations. He is asserted to have been the author of more than 20,000 volumes, treating of the nature and orders of celestial beings, of astrology, medicine, and the first principles of things. Many of the alleged writings of Trismegistus were undoubtedly the forgeries of a later age, when it became desirable to affix to fiction the sanction of antiquity. All his writings, together with the original columns of Hermes, were committed by him to the care of the priesthood, to be transmitted by them to posterity. Thus we have the origin of Egyptian wisdom, the instrument by which it was to be disseminated, and the channel through which it was to descend to future generations. The priesthood revived or continued the use of the hieroglyphical or symbolical character originally engraved upon the pillars of Hermes, of which they possessed the key or method of interpretation. They also invented a more compendious method of writing,² the hieratic, which was alphabetical, and was of readier and easier use in explanation, and for religious and other purposes.

There is a necessary connection between the knowledge of scientific truth possessed by any people, and the progress they have made in different departments of civilization. The successful prosecution of industrial pursuits; the religious and social economy of a people; their culti-

¹ *Enfield*, 38. ² *Idem*, 39.

vation of the arts; and their managing rightly the machine of government, including its different departments, and the arrangement of its finances; requires a practical knowledge of some branches of mathematics, of mechanical powers, and of astronomical science. In all these the Egyptians must have made some proficiency.

Arithmetic and geometry seem to have been the favorite studies of the Egyptians. The latter, more especially, must have been a science considerably cultivated.¹ It has numerous applications to all the purposes of civil life, and more especially to some peculiarities in the industrial pursuits of the Egyptians. The principles embraced in land surveying must have been early put in practice by the Egyptians. The mensuration and division of land in Egypt was established even before the age of Joseph.² During his age, every one is found having his own particular domain. This necessarily supposes the practice of land measuring. The annual inundations of the Nile, introducing confusion into the boundaries of estates, taking from some and adding to others,³ removing some land marks and covering up others, must have tended to introduce and perfect the practice of land surveying, and thus given birth to geometry in Egypt.

Nor did they rest satisfied simply with the acquisition of the first principles of that science. Without the art of leveling, they could not so effectually have succeeded in conducting the waters of the Nile, by means principally of canals, over all the fertile parts of Egypt.

Their knowledge of mechanical forces is rendered sufficiently evident by the use they must have made of them in the erection of their stupendous structures. With all the knowledge of those forces now possessed, it is little less than mystery by what agencies those enormous obelisks and colossi could have been removed from the quarry where they were cut, transported sometimes to considerable distances, and then placed so strongly on their base as

¹ *Goguet*, I, 258. ² *Idem*, 257. ³ *Idem*, 258.

to encounter the assaults of the elements unharmed for some thirty centuries.

The Egyptians must have made respectable attainments in the science of astronomy. Some attribute to them the origin of this science, but it seems that the oldest astronomical observations were made by the Chaldæans at Babylon.¹ The Egyptians, however, have had the preference for exactness, and for what, in strict terms may be called astronomical science, the Chaldæan astronomy being too much tinctured with astrology. The Egyptians were also astrologers, and the ardent pursuit of astrology, no doubt contributed to the advancement of astronomy.

The great antiquity of the Egyptian government and institutions; the early establishment of its people in the settled forms of social and civil polity; the delightful mildness of its climate; the beauty, brightness and loveliness of its skies; the extensive prospect which was there presented, especially in northern and southern directions; its position, at no very great distance from the equatorial region, which enabled it to command a wider range of starry observation; the early stimulus afforded to its people in their rage for judicial astrology; all offered facilities and created motives and inducements for the cultivation of astronomical science.

One of the best evidences of their early progress in this science,² is that they were the first who gave a certain form to their year. They divided it into twelve months. Whether it first consisted of lunar months, three hundred and fifty-four days, or of three hundred and sixty, is now unknown,³ but the year of three hundred and sixty days was of an antiquity prior to the age of Moses.

The first step taken by mankind in dividing and measuring time, was probably to institute the week, consisting of seven days. The eastern nations seem in all ages to have had this institution. The next natural division was the lunar month, which seems, in the early ages, to have

¹ *Goguet*, III, 120. ² *Idem*, I, 229. ³ *Idem*, 230.

been their year.¹ The observation that twelve revolutions of the moon brought about the same seasons, and the same temperature of the air, led naturally to the adoption of a larger division approaching nearer to our present year.² This shows why the year was first lunar, consisting of three hundred and fifty-four days. The Tartars, Arabians, and some other nations still use the lunar year.

Their next observations were probably directed to the sun, and an approximation made towards the period of his annual revolution.³ What they aimed at was to make the solar and lunar months agree, which they sought to accomplish by adding six days to every twelve lunar months. This made their civil year to consist of three hundred and sixty days. This was the duration of the Egyptian year in the time of Moses.⁴ Most of the nations of antiquity, for many ages, knew no other year than this.

The inequality of meridian shadows, and other appearances must have in the course of time,⁵ led to the discovery of the difference between the solar and lunar year, and that one revolution of the sun surpassed the duration of twelve lunations. Natural gnomons, such as mountains, trees, edifices, etc., may have contributed to this discovery and led to the invention of artificial gnomons. It has been suggested that the Egyptians formed, fashioned and created their beautiful and lofty obelisks to serve the astronomical purpose of a gnomon.⁶ Some reasons are urged for this which gives it at least a strong probability.

The next advance made by the Egyptians in their calendar was to add five days to their year of 360, making their solar or civil year to consist of 365 days.⁷ They did not place these five intercalary days in the way they are placed at present. They did not distribute them in the course of the year. Their months were still each of thirty days,⁸ and then at the end of the twelve months they placed their five days following each other successively,

¹ *Goguet*, I, 231. ² *Idem*, 232. ³ *Idem*, 234. ⁴ *Idem*, 236. ⁵ *Idem*, 248. ⁶ *Idem*, 249. ⁷ *Idem*, 252. ⁸ *Idem*, 256.

between the last month of the old, and the first of the new year. This change must have occurred subsequent to the age of Moses,¹ or about 1500 years B. C., but at what particular period of time it occurred cannot now be ascertained.

Another advance remained still to be made, as the 365 days fell short by nearly a quarter of a day in measuring the entire solar year. They, therefore, added about six hours to the 365 days,² which completed the solar year. The time at which this was done is uncertain, but it was probably a short time prior to the visit made by Plato to Egypt, or about 388 years B. C.

The discovery of the zodiac was very ancient in Egypt.³ Its original discovery was probably the work of the Chaldeans. So also most of the planets were discovered early, a difference between their motion and that of the fixed stars being perceived in the earliest ages.⁴

The Egyptians are said to have known that the eclipse of the moon was caused by the shadow of the earth.⁵ The astronomers of Thebes or Heliopolis are said to have calculated these eclipses and also those of the sun. Thales who had studied in Egypt calculated that eclipse of the sun, which, by the terrors it inspired, separated the armies of the Medes and Lydians the moment they were engaged in battle. The Egyptians seem also to have suspected that the comets were stars that had periodical returns.⁶ They had even constructed astronomical tables, by means of which they ascertained with tolerable exactness, the revolutions of the planets, with their direct, stationary, and retrograde motions. They are also said to have perceived that the sun was the centre of the motions of Mercury and Venus; and that in certain positions, these two planets passed sometimes above and sometimes below the sun. There are even appearances going to indicate that they had at least caught a glimpse of that system

¹ *Goguet*, I, 252. ² *Idem*, 301. ³ *Idem*, I, 244. ⁴ *Idem*, 249. ⁵ *Idem*, III, 107. ⁶ *Idem*, 107.

that places the sun in the centre, and makes the earth and other planets revolve around him.¹

There is no possibility of arriving at any absolute certainty in relation to the real advancement made by the Egyptians in astronomical science. From the fact that those who were the most conspicuous in Grecian philosophy in advancing this science, as Thales, Pythagoras and others, made it their business to visit Egypt and go through a course of study there, and that after doing so, they announced truths before unknown to that philosophy, it is inferred that Egypt furnished much of the material out of which the philosophy of Greece afterwards founded its schools and reared its structures of beauty and sublimity. It is clear, however, that they lacked many of the instruments now deemed so essential to the promotion of the study of astronomy. They knew not the use of pendulums,² nor were they acquainted with telescopes. Logarithms were not then invented, nor had numerical figures then come into being.

There is one feature characterizing Egyptian astronomy that is hardly discernible in any other department of Egyptian thought, and that is, that, at the present day, it is known to have had a progress and a history. In almost or quite, every other thing, the inquiry is, What *attainment* was made by the Egyptians? here alone we may ask as to *progress*.

Medicine as a science may be said to have received considerable cultivation among the ancient Egyptians. Amongst the most innumerable number of books, ascribed to the second Hermes,³ there were six on medicine, the first of which related to anatomy. But these books are not quoted by any physician of antiquity; and, like the other books of Hermes, little more is known of them than the name. It is said that the same custom anciently prevailed here which we have seen to have been practiced by the Babylonians, and to which may possibly be traced the

¹ *Goquet*, III, 108, ² *Idem*, 124. ³ *Idem*, I, 202.

origin of medicine. The sick were exposed to public view, so as to attract the attention of others, with a view to enable them to profit by the advice of any who might have been similarly affected,¹ and by the use of remedial agents had obtained a recovery. This was prior to their possessing a knowledge of the art of writing. After the invention of that art, those who had been afflicted with diseases and had recovered, put in writing the remedies by which their recovery had been effected; and these writings were placed in their temples, where every one could have access to them, and select the remedy which he supposed would meet his case.

After these writings, or memoirs, had greatly augmented in number, it became necessary to put them in order. Those to whom this duty was confided came to acquire a particular knowledge of the composition of the different remedies. By communicating to each other the results of their knowledge thus acquired, and correcting each others deficiencies and lack of knowledge, they came in time to be more or less versed in the science of medicine, and were consulted by those having occasion for medical advice. These were the first physicians, and they must have existed as early as the age of Moses.

The Egyptians are regarded as having cultivated medicine more anciently and learnedly than any other people, and as being the first who reduced it to principles, and subjected it to rules. There was probably more occasion for the practice of medicine in Egypt² than in any other country of antiquity. The annual overflow of the Nile, the existence of stagnant marshes as a consequence of that inundation, the creation of mephitic or miasmatic effluvia, would tend to originate many forms of disease, and thus call early for the services of the physician. In this, as in most other things, the exigency itself creates that which, as nearly as possible, complies with its requisitions. Hence we are told that no other people

¹ *Goguet*, II, 242. ² *Idem*, 243.

among the ancients, numbered more physicians than the Egyptians.¹

The Egyptians came even to carry the principle of the division of labor into the practice of medicine. They were of opinion that the life of one man was insufficient to acquire a knowledge of a science so extensive as that of medicine. They accordingly divided it among different practitioners. They had physicians for different diseases; one for instance, for diseases of the eyes, another for the diseases of the bowels, etc.

By this means a single physician could apply himself to the study of a single malady, and thus render himself more perfect in combating it.² We have little transmitted to us in regard to the nature of their remedies. They made great use of medicine and purging drinks. Their care extended to the prevention as well as cure of diseases. They are said to have first made known and used the oil of sweet almonds,³ and to have invented or discovered the medicine called nepenthe, the effect of which was to produce a forgetfulness of all ills, and to dissipate all weariness. This is supposed to have been some preparation of opium, which induces sleep, gives rise to a kind of gaiety, and is still very extensively used in the east.

It is alleged by many that the practice of physic in Egypt was mixed up with many superstitious rites; that the physicians were also astrologers, and that the aid of things mysterious and superhuman was invoked for the cure of disease.⁴ This is not improbable, as we find such kind of machinery resorted to in the treatment of disease among almost every people in the early period of their history. It is abundantly exemplified in the medicine man of the American Indian.

There was one great peculiarity in the practice of the Egyptian physician, and that is, that in the treatment of disease very little was made to depend upon the will and choice of the physician.⁵ All their prescriptions were

¹ *Goguet*, II, 245. ² *Idem*, 245. ³ *Idem*, 246. ⁴ *Idem*, 247. ⁵ *Idem*, 246-7.

contained in certain sacred books, to which they were obliged to conform without any change or deviation. In case the physician varied from these prescriptions, and the disease terminated in death, the physician was answerable with his own life, but if he adopted them and death resulted, he was exonerated. The physician, therefore, had less need of judgment than of memory, and all possibility of the science of medicine becoming progressive was annihilated. The Egyptian physicians had a public provision made for them by law,¹ so that those who fell sick in the army, or on a journey within the Egyptian dominions, were administered to without fee or reward.²

Astrology, magic, and what may in general be termed the fictitious sciences, were extensively cultivated in Egypt, but were chiefly, if not wholly, confined to the priest caste. By many they are supposed to have been the originators both of magic and astrology. It was in part by the practice of these that the priest caste succeeded so well in establishing and continuing their influence and power so thoroughly over the common mind. Under the veil of mystery and magic they could effectually conceal themselves, and also practice imposition upon others. Having learnt the natural processes and operations that were going on in the universe around them, so far as the learning of that day had ascertained them; and, to some extent, the agency that mind possessed in interfering with, regulating and controlling them, they were enabled to exhibit, under imposing forms, many illusions and deceptive appearances that had great weight and influence upon the common mind. With great form and ceremony they could display their astrological calculations, magical incantations, and all those peculiar arts by which the senses could be practiced upon and deluded, and the common mind made the sport of imposition and imposture. They availed themselves of those peculiar relations and reciprocal sympathies which exist between man and nature, and out of them

derived all the influences capable of being exercised upon human susceptibilities. In the time of Moses, the magicians constituted a numerous and powerful body in Egypt, and were enabled to perform many wonders and prodigies. The philosophy of the Egyptians, so far as it had as the subject of its speculations, the universe, the destinies of the human soul, and the infinite or eternal, was mostly embraced in their theology, or religious notions, and has already been in part considered. They evidently believed in the eternity both of mind and matter,¹ and of a primeval night or chaos, in which were blended together, in utter confusion, all the elements of things. The eternal coexistence of these two great principles, matter, and all the varied forms it was capable of assuming or of being made to assume; and mind, the intelligent active principle, capable of acting upon, influencing and modifying matter in its various combinations, seems to have laid at the foundation of most of the philosophy of the ancient world. There was little, if any, separation, especially in Egypt, between the elements of philosophy and religion. Both were blended together, and intimately mingled with each other. What the one shadowed forth in forms of thought, the other embodied in celestial panoply, invested with the attributes of deity, and rendered to them adoration and worship.

There is little doubt but that many of the myths, fables and theories of the ancient Egyptians were adopted by the Greeks, and interwoven by them into their different systems of philosophy and mythology. They were no doubt modified so as to suit the peculiarities of the Greek character, and to become adapted to the forms of Grecian thought. Through these means and instrumentalities they have exerted their influence upon succeeding ages, and have more or less modified the thinking of the world to the present time.

In studying the philosophy of the Egyptians during the period of the Pharaohs, we become acquainted with every-

¹ *Enfield*, 43.

thing appertaining to that element that is strictly Egyptian. It is not, however, to be forgotten that Egypt had its Ptolemies as well as its Pharaohs; and its Alexandria as well as its Memphis and Thebes. The immense libraries and schools of philosophy founded and established in that great emporium, were not only wonderful in themselves, but also in the influence they have exerted upon the mind of all subsequent ages.

The Alexandrian library, commenced by the first Ptolemy and greatly increased by his successors, became at last to be much the finest and largest library in the world,¹ containing no less than 700,000 volumes. This immense library was destroyed when the city was taken by the Saracens. The philosophy of the Alexandrian school was of a peculiar character. It had little more connection with the old Egyptian philosophy than that Alexandria in Egypt was its seat. For some centuries after the commencement of the Christian era that great city might be regarded as the centre of the civilized world. Its fortunate location, equally with the mingled character of its elements, rendered it a place where the two civilizations of the east and west could meet, and, as far as possible, blend themselves together. Its school was a focal point where the rays of eastern and western philosophy became united and mingled with each other, and from whence their blended light was irradiated in every direction. It is in this school that we first hear pronounced the word *eclecticism*. The eclectic doctrine assumed that all systems of philosophy, and all forms of human thought, were in some respects true and in others false; in other words, that truth and error were present in every system. The great object, therefore, of this philosophy was to select from all systems their truths and reject their errors, and thus to form a perfect system in which truth should be found unmingled with error. The most distinguished sect, and that which carried out the most fully the principles just indicated, was the new

¹ *Encyclopedia Perthensis*, i, 400.

Platonists who arose in Alexandria about the close of the second century. Ammonius Saccas of Alexandria, a man who earned his subsistence by carrying burdens,¹ was the author of this sect. He was a man of great genius, and among his pupils were Longinus, Plotinus, Origen, and Herennius. Plotinus was an Egyptian by birth, and contributed, by his writings, very much to settle the doctrines of new Platonism. This sect believed that all true philosophy originated among the eastern nations;² that it was taught in Egypt by Hermes, and revived in Greece by Plato; that all religions, in their original integrity, conformed to this ancient philosophy, although they had been subject to some corruptions; and they so interpreted the doctrines of other philosophical and religious sects by art, invention and allegory, that they seemed to bear a resemblance to the Egyptian and Platonic systems.

The philosophy of this sect, according to Plotinus, consisted in attaining a knowledge of the *absolute*,³ and an intimate union with it in order to work out and fulfill human destiny. That philosophy should know the one which is the cause and essence of all things, the original light from which everything proceeds by emanation, and that, not by thought and reflection but by intuition which precedes thought. It taught that the absolute, that which is above the senses, is the foundation of the world; and that it is knowable by intuition, and not by thought, which is subsequent. That intelligence was the product and image of the one, and that it penetrated all things. That the soul proceeds from it as the forming thought, and that having thus proceeded from it, it seeks the one to be united with it. That this is done by immediate intuition and enjoyment, the conceiving and the conceiver, becoming one, the conceiving soul returning to the one and becoming what it conceives. The entire spiritual world was thus resolved into one spiritual being. All became only intuition. The

¹ *Encyclopedia Americana*, ix, 251. ² *Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, 869. ³ *Encyclopedia Americana*, ix, 251.

sensible world they held to be only the image of the intelligible world, and time the image of eternity, from which it was an emanation. They held evil to be either only apparent or necessary, but if the latter it would cease to be evil.

There were two features about this sect that render it interesting. One was a poetical elevation of the soul to which the previous dogmatic and skeptic systems of Greece must, from their very nature, necessarily be strangers. The other was the reconciliation which was here attempted between the Greek philosophy on the one side, and that of the east, together with paganism in general, on the other.

This philosophy had a great influence on the manner in which Christianity was received and taught in Egypt.¹ A variety of heresies originated from this philosophy, which long disturbed, and sometimes convulsed the church. The gnostic heresy derived its origin principally or wholly from this source, and violent religious controversies continued to disturb the Alexandrine church, until the orthodox tenets were established in it by Athanasius, in the great controversy with the Arians.

There were great mathematicians in Alexandria, as Euclid, the father of scientific geometry, Apollonius, whose work on conic sections is still extant,² and Nicomachus, the first scientific arithmetician. There were also astronomers, who employed the Egyptian hieroglyphics for marking the northern hemisphere, and who fixed the images and names of the constellations, still in use. There were also natural philosophers, anatomists, physicians, and surgeons, of great and deserved celebrity. Indeed Alexandria, in its most flourishing era, might be said to concentrate in itself a great proportion of the light of the world. It was thought's brilliant centre from which irradiated in every direction light, knowledge, and power. It belongs, however, more to Grecian than Egyptian philosophy.

¹*Encyclopedia Americana*, I, 165. ²*Idem*, 165.

In taking leave of the valley of the Nile, so far as its thought and philosophy are concerned, one general remark should be made; and that is the very first glimpse we have of Egyptian civilization,¹ reveals to us a people already very considerably advanced in the development of several of the elements of humanity, especially those of industry, society, and the arts; and what is very remarkable, the same general customs and modes of life that prevailed in the Augustan era of that people, are also found in the remote age of Osirtasen, the contemporary of Joseph. Nor is there any doubt but that the same prevailed in the days of Abraham. It is, therefore, a civilization, of whose birth we are ignorant, and whose progress, even, lies far back beyond the reach of history.

Art.

The monuments of Egyptian art, still remaining, are so numerous, and some of them so perfect, as to enable us to speak with confidence in relation to the development of this element among the Egyptians. Fortunately their numerous stone quarries furnished them with the material to erect everduring structures; which have not only proclaimed their achievements in one department of art, but have also afforded them the best possible means of sending down to us the evidences of their advancement in several other departments. While, for instance, the temple stands forth an unimpeachable witness of their success in practicing the art architectural, the sculptures and paintings that adorn its walls furnish evidence, not less satisfactory, of their progress in those arts of design.

In glancing at Egyptian development of this element of humanity, as their immense stony structures have served as the bases upon which many of the arts have been practiced, and have probably furnished a strong motive to practice them, it seems proper to consider :

¹ *Wilkinson*, III, 260.

1. The art of architecture as practiced by them in the erection of the monuments. This is principally displayed in the pyramid, palace, temple and tomb.

I. The pyramid, its form, situation, size, antiquity, and use.

1. The form. The pyramid is a body, generally solid, standing on a triangular, square, or polygonal base,¹ and terminating in a point at the top. It is formed by the meeting of three or more planes at a point termed the apex. Most or all the Egyptian pyramids are erected upon a square base, presenting therefore four faces or planes. In the three great pyramids these faces or planes stand exactly opposite the four cardinal points.²

The most obvious reflection that arises from the contemplation of this form is, that it combines in an eminent degree the elements of strength and durability. If its size be sufficient no merely human power can ever overturn it; and no commotion of the elements will be likely to disturb it. Even the rock of the earthquake would be insufficient to upheave it from its foundation. It is said that one of the caliphs once commissioned one of the most skillful engineers of the age to destroy these edifices, but that the engineer after making many efforts, and expending much time and treasure finally gave it up.³

2. Their situation. The pyramid architecture did not prevail equally in every part of Egypt.⁴ There were none of these structures in Upper Egypt. Their location, no doubt, had reference to their proximity to the species of rock of which they were built, and to the facilities in obtaining it. This was a species of limestone not found in Upper Egypt. They are situated in the region of Memphis, extending over a line of some twenty-five miles in length.⁵ They are about twenty-five in number, of which some eighteen may be termed large, and the rest small. They are mostly found in clusters near the villages Ghizeh,

¹ Webster, 398. ² *Egyptian Antiquities*, II, 204. ³ *History of Architecture*, 82. ⁴ Heeren, II, 77. ⁵ Gliddon, 54.

Zaccára and Dashaór. Many of them are in the great necropolis of the ancient Memphis, and surrounded with tombs, pits, excavations,¹ passages, subterranean works and superficial structures, all exclusively dedicated to the dead.

There are also pyramids in Ethiopia. In the vicinity of the ancient Meroe there are not less than eighty, at Noori forty-two, and Gebel-Berkel seventeen.² All these however, are much smaller, and composed of sandstone.

3. Their size. They are very various in size. The pyramids at Ghizeh standing on a plateau formed of the calcareous rock of the Lybian chain, contain among their number three of the largest size. The largest of these is sometimes denominated the great pyramid. It has been generally known as the pyramid of Cheops, but lately it has been called the pyramid of Shospho or Suphis, he being ascertained to be its founder.³ This structure exceeds 450 feet in height, the length of each face 746 feet,⁴ containing in the whole 89,028,000 cubic feet of masonry, and covering near twelve acres of ground. It is composed of limestone cut in blocks, varying from two to five feet square. This immense structure is not entirely solid. There is an entrance nearly in the centre of it, and a passage descending at an angle of 27°, terminates in an unfinished chamber, below the level of the ground. There is also another passage running from this about 100 feet from the entrance,⁵ ascending at about the same angle until it reaches the great gallery, which runs horizontally into what is called the queen's chamber. Thence it continues to a large room called the king's chamber, in which is found a sarcophagus of red granite seven feet four inches in length by three feet in breadth, being only three inches less than the width of the door by which it was admitted. The interior space occupied by chambers and passages,⁶ so far as they have yet been discovered, amount to only

¹ *Gliddon*, 54. ² *Idem*, 55. ³ *Topography*, 323. ⁴ *Gliddon*, 54. ⁵ *Topography*, 324. ⁶ *Gliddon*, 54.

56,000 cubic feet, being only $\frac{1}{1875}$ part of the whole mass. These interior passages and chambers are lined with blocks of granite.

The second in size is the pyramid of Cephren, or Sen-suphis, which is inferior to the first not only in its dimensions, but also in its general style,¹ and in its materials having been less carefully selected. Its actual height is about four hundred and thirty-nine feet, and the length of its base about six hundred and ninety. The passages in this pyramid are of a similar kind to those already mentioned, but there is no gallery, and they lead only to one main chamber, in which is a sarcophagus sunk in the floor. This pyramid appears to have had two entrances, an upper one open, and one about sixty feet below it, which is still unopened.

The third is the pyramid of Mycerinus, Moscheris or Mecherinus, which differs from the other two, being built in almost perpendicular degrees,² to which a sloping face has been afterwards added. The outer layers were of red granite, many of which still remain, rendering this pyramid much the most elegant in appearance of the three. This has never yet been opened. There are many others of smaller dimensions, varying very much from each other in relative size.

4. Their antiquity. The pyramids are undoubtedly among the most ancient of Egyptian monuments. It is a curious fact that while the obelisks, palaces, temples, and tombs are almost literally covered with hieroglyphics,³ there are none upon the exterior or interior of the pyramids, not even upon the sarcophagus. From this fact some have inferred that they were erected prior to the age of hieroglyphics, an inference which may be justly questionable.

The earliest of all structures erected by the joint efforts of a community seems to have been the mound of earth.⁴

¹ *Topography*, 329. ² *Idem*, 330. ³ *Idem*, 326. ⁴ *Egyptian Antiquities*, II, 255, 256.

This has been found among nations less advanced in the mechanical arts, and with them appears to occupy the place of the pyramids. In some parts of Asia, Europe, and North America, are found these ancient and enduring monuments. Such is the great mound of Halyattes, near Sardis; which, as measured by Herodotus, was three thousand eight hundred Greek feet in perimeter, even exceeding the perimeter of the great pyramid of Egypt. The Silbury hill in Wiltshire, which is in form of a truncated cone 2027 feet in circumference at the base, the sloping height 316, the perpendicular 170 feet, and the area covered over more than five acres. Similar to these, in general character, are the mounds which serve as tombs of the Scythian kings on the banks of the Borysthenes, and the numerous mural monuments that are scattered along the valleys of the Ohio and the Mississippi in North America.

An advance upon the earthy mound was the pyramid built of brick, or of brick mixed with clay. Of this character seem to have been the pyramidal structures of Mexico. Of these there were several, the most remarkable of which was the great teocalli or pyramid of Cholula,¹ standing in the plain of Puebla, consisting of four receding platforms of equal elevation, appearing to have its sides exactly opposite the four cardinal points, rising to a perpendicular height of one hundred and seventy-seven feet, and covering an area of over forty-seven acres of land. There are many other pyramids in Mexico, and one in particular having a base of eighty-two feet,² rising to a height of fifty-nine feet, having six or seven platforms, and built entirely of well hewn stones of a remarkable size.

The antiquity of the stone pyramids of Egypt has been a matter much involved in doubt until quite recently, and the precise period of time at which any one of them was built, has never yet been arrived at. A great approximation, however, has been made in the case of the great

¹ *Egyptian Antiquities*, II, 253. ² *Idem*, 254.

pyramid.¹ The names of Suphis, Saophis, and Cheops have been identified as the same, and he is proved to have raised that massive structure, not alone from the statement of Herodotus, but also from the fact that the name of Shoopho in the quarrier's marks, has been found in the new chamber of the pyramid, scored in red ochre on the rough stones. This has been considered as giving to the great pyramid, a date anterior to the year 2272 B.C. which is carrying it back into a very high antiquity.² It must have been constructed ages prior to the invasion of the Hyksos, and long before Abraham traveled into Egypt. And yet from all the facts that can be collected, Egypt must then have been united under one sovereign, and the Egyptians, a people already much advanced in industry and art. Without such an advancement, and without concentrating the energies of an entire people, such a structure would have been an impossibility.

5. Their use.³ There is little doubt now remaining but that the pyramids were made use of for tombs,⁴ that they were the sepulchres of their kings and probably of their queens. The entrance into them, their small granite-lined chambers, the sarcophagus found there, their situation, many of them in the great necropolis of Memphis, all indicate that they were the resting place of royalty. The Egyptians, as we shall see hereafter, manifested great anxiety to preserve their remains entire and for the longest possible period of time.

This desire might have originated the pyramids. The earth mounds, formerly mentioned, appear to have been devoted to the same purpose. The uniformity with which they are found facing the four points of the compass has given origin to the idea that they might have answered some mathematical, or more probably, historical purpose. But their chief use was undoubtedly to serve as sepulchres.

To find the palace, temple, catacomb or tomb, we should leave Memphis, and travel southward to the city of Thebes.

¹ *Gliddon*, 56. ² *Idem*, 56. ³ *Topography*, 327, 328. ⁴ *Gliddon*, 55.

This lies in Upper Egypt in the Thebaid, and was the ancient capital. It is known as the "hundred gated Thebes," but there is not the slightest evidence that the city ever possessed any walls.¹ There are no remains of any now to be found. On its east and west sides it had the mountain and the desert. On the north a long strip of fertile country studded with cities, and on the south the same but to a less extent.

It is with extreme difficulty that we can bring our minds up even to a faint realization of the splendor of ancient Thebes. It breaks upon our view like some vision from another sphere, and it is so unlike anything that occurs in authenticated records that we find a difficulty in yielding our assent to it. Its greatness and glory existed at a period before the muse of history had commenced her labors, and when she had lit her torch and was beginning her record, the royal city, so far as that greatness and glory were concerned, was among the things that were. Its ancient people, however, seem to have been well aware of the peculiarity of their position, and resolving not altogether to perish from human memory, they made their own records and inscribed them with their own language, and although time forgot the one, yet it could not destroy the other. And there those records have remained through successions of suns and seasons, amid the downfall of dynasties, and changes in the affairs of men, ever true to their founders, ever proclaiming to the admiring mind the power, energy, greatness and glory of a race that has passed away.

Thebes may well be regarded as the centre of a civilization that sprung up in the spring time of the world. In comparison with it, Athens and Rome were but of yesterday. It must now be viewed in the light of its monuments, its sculptures and paintings, and its recently recovered language. As we found the pyramid in ancient Memphis, so here we find

¹ *Topography*, 42.

II. The palace, and along with it also the temple and catacomb. These constituted the glory of ancient Thebes, as they still render it the wonder and admiration of the world.

The palace and temple are more distinguished from each other by the sculptures and paintings on their gates and walls, than by any difference of plan adopted in their construction. In the erection of all the palaces and temples, quite a uniformity in the general arrangement seems to have been observed, accompanied, however, with sufficient deviations to constitute a pleasing variety. Take, for instance, the great palace of Medinet Abou.¹ We encounter at its entrance, one of those mighty superstructures termed by the French, pylones, and by the Greeks, propylæa. They are entirely unknown to modern architecture. They are made up of two obtuse pyramidal structures, rising to great heights (in this instance being sixty-six feet), and they enclose between them the principal gate, forming the grand entrance.

Through this gate the entrance is effected into a large court, surrounded on one side by eight great pillars, and on the other, by pilasters, to which are affixed colossal statues of Osiris as caryatides.

Directly opposite to the principal entrance stands a second pylone, similar to the first, although somewhat smaller. This leads into a second court of pillars or peristyle, the galleries of which are formed by pilasters with caryatides and columns. This peristyle is imposing from its massiveness and solemn grandeur. The diameter of the pillars near the base,² is seven and one-half feet, and they are almost twenty feet in height. These support immense stone blocks which form the architraves and roof. The pilaster caryatides, presenting so many colossal statues of Osiris, throw over the whole an imposing air, and placed the Egyptian in the midst of multiplied representations of his favorite god.

¹ *Heeren*, II, 215. ² *Idem*, 216.

At some distance north-west of the palace stands the temple of Medinet Abou,¹ now nearly in ruins, and north-west of this temple is a plain which may be called the field of colossi. Seventeen of these are still counted; some of which are standing while others are in part or wholly thrown down. Among them is the colossal statue of Memnon so famous for the sounds issuing from it at the rising of the sun.

The two objects that principally attract the attention in this field are two immense colossi, the northern one called Damiy, and the southern Shamy, both facing the Nile. They are composed of sandstone, are represented in a sitting posture, and, including the pedestal, rise to the astonishing height of sixty feet. The weight of each is calculated at 2,612,000 lbs. One of them is a monolith, being composed entirely of one stone, and the other is supposed to have originally been so composed. The colossi, among the Egyptians, were almost uniformly monoliths. One of these is regarded as the ancient statue of Memnon, but it has long since ceased to raise its voice of greeting to the rising sun.

At a little distance from these is a large fragment of a colossal statue in a walking attitude, above thirty feet in height,² and a little further on the trunk of another of black granite. Still further is the remnant of a colossus of yellow marble, in a walking attitude, and a little in advance the remains of two sitting colossi of red granite. Beyond them are two others, each forty feet in height, represented as walking. The colossi, fragments of pillars and other remains which are here found so near together, give rise to the conjecture that an immense building once stood here, which with its pylones, courts, colonnades, and saloons, must have been some 1800 feet in length.

North of the field of colossi is a structure which some have called the Memnonium, and others the palace and tomb of Osymandias.³ It is composed of sandstone. The

¹ *Heeren*, II, 222. ² *Idem*, 224. ³ *Idem*, 226.

entrance is through a majestic pylone into a quadrangle, one hundred and forty feet in length and one hundred and sixty-one in breadth. The area is so filled up with blocks of granite as to give it the appearance of a stone quarry. These, however, are only the ruins of one immense colossus, the head, foot and hand still remaining. The forefinger is nearly four feet in length, the breadth from one shoulder to another, twenty-one feet, the height including pedestal seventy two feet. It was composed of the most beautiful rose colored granite of Syene. The pit from which it was cut out is still to be seen, its distance of transportation forty-five leagues, its weight nine hundred tons. The remains of four other such colossi have been traced in this building.

A second pylone gives an entrance into a peristyle of about the same dimensions as the quadrangle.¹ It was surrounded by galleries formed by pillars and pilaster caryatides. This also contained two colossal statues, each about twenty-three feet high. One was composed of black granite, the body of the other is also black with a head of rose colored granite well preserved. The Egyptian character is preserved in the head, which possesses great calmness in appearance, and that happy physiognomy which "pleases more than beauty."

Three gates of black granite conduct out of the peristyle into a spacious saloon, divided into three compartments, in which there are sixty pillars in ten rows, each six pillars deep; four of these rows are still standing, the pillars in the middle division are over six feet in diameter and thirty-five feet high. There is an entrance out of this into a second and afterwards a third saloon, in each of which eight pillars of the same size are still standing. Passing by the temple of Isis, smaller but in more perfect preservation, the alley of pedestals on which once stood colossal sphinxes two hundred in number, and the palace of Gornou, we come to the monuments on the eastern side of the Nile. Here we encounter the ruins of Luxor and Karnac.

¹ *Heeren*, II, 227.

The ruins of Luxor,¹ so called from the name of a village where they are found, are on an artificial elevation some ten feet high, and are two thousand feet in length and one thousand in breadth.

The front of this temple is adorned with two most beautiful obelisks of red granite, and more than eighty feet high.

Immediately behind these are two sitting colossal statues each forty feet high,² having on collars and a head dress of many peculiarities.

Directly behind these is one of those immense pylones, so almost universally found fronting the ancient Egyptian palaces and temples. Within it, two pyramidal masses, which mount upward to the height of fifty-two feet, is enclosed the principal gate. Through this the entrance is into an immense colonnade surrounded with galleries.

A second pylone leads into a second colonnade, and this into many saloons and apartments, which cannot well be particularly described. Each one of the forty columns in the second colonnade rises to the height of forty-five feet.³ This immense palace is not built after a single plan. The entire whole may be divided into three parts, which have different sites. The great hall of granite and buildings surrounding it, constituting the hinder part, was probably the first built. Then the second colonnade, and afterwards the first great colonnade with its pylones, obelisks, and colossal statues. Each of these was probably the work of different monarchs.

In the ruins of Karnac are perhaps to be found the most wonderful remains of Egyptian architecture.⁴ These are nearly two miles north of Luxor, and about a mile from the Nile. They are built upon an artificial elevation, fenced by a wall of brickwork. The walls of Karnac are over two thousand five hundred toises in extent, each toise being a measure of over six English feet. It requires an hour and one-half to walk round them. The ruins are

¹ *Heeren*, II, 238. ² *Idem*, 239. ³ *Idem*, 242. ⁴ *Idem*, 243.

those of a palace and temple. The first looks toward the river from which there leads to it an avenue of sphynxes, each with a ram's head and lion's body called cir-sphynxes. Some of these are still remaining. This leads to the great pylone with the principal entrance, the length of which is fifty-six toises, and the height twenty-three. The principal entrance itself was above ten toises high. This entrance leads into a great open colonnade, the columns bordering it on the north and south sides being forty-two feet high,¹ the series on the north consisting of eighteen columns still remaining, while the southern is broken by a temple leaning against the palace, and having its principal entrance out of this colonnade. This open colonnade is only a kind of anteplace to the grand hall of columns, or covered saloon, which presents the sublimest and most stupendous specimen of ancient Egyptian architecture. A flight of twenty-seven steps leads into it, through an antechamber and another pylone. Everything here is colossal. It is the great hypostyle hall of Karnac. Its width is about three hundred and thirty-eight feet,² and its length or depth one hundred and seventy. The great courts and chambers in some of the oldest Egyptian buildings, such as Medinet Abou, and the Memnonium, have their width greater than their length, the entrance being in the centre of the longest side. In the small chambers it is almost always the reverse, and also in some of the large courts, as in those of the palace of Luxor, temple of Edfou and other temples. Its area exceeds forty-seven thousand square feet.³ So capacious is it that the church of Notre Dame in Paris could stand in it entire. The ceiling consisting of unhewn blocks of stone, is supported by one hundred and forty columns. Each column of the two central rows, which are a little higher than the others, measure sixty-five feet in height, ten feet in diameter, and thirty feet in circumference.

¹ Heeren, II, 244. ² *Egyptian Antiquities*, I, 88. ³ Heeren, II, 245.

Champollion says,¹ "The imagination, which in Europe rises far above our porticoes, sinks abashed at the foot of the one hundred and forty columns of the hypostyle hall of Karnac."

From this immense hall,² a new pylone leads into a second open colonnade, adorned with two magnificent obelisks, and behind this come the buildings which seem intended for the proper dwelling. Saloons and a number of apartments are found here, formed entirely of granite.

The great temple of Karnac lies in a southerly direction from the palace.³ Four different pylones give four different entrances into as many open colonnades.⁴ In these are still standing twelve colossal statues, each a monolith. The remains of a number more may be traced.⁵ The southern gateway of this temple is built of red sandstone, is more than sixty-two feet in height, and is not, as is almost invariably the case, attended by a pylone, but stands free and alone. This gateway leads into a gallery of colossal rams, twenty-two in number. The real entrance into the temple itself, is, nevertheless, through a pylone, before which are the remains of colossal statues. An open colonnade first occurs, and then the entrance is into a saloon of columns. Behind this is the adytum, or the holy of holies, and then other saloons and apartments.

This temple is, without doubt, one of the most ancient now existing in Egypt,⁶ and yet it seems in part to have been constructed of the materials of more ancient edifices. This, as well as the palace, was probably the work of several successive monarchs. A few polygonal columns bear the early date of Osirtasen I, by many supposed to be the contemporary of Joseph.⁷

The ancient structures of Luxor and Karnac, were connected together by an avenue of colossal sphinxes, leading from one to the other, and in its approaches to Karnac, dividing into numerous alleys.⁸ These are from twelve to

¹ *Egyptian Antiquities*, I, 89. ² *Heeren*, II, 245, 246. ³ *Idem*, 248. ⁴ *Egyptian Antiquities*, I, 92. ⁵ *Heeren*, II, 248. ⁶ *Idem*, 249. ⁷ *Topography*, 175. ⁸ *Heeren*, II, 250.

eighteen feet long, partly lions couchant, with ram's heads, partly with women's heads, and partly with rams couchant. The largest avenue must have contained over six hundred of these colossal figures, and the whole probably amounted to far above double this number.

There are many other temples, as that of Tentyris, Apollinopolis, Hermontis, Hermopolis, Teutopolis, etc., but they need not be particularly described.¹ The labyrinth, however, is deserving of more special attention. This was one of the most remarkable structures in ancient Egypt. By many it has been thought superior to the pyramids. It was situated near Lake Mœris in the Zayoum. It is described by Herodotus, as containing twelve roofed courts, the entrances to which were opposite each other, six being to the north, six to the south, one after the other. They were surrounded by a single wall, and contained chambers of two kinds, some under, some above ground, three thousand in all, fifteen hundred of each kind. Above them all was a roof of stone, like the walls, which latter were covered with sculptured hieroglyphics. Each court was surrounded by rows of columns, the greater part being built of white stones inlaid. A subterranean passage connected it with a pyramid. The passages between the roofed porticoes and the winding passages through the courts were very diversified. "There is," says Lepsius,² "a mighty knot of chambers still in existence, and in the midst of the great square, where the Aulæ stood, covered with the remains of great monolithic pillars of granite, and others of white, hard limestone, gleaming almost like marble." This splendid edifice was considered by Bunsen, to have been dedicated to the use of all Egypt, and to have been used for national purposes. Here, he supposed, assembled delegates from each district, the most distinguished of the warrior and peasant castes, with the priests and priestesses of the temples.³ Here were celebrated the

¹ Heeren, II, 27. ² Lepsius's *Discoveries in Egypt*, 78. ³ Bunsen's *Egypt's Place in Universal History*, II, 322, 323.

great panegyrics, the most important legal questions decided, and quarrels adjusted. It was essentially a civil, religious, and political shrine; a museum, in which the exploits of their kings, and the history of each province were exhibited, and probably illustrated by hieroglyphical inscriptions. There the people of each district found the history of its own princes recorded, and the splendid monuments they had erected, the main features, in fact, of their individual and general traditions.

The builder of this mighty monument is placed towards the end of the twelfth dynasty, the last of the old empire, shortly before the irruption of the Hyksos. The cartouches disclose the name of *Amenemha III*, under whose reign it was built, either wholly or in part.

The ancient Egyptian temples and palaces,¹ resemble each other in having splendid pylones as entrances, open colonnades, saloons of columns, pillar courts, and pillar halls, even rooms intended for habitations, those in the temples probably for the priests. In temples there is an interior sanctuary or adytum. This is wanting in the palace, but in the place of it are saloons and chambers, built, not of sandstone, but of granite.² The palace was not only the habitation of the ruler, but was also adapted to public use. In their splendid halls of columns, justice was probably administered, ambassadors received, tributes paid. There is also observed a difference in style of architecture, between palaces and temples.³ That of the palace is more pleasing and simple, though retaining a character of grandeur and majesty.

There is also a difference, as before remarked, in the sculptures and paintings that decorate their walls and pillars. Those of the temples always relate to religious matters,⁴ those of the palace are generally historical reliefs, martial expeditions and triumphs, assemblies of the people, and scenes of a domestic nature.

¹ *Heeren's Historical Researches*, II, 271. ² *Idem*, 272. ³ *Idem*, 274.

⁴ *Idem*, 272.

The general character of Egyptian architecture was grave, heavy, massy and sublime. It abounds in straight lines and angles, not in waving lines and curves. The architectural art was undoubtedly among the earliest of human inventions, and its works have been commonly regulated by some principle of hereditary imitation. Its first essays were of the simplest character. They must have had reference to the materials which the country furnished, to its climate, and the early habits and associations of its people. The same kind of structure which the circumstances of a rude people led them first to adopt, has been afterwards imitated by their more refined and opulent posterity. Upon this principle the ancient Egyptian style of architecture had its origin in the *cavern* and *mound*. The numerous catacombs, soon to be noticed, were excavated caverns. The Chinese were originally nomadic,¹ a tent-dwelling race. Hence their style of building is modeled from the *tent*. The Grecian was derived from the wooden *cabin*, while the Goths, who inhabited the dark forests of central and northern Europe, moulded the Gothic style from ideas derived from the *bower* of trees.

The Egyptian pillars are of an irregularly rounded form, their diameter varying at different parts of the height.² It very generally diminished towards the base and capital; it had a greater relative thickness than height; it had more strength than beauty. Above the rows of pillars rest large blocks of stone, reaching along the whole breadth of the building,³ from the centre of one column to that of the next in the same row. Upon these, and at right angles to them, were placed large cross blocks, extending in a similar manner from each pillar of the front row, to the corresponding one in the next, and so on. Thus the tops of all the pillars were united by strong beams of stone, which make a frame-work adapted to

¹ *Encyclopedia Americana*, I, 334. ² *Egyptian Antiquities*, I, 101, 102.

³ *Idem*, 97.

receive the large flat slabs that form the roof. These projecting beyond the front and sides, have their outer edges rounded into that bold curve, which corresponds to a Grecian cornice, and is so striking an ornament in Egyptian architecture. The structures are generally but one story high, and, as they sometimes spread over a large surface, their height is not proportioned to their other dimensions.

The capitals of the Egyptian pillars offer a singular variety.¹ They vary not only in different structures but also in the same. The Egyptians copied nature as she appears in Egypt. The calyx of a flower supported by its stem furnished them at once with a model for the column, the shaft, the base, and the capital.² The lotus, which was typical of the inundation, and sacred to Isis, was the plant the most generally selected. The leaves and stem of the reed furnish another model. Another, very elegant, is derived from the branches and leaves of the palm, and the capsules of its fruit. Another is furnished by a bunch of palm tufts, as they appear in early spring,³ before the branches and leaves are expanded, and when the entire top of the tree resembles a single flower bud. The tendrils of the vine, intermixed with palm leaves, present another beautiful model for the formation of an Egyptian capital. Although it was long denied that the ancient Egyptians understood the principles of the arch, or made use of it in any varieties of their architecture,⁴ yet it now seems generally conceded that although not very common, yet it is found in some of their ancient structures.

One remaining specimen of Egyptian architecture is found in the catacomb. Every Egyptian city had its own catacombs.⁵ Those of Memphis are found at Zaccára.⁶ Those of Thebes are situated in the Libyan mountain chain, extending some four or five miles in length. The Libyan chain here forms a steep ridge nearly three hun-

¹ *Egyptian Antiquities*, I, 105, 106. ² *Denon*, 50. ³ *Idem*, 51. ⁴ *Topography*, 81. ⁵ *Heeren*, II, 253. ⁶ *Idem*, 254.

dred feet high. The catacombs are arranged in tiers rising one above another. The lowest are the largest and most beautiful; they belonged to the more wealthy portion of the community. They become smaller and poorer the higher their location.

In the greater number there are merely open doors for entrances; in others that are more spacious and splendid, there is an open vestibule before the entrance. The lower passages to which the entrance leads run off in various directions, sometimes horizontally, sometimes downwards, sometimes straight, and at others winding. At one time they lead into saloons and apartments, at another into pits. Some run into each other and form a species of labyrinth. In the large caverns are saloons twelve and sometimes fifteen feet high, supported by rows of pillars. Behind them is a smaller apartment with a platform raised four steps. In the background is often found a sitting human figure, hewn in high relief, and frequently accompanied by two females. Upon the side of the hall are galleries in which are the mummy pits, from nine to twelve feet wide, and from forty to fifty deep. The caverns differ in their regularity. They are now inhabited by bats and Arabs.

The catacombs are, in general, without pillars, and have little resemblance to the ancient Egyptian buildings.¹ The walls are highly ornamented with sculptures and paintings. The ceilings at the entrance, and in the front corridors, are usually arched.

The most remarkable evidences of Egyptian art in the Theban necropolis are to be found in the royal sepulchres. These are situated in a valley in the interior of the Libyan mountains.² This valley was made by nature almost inaccessible, but a way hewn in the rocks leads to a narrow pass, which forms its entrance. From this narrow entrance the valley spreads out into two branches, one south-east, and the other south-west. In neither branch of this valley is found a sign of vegetation.³ Steep, rugged rocks, white

¹ *Heeren*, II, 255. ² *Idem*, 257, 258. ³ *Idem*, 258.

and glistening, enclose it on every side, rendering it the fitting abode of death. The heat produced by the reflection from variously inclined white surfaces of the scorching rays of the sun is most intense. Nor is it softened by any refreshing breeze. No wandering zephyr ever finds its way into this secluded valley to disturb the repose of the Pharaohs.

The general appearance of such of these catacombs as have been opened is similar,¹ though not precisely alike. They differ from each other in size, and also in embellishments. The depth varies from fifty to three hundred and sixty feet. Some are covered with ornaments completely finished, in others they are scarcely commenced. It is stated by Mr. Osburn, in his *Monumental History of Egypt*, that the reigning Pharaoh, on ascending his throne, immediately selected and caused to be commenced the construction of his tomb, and that the prosecution of the work continued during his life. This had reference not only to the construction, but also to its adornment by way of sculpture and painting. All further progress, both in its construction and adornment, was suspended by the death of the monarch. The sepulchre, just in the precise state in which that event found it, then received the embalmed mummy, and was then closed up, as was supposed, forever from the eyes of men. This would easily account for the unfinished state in which some of these sepulchres are found.

Each of these caverns forms a suite of corridors, chambers and apartments, in which there is generally one principal saloon. This usually contains an elevation, upon which stood the sarcophagus containing the body of the king. In about one-half the number that have been opened and examined the sarcophagi have entirely disappeared; in the remaining half the whole or some part still remain. That found in the largest cavern is twelve feet long, and formed of red granite. When struck with a hammer it emits a

¹ *Heeren*, II, 259.

sound like a bell. The principal apartment in this tomb is vaulted, and supported by eight pillars. There are at least ten doors to be passed before arriving at the sarcophagus. Several mummies are found in an apartment next adjoining the principal one, giving rise to the presumption that those who had been the most about the person of the monarch during life were also his companions in the sepulchre.

In examining another of these royal tombs, Belzoni discovered that wonderful piece of art,¹ a sarcophagus of the purest oriental alabaster, the dimensions of which were nine feet five inches in length, and five feet seven inches in breadth. No other work of art like this has ever yet been found. It is semitransparent, and covered both within and without with hundreds of figures, which appear to relate principally to funeral rites.² From the sculptures and paintings that constitute its embellishment it is certain that the Pharaoh who rested here had dominion over foreign nations.

Another art practiced by the ancient Egyptians, kindred in some respects to architecture, was sculpture.

This is accomplished by the hewing, cutting, or carving some hard substance into forms. It consists in the representation of external forms by their tangible properties,³ in either actual or proportional magnitude. Of all the arts purely imitative, it probably first exercised the ingenuity of mankind. It originated in the deep desire of men to perpetuate the memory of those, who might otherwise soon fade into forgetfulness. Hence, "the grey stone, the rude column, the dressed altar, the visible shape, the perfect statue," according to the degree of intelligence and skill possessed, have appeared as the offerings of piety, the tribute of friendship, gratitude or admiration. So true is the allegory of Grecian poetry, which feigns that "love and the natural affections first taught man the arts of genius."

¹ *Heeren*, II, 261. ² *Idem*, 265. ³ *Constable's Sculpture*, I, 21.

The materials made use of in Egyptian sculpture were in general wood and stone. Of the latter there were four kinds,¹ one soft, a species of sandstone, three hard in a calcareous rock, out of which the tombs with their sculptures were hewn, basalt or trap, the material of the smaller statues, and the granite of a reddish hue, or of a dark red ground with black specks.² The colossal figures are uniformly granite. Metal was also employed for the casting or hammering of bronze figures, and clay was moulded into various forms.³

The material used, by far the most universally, was stone. There were three kinds of Egyptian sculpture in this material.

1. The first kind was the bas-relief, which consisted in raising the figure above the tablet or flat surface to which it was attached, by means of cutting away the stone all around it.⁴ It was said to be high or low, according as it was thus made to project much or little from the tablet or flat surface. This was probably the first or initiatory step in the prosecution of the art. Rude outlines on the smooth surface of a rock were the first work of the sculptor. In one of the royal catacombs at Thebes is still to be clearly traced the successive steps taken in the execution of this species of sculpture. The position of the figure was first decided upon by the artist, who traced it around roughly with a red color.⁵ Next came the draughtsman, who carefully sketched the outlines in black, and then submitted them to the former for his inspection. The artist then altered those parts which he thought deficient in proportion or correctness of attitude; and in that state they were left to the operations of the sculptor's chisel. This, although probably the first, is not now the most common kind of relief found in Egypt.

2. The second kind of sculpture was what the Italians call *intaglio rilevato*. This is formed by cutting *into* the

¹ Heeren, II, 25; *Egyptian Antiquities*, I, 370. ² *Constable's Sculpture*, 39. ³ *Egyptian Antiquities*, I, 370. ⁴ *Idem*, 382. ⁵ *Topography*, 107.

flat surface of the stone,¹ and in that way forming the outline of the figure to be represented. In this species the Egyptian sculptor contrived to give the figure a projecting or raised appearance, which was done by cutting it deepest all round the edges, and allowing it to rise in a curved form towards the central parts. The degree of elevation thus given is very different in different specimens. In some it is hardly perceptible, while in others the central parts of the relief are almost on a level with the tablet.

3. The third kind of sculpture is that of the complete figure.² This may, perhaps, be said to be only the completion of the first kind, the bas-relief of the figure becoming higher and higher, until it is entirely detached from the original tablet. In this art, therefore, there is a progress, and consequently a history. The first important step in the process was to hew the figure in the living rock.³ This was gradually advanced from low to high-relief,⁴ but was still left adhering to the natural bed. The art was practiced in this stage not only in Egypt but in India. It may be seen in the rock-cut temple at Ipsambul.

The ancient Egyptians made a further progress. They learned to separate the block of stone, upon which the image was sculptured, from its parent rock, and to transport it wherever they chose.⁵ But they never ventured to deprive the statue of the squared pillar at the back, which remained to the latest age of genuine Egyptian sculpture. It never stood forth separate, detached, a perfect statue, in all its parts and proportions, until it issued from beneath the chisel of the Grecian sculptor.

The Egyptian statue was formed of a single block, and hence unity of mass was a leading idea with the artist.⁶ The rectangular pillar which supports the back, is generally of wider dimensions in the lower than the upper parts. In Egyptian sculpture neither arms nor legs were detached or free. The arms are generally found crossing each other,

¹ *Egyptian Antiquities*, I, 382-4. ² *Idem*, 384. ³ *Constable's Sculpture*, 6. ⁴ *Egyptian Antiquities*, I, 374. ⁵ *Idem*, 374. ⁶ *Idem*, 375.

and the limbs on both sides placed in exactly the same position. The posture of the statue is generally sitting, but sometimes standing. There are no indications of motion or life. All have the air and attitude of most profound repose, of solemn and undisturbed tranquillity.

One peculiarity observable in Egyptian sculpture is, that whenever the dimensions are much beyond nature,¹ the head is always larger than the colossal proportion of the other parts of the body would require.

It is a curious subject of inquiry to examine the specimens of Egyptian sculpture in reference to the national physiognomy of the ancient Egyptians. The following are found to be the general character of the sculptured head and features.² The forehead rather low; the eyebrow less marked and prominent than in the Greek style; the eyes rather flat and long, and drawn in an oblique direction; the hair of the eyebrows but faintly marked, sometimes by nothing more than a line; the nose rather short and rounded at the end; the lips closed and often wearing a soft and placid smile, in keeping with their quiet attitude, rather thick, although not approaching the large lips of the negro; the chin rather small and receding; the cheek bones high and marked; the ear placed much too high; the extremities of the mouth raised a little, giving a kind of smiling expression to the face.

It is principally from the sculptures in relief, both bas and intaglio, that we derive our lessons of instruction, in regard to the ancient Egyptians. These are scattered over the monuments with a profusion truly astonishing.³ The pylones, walls of temples, palaces and tombs, columns, ceilings, except the cornices, are all covered over with hieroglyphics and sculptures, in an order, and of a size adapted to the massy forms of architecture upon which they are inscribed. The hieroglyphics proper form but a small part of this immense display of sculpture. The principal part are the great reliefs, all of which have a

¹ *Constable's Sculpture*, 27. ² *Egyptian Antiq.*, II, 9, 11. ³ *Hebren*, II, 174.

design and meaning which can generally be arrived at by proper attention. Some are historical reliefs, representing battle-scenes, two armies actually engaged upon the battle-field, victory, and the flight of the enemy, the assailing a strong fortress, the final triumph. These are found upon the walls of the palace. On the temple walls and ceilings are found reliefs representing religious rites, various Egyptian deities, and many of their forms of worship, the offerings made, long processions of the priests, and sacrifices. The walls of the catacombs are covered with sculptures representing the concerns of every day life, thus bringing the affairs of life and death into a near and intimate relationship. The various industrial pursuits, the manners and customs of the Egyptians, the court of death, and many peculiarities in the Egyptian character, as developed in their forms of life and action, are there portrayed.

Thus the monuments become, as it were, "an open book, where science unfolds, morality teaches, and the useful arts are set forth. Everything seems to speak, all seems animated; and all in the same spirit.¹ The door-posts, the most secret corners, give a lesson or a rule, and the whole in most wonderful harmony. They become, in a manner, the living archives of the science and knowledge of the nation."

Another art practiced in Egypt, and kindred to sculpture was painting.

It is not a little singular that the sculptures just spoken of were also paintings.² The colors of those on the outside of the walls are not so well preserved, but these are also supposed to have been originally painted. This adds greatly to the effect of the sculptured reliefs.

Painting is an art of less antiquity than that of sculpture.³ The Egyptians first painted their reliefs before they laid their colors on a flat surface. The colors they employed were black, blue, red, green, yellow and white.⁴ The materials were various from which these colors were

¹ Heeren, II, 178, 179. ² *Idem*, 176. ³ *Egyptian Antiquities*, II, 44. ⁴ *Idem*, 45.

obtained. The black might be made from lees of wine, burnt pitch,¹ charcoal and soot. The blues appear to have been oxides of copper.² The reds were obtained from minium, cinnabar, or native vermilion. The greens were a mixture of yellow vegetable pigment with a copper blue, and held on by glue water; the vegetable might have been the henni plant. The yellows were of a bright sulphur color, and appear to have been vegetable colors. The whites were generally preparations of lime or gypsum. There were also other substances, such as ochrous earths, red and yellow, and also madder, that was probably used for the purpose of painting. The coloring of the Egyptian painter was brilliant and vivid, and long retained its peculiar lustre. On the opening of a new catacomb, the paintings are found as fresh and brilliant as if they had been executed but yesterday. To this high state of preservation, the dryness of the atmosphere in Upper Egypt,³ combined with the invariable temperature of most of the tombs very much contributes.

There were two striking defects in this art as practiced by the Egyptians, the one relating to the coloring, the other to the drawing. They seem to have known nothing of the mixing or blending of colors. They could not, therefore, variegate, or multiply beyond the simple colors. Neither could they soften down so as to form varying degrees of intensity. They could present no contrasts of light and shade. One part must be all red, another all blue, and so on through the different colors.

The defect in drawing, and which has an equal application to the sculptures, as to the paintings, was a total, or almost a total want of perspective both in figures and in the representation of inanimate objects. All seem equally near to the eye, and those on the same plane instead of being shown one behind the other,⁴ were placed in succession one above the other, on the perpendicular wall. The

¹ *Egyptian Antiquities*, II, 48. ² *Idem*, 46. ³ *Idem*, 52. ⁴ *Wilkinson's Manners and Customs*, III, 313.

process of painting, where there were no bas-reliefs, was the following. The ground was first prepared by covering it with a thick layer of fine plaster, consisting of lime and gypsum,¹ smoothed and polished. A thin coat of lime whitewash was laid upon this, and then the colors were painted, being bound fast either by animal glue, or occasionally with wax. The whitewash was made of shell limestone, but little burnt, and possessing much tenacity. The coloring matter is but slightly attached to the stone, and in a moist and humid climate, soon disappears. So very slender are the connecting ties between the two, that the colors will generally leave the stone on being touched with the moistened finger.²

Several coats of paint are sometimes put on one over another, and occasionally one color on a ground of a different color.³ The whole mass of paint must, therefore, be very thick, and it has been found covered with a gummy or waxy glazing for the purpose of preservation.

The mode of painting both men and animals was uniformly to give a profile view.⁴ This was the primitive style of painting, and characterizes the commencement of the art. It is easier of accomplishment, and more readily understood from its simplicity. All the heads both male and female exhibited upon the monuments are in profile; but a very important question has arisen whether they can be relied upon as portraits of those they profess to represent. Portrait painting became somewhat common among the Greeks about the epoch of Alexander, B. C. 335.⁵ It was probably practiced earlier than that, as historical painting was of an earlier date. Little reliance, however, can be placed upon the genuineness of busts or paintings as portraits which are of a date prior to Alexander. The frequent copying and extensive multiplication of them would tend to destroy their character as likenesses. But there are still extant on the monuments, profile views pro-

¹ *Egyptian Antiquities*, II, 49. ² *Idem*, 52. ³ *Idem*, 53. ⁴ *Wilkinson*, III, 269. ⁵ *Egyptian Antiquities*, II, 79.

fessing to be portraits of Egyptian kings which, according to the received interpretation, go as far back as Amanoph I, or Amosis the first king of the eighteenth dynasty, about the year B. C. 1822, nearly 1500 years prior to the age of Alexander. There is little doubt but that these heads were designed as portraits. They are distinct from each other, and, although drawn in accordance with conventional forms, still the outline of the face,¹ from the forehead to the chin, has a marked individual character. It is remarked by Bunsen that we see in the Pharaonic portraits of the best periods of the new empire a personal character, though unfortunately in most cases history gives no commentary upon them. That the observer cannot fail to remark the unmeaning expression of Tuthmosis II,² the type of command in his sister, and the fine and beautiful features of Tuthmosis III. That Horus looks like a weak enthusiast; the aquiline nose and Asiatic forehead of Rameses II, are well known; and that his great father, Sethos I, is the prototype of the nobleness of his features. That there is a wonderful difference between Amunoph II and III, and the weak minded bigot who tried to introduce the adoration of the sun's disk, instead of the ideal worship of Re.

Many of these heads are repeated on various monuments. Those of the most distinguished kings, such as Thothmes IV, Amunoph III, Rameses II and III, and some others are of frequent occurrence, not only on the monuments of Egypt, but also upon those in Nubia, the ancient Ethiopia. The representation of the same individual, whether it occurs frequently on the same building, or on different buildings of different dates, is always exactly the same. This has been urged as an argument both in favor and against their character as likenesses. They would undoubtedly differ if taken with fidelity at different times in their life. It is not improbable that the likeness was taken on the king's accession, or at some

¹ *Egyptian Antiquities*, II, 80. ² *Bunsen's Egypt's Place in Universal History*, IV, 656.

great epoch in his life, from which copies being afterwards taken, would cause the uniformity observed. It should be observed, however, that the medals of some of the Roman emperors present us with different heads, corresponding to different epochs in their life.

Another argument is drawn from family likeness. Each king and queen has the name and title placed near the likeness, generally in two cartouches or royal ovals,¹ though in some cases there is only one. It has been remarked that a family likeness appears in those kings, who are of the same family. This is particularly observable in two kings of the eighteenth dynasty, Thothmes IV, and his son and successor Amunoph II. The evidence taken altogether seems to be in favor of their being likenesses of those they represent.

The subjects represented by painting are the same as those previously mentioned as represented by sculpture. The Egyptian school of painting made no progress. From first to last there is scarcely observable any variation. The proportions are observed to be a trifle elongated in the age of Rameses II, still the difference is hardly perceptible.²

The strong power that always fettered the efforts of Egyptian art in its execution of sculpture and painting was the necessity of adhering strictly to conventional forms.³ The same formal outline, the same postures and attitudes, the same modes of representing different parts, appear ever to have been practiced by the Egyptian artists. The Greeks copied after nature in its varied displays of power and passion, pleasure and pain; the Egyptians after certain models or conventional forms established by law. By this means defects and imperfections were perpetuated equally with beauties. A formality and stiffness is everywhere observable. There is no fire in the eye, no animation in the features. The same

¹ *Egyptian Antiquities*, II, 81. ² *Wilkinson*, III, 266. ³ *Idem*,

imperturbable countenance is exhibited on the battle-field, in the highest and wildest excitement of contest and carnage; and in the spacious temple, while engaged in peaceful worship and offering incense to the deity. There was no improvement, nor even the opportunity afforded for it. The volume of Egyptian art was stereotyped in the beginning, and all its subsequent efforts could accomplish little more than the production of copies from the original draft. Although variety might be introduced into individual figures, yet the laws, principles, models, upon and under which they were formed were always the same.

Plato and Synesius mention the stern regulations which forbade their artists to introduce innovations in religious subjects; and the more effectually to prevent this, the profession of artist was not allowed to be exercised by common or illiterate persons, lest they should attempt anything contrary to the laws established, regarding the figures of the deities.¹

This primitive school of art differs in many respects from the subsequent Grecian schools. The creations of the Grecian artist originated from a representative impulse which constrained him to represent what inwardly filled and agitated his soul,² because it was so beautiful and exalted in character. But the representation of the Egyptian artist is inwardly guided by external aims. It seeks to authenticate particular events, actions or services. It is entirely of a historical, monumental nature, much the same as an embodied inscription.

Neither the form of body among the Egyptians, nor their mode of thought, nor their customs and laws,³ were favorable to a high style of art. The ancient Egyptians in their form of body resembled more the Chinese than the Greeks. They presented little variety. The very same conformation observable in Egyptian statues has

¹ *Wilkinson*, III, 87. ² *Muller's Ancient Art and its Remains*, 232.

³ *Wincklemann*, I, 243-4.

been remarked in the heads of the figures painted on mummies, which were probably accurate likenesses of the deceased. The Egyptians were of a dark brown complexion, the same given to the heads on painted mummies.

The Egyptians in their mode of thought, manifest little of pleasure or gayety. They had more about them of the solemn, melancholic and mysterious. Their usages of caste, and adherence to prescribed forms, operated disadvantageously to art. Their artists were merely artisans, the son following the craft of his father, and not yielding to inclination in the choice of pursuits.¹ There could be, therefore, no different schools of art, in Egypt, as there were subsequently in Greece. Again, the Egyptians were deficient in the knowledge of a science essential to the practice of art, viz: anatomy. They had too much respect for the dead to permit any dissection of the body. Accordingly the muscles and bones are found but feebly marked, and some of the parts incorrectly rendered.

The more ancient style of Egyptian art prevailed down to the conquest by Cambyses.² The main feature which distinguished it, was the adoption of the straight line in their architecture, their embellishments, and to a great extent, in the very contour of the nude figure. Hence the figures are angular, the attitude stiff and constrained, the feet parallel, and the arms hanging straight down along the sides. This generally precludes any action, that being expressed principally through the movement of the arms and hands. In the female figure, the right arm only hangs confined to the side, the left laying across the body below the heart. While the bones and muscles are slightly marked, the nerves and veins are not rendered at all, but the knees, ancles, and a marking of the elbow, are prominently shown as in nature.

Animals were much more faithfully rendered by Egyptian art than human forms. Many of these, especially sphinxes and lions, are executed with a good degree of

skill, characterized by "an elegant variety of softly deviating outlines and flowingly unbroken parts. The Egyptian artist or artisan was probably restricted to a more conventional style in his rendering of the human form, while in regard to animals, he had a larger license to imitate purely what he found in nature.

The Egyptian artists differed very considerably from the Greeks in their representation of the parts and features of the human head. This is more especially noticeable in the form and position of the eye. The Egyptians drew the eyes flat and oblique, placing them almost on a level with the forehead, so that the upper margin of the orbit, on which the eyebrows are denoted by a sharp prominence, is flat. The Greeks set the ball of the eye more deeply, thus producing more light and shadow, and consequently a much stronger effect. The heads of the Egyptian artists have no ideal beauty, and the soft profile of Greek heads is unknown to Egyptian art. The cheek bones are strongly marked and prominent; the chin somewhat small and receding, destroying thereby the perfect oval of the face. The meeting of the lips toward the corners of the mouth, instead of being, as in Grecian heads, drawn rather downwards, is drawn upwards, while the closure of the mouth is done in such a manner that the lips are separated from each other only by a simple incision. The lips in the Grecian heads are often represented open. The ears were placed by the Egyptian artists high on the head; so high, that in some cases the lobe of the ear is almost on the same line with the eyes. The feet are represented as flat and broad, and, like the fingers, have no markings of the joints.

Notwithstanding, however, the art of the old Egyptian empire in many respects compares unfavorably with that of the more modern Greek, yet its great merits ought by no means to be overlooked. The secret of the proportions of the human body was first revealed to the Egyptians. They laid down its first canon which was afterwards much improved upon by the Greeks, according to models

of their own more perfect proportions. And thus while the attitudes in the pictures of the gods and statues of the Pharaohs in the old empire are stiff, conventional, and kept in the leading strings of caste rigidity, they are not without expression and life. There is much of that severe execution which is the only real way of arriving at perfect beauty.

The Egyptian style of art became modified from the period of the Persian conquest. The chest was represented more strongly elevated; the ribs more distinctly marked; the joints and cartilages of the knees worked out more prominently; the muscles rendered more plainly visible; and the shoulder blades rising up with a more decided rounding. The head also exhibited marked variations. The eyes are deeply sunk for the purpose of projecting the eyebrow bones, and of obtaining light and shade. The influence of the Greek spirit in art is obviously modifying, softening down, and curving the rough and straight lines of the old Pharaonic style.

So far as regards mechanical execution the Egyptian figures now extant are finished, smoothed and polished with almost infinite pains. Something more than the chisel has been employed for this purpose. Even the figures on the points of the lofty obelisks have an execution which fits them for examination within short distances.

Another art for which the ancient Egyptians were celebrated was that of embalming.

“By this we are to understand an artificial operation, in which, by the aid of various medicaments,¹ a dead body may be rendered capable of resisting the process of putrefaction.” Air and moisture are the great agents that commence and accelerate the putrefactive process. Without the action of these agents, putrefaction cannot take place. Any process, therefore, that arms the body divested of life with a power to resist these agents, or that excludes it from

¹ *Pettigrew, 44.*

their action, will preserve it for any period of time in the same condition in which it found it.¹ The Ethiopians employed a diaphanous resin to preserve their dead bodies; the Persians enveloped their's in wax; the Scythians folded their dead in skins. These went upon the principle of exclusion.

The Egyptians resorted to the process of embalming for the purpose of preservation. This process had a three fold effect in reference to the action of these agents:

1. It removed from the body those parts which are peculiarly liable to their action, the contents of the cranium and abdomen.

2. By a system of tight bandages, it excluded all or nearly every part of the body from their action.

3. By its medicaments it armed the body with the power to resist them.

It has been a matter of curious speculation as to the motive that originally led the Egyptians to the invention and practice of this art. It has been asserted that the ancient Egyptians believed in the immortality of the soul, as connected with the preservation of the body.² That when the body was suffered to decay, the soul lost its place in the regions of happiness, and during three thousand years wandered through all forms of living creatures, until it came again into a human figure; not, however, the original one, for that had disappeared.³ If the body was preserved, and not suffered to see corruption, then the soul, if sufficiently meritorious, could pass the time in the regions of Amenti, in the midst of enjoyments. This would certainly furnish a strong motive to resort to every possible expedient to preserve the body from the putrefactive process.

The art of embalming is not practiced or known among the Egyptians of the present day.⁴ Our knowledge of the manner in which it was practiced is derived principally from

¹ *Pettigrew*, 44. ² *Egyptian Antiquities*, II, 152, 153. ³ *Heeren*, II, 190, 191. ⁴ *Pettigrew*, 44.

Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus, and from what we can derive from the inspection of the mummies and monuments.

Among the ancient Egyptians the practice of this art constituted a distinct profession. Those who followed it always kept on hand models in wood of the different styles of embalming,¹ from which the relatives of the deceased made their selection.

There were three styles of embalming, each differing from the other two, both in the method of its performance and in the price, the first being the most perfect and the most expensive, the second less so, and the third still less than either.

In the first style, those who practiced the art proceeded in the first place to pull the brain out through the nostrils by means of a crooked piece of iron.² Having succeeded in extracting a part of it in this manner, they obtained the remainder by pouring in certain drugs.

The next step is to make an incision into the flank,³ on the left side, for the evisceration of the body.⁴ The scribe first marks the line, and then the cutter or dissector, in accordance with his directions, makes the incision with an Ethiopic stone, remarkable for its hardness and capability of bearing a very keen cutting edge. Through this incision the intestines, and other viscera, are extracted from the body by the embalmers. They were divided into four portions, and dedicated to the four genii, or gods of Amenti. To Amset, who was represented with the head of a man,⁵ were dedicated the stomach and large intestines; to Hapi, having the head of a Cynocephalus ape, the small intestines; to Smautf, with the head of a jackal, the lungs and heart; and to Kebhnsnof, represented with the head of a hawk, the liver and gall-bladder. They were either deposited in vases, bearing their respective heads, or were returned into the body accompanied by these four figures.

¹ *Pettigrew*, 45. ² *Idem*, 46. ³ *Idem*, 46-8. ⁴ *Idem*, 56. ⁵ *Wilkinson*, v. 70, 71.

The inside of the body after being divested of the intestines and viscera was cleansed and rinsed out with palm wine,¹ and thoroughly scoured with pounded aromatics.² It was then filled with aromatic substances,³ myrrh, cinnamon, and cassia. Some resinous matters were also thrown into the body. These would afford protection against moisture,⁴ one of the agents essential to putrefaction. They form a kind of varnish on the surface to which they are applied.

The next operation was that of salting the body,⁵ or immersing it in natron. This was a fixed alkali, the effect of which was to dry up the fibre without destroying it.⁶ It has been supposed by many that this operation of salting the body or steeping it in natron preceded instead of succeeded the filling it with the aromatic substances above enumerated.⁷

The body was kept steeped in natron for the space of seventy days,⁸ after which it was thoroughly washed, bandaged and placed inside the wooden case prepared for it.

The second style of embalming, which was less expensive and less perfect than the first,⁹ consisted, according to Herodotus, in injecting the body through the seat with cedar oil, by means of syringes without making any incision. The body was then laid in salt for the prescribed number of days, and on being taken out the injected matter was suffered to escape, which brought away with it the bowels and viscera dissolved. Nothing but skin and bones remained.

It has been remarked,¹⁰ however, that the liquor from the cedar called cedria, is not caustic, and could not therefore have performed the dissolving process mentioned by Herodotus. It has been therefore supposed that prior to the use of the cedria, injections of natron rendered caustic

¹ *Pettigrew*, 46. ² *Idem*, 61. ³ *Idem*, 78. ⁴ *Idem*, 80. ⁵ *Idem*, 82. ⁶ *Idem*, 83. ⁷ *Idem*, 83, 84. ⁸ *Idem*, 46. ⁹ *Egyptian Antiquities*, III, 103. ¹⁰ *Pettigrew*, 84, 85.

were resorted to for the purpose of dissolving and bringing away the viscera, and that subsequently cedria was injected to destroy insects, and dry up the animal fibre, and thus destroy the action of moisture as a putrefactive agent. The body was then given to the friends without anything more being done to it.

The third style was the cheapest and most common. The inside of the body was washed with *syrmaea*,¹ after which it was steeped in natron for the seventy days and then returned to its friends.² The word *syrmaea* is applicable to any strong purgative dose, and means a powerful injection for the purpose of destroying the viscera and intestines. Mummies, thus embalmed, were not calculated to last long, and as they became very dry they would be mere skeletons.

The ordinary mode of sepulture among the Egyptians, tended to preserve the body, and thus effect a kind of natural embalming.³ The body, after being wrapped round with a few swaddling cloths, was laid upon beds of charcoal. It was then covered with a mat, upon which was piled a quantity of sand seven or eight feet in thickness. The effect of this was to dry up the moisture, and thus remove one of the agents of putrefaction and render the body shriveled and dried up. At the same time its almost or entire exclusion from the atmosphere removed it from the action of another putrefactive agent.

When the embalming was well done according to the first and best style,⁴ all parts of the body although dried retained their natural form. The hair, eyes, nose and mouth were in so good a state of preservation that one could easily recognize the expression of the countenance. The eyelids, lashes and eyebrows were found in a natural state. The eyes slightly injured because dried, and the pupil in consequence become slightly contracted. The nose was in a natural state, the tongue dry, and the lips thin.

¹ *Pettigrew*, 46, 47. ² *Egyptian Antiquities*, II, 116. ³ *Pettigrew*, 50.

⁴ *Egyptian Antiquities*, II, 97, 98.

After the seventy days immersion of the body in the solution of natron, and the washing it so thoroughly as to remove all the superfluous salt that would be likely to attract moisture,¹ the bandages were to be applied. Mummies were not all bandaged, some being merely covered with a mat. One of the chief purposes of bandaging was probably the exclusion of air and moisture. The quantity found on some mummies is truly enormous. It has been computed to consist of not less than one thousand ells of cloth. On some, more than one thousand yards have been used. In one instance the bandages weighed twenty-nine and one-half pounds. In another thirty-five and one-half.

The material of which the bandages were composed has generally been supposed to be cotton,² some have been found of linen. The coarsest kind of bandage is always found nearest to the body. There is much variety in length and breadth. They are sometimes a yard or more in breadth, but do not in general exceed seven or eight inches.³

The bandages were variously tinged. Those nearest to the body were saturated with bituminous matter. The coarse bandages round the poorer class are found charged with natron,⁴ not bitumen. Some bandages are also found impregnated with resin. The bandages are sometimes found marked with hieroglyphical characters or alphabetical letters,⁵ giving the name and profession of the deceased.

The method of applying the bandages very much varies. In order to effect their immediate application to the body, compresses were placed in various parts that no space or deficiency might be left.⁶ The air was thus effectually excluded. The bandages are found to vary very much in thickness in different mummies. Sometimes they are found to have been wound twenty or thirty times around the members and body. When the mummy with its

¹ *Pettigrew*, 89. ² *Idem*, 90. ³ *Idem*, 91. ⁴ *Idem*, 93. ⁵ *Idem*, 94. ⁶ *Idem*, 95.

bandages around it is first taken out of its case it presents very much the appearance of a large mass of cloth,¹ somewhat resembling the general outline of the human figure. In one instance, forty-six folds of cotton cloth were counted.²

The bandages were undoubtedly applied wet, as the object was close and effective binding. Compresses and rollers were also used for the same purpose. Immediately beneath the envelope, long and broad bandages proceeded from the head to the feet somewhat in the form of the figure 8. Of these there were several folds, and then a more regular application if the roller is observable around the body and limbs in a spiral manner. Compresses at the sides of the body and limbs extended the length of two or more feet, to admit of the firm and steady application of the rollers. The cloth increases in looseness of texture until the bandage comes in contact with the body.

In some instances, the limbs are found to have been separately bandaged;³ in others, they were included in the general bandaging. Mummies of the priest caste were bandaged with great care and attention. The bandages are strips of red and white linen, intermixed, covering the whole body, and forming a curious effect from the two colors.⁴ The arms and legs are not enclosed in the same envelope with the body, but are bandaged separately, being preserved distinct even to the fingers and toes. The arms are always found folded across the breast. The bandages are linen, and so applied that the shape of the figure is most carefully preserved.

After the outer series of bandages are removed, it is not uncommon to find various idols, papyri, amulets, ornaments, etc., sometimes possessing great interest. In one instance,⁵ there was found placed upon the bandages, a portrait painted upon a thin plate of cedar wood, the colors of which appear to have been fixed by a strong gluten. Necklaces are found upon males as well as females.⁶

¹ *Egyptian Antiquities*, II, 117. ² *Pettigrew*, 95. ³ *Idem*, 98. ⁴ *Idem*, 99. ⁵ *Idem*, 100, 101. ⁶ *Idem*, 104.

Along with the body are often found emblems of the profession or trade of the deceased. Pickaxes, fishing nets, razor and stone, cupping glasses, vases of perfumes, pottery, baskets of fruits, loaves of bread, paints and brushes, instruments of surgery,¹ the bow, arrow, lance, distaff, etc., have all been found, indicating the pursuits followed by the individual in his life time. Combs, paints, mirrors, and other articles of the toilet, have been found with the mummies of females.²

The mummies, after being properly embalmed and bandaged, are ready to be placed in their cases or sarcophagi.³ They were not all placed in cases. Some were merely swathed in a bandage, and then deposited in the tomb. Such, however, were very imperfectly preserved.

Some of the sarcophagi are very splendid. They are composed of various materials: sycamore, cedar, deal. Some more durable. One already mentioned, found in a royal tomb, composed of oriental alabaster. These sarcophagi were generally in a high degree ornamented. They were covered with hieroglyphics, and emblematical characters.

After being placed in the sarcophagus, the dead was ready to be consigned to the tomb. Until there deposited, it could not enter the empire of death.⁴ The entrance into that empire could alone secure the tranquil continuance of existence ever after. Hence originated the earnestness of desire possessed by the Egyptians to entomb their dead. The mummies of their ancestors and families were the surest pledges that could be given for debt, for no duty was deemed more sacred than that of redeeming them, and giving them a secure resting place.⁵ Before, however, they could pass to their repose, it was necessary that the tribunal of death should assemble, and pass upon the lives they had led. This will find a more appropriate place in the social habits, manners and customs of the Egyptians.

¹ *Pettigrew*, 111. ² *Idem*, 112. ³ *Idem*, 115. ⁴ *Heeren*, II, 196. ⁵ *Idem*, 197.

The art of war as practiced by the ancient Egyptians had little to distinguish it from the same art as practiced by the Assyrians, Babylonians and Persians. Although it can hardly be said that the Egyptians are celebrated for the wars they waged, or the conquests they achieved, yet that is perhaps more owing to the celebrity they obtained in other things than to any deficiency in military prowess. Egypt, like most other ancient nations, had her conquerors, whose heroic achievements not only became the theme of tradition, but were also sculptured in enduring characters upon the monuments. From the fact that one great portion of the population of Egypt was devoted to the profession of arms, and made it the great business of their lives, we should naturally expect to find them making a higher degree of attainment in the practice of it there than among other early nations. We find, however, essentially the same weapons, both offensive and defensive, made use of, and substantially the same kind of armor adopted as a defense, which the ancient nations in the west of Asia were so generally in the habit of using. There was also a great similarity between the art early practiced by the Egyptians and that subsequently put in practice by the Greeks.

The offensive weapons of the Egyptians were the bow, spear, two species of javelin, sling, a short and straight sword, dagger, knife,¹ falchion, axe or hatchet, battleaxe, poleaxe, mace or club, and a curved stick. Their defensive arms consisted of a helmet of metal, or a quilted head piece, a cuirass or coat of armor made of metal plates, or quilted with metal bands, which extended about half way to the elbow, forming a short sleeve, and an ample shield, which in length was equal to about half his height, and generally double his own breadth, and which constituted his chief defense.

The archers were skillful in the use of the bow,² and the success of the Egyptian arms seems in a great measure attributable to them. They fought both on foot and in

¹ *Wilkinson*, I, 297, 298. ² *Idem*, 288.

chariots, and probably constituted the chief part of both wings. Several bodies of heavy infantry divided into regiments, each distinguished by its peculiar arms, formed the centre, while the cavalry covered and supported the foot. The infantry was divided into regiments,¹ and these were formed and distinguished according to the arms they bore. The bowmen and light infantry were taught either to act in line, or to adopt more open movements, while masses of heavy infantry armed with spears and shields, and a falchion or other weapon, moved sometimes in close array in the form of a phalanx, and at other times formed into long columns, or small distinct bodies.

Each battalion and company had its own particular standard,² which represented a sacred subject, frequently a sacred animal, which served to point out to the soldiers their respective regiments or companies, enabled them to keep their ranks, encouraged them to the charge, and gave them a rallying point amid the confusion of battle. The sound of the trumpet summoned the soldiers to form,³ and they marched on to the charge under the same inspiring sound added to that of the long drum. These are found among the earliest sculptures of battle-scenes. The variety of weapons used by different corps, as well as the care they took in allotting to each its respective duties during action, in selecting those best suited to a peculiar service,⁴ and in the judicious arrangement of the army and its component parts, show the great experience acquired early by the Egyptians in the art of war. The king and commanders rode in chariots or cars, each chariot containing besides the driver one and sometimes two warriors.⁵ No chariot contained more than two wheels, and there is no instance of their making use of chariots armed with scythes. They were uniformly drawn with two horses.⁶

In attacking a fortified town, they advanced under cover of the archers, and either instantly applied the scaling

¹ *Wilkinson*, I, 292. ² *Idem*, 294. ³ *Idem*, 297. ⁴ *Idem*, 328. ⁵ *Idem*, 350. ⁶ *Idem*, 356.

ladder to the ramparts,¹ or undertook the routine of a regular siege. In marching, the chariots led the van; the king in his car of war, attended by his chief officers, occupied the centre,² preceded and followed by bodies of infantry, armed with bows, spears, or other weapons, according to their respective corps. The archers generally commenced the fight by a discharge of arrows. The chariots then advanced to the charge, and at the same time the heavy infantry,³ armed with spears or clubs, and covered with their shields, moved forward in close array, pressing upon the centre and wings of the enemy.

That the Egyptians did not adopt the murderous practice of slaughtering all their enemies, so generally followed by savage nations, is pretty evident from the number of prisoners they took, and in the naval fight of Ramesis III, they are represented, both in the ships and on shore, as rescuing the enemy, whose galley had been sunk, from a watery grave. The captives were employed in the service of the king in building temples, cutting canals, raising dykes and embankments, and other public works.⁴

Another fact going to show the advance of their civilization relatively to other nations is, that the soldiers wore no arms except when in service, on garrison duty, or in attendance upon the king;⁵ and the private citizen at no time carried offensive weapons about his person either in the house or street.

The *Art of Music* was very successfully cultivated by the ancient Egyptians. It was practiced in their military movements, in their social parties; in their religious exercises; and in their wailing for the dead. Instrumental music must have attained considerable perfection if we are to judge from the number, variety, and frequency of occurrence of their musical instruments. The drum and trumpet were more peculiarly considered martial instruments, the latter being used in a more peculiar manner to

¹ *Wilkinson*, I, 359. ² *Idem*, 391. ³ *Idem*, 392. ⁴ *Idem*, 402-3. ⁵ *Idem*, 402.

sound the charge.¹ The former, slung from the shoulder, was beaten by the hand at each end.

Among the instruments played on by the Egyptian band was the harp, guitar, lyre, flute, single and double pipe, round and oblong tambourine, cylindrical maces, and cymbals.²

The harp was constructed of various forms, and some of them possessed of great elegance. The number of their chords varied from four to seventeen and even twenty-one.³ They were performed upon in various attitudes. Some being seated on the ground, others standing, or sitting on a stool, and one a light four-stringed harp, of smaller dimensions, was sometimes carried and played on the shoulder.

The lyre was another instrument almost equally as varied in its form.⁴ Although by some the number of its strings has been limited to three, yet instances are found of its having five, seven, and even seventeen. It was generally held under the arm, but was sometimes supported on a stool or table.

The guitar had three or five chords, and was played with the plectrum.

Although there is little doubt but that music, as an art to be reduced to practice, was cultivated by those who made musical performances their profession, and gained their livelihood by playing in public,⁵ or for the entertainment of a private party, yet a question has been made how far the art itself was based upon scientific principles, and, in connection with them, studied and understood. From the fact that Plato and Pythagoras, especially the latter, who had gathered so much from the "wisdom of the Egyptians," understood so well the scientific principles connected with the practice of the art, and from other circumstances, it is inferred that the priest caste made it a subject of study, and understood it in its scientific bearings.

¹ *Topography*, 239. ² *Idem*, 238. ³ *Idem*, 239. ⁴ *Idem*, 239. ⁵ *Wilkinson* II, 223.

One means of determining the extent to which the art of music has been carried among any people, and the perfection which they attained in its practice, is to examine their instruments. In the infancy of the art, no other instruments are known than those of percussion.¹ Pipes of various kinds, and the flute, were afterwards invented, the first very rude, and made of reeds which grew in the rivers and lakes. In process of time, these were improved and others invented. The method of obtaining more perfect melody from a smaller number of strings, by means of shortening them on a neck during the performance,² similar to our modern violin, evidences very considerable attainment in the art, and yet this was familiar to the ancient Egyptians, as abundantly appears from the monuments. The great degree of perfection to which the instruments were brought, as is also evidenced by the sculptures on the monuments, shows very conclusively the progress made in the practice of the art, and also a more or less thorough knowledge of the scientific principles upon which that practice was founded.

Among the instruments of sacred music, were the harp, lyre, flute, double pipe, tambourine, cymbals,³ and even the guitar; nor were the trumpet, drum and mace excluded from the religious processions, in which the military were engaged.

The Egyptians were evidently acquainted with the triple symphony, that is that produced by the harmony of instruments, by that of voices, and by that of voices and instruments.⁴ Their songs were numerous, and made for certain occasions. Some of them, according to Herodotus, were sung in a plaintive tone, and descended from father to son from the early era of their first monarch. The hymns in honor of the dead were of a lugubrious and less harmonious nature, and the mournful dirge of maneros with the Egyptians was nearly related to the *linos* of the Greeks.

¹ *Wilkinson*, II, 226. ² *Idem*, 228. ³ *Idem*, 315. ⁴ *Topography*, 239-240.

Of the practice or knowledge of the arts of poetry, eloquence or oratory among the ancient Egyptians, we know nothing. The motive to their cultivation must have been weak or entirely wanting, where they could have been of but little or no avail had they been possessed in perfection. They are plants, especially those of eloquence and oratory, that can flourish only in an atmosphere of freedom.

CHAPTER XII.

ARABIA—ITS DESCRIPTION, HISTORY, INDUSTRY, RELIGION,
SOCIETY, GOVERNMENT, PHILOSOPHY, AND ART.

Arabia.

By simply crossing the isthmus of Suez, or the northern part of the Red sea, we pass from Egypt into Arabia. Notwithstanding, however, the brevity of this passage, we find ourselves amid scenes, among men, and in a civilization, as different from the Egyptian, almost as if we had passed to another planet. It is not a little extraordinary, that the Arabians and Egyptians could have inhabited territories lying immediately contiguous to each other for such a succession of centuries, and yet have failed to exert the least modifying influence upon each other. It goes strongly to show either that man is very much the creature of physical causes, or that every different race or variety of the species had impressed upon it at its origin a certain marked character or peculiarities, by virtue of which it was to enact the part, perfect the civilization, and fulfill the destiny originally confided to it. It is most probably the latter, and that physical causes and circumstances have been so ordered and arranged as to become themselves subservient to this great principle.

Egypt we have seen to be a land of monuments, but its monuments were marble. Arabia, in one sense, is also a land of monuments, but its monuments are men. Man is there monumental because he is unchanged. The Bedouin of the desert and the rocky Arabia, possesses the same general features, traits of character, modes of life and civilization, that were in ancient times possessed by the immediate descendants of Ishmael. The Assyrian, Babylonian, and Persian civilization, have traveled by him on

their journey westward, while the Egyptian, Hebrew, Syrian, and Phœnician, Grecian and Roman, have for ages hovered around him, and yet he has remained the same. The manners, customs, forms of intercourse and modes of life that belonged to the early patriarchs are yet to be seen impressed upon the living page of Arabian being.¹

Arabia is peninsular in its situation, forming the south-western extremity of Asia, and lying intermediate between the rest of Asia and Africa. On the north it is bounded by Syria,² a narrow strip of land which separates it from the Mediterranean sea. On the north-east it follows pretty much the course of the Euphrates to its mouth. It is separated from Persia on the east by the Persian gulf. Its south-eastern boundary is upon the Indian ocean. The Red sea and isthmus of Suez on the west separates it from Abyssinia and Egypt. These boundaries, it should be remarked, include countries at present occupied by the Arabs, but which do not seem anciently to have formed a part of Arabia. Much or all of Palestine, Arabian Irak, and the Syrian desert are included.³ A straight line drawn from the Persian gulf to the extremity of the Red sea probably marked its northern boundary in ancient times.

Arabia has been variously divided. That which is the most general, and also the most natural, as being based upon its physical peculiarities, is into three parts, viz: Arabia Petraea, Arabia Deserta, and Arabia Felix, or Arabia the rocky, the desert, and the happy. Arabia Petraea comprehends the tract of country lying south of the Dead sea between Palestine and Egypt, at the northern extremity of the Red sea. It is the north-west part of Arabia. Arabia Deserta is the north-east part, extending on the north and east as far as the Euphrates, which separated it from Mesopotamia and the Arabian Irak. Part of it towards the east is supposed to be the land of Uz.⁴

¹ *Malte-Brun*, II, 189, 190. ² *Idem*, II, 189. ³ *Origenes*, III, 243. ⁴ *Bell*, IV, 216.

Arabia Felix contained the fertile habitable regions to the south and west, bordering upon the Indian ocean and the southern part of the Red sea, and is supposed by many to have been the Sheba of scripture.¹ Each one of these divisions possessed, in general, features corresponding to its name.

Arabia Petræa did not admit of much cultivation, a very great part of it being covered with dry sands,² or rising into rocks or sharp and irregular mountains, interspersed, however, with occasional vales of great verdure and loveliness, resembling in their appearance the happy Arabia. This division of Arabia is comparatively small, yet it has, nevertheless, been the scene of some of the most extraordinary events that have occurred in the world's history.³ Within it are contained the mountains of Horeb and Sinai, and through its rocky and sterile wastes were performed most of the wanderings of the Hebrews. It has been a region of miracles, and Jew, Christian and Moslem unite in surveying it with equal curiosity and respect. Here was the land of Edom, the ancient Idumea. The principal city of Arabia Petræa was the ancient city of Petra, which derived its name from its rocky situation.⁴ It was entirely inaccessible except by one narrow path, in which but few could go at once, which circumstance, in connection with the steepness of the ascent, rendered it a fortress almost impregnable. This ancient capital disappeared for many centuries, and all traces of it were lost. Its rocky tablet became effaced, and it was blotted out from the memory of man. The persevering industry of modern travelers within the last half century has discovered it, and restored to the world its ruins.⁵ They are situated in the Wady Mousa, near the foot of Mount Hor. They are found to exhibit some very curious remains of architectural excavation, attesting its ancient importance and magnificence. The surrounding region, once populous is now all a desert.

¹*Bell*, IV, 216. ²*Universal History*, XVIII, 335. ³*Drummond*, III, 247, 248.
⁴*Universal History*, XVIII, 339. ⁵*Conder's Dictionary of Geography*, 520.

Arabia Deserta is much the largest division, and for the most part consists of an arid desert. To the north it is very extensive, lying between Syria and the countries on the Euphrates.¹ This is sometimes termed the great Syrian desert. The whole coast of Arabia, from Suez to the head of the Persian gulf, is one immense plain called the Tehama, which presents a picture of the most complete desolation. The interior of Arabia is diversified by extensive ranges of mountains, but there is no river of any importance throughout Arabia, a country containing an area of about one million square miles. It must not, however, be supposed that all included within this division is equally barren. There are parts of it by no means so sterile as this denomination would lead us to suppose.² The mountainous parts of the country are fertile. The less elevated parts are sterile. There is, however, a great scarcity of water, and the want of irrigation renders the soil unproductive.

Arabia Felix, or the third division, is the only one which is termed the happy; and even this should be limited to a small part only of what is included under that general division. Where the climate is rendered temperate by the elevation of the soil above the level of the sea, as among the hills and vales of Yemen,³ nature has been prodigal of her bounties. Flowers and fruits and odoriferous shrubs everywhere abound. It is the land of frankincense and of myrrh. Its mountains are covered with the date and the coffee tree, and along its cultivated valleys glide perennial streams. Sana, the metropolis of Yemen, has been long celebrated for the amenity of its environs; and its gardens rival those of Damascus. But all that is comprised under Arabia Felix is not equally fortunate.

The whole of the southern part of the peninsula has been called the happy, and yet but a comparatively small part of it is entitled to be thus denominated. Its most

¹ *Goodrich's Geography*, 923. ² *Origines*, III, 252. ³ *Idem*, 256.

delightful provinces, as Yemen and Oman, resemble each a large oasis, situated on the borders of the mighty desert.¹ If numerous rivers water the vales of Yemen, they are dried up ere they reach the sea, in crossing the burning plains of Tehameh. If cool breezes from the ocean refresh the groves of Aden, and waft balmy odors over the hills of Saba, the scorching breath of the deadly samiel, is still the scourge of the desert from Mahrah to Mecca. A vast and sandy region, nearly a thousand miles in length, and four hundred in breadth, extends from the northern limits of Yemen to the western border of Oman; and forms a real and gloomy contrast with the delightful pictures, which the imagination paints to itself of the happy Arabia. Thus diversified and checkered, like human life, is the region of Arabia, a part comparatively small abounding in fertility, while far the greatest part is a lonesome desolate wilderness, exhibiting plains covered with sand,² or mountains consisting of naked rocks and precipices, with occasional valleys and oases of fertility. This natural division is unknown to the Arabians. They divide the country into five parts, viz: 1, Yemen; 2, Hedsjas; 3, Oman; 4, Lachsa; 5, Nedsjed. This is a civil division. The first corresponds with Arabia Felix,³ the second with Arabia Petræa, and the three last with Arabia Deserta.

We made, almost at the outset, the remark that there were two great races or divisions of men—the nomadic or wandering, and the settled or civilized. Arabia seems to be the point of union at which these two races meet. It is the home of both, and nourishes both within its bosom. The happy Arabia has, from time immemorial, been the abode of settled, and, to some extent, civilized man. Over the rocky, desert region, has, from the same early period, roamed the Bedouin, enjoying a stern independence, and extracting whatever of enjoyment he could, from his nomadic mode of life, and his desert home.

¹ *Origines*, III, 257. ² *Universal History*, XVIII, 346. ³ *Goodrich's Geography*, 923.

In making use of the Aramæan language, different dialects of which were spoken by the Hebrews, Syrians, Phœnicians and Assyrians, the fact is made abundantly manifest that the Arabians, or at least a large portion of the inhabitants of that peninsula, belong to the Aramæan or Semitic race. The original tie or bond by which the different families composing this race were bound together, refers back to a remote and a distant antiquity.

Arabia presents itself among the earliest of those countries which were settled after the deluge. The descendants both of Ham and of Shem were the original settlers of Arabia. As the names of the patriarchal settlers were in many cases bestowed upon the different portions of country which they and their descendants inhabited; and which they long preserved, in some instances even to the present time, it is less difficult to trace out the lines of emigration and settlement here than in most other countries. It is also a favorite canon regarding the settlements in Arabia, that the seats of the patriarchal families¹ are generally to be sought and found in the order in which the patriarchs, their respective forefathers, are named in scripture. Thus to Cush, the son of Ham, and Joktan, the descendant of Shem and their children are due the settlement of many portions of Arabia. These first colonists are traced by the blended lights of classical, oriental and modern geography, over the entire face of the ancient Arabia Felix, or the whole country stretching south of Medina and parted off by a line passing from Yembo across the peninsula, and along the southern shore of the Persian gulf.² This extensive region, the Arabia Felix of Ptolemy, may be assigned as the proper country of the families of Cush and Joktan. Those of the Cushites, however, originally extended northward, to the head of the Persian gulf, and even to the vicinity of Madian or Midian, near the head of the Red sea. Thus these Cushites and Joktanites are traced in their settlements around

¹ *Foster's Geography of Arabia*, II, 54. ² *Idem*, I, lxiv.

the rim of eastern, southern, and western Arabia, while the former at very early periods crossed the straits now called Bab-el-Mandeb into Africa, and became the Ethiopians of the Upper Nile. Thus this sea-girt rim of settlements formed the connecting link between the Ethiopians of the east and the west, those of western Asia and of eastern Africa.

The sons of Cush, with the exception of Nimrod, settled originally in Arabia. The Old Testament writers call Arabia "Cushan," or "the land of Cush."

Seba, the eldest son of Cush,¹ first colonized that part of Arabia Deserta which lies adjacent to the Euphrates, hence in after times the city of Sabe, and the people of the Sabeans, on the borders of Chaldæa, as also the occurrence, in continuous series, along the shores of the Persian gulf, of the Cushite names and families of Havilah, Sabtah, Raamah, and Dedan, all which are disposed in the order of seniority, below the presumed seats of the first born Seba. In Arabia the streams of original colonization are easily followed, because the country, rarely violated, and never occupied, by a foreign conqueror, has remained peopled in all ages by the same primitive tribes. While the Hebrews, although scattered over the world, have been shut up in the same faith, the Arabians have been shut up in the same country. Thus the Arabs along the Persian gulf, the Cushites, have been distinguished as a fine race of men,² remarkable for lofty stature, and dark complexion. They were the Ethiopians of the ancient world. These Sebaim, or Arab tribe, occupying Seba on the Persian gulf, are entirely distinct from the Sabeans of Southern Arabia, and also from the Sabeans or Shebans, the descendants of Raamah on the eastern shore of the Red sea.

But while these descendants of Ham were following in their settlements the line of coast, constituting the rim of the Arabian peninsula, the descendants of Shem, embraced in the sons of Joktan, were also making their settle-

¹ *Foster's Geography of Arabia*, 1, 24. ² *Idem*, 31.

ments in the most delightful portions of Arabia Felix. Shebe, the tenth son of Joktan, succeeded in establishing a tribe or nation that acquired great power and influence in Southern Arabia. This was the Sabeans of Yemen, a tribe or nation so influential as to have conferred the generic title of Sabeans upon the kindred and dependent tribes who peopled the south of Arabia, extending, as Pliny states, from gulf to gulf, and whose capital, Mariaba, or as the Arabs called it indifferently Mareb or Saba, was seated in the centre of a circular valley at the foot of the Nikkum or Lokkum mountains. This ancient tribe or nation has been identified with the modern Katabeni, or Beni Khattan (the idiomatic anagram for Joktan) which now extends over the greater part of Central and Southern Arabia,¹ from the borders of Nedjd to the shores of the Indian ocean; and from the coast of the Arabian gulf to the mountains of Oman. It was this powerful race of Joktan which, pressing towards the southern coast, hung so heavy upon the rear of the Cushites or Ethiopians, that the gate of the Arabian gulf or the straits of Bab-el-Mandeb,² a channel of about seven leagues in breadth, interspersed with islands, proved a barrier entirely insufficient to confine them to Asia, and hence led to their crossing, and thus planting themselves in Africa.

Another source of Arabian colonization was a later descendant of Shem, in Ishmael, viz: son of Abraham. This race originally occupied the northern part of Arabia. They are described by Moses as "dwelling from Havilah unto Shur, that is, before Egypt; as thou goest toward Assyria." Under the matronymic of Hagarites or Hagarines, they are geographically traced from Agar,³ or Mount Sinai, on the confines of Egypt, to the province and city of Hagar, on the Persian gulf. What was anciently Havilah is now known as the province of Bahrein. It is situated in the eastern part of Arabia on the Persian gulf. In this province the Hagarites event-

¹ *Foster's Geography of Arabia*, 1, 87, 88. ² *Idem*, 148. ³ *Idem*, 200.

ually gained an ascendancy over its previous Cushite population.

But the wandering Arabs were not easily kept within certain prescribed limits. These intermingled with other Abrahamic tribes, to be presently mentioned, under the denomination of Hagarites or Hagarenes, in process of time, sent offshoots southward, both through the heart of the Arabian peninsula, and along its southern or western coasts, until they became blended with those of Cush and Joktan, in the neighborhood of the Arabian sea or the Indian ocean. From this and other similar cases, has been derived a law of Arabian colonization, viz: that "while the infancy of each successive race was nursed in the desert, its hardy sons, in their maturer strength, instinctively pressed toward the fertile regions of the south, where, accordingly, Arabs of all the patriarchal races may be found.

The most celebrated of all the descendants of Ishmael, and the one whose tribe became the most extensive and powerful, was Nebaioth, his first born. Hence came the Nabatene, or Nabatheans, who, in the ages of the Syrian kings, and the first Cæsars, were dominant in the peninsula from the Nile to the Euphrates, and from Mount Lybanus to Mount Zametas. It seems always to have been the custom in Arabia for the associated Bedouins to merge for the time being, their own names in that of the ascendant tribe or nation.

This tribe or nation had, for their capital, the famous city of Petra,¹ which lay nestled among the rocks, all but inaccessible, midway in the desert which divides Syria and Palestine from the Arabian gulf. For a course of ages, the commerce of the east flowed chiefly through this channel. Petra was the common market for the rich products of Yemen, and the richer imports of India. The result was that the Nabatheans were possessed of great national opulence. Every industrial pursuit received its

¹*Foster*, i, 221, 222.

appropriate stimulus. I have before alluded to the *Book of Nabathean Agriculture*, evincing the great knowledge of this ancient people in agriculture. But while some were agriculturists, a large proportion made their home in the desert, seeking there a pasture for their herds and flocks.

Another great tribe or nation of Ishmaelitish descent, is the Kedar of Scripture, the Cedrei or Kadraitæ of the classic geographers, identified as the great tribe of Carbæ, or Harb, of the present day. "The glory of Kedar," and "the tents of Kedar," are phrases found in the early scriptures. The seats of this tribe are on the south of Arabia Petræa, and towards Hedjaz. Arabian tradition derives from them the Koreish of Mekka, the tribe of Mahomet. They have ever been both a pastoral and a commercial people, hence we have "the tents," and the "glory" of Kedar.

Another source from which the population of Arabia were derived, were from Esau, the brother of Jacob. He, with his wives, and sons, and daughters, and household, went into the country from the face of Jacob, and dwelt in Mount Seir. His more special seat was Edom or Idumæa. The generic appellative of the race of Esau, finally came to be the Amalekites, who were ultimately the representatives of all the Edomite tribes throughout Northern Arabia. The same region of country thus occupied by the descendants of Esau, under the name of Amalekites, have, at more recent periods, been peopled by Arabs under the general name of Saracens. This term has been supposed by some to be a derivative from Sarah, the wife of Abraham.

In the fact, before referred to, that the Arabian peninsula embraces two races, or orders of men, the nomadic and the settled, we perceive exhibited on a smaller scale what the Asiatic continent has on a much larger. The rocky and the desert Arabia have brought forth and nourished the same hardy races of men as the great plateau of Central Asia, and from each have emerged at various times those hardy sons of hardship and of toil who have imparted

energy and power to the permanent settlers in more genial climates. Thus by successive renewals has the vigor of races been preserved, and the human race, in all its varieties, been enabled to accomplish more and higher advancements.

The Bedouin portion of Arabia has been more directly derived from Ishmael, of whom it was said in the spirit of prophecy, Genesis, xvi, 12, "And he will be a wild man, his hand will be against every man, and every man's hand against him; and he shall dwell in the presence of all his brethren." This prophecy sums up in terms, clear and explicit, the general character of his race. They have been emphatically wild men, their hand against every man and every man's hand against them. A wandering, trafficking, predatory kind of life has always been led by the Bedouin. They have ever dwelt in the presence of their brethren; and are, perhaps, the only people who have preserved, on their own soil, their independence and complete nationality from the earliest period to the present time, amid the commotions of states and the revolutions of empires. The Egyptian, Assyrian, Babylonian, Medo-Persian, Grecian, and Roman empires have successively risen, flourished and fallen around them, but they have remained unsubdued and unchanged. Even the nomadic hordes that have at different times descended from the high table land of Central Asia and rolled around them an awful and terrific desolation, have stopped at that rocky and sandy barrier, and left free those who were wanderers like themselves.

The Arabs, although situated in the centre of the ancient world, and in a position easily to be brought into relations with the east and the west, appear never to have figured much in general history until the era of Mahomet. This extraordinary man, who was destined to originate a system of faith, to unloose passions and propensities, and to set in motion impulses and physical forces that have revolutionized one-half the world, and exercised a prodigious influence upon the other, was born at Mecca, A. D. 569. His ancestry were of the tribe of Koreish, and he

was a lineal descendant of Haskem, whose memory was much revered by the Arabs, and in whose family was the guardianship of the Kaaba, the great heathen temple at Mecca. Although of illustrious descent, he was born poor, and, at a tender age, left an orphan.¹ He was early consigned to the guardianship of his uncle, Abu Taleb, by whom he was instructed in the arts of war and merchandise, particularly the latter. He accompanied him to the fairs of Syria, and there became acquainted with a monk in a Nestorian monastery,² from whom he is supposed to have derived his principal knowledge of the Christian religion. When in his twenty-fifth year, he was recommended to Kadajah, a rich widow of Mecca, and becoming her agent or factor, he conducted business so much to her satisfaction, that she made him her husband, and gave him the command of her wealth. It was not until he attained the age of forty that he began to proclaim the singular mission which he claimed had been confided to him.

Mahomet is represented as possessing great beauty of person, animation of countenance, courage, an easy and natural elocution,³ with qualities of mind fitted for the reflection of solitude, or the diversified scenes of social life. Although educated in the midst of a noble race, and in the use of a pure dialect of Arabia, he was, in respect to mental attainments, but little better than an illiterate barbarian, having never been instructed in the arts of reading and writing, and having, therefore, few sources of information beyond what his own experience could furnish. Fortunately for him Mecca was not only a commercial city, but it was also the seat of the Kaaba, which rendered it holy, and attracted to it annually pilgrims from every part of the Arabian world. As those who have nothing to lean upon but experience generally make the most out of it, so Mahomet by mingling much with merchants and pilgrims was enabled to acquaint himself tolerably

¹ *Bell*, iv, 219. ² *Encyclopedia Americana*, viii, 554. ³ *Gibbon*, 910.

minutely with the political state and character of the different Arabian tribes, and also with general notions of the Jewish and Christian forms of faith. He early gave a portion of his time to solitude, that school of genius; and was accustomed, during the month Ramadan, to retire from the world, and in the cave of Hera, about three miles from Mecca, to devote himself to religious contemplation. There, undisturbed by the business or occupations of the world, he could nourish the spirit of enthusiasm and temper it with the coolness of reflection, and mature that system of doctrine, and those schemes of ambition, which were soon to disturb the repose of empires, proclaim the downfall of many a pagan system, and usher into the world a new faith.

In the year A. D. 609, the fortieth year of his age, he began the promulgation of his pretended mission. His first convert was his wife Kadijah, his second her cousin Waraka, his third his own servant Zeid, whose conversion procured him his freedom, a rule which has ever since been observed by Mahometans. Next the youthful Ali his cousin, then Abubeker, a man held in high estimation in Mecca, and through whose influence ten other respectable citizens declared themselves converts to Islamism. To convert and ground these fourteen thoroughly in the faith, required three years of laborious effort. Thus slow was the early progress of Islamism. Even for the first ten years, during which he persevered in the exercise of his mission, that strange system of faith which was to overspread the east and west,¹ made but a slow and painful progress within the walls of Mecca.

By publicly preaching his doctrine among the pilgrims who annually paid their adorations at the Kaaba he had secured some proselytes in other parts of Arabia. In the tenth year of his mission he had the misfortune to lose his wife Kadijah and his uncle Abu Taleb the father of Ali. His enemies, the Koreishites, becoming more and

¹ *Gibbon*, 917.

more inveterate against him and the house of Hashem, finally resolved on his death. Mahomet fled; and with Abubeker alone having eluded their pursuit by remaining three days concealed in a cave in the neighborhood of Mecca,¹ where it is said the providential deceit of a spider's web and a pigeon's nest at its entrance protected the cavern from being examined, he made good his flight to Medina. This is termed the Hegira, signifying flight, and furnishes all of the Mahometan faith an era for the computation of time.² It corresponds with the 16 July, A.D. 622.

At Medina, which was peopled pretty much by Jews and Christians, Mahomet found less opposition than from the adherents to the old Arabian superstitions at Mecca. Here he assumed the exercise of the regal and sacerdotal office, erected a house and mosque, espoused Ayesha, the daughter of Abubeker, gave his daughter Fatima to Ali, and resolved to propagate his doctrines with the sword. He displayed his white banner before the gates of Medina, and wedded forever the sword of the spirit with the sword of war. The adoption of the creed of Islamism, the payment of tribute, or the terrors of battle were the alternatives presented.³ Mahomet himself fought in person at nine battles or sieges, and fifty enterprises of war were achieved in ten years by himself or his lieutenants. The different professions of merchant and robber, which had ever been united in the Arab, were still continued in union; and the petty excursions at first undertaken for the attack of caravans, and which were very uniformly successful, prepared the followers of Mahomet for the conquest of Arabia.

The first regular battle was fought with the Koreishites in the vale of Beder.⁴ Three hundred and thirteen Moslems, followers of Mahomet, here met one thousand warriors of the tribe of Koreish. The prophet having from his throne or pulpit demanded the succor of Gabriel

¹ Gibbon, 918. ² Bell, IV, 221. ³ Gibbon, 920. ⁴ *Idem*, 920, 921.

and three thousand angels, and seeing the Moslems pressed and fainting on all sides, he mounted his horse, cast a handful of sand into the air, and exclaimed in a voice of thunder, heard by both armies, "Let their faces be covered with confusion." The Koreish trembled and fled, leaving seventy of their bravest men slain on the field of battle. He and his followers next encountered a severe defeat on Mount Ohud not far from Medina. This seemed to throw a doubt upon the infallibility of the prophet and the divinity of his mission; but Mahomet, never at a loss for expedients, attributed the defeat to the sins of the Moslems, and inculcated the most rigid doctrine of predestination. One of the sins laid to the charge of the Moslems was their granting quarter to their enemies on a former occasion.¹ From that time his contests were more murderous and sanguinary. "In the shade of the crossing cimitars," declared the prophet, "paradise is prefigured," and this was long the favorite war cry of his followers.²

The Koreishites next raised an army of ten thousand men, and laid siege to Medina. They retired with considerable loss after a siege of twenty days. Mahomet now became the most powerful prince of Arabia, marched against Mecca, but found the city too strongly fortified to be easily taken. He concluded with the Meccans a truce for ten years, stipulating that he might perform a pilgrimage to the Kaaba, and worship there for the space of three days. This was performed, and several conversions made, and among others, those of Kaled and Amrou, the future conquerors of Syria and Egypt.

The triumph of Islamism could by no means be complete in Arabia until Mecca, the holy city, could be made to bow to the dominion of the prophet. In the year following its conclusion, a pretense for breaking the truce was easily found, and Mahomet surprised the astonished Koreish with a besieging army of ten thousand men.

¹ *Taylor*, 359. ² *Idem*, 359.

The city capitulated, its keys were surrendered up to Mahomet; the Kaaba, that ancient temple, which, for so many centuries, had been the object of worship of the idolatrous Arabs, now came into his possession. All traces of idolatry were removed from this national sanctuary; its three hundred and sixty idols were all broken, but the celebrated black stone,¹ an aerolite, which the Arabs had venerated from an unknown age,² was still suffered to remain, and was sanctified by the touch of the prophet.

This led to the firm establishment of the Mahometan power in Arabia. The Koreish, hitherto the inveterate enemies of that power, were now subdued, and the most of them even converted. The pagans, however, made one more rally in defense of their ancient faith and idol gods. A fierce battle was fought in the valley of Honain,³ in which Mahomet was in great personal danger, and the Moslems, although at first thrown into disorder and partially defeated, finally succeeded in obtaining a decisive victory. This secured to Mahomet his final and complete triumph in Arabia. The year following is styled the "year of embassies," from the number of Arabian tribes who announced their submission and conversion.

Three great objects had now been accomplished. The southern parts of Arabia were freed from a foreign yoke; the Arabians were all reduced under one dominion, and could now regard themselves as one nation, and not as a mere aggregation of independent tribes; and the faith of Islam, was, with slight exception, professed throughout Arabia. The prophet had now touched the highest summit of his greatness. He performed his last pilgrimage to Mecca, in which he was accompanied by nearly one hundred thousand warriors.⁴ On his return to Medina, he was seized with a mortal disease, a consequence, it is said, of a poisonous potion administered to him some four years previously, by a Jewish female. On the 8th of June,

¹ *Taylor*, 360. ² *Gibbon*, 922, 923. ³ *Idem*, 923. ⁴ *Taylor*, 360, 361.

A. D. 632, in the sixty-third year of his age, this extraordinary man breathed his last, his head reclining on the lap of Ayesha, the youngest and best beloved of his wives,¹ uttering the last broken, though articulate words: "O God! pardon my sins. Yes — I come — among my fellow citizens on high."

Thus expired one of the most extraordinary of men. In the face of a people wedded to heathenish superstition, pagan idolatry, and one of the most debasing forms of polytheism; he announced the simple faith of the one God, and his prophet, and triumphantly established it. This heathenish superstition, however, although so apparently in full force at the Kaaba, failed, nevertheless, to have really such full possession of the Arabian spirit. Mahomet is charged, rather with having followed, than led, the religious movement of his time. The government of *the one God* was an idea which never was or could be banished wholly from the Semitic race. As the patriarchal form was still the social institution of Arabia, so the patriarchal religion was still prevalent among the Arabs. Superstitions, stained with idolatry, had crept in, and in some tribes had spoiled the purity of the patriarchal religion, but all the enlightened minds of Arabia were aspiring after a better worship. So also in the sixth century, Arabia experienced an influx of new ideas, in consequence of its being opened to the Greeks, Syrians, Persians, and Abyssinians. Along with all these, there was a presentiment of a great religious renovation, and the expectation that Arabia's time had come.² In the midst of all this, Mahomet appeared. He made no pretense to the power of working miracles, as that would diminish the merit of faith. In marrying Zeinab, the wife of his emancipated slave and adopted son, Zeid, he not only offended against right and decency,³ but violated a relationship which had ever been held inviolable amongst the Arabs. As a legis-

¹Gibbon, I, 925. ²Renan's *Religious History and Criticism*, 265-8. ³*Encyclopedia Americana*, VIII, 556.

lator, he allowed polygamy,¹ but limited the number of wives which any man could be entitled to at one time to four;² and in direct violation of his own law, married eleven, ten of whom were widows. Every violation of right or law could be justified by a new chapter in the Koran, and the angel Gabriel was always ready at his summons, to approve or absolve, according to the wishes of the prophet. His epileptic fits he converted into trances.³ On his beast, Borac, and a ladder of light, he made in one night, the tour of the seven heavens, and describes with great particularity, the surprising sights and scenes he there beheld. This was, at first, too strong for human credulity to swallow; but on being insisted on by the prophet, and vouched by Abubeker, his followers received *that* in the *triumph*, which had been the *trial* of their faith.

It would seem as if the further anything exceeded all human belief, according to the ordinary laws of mental action the more firmly it may sometimes be grasped, and maintained as an article of faith.

In the face of all these obstacles, and in the light which the experience even of the Arabian world could elicit, in the seventh century of the Christian era, it is certainly a curious inquiry, in what lay the secret of his great success? The complete answer to this question would require to be taken into consideration, the manners, customs, habits, forms of life, and civilization of the Arabians; the peculiarities of the faith of Islamism, as well as the character and capacity of the prophet. One great source of his power lay in his mastery over the Arabian language. The Koran was the sign of a literary revolution, as well as of a revolution in religion. It signalizes among the Arabs the transition from the versified style to prose, from poetry to eloquence. The age of Arabic poetry was passing away, and Mahomet appeared in the midst of an exhausted literature, with his vivid and earnest recitations. His language was energetic, sonorous, full of rhythm, so that

¹ *Anquetil*, v, 4. ² *Gibbon*, 927. ³ *Anquetil*, v, 7-9.

when Otba, son of Rebia, first heard him speak, he went back to his friends, and said: "By my faith, Mahomet has used towards me speech such as I never heard. It is neither poetry nor prose, nor the language of the magician, but it is penetrating."¹ This success has been largely ascribed to the originality of his language, and to the novel turn he gave to Arab eloquence.

In addition to all this, Mahomet was undoubtedly a great man; great not only in a point of view purely intellectual, but also in the strength of the feeling that he had a destiny to fulfill, and that he must and should fulfill it. It is the power of this feeling, and the fixed assurance of success, that possess a mighty agency in moulding and shaping the destiny of the great.

How far Mahomet was self-deceived in regard to the divinity of his mission, it is doubtless now impossible to tell. The supposition is by no means improbable, that he may have wrought himself up into the belief in its truth and importance. One thing is clear, and that is, that his language and bearing always had reference to the character he had assumed. He never seemed for a single moment to forget that he was the prophet of God. Whatever his situation and circumstances, whether preaching from the pulpit or promulgating his doctrines in the Koran;² whether in the intricacies of business, or amid the stirring activities of the battle-field; whether engaged in dissipation, in the company of his wives, at table, during the day or in the night, he was ever the same, uncompromising, and apparently full of the conviction that "There was one God, and Mahomet was his prophet." Thus steadily keeping in view one object, and allowing nothing, even in his most unguarded moments to escape him unless it was in itself calculated to effect that object, had an incalculable amount of influence upon his followers. Appearing to be himself convinced, he convinced others. Always acting in the character he had assumed, he left them no means of escape from his

¹ *Renan's Religious History and Criticism*, 279, 280. ² *Anquetil*, v, 18.

specious seductions. When everything comes to be fully considered, his success will less excite our surprise, and will become more explainable upon the ordinary principles of human action.

Mahomet had united in his own person the regal and sacerdotal power.¹ At his death he made no will, appointed no successor, and left no children but Fatima who was the wife of Ali. No principle of succession had been established, and the altar and throne were both vacated by the death of the prophet. The selection of a successor from among so many competitors, and amid such clashing interests, shook the fabric of Islamism to its foundation. After some days of fierce dispute the choice fell upon the Abu Bekr, the father of Ayesha and one of the earliest disciples of the prophet. He assumed the title of khaliph or vicar, a term by which the Saracenic emperors were afterwards designated. All finally acquiesced in his selection.

After superintending the funeral obsequies of the prophet, his attention was first directed to Moscilama, an impostor, who, during the life of Mahomet, had proposed to divide with him the earth equally. The force sent by Abu Bekr overcame him, so that a much smaller part fell to his share.

There were also other pretenders, prophetesses, whose seductive arts might have proved fatal to Islamism,² had they not been immediately suppressed. All these revolts being promptly quelled, the khaliph was left sole ruler in Arabia.

The prophet had infused into the very soul of his faith the element of self-preservation and extension, and that too by an appeal to physical force. The Saracenic empire was but the development of this element. We are now to see the physical forces of Arabia. Under the denomination of "Saracen," a term of doubtful derivation, commence acting their part upon the theatre of the world, and

¹ *Taylor*, 361. ² *Anquetil*, v, 23.

achieve, with startling rapidity, an extent of dominion, equaling, if not surpassing, all that then remained to Rome. This may be styled the sixth great empire that has arisen among men. It was preceded by the Assyrian, Babylonian, Persian, Grecian and Roman, and perhaps the Egyptian under Sesostris should be included, which would make it the seventh. Of these, however, the three first may be well considered as one dominion, which was exercised under different names according as the different provinces of the empire became its seat. The Egyptian was of so uncertain a character, and at best so temporary and evanescent, as hardly to merit the denomination of *empire*. In this point of view the Saracenic was the fourth great empire that rose and flourished.

The course of empire had hitherto been from east to west, the Assyrian, Babylonian and Persian being the most eastern, the Grecian or Macedonian lying to the west of that, and the Roman still further west. Here this law is reversed, and empire travels from the west, from Rome, to visit again the climes of the east.

Mahomet, during his life, and after feeling that his power was established in Arabia, gave sufficient indications that his ambition was not limited to the peninsula. With a mixture of strange presumption and enthusiasm he sent a summons to the Persian king, to Heraclius,¹ then the Greek emperor at Constantinople, Mokawkas, the ruler of Egypt, the king of Ethiopia and some others, requiring them to embrace the new revelation of the divine law made through him. These summonses were not altogether successful. A war had broken out between him and Heraclius previous to his death, and his army had marched into Syria and taken some towns from the Greek emperor.

The new khaliph was venerable for his age and wisdom, but seems not himself to have been a warrior.² He had however, great generals, under whom the Saracenic

¹ *Encyclopedia Americana*, VIII, 556. ² *Anquetil*, v, 23.

empire rapidly developed itself. Among these, the most distinguished was Kaled, the son of Walid, surnamed the "sword of God," who to great valor joined a consummate military skill. There was also Yezid, Obeidah, Derar, Rasii, and Said the son of Kaled, all intrepid soldiers, and ready to obey a command, to act the subaltern or commander as the occasion required.

The khaliph inspired his army with great enthusiasm. They went forth as so many missionaries, to plant the faith under the upreared crescent, and, according as fate should ordain,¹ to achieve glorious victories, or to earn paradise by a crown of martyrdom. In their camps was exhibited the fervor of devotion amid all the mighty bustle of warlike preparation. As has generally been witnessed among nomadic nations, women were found marching in their armies, and fighting by the side of their fathers, brothers and husbands.

With armies thus enthusiastic, resolute and determined, it is not surprising that events, great and extraordinary, should take place. Nor were the nations by whom they were surrounded in a very fit condition to resist successfully such a tremendous outbreak. The kings of Persia and the emperors who still swayed the sceptre of the eastern empire at Constantinople, had weakened themselves by a series of wars, which they had carried on with each other. Their political institutions, especially those of the eastern empire, had served the purposes they were designed to accomplish, and bore about them every mark of decay and decrepitude. They were, in their turn, destined to yield to the energies of a new race coming up with vigor and power under the impulse and enthusiasm of a new faith.

The province of Irak, the ancient Babylonia, was subdued by Khaled.² A more important enterprise was undertaken, the conquest of Syria. For this purpose a numerous army was raised. A large detachment sent by the emperor Heraclius met this army on the frontiers and

¹ *Anquetil*, v, 23. ² *Taylor*, 361.

was defeated with great slaughter. But at Gaza, the Moslems, under the command of Abu Obeidah, were defeated. The command of Obeidah's division was then given to Khaled, and Amru was invested by the khaliph with the supreme command. The city of Bosra soon fell before the vigorous attacks of the Saracens, and the Syrian capital Damascus was subjected to all the horrors of a siege. Heraclius sent an army of 100,000 men to the relief of the city.¹ This army was thrice routed, and in the last battle more than half their number were left upon the field. Damascus fell A.D. 634, and on the same day expired the khaliph.

The second khaliph was Omar, who was elevated to the khaliphate by the army. Close upon the conquest of Syria followed the subjugation of Persia. The dynasty of the Sassanides was soon to meet a final overthrow. Yezdijird, the last of that race, sent an army under the command of Terokshad, to recover Irak. The Saracens and Persians met on the plains of Kadesia. The battle lasted several days, and finally resulted in the total defeat of the Persians.² The Persians again rallied their forces, and a new army was assembled in the northern and eastern provinces. Another battle was fought at Nahavund, A. D. 641, which decided the fate of Persia. Nothing could resist the fierce and furious attack of the Saracens. The Persian lines were completely broken by it, and it was, in fact, a carnage rather than a battle.

The death of Yezdijird, A. D. 651, terminated the dynasty of Sassan, which had ruled Persia for four hundred and fifty years. Persia and its religion, the fire worship of Zoroaster, both fell under the Mahometan sway.

In Syria, the war was prosecuted with much success. One city after another fell before the Moslems,³ and an army sent by Heraclius was defeated in the battle of Yermuk. Jerusalem, a city that united the sympathies of the Jews, Christians and Mahometans, at length saw,

¹ *Taylor*, 362. ² *Idem*, 633. ³ *Idem*, 363.

surrounding its sacred walls, the victorious Saracens, under the command of Abu Obeidah. After a siege of four months, the most favorable terms it could obtain, were those of surrendering to the khaliph in person. To receive this surrender, Omar appeared, riding upon a red camel, with a sack of corn and water-bag slung from the saddle, a wooden platter his only utensil,¹ his dress of camel's hair coarse and torn, a single slave his attendant and escort. Thus appeared the commander of the faithful, whose first act upon his arrival was to recite the public prayers, and preach a sermon to the army. This done he signed the capitulation, entered the city at the head of his troops, familiarly conversing with Sophronius, the Christian patriarch, and selected the site of the temple of Solomon for a Moslem mosque, on which was reared, and still stands, bearing his name, the Mosque of Omar. The capture of Aleppo, after a four months' siege, and of Antioch, which followed, completed the subjugation of Syria. In six years from their first appearance in Syria, the whole of that province and Palestine bowed beneath the sway of the Saracens.

The next point attacked was Egypt, which was subdued by Amur, the Saracen general, without much difficulty. The city of Alexandria alone interposed a vigorous defense. It was taken by storm, and its valuable library of 700,000 volumes consigned to the flames, on the ground that if the books contained anything in them that was not in the Koran they should be destroyed, and if they contained nothing but was in it, they were unnecessary, and, therefore, should be burnt. In the very midst of these triumphs Omar was assassinated by a slave A.D. 643.² During his reign of ten and a half years, the Saracens had subdued Syria, Chaldæa, Persia and Egypt, taken thirty-six thousand cities, towns and castles; destroyed four thousand Christian churches, fire and idol temples, and built fourteen hundred mosques.

¹ *Taylor*, 634. ² *Idem*, 364.

Omar was a khaliph of severe simplicity. He spent his time in praying and preaching, in dispensing justice and administering the affairs of his empire. He instituted the era of the Hegira; established a police in Medina and other great cities of the empire; organized a regular system of pay for soldiers in the field, and gave pensions to those who had been wounded and disabled.

The six commissioners to whom the will of Omar assigned the election of a new khaliph, selected Othman, the secretary of Mahomet. During his reign the Syrian and Egyptian armies penetrated into Armenia and Nubia. Moawiyàh, governor of Syria, fitted out a fleet, by which Rhodes was subdued, and its celebrated colossus destroyed. Othman was besieged and slain in his palace in the thirty-fifth year of the Hegira.

Ali, the cousin and son-in-law of the prophet, was next proclaimed khaliph. The Saracenic empire now became rent with internal dissensions. The standard of revolt was raised in Arabia by Ayesha the widow of the prophet, in Syria by Moawiyàh, while the army of Egypt set at defiance the authority of their sovereign. Ali encountered and defeated the partisans of Ayesha at Bassora, took her prisoner, and dismissed her to her station at the tomb of her husband.¹ He next marched against Moawiyàh whom he met on the plains of Seffèin, and during several months various battles took place between them with various success.

At length Moawiyàh finding his forces diminishing fixed a copy of the Koran to the top of a pike, and caused proclamation to be made that the sacred book should decide all differences.² Two commissioners were appointed, and through the treacherous management of Amur,³ one of them, Moawiyàh was proclaimed khaliph. The war was again renewed. In this state of things three enthusiasts came together at Mecca, and agreed to devote themselves for the public good, and on the same day to assassinate

¹ *Bell*, iv, 226. ² *Taylor*, 365, 366. ³ *Anquetil*, v, 41, 42.

Amur, Moawiyàh, and Ali. They poisoned their swords and each chose his victim.¹ Moawiyàh was wounded but recovered. Amur's secretary received the blow intended for his master, and Ali was mortally wounded in the mosque at Kufah.

Although on the death of Ali, Moawiyàh soon became chief of the Saracenic empire and founded the Ommiade dynasty of khaliphs, yet the intestine troubles of the Saracens were not ended.² Moawiyàh was the son of Abu Sofian the chief of the Koreish tribe, who was the early and greatest enemy of Mahomet. This may, perhaps, to some extent, explain the rancour, animosity and deadly hostility, which seems to have prevailed between the founder of the Ommiade dynasty and the descendants of the prophet.

Hassan succeeded his father Ali as khaliph, but he soon abdicated in favor of Moawiyàh, and retired to a humble cell near the tomb of his grandfather.³ There he was soon removed by poison at the instigation of the khaliph. Moawiyàh, now sole lord of the Moslem world, transferred the seat of empire to Damascus. He made a still more important change. The khaliphate had hitherto been elective, and bestowed as the highest reward of intelligence, valor, and devotion to the propagation of the faith. He succeeded by a series of well directed efforts in rendering it hereditary, instead of elective.⁴ His son Yezid, a feeble and dissolute youth, on the death of his father, was proclaimed as commander of the faithful, and the successor of the apostle of God.

Upon the accession of Yezid another effort was made by the descendants of Mahomet to wrest the sceptre from the Ommiade dynasty, and restore it again to the descendants of the prophet. His grandson Hosein, the son of Ali, escaped from Medina and claimed the khaliphate. Himself, his son, nephew, and many of his relatives and followers were all slain together, and the hopes of his house, for the present entirely extinguished.

¹ *Bell*, iv, 226, 227. ² *Gibbon*, 931. ³ *Bell*, iv, 227. ⁴ *Gibbon*, 931.

These fatal dissensions engendered a religious hatred between the friends and enemies of Ali, which has outlived the occasion that produced it,¹ has been renewed in every age of the Hegira, and is still maintained in the hatred existing between the Persians and Turks. The Persians are called *Shiites* or sectaries, being of the sect of Ali, and insist as an article of faith that if Mahomet be the apostle, his companion Ali is no less the vicar of God. They execrate the khaliphs who supplanted him, and more especially the name of Omar. Their faith is more confined to the Koran, excluding all tradition.

The Turks are called *Sonnites*, who believe in tradition as well as the contents of the Koran. They respect the memory of all the successors of the prophet, assigning, however, the last and humblest place to Ali.

The Shiites revere the descendants of Ali, the twelve imaum or pontiffs of the Persian creed being Ali, Hassan, Hosein, and the lineal descendants of Hosien to the ninth generation. Their descendants, or those claiming to be such, became very numerous and extensively diffused. The sceptre of the Almohades in Spain and Africa,² of the Fatimites in Egypt and Syria, of the sultans of Yemen, and of the sophis of Persia, has been consecrated by the title of imaum. At the present day a swarm of the real or pretended descendants of Mahomet and Ali, is honored with the appellation of sheik, or sherif, or emir, and in the Ottoman empire they are distinguished from others by a green turban, and by having certain privileges. The descendants of Hassan, the son of Ali, and grandson of the prophet, after the revolutions of twelve centuries had still the custody of the temple, and the sovereignty of their native land.

These domestic dissensions suspended for a short time the career of Saracenic conquest,³ but their military spirit was soon restored to its former strength. The possession of Egypt was extremely desirable as the key to southern

¹ Gibbon, 929. ² *Idem*, 933. ³ Taylor, 366.

Europe and western Africa. The first attempts of the Saracens to extend their creed west of Egypt were entirely unsuccessful. Three times they were compelled to abandon the enterprise, but their continued perseverance was at last crowned with success, and the creed of the Koran was extended through northern Africa to the shores of the Atlantic. Those shores, limiting their progress in one direction, only turned their attention to another. In the north-western extremity of Africa they came into proximity with the south-western of Europe. The Goths, the savage conquerors of Europe, and the Arabs who had overran and subdued a great portion of Asia and Africa, here met face to face. Spain was then under Gothic sway, but the valor, power, force, and energy of Alaric had not descended to Roderic.

Count Julian, a Gothic noble, being irritated by the treatment he had received from his sovereign, Roderick, invited the Saracens into Spain, A. D. 710. A second descent was made by Taric, the general of Musa, with about 12,000 Saracens, in A. D. 711. These were joined by Julian, with all the disaffected Goths. The Gothic army under Roderick, numbered 90 or 100,000 men. The forces of the east and west met in the town of Xeres, near the ancient city of Cadiz, where for four days a deadly strife was kept up. On the fourth, the forces of the Goths were defeated, and the Gothic power in Spain broken. The subjugation of Spain, under the dominion of the Arabs, or the Moors as they were termed, was completed by Musa in person, during the years A. D. 712 and 713.

It could hardly be expected that a power sufficiently vigorous to extend itself from Arabia through Egypt, all along the northern coast of Africa, to the Atlantic, and, in addition, had rolled its conquering wave over the Spanish peninsula, should meet with a final barrier in the Pyrenees. After the Moors or Arabs had got sufficiently established in their new dominion, and in the year A. D. 731 they poured their forces over the Pyrenees into France, having in view the subjection of that monarchy, the conquest of Italy and

Germany, the entire subjugation of Christendom, and then descending the Danube, the overthrow of the Greek empire, the capital city of which had hitherto withstood their assaults. This invasion and attempted subjugation of Europe by the Saracens, presents a feature of great interest in general history. Although they had met with some defeats, yet it could hardly be said that they had yet failed in any enterprise which they had undertaken in earnest to accomplish. It remained, therefore, to be tested, whether Europe should bow in subjection to Asia, mount the crescent above the cross, and be compelled to receive the Koran at the point of the spear and the sabre.

With an immense Saracenic host, said to have numbered, including women and slaves,¹ 400,000; Abdalrahman passed the Rhone, besieged and took Arles, defeated an army of Christians sent to its relief, passed the Garonne and Dordogne, defeated a second army under Count Eudes, overran the provinces of Aquitaine, planted his standard on the walls of Tours and Sens,² and advanced to the banks of the Loire; having achieved a victorious march of over 1000 miles from the rock of Gibraltar into the very heart of France, having defeated and dispersed two Christian armies, and taken and pillaged every city that lay in his course. The defense of Christendom seemed to depend upon the genius of one man; Charles, surnamed Martel, or the hammer, the founder of the Carolingian race of kings of France. The two armies met in the centre of France, between Tours and Poitiers. Never since the great battle of Chalons between Attila the Hun and Alcius, the Roman general, had the forces of the east and west stood so directly face to face as at this time. It was the second time France had been the battle-field where Europe stood up in all its strength against Asia.

The battle lasted seven successive days. During the first six the combats were desultory, but on the seventh, in a closer onset, the power of the Frank prevailed, and during

¹ *Encyclopedia Perthensis*, xix, 667. ² *Gibbon*, 976, 977.

the night that succeeded that bloody day, the Arabs, their leader being slain, provided for their safety by a hasty flight. Thus was Europe rescued from the yoke of the Saracen, and Charlemagne, the grandson of Charles Martel, afterwards drove his forces back to the Ebro, and although they subsequently recovered the Spanish provinces yet they never again dared cross the Pyrenees.

While these events were transpiring in the west, the east continued to be the scene of Saracenic warfare, and generally of triumph. The particular detail of these triumphs is possessed of but little interest. In the palmy days of the Arabian empire it extended two hundred days journey from east to west,¹ stretching from the confines of Tartary and India to the shores of the Atlantic ocean. Retrenching the sleeve of the robe, as their writers styled the long and narrow province lying along the north of the African continent, the solid and compact dominion from Faugana to Aden, from Tarsus to Surat, will spread on every side to the measure of four to five months of the march of a caravan.

The Koran was studied at Samarcand and Seville; the Moor, Indian and Persian embraced as countrymen and brothers in the pilgrimage of Mecca, and the Arabian language was adopted as the popular idiom in all the provinces to the westward of the Tigris.

The Saracenic empire seems ever to have contained within itself the elements of intense activity. While their arms were actively employed against the enemies of the Koran, the empire was frequently rent by domestic dissensions, and torn asunder by hostile claimants to the khaliphate.

From about the year 661 to 750, the house of Moawiyàh, known as the dynasty of the Ommiades, continued to enjoy the khaliphate, and generally in accordance with the change effected by that khaliph from an elective to an hereditary sovereignty.² In the reign of Muwaun

¹ *Gibbon*, 971. ² *Bell*, iv, 227.

an insurrection was made in favor of the great grandson of Abbas, the uncle of the prophet, which terminated in a general massacre of the descendants of Moawiyah. Thus by a retributive justice, which, although it may be long delayed, rarely fails ultimately to prove that there is a just dispenser of all events, the descendants of Moawiyah and Yesid met with the same fate which they had visited upon the descendants of Ali nearly a century previous.

The dynasty of the Ommiades was not easy to be overthrown. The revolution, which finally accomplished it, led to the dismemberment of the empire.¹ It commenced with Mohammed the grandson of Abbas, who resided in Syria, and was long engaged in forming a party, and securing partisans for an approaching struggle. His son Ibrahim succeeded to his claims, and sent Abu Moslem into Khorassan, who there first raised the black standard of the house of Abbas. From this time three great parties rent, by their dissensions, the Saracenic empire, and each party was distinguished by a particular color which it assumed as its distinctive badge. Black was the color selected by the Abassides, white by the Ommiades, and green by the Fatimites, who claimed a descent from the prophet, through Fatima his daughter, and the wife of Ali.

The last of the Ommiade line was overthrown and slain, near the river Jab, by Abul Abbas, surnamed Al Saffah, or the sanguinary, who massacred all the princes of that family he could seize,² and even carried his cruelty and resentment so far as to break open the sepulchres of the khaliphs from Moawiyah downward, and to burn their mouldering contents, and scatter their ashes to the winds. Ninety members of the Ommiade family, living at Damascus, were all in one day invited to a feast, and there beaten to death with clubs in a most barbarous and savage manner. Abd-er-rahman, the youngest of the race, alone escaped from this indiscriminate massacre. He succeeded, after a series of almost incredible adven-

¹ *Taylor*, 367. ² *Idem*, 367.

tures, in reaching Spain, the western limit of the empire of the Saracens, where the name and memory of Moawiyâh were still cherished, and where he was chosen their sovereign, thus becoming the founder of the second dynasty of the Ommiade khaliphs.

The example thus set in Spain was not long without imitation. The real or pretended descendants of Ali and Fatima possessed themselves of the thrones of Egypt and western Africa,¹ where they established the dynasty of the Fatimite khaliphs. Thus in the tenth century, the chair of the prophet was disputed by three khaliphs,² one reigning in Cordova, another in Caricoan, and a third at Bagdad.

Arabia had long ceased to be the seat of the khaliphate and its holy city, the residence of the khaliphs. The Ommiades made Damascus the capital of their empire. The first of the Abassides fixed his court at Kufah, whence it was transferred to Haschemiah on the Euphrates; and Almansor, the second of the Abassides, erected, on the Tigris, the magnificent city of Bagdad. The foundations were laid in the 145th year of the Hegira, and it was so far completed in four years as to be made the capital of the Saracen empire. Bagdad continued to be the residence of the Mahometan khaliphs until its destruction by the Tartar about the middle of the thirteenth century.

In the reign of the Abassides in Bagdad was exhibited the same general outline of historic events that signalize the rise, progress, triumph, decay, and downfall of despotic dynasties. The energies that are requisite to found a new house are generally sufficient to infuse into it the elements of success, and to carry it forward for some time in triumph. Some of the first khaliphs among the Abassides were princes of power and their reigns, reigns of glory. Among these, and perhaps the most distinguished, was Harun al Rashid, the son of Mohadi, and the fourth of his dynasty. To a great literary celebrity, he superadded the fame of the warrior. The wars he waged with the Greek empire

¹*Bell*, iv, 227. ²*Gibbon*, 978-80.

were generally successful. Twice he invested the city of Constantinople, and compelled the emperor of the east to pay him tribute.

The Saracenic empire gradually passed from splendor into weakness. It had sprang into a full maturity of being with too great a rapidity to allow its institutions time to become adapted to each other, or in any way cemented together. It lacked solidity. It wanted every element of durability. It extended over various varieties of the human family, differing essentially from each other in language, manners, religious convictions, modes of thinking and feeling, and habits and forms of action, the same regal and sacerdotal dominion. A despotism, which is at all widely extended, requires a delegation of power from the despot to the rulers he appoints in the different provinces. This power, it is true, is subject to be revoked, but, until its revocation, clothes the ruler with the power of the monarch. Hence the revolts of provinces are of such frequent recurrence in the history of despotism. This is the most likely to occur where the inhabitants of different provinces belong to different varieties or families of the human race. The social, moral and political ties that bind them together, are much stronger than those that connect them with a foreign dominion. This latter is often accomplished only by force. It is owing to this, and the many causes that conspire to incite or drive the governors of provinces into a state of revolt, that the most frequent mode in which an empire so constructed terminates, is by dismemberment. Thus it was with the empire of the Saracens. The members became too strong for the head. The provinces revolted—the empire became dismembered. Different and rival khaliphs swayed the sceptre over the east, over Egypt and northern Africa, and over Spain. The khaliph of Bagdad was, perhaps, regarded as having the best claim to be considered the representative of the prophet. Rahdi, the twentieth of the Abassides, and the thirty-ninth of the successors of Mahomet, was the last who deserved the title of com-

mander of the faithful.¹ The khaliphate continued for some time after it was limited to the walls of Bagdad.

Long, however, before the destruction of Bagdad, the Arabians had yielded hardly a nominal submission to the eastern khaliphs. The impulses under which they had achieved this widely-extended empire, were too strong to admit of their long continuance. The Arabian sovereignty was lost by the rapidity and extent of conquest. After the reign of three khaliphs,² the seat of the khaliphate was removed from Medina to Damascus, and afterwards to Bagdad. The rod of a subject, perhaps of a stranger, ruled over Arabia. The Bedouins of the desert had never learnt the lesson of submission. They resumed their old predatory habits.³ So little were they subject to the khaliphs of Bagdad, that the abolition of the khaliphate did not transfer their allegiance to the conqueror. Long, therefore, before the entire downfall of the Saracen empire, the stream that had overflowed, and deluged half the world, had returned to its original channel, and the history of Arabia exhibited, and has continued since to exhibit, much the same general features as before the birth of the prophet. There have been, however, two exceptions, one occurred during the existence of the khaliphate, the other within the last century.

It would certainly excite our surprise if a successful imposture like that of Mahomet, should not have imitators. Near the close of the ninth century arose a new preacher or prophet in Arabia, of the name of Karmath.⁴ His first appearance was in the neighborhood of Kufah.⁵ He soon gained an immense number of followers, and occasioned great disturbances throughout Arabia. The object proposed was thoroughly to reform Mahometanism. They could, at one time, muster in the field, 107,000 fanatics. The Karmathians made themselves masters of Bahrein, and took and pillaged successively, the cities of Bassorah

¹ Gibbon, 992. ² *Idem*, 934. ³ *Encyclopedia Perthensis*, XIX, 669. ⁴ *Bell*, IV, 227. ⁵ *Gibbon*, 989, 990.

and Kufah. Abu-Thaher, the successor of Karmath, led his troops across the desert to the holy city, where he put 30,000 citizens and strangers to the sword, and carried off in triumph, the black stone of the Kaaba. It was afterwards restored. Such was their enthusiasm and success, that the khaliph began to tremble, even for the safety of Bagdad. With a considerable principality under their dominion, in the very heart of Arabia, they continued for a long time, the scourge of the khaliphate, compelling it to pay an annual tribute, that the pilgrimage to Mecca might be regularly performed. It seems at last to have split into different parties and disappeared, or the fires of its enthusiasm having died out, it became at last entirely extinguished.

About the middle of the last century, a poor shepherd of Arabia, by the name of Soliman, according to the traditions of that country,¹ beheld in a dream, a flame proceeding from his body which extended to a distance all around him, destroying everything in its way. This was interpreted as prefiguring the rise of a new political power, to be established by his son.² The name of his son was Abd-el-wahab, the founder of the sect of the Wahabees, who started up in the province of Nedjed.³ He was a man of education, having pursued his studies at Bassorah, Bagdad and Damascus. His first progress was slow, and the doctrines he at first professed, seem to have extended no further than to his own peculiar interpretation of the Koran. He appears subsequently to have aspired to the establishment of a new religion.

His doctrines were simple, and might perhaps be summed up in a pure theism. He admitted the Koran, but rejected all the stories contained in it, denied the apostleship of Mahomet, and disregarded all the traditions of the Mussulmen. He prohibited all show of wealth and splendor. His religion was to be propagated by the sword, and all to be extirpated who refused to receive his instructions.

¹Malte Brun, II, 207. ²Bell, IV, 228. ³Encyclopedia Americana, XIII, 40-2.

Sheik Mohammed the son of Wahab, and Mahomet Saoud, his son-in-law, and emir of Nedjed, made a partition between them of the spiritual and temporal power, thus affording an instance of the separation of church and state.¹ The first was the priest, and regarded as the supreme head of the Wahabees. The other was the prince and general, having in charge all the temporal affairs. This partition was preserved among the descendants of the two. Their capital was Derreia situated in the desert to the south-east of Bassora.

A long train of successes now signalized the triumphs of the new faith. Mahomet Saoud formed a well disciplined army whose enthusiasm was inflamed by his harangues. Dying in the midst of his projects, his son Abd-el-Azis inherited both his courage and his zeal.² Two armies sent against him by the pacha of Bagdad were weakened and defeated. The holy shrine at Carbela, where the Shiites were accustomed annually to weep over the untimely death of the sons of Ali, was taken by them, the tombs destroyed and the town ransacked in the year 1802. The next object of ambition was the possession of Mecca and Medina. Zayif was besieged and taken, and all the holy tombs destroyed, including the celebrated monuments erected over the remains of Abdullah Ebn Abbas, the uncle of the prophet. In 1803 Saoud, the eldest son of Abd-el-Azis, took Mecca the holy city, plundered and destroyed many tombs and holy places, but left uninjured the Kaaba. In the year following Medina fell into the hands of the Wahabees, and the tomb of the prophet was destroyed. The annual pilgrimages of the faithful to Mecca were interrupted. In 1807 Saoud issued orders that every Turk should leave Arabia, including all pachas, radis and other officers by which the judicial power fell into the hands of the Wahabees. Thus the new faith spread over Arabia and embraced all that vast desert which is bounded by the Red sea,³ the Persian gulf, and

¹ *Malte Brun*, II, 208. ² *Bell*, IV, 228, ³ *Malte Brun*, II, 209.

environs of Aleppo and Damascus. The overthrow of the Wahabees was more rapid than had been their rise and prosperity. It was principally accomplished by Mohammed Ali, the pacha of Egypt. He conquered Yamb and Nahala in 1811. In 1815 he took the holy city of Mecca, and the Wahabees were compelled to evacuate the territory of Hedjas. Ibrahim, the son of the pacha, inflicted on them a total defeat in 1818, and blocked them in their camp near the capital. The camp was afterwards stormed, eighty pieces of artillery taken, 20,000 soldiers slain, and their sovereign, Abdullah Ben Sund, taken prisoner.¹ Their capital soon after fell under the dominion of the conqueror. Detached bands of Wahabees still continued to rove over the desert, and carry on their predatory warfare, sometimes with considerable success.

Thus at the close of Arabian history we are brought back to the same people, the same institutions, the same state and condition of things which we found at starting. Nothing seems to have been gained and nothing lost, but time. History produces no other instance in which a people have swelled into a great empire, which in its turn has passed away, and yet left upon that people scarce a record of its existence.

Industry.

There is little remarkable in Arabian industry, as before remarked. There are two kinds of Arabs in Arabia. The one is the ancient Sienite Arabs, Ishmaelites, or Nabathæans, the modern Bedouins, who roam over the rocky and desert Arabia. The other is a more settled race occupying Arabia Felix. The one are the Arabs dwelling in tents, the other the Arabs dwelling in cities.

The first live, as they always have lived, in encampments, pitching their tents wherever they find pasturage, and changing their abode as often as the support of their

¹ *Encyclopedia Americana*, XIII, 42.

cattle,¹ or the approximation of an enemy, renders a change of place expedient. They never occupy towns or houses, engage in no pursuits of agriculture, are strictly, so far as their industry is legitimately concerned, a shepherd race, relying for support on the produce of their flocks and herds, or the hire of their camels. They subsist principally upon the milk and flesh of their cattle, and the few vegetables which the desert produces; clothe themselves with the fleeces and skins of their sheep and camels; and supply many of their wants by plunder.

The wandering shepherd life, and the industry connected with it; the hire of themselves and their camels to merchants in the prosecution of the caravan trade; such traffic as the fleeces of their sheep, their valuable horses, and the skins of their sheep and camels, enable them to carry on; their predatory attacks upon caravans and travelers, and the plunder they are thus enabled to acquire, constitute altogether the Bedouin's means of subsistence, modes of life, and pursuits of industry. Of all animals they esteem the horse and the camel the most valuable, and expend the most care, attention and industry in rearing them up. Arabia is supposed by many to be the original country of the horse.² Probably the most splendid specimens of this animal are here exhibited. He is remarkable for swiftness and docility. He is brought up in the tents among the children of the Arabs, and ever treated with gentleness and kindness.

The camel is to the deserts of the south what the reindeer is to the snows of the north. Its hoof, the cartilaginous texture of its mouth, its fifth stomach, all fit it, in an eminent degree, to tread on burning sands, to feed upon hard and prickly plants, and to carry within itself a reservoir of fresh water, by means of all which it is enabled to traverse the Arabian deserts.

The dwellers in cities are more indolent and effeminate than those who dwell in tents,³ but their character is not

¹ *Bell*, iv, 235. ² *Gibbon*, 902. ³ *Bell*, iv, 5

materially different. These have devoted themselves, to some extent, to the labors of agriculture, and also to the mechanic arts and to commerce.¹ One of the principal cares of agriculture here, as in Egypt, consists in managing the distribution of the water for irrigation, which proceeds from rivulets, wells and pools. Wheat, Turkey corn, and doora, cover the plains of Yemen and of some other fertile parts of the country. The mountains of Yemen formerly abounded in gold mines, from which large quantities of the precious metal were obtained, but at present no part of Arabia is celebrated for its mineral wealth.

The vegetable productions of Arabia are rare and of great value. There are the coffee shrub and the balm tree. The coffee plantations are cultivated in terraces on the western side of the great mountains of Yemen.² The balm of Mekka is the most fragrant and costly of all the gum resins. Gum arabic is obtained from a species of acacia. The fruits of Arabia are figs, pears, quinces, apricots, almonds, filberts, peaches, oranges, lemons, tamarinds, dates and cocoa-nuts. Esculent vegetables such as melons, etc., also flourish in Arabia.

Little is known in regard to the manufactures or mechanic arts practiced by the Arabians. Their commerce was principally carried on by caravans. The holy city of Mecca, built on a plain about two miles long, and one broad,³ at the foot of three barren mountains, was the great commercial centre of Arabia. It was placed almost at an equal distance from Yemen on the south, and Syria on the north, being about one month's journey from either. While Syria was the winter, Yemen was the summer station of her caravans. The Koreish tribe were the most enterprising of the merchants of Mecca. In the southern markets of Saana and Merab, and in the harbors of Oman and Aden, they loaded their camels with aromatics, in exchange for which they furnished corn and manufactures

¹ *Malte Brun*, II, 197. ² *Bell*, IV, 231. ³ *Gibbon*, 903.

which they had purchased in the fairs of Bostra and Damascus. Thus was kept up a lively system of exchange, which diffused plenty and riches in the streets of Mecca.

A great part of the trade of the west with India was anciently monopolized by the Arabians. After the discovery of the Cape of Good Hope by the Portuguese, the ancient channels of trade became changed, this monopoly ceased, and the commerce of Arabia rapidly declined.

Religion.

Before the appearance of Mahomet, the Arabians were, to a large extent, idolaters, although there were many Christians and Jews scattered over Arabia, and the Semitic mind inclined to the belief in monotheism. The religion of the magians was found prevailing to some extent, but the sabian faith was the more universal. This last was probably one of the most ancient forms of idolatrous worship. It seems to have been the earliest that prevailed among the eastern nations, and its prevalence among the Arabians goes to show their great antiquity.¹ With them this consisted chiefly in worshipping the fixed stars and planets, including the entire host of heaven, and the angels or intelligences which inhabited them. A clear firmament and an extended plain was the school in which they studied the sabian faith. As they observed the changes of the weather to occur at the rising or setting of certain stars or constellations, they were easily led to ascribe to them a divine power, and to believe themselves indebted to their influence in dispensing refreshing rains upon the parched earth.²

They imagined the sun, moon, and stars to be inhabited by intelligences of a middle nature between man and a supreme being,³ the creator and lord of the universe, whom they call Allah, the most high God. These intelligences, they supposed, actuated those orbs much in the

¹ *Universal History*, XVIII, 378, etc. ² *Idem*, 379. ³ *Idem*, 380.

same manner as the soul actuates the human body, causing their various motions. These, according to their belief, were mediators between man and God.

One difficulty attending the sabian form of worship, was that the sun,¹ moon and starry host were as much under the horizon as above it, and hence, in order to have, at all times, objects of worship, they had recourse to the invention of images, in which, after consecration, they supposed the inferior deities to reside, as fully as in the stars themselves. This may account for the introduction of image worship.

Some of the Arabians carried the faith so far as to attribute to the fixed stars, a power superior to what the sabians in general allowed.² They were unwilling to take the least step, without receiving from them a favorable omen. They also held to the existence of dæmons, genii, or middle intelligences,³ influencing the affairs of the world. These they asserted to be the daughters of God.⁴ Some of the pagan Arabs believe neither in a past creation, nor a future resurrection, attributing the origin of things to nature,⁵ and their dissolution to age. Others allowed both a creation and a resurrection, and to avoid the necessity of going on foot at the resurrection, they had their camel tied by their sepulchre and left without food to perish there, in order that it might accompany them to the other world. Some believe in a kind of metempsychosis, that a bird called Hamah, was formed of the blood near the dead person's brain, which once in a hundred years visited the sepulchre.

There seems to have been several idol gods whose worship was local, such as Allat the idol of the tribe of Thakif, Al-Uzza, of the tribes of Koreish and Kenanah, Manah of the tribes of Hodhail and Khozaah,⁶ and several others. The last mentioned idol was a large stone which was demolished by one Saad in the eighth year of the Hegira, a year so fatal to Arabian idols.

¹ *Universal History*, xviii, 380. ² *Idem*, 392. ³ *Idem*, 389. ⁴ *Idem*, 392. ⁵ *Idem*, 389. ⁶ *Idem*, 383.

The famous Kaaba or great temple of Mecca was, from the earliest ages, the depository of idols and images, and held in the greatest veneration throughout Arabia. This is an uncovered open square,¹ surrounded with colonnades, and adorned with minarets. The enclosure contains five or six chapels or houses of prayer. In the centre is a small square building, called more particularly the Kaaba, within which is a large black stone, which was an ancient object of adoration among the Arabians. There were pilgrimages to Mecca long before the time of Mahomet. Thither the tribes of Arabia resorted, and while there they were accustomed to go seven times round the sacred building, and then kiss the black stone, with respectful homage. Besides the black stone, the Kaaba contained three hundred and sixty images or idols, which were afterward destroyed by Mahomet.

Sacrifices were offered here as well as in all other parts of the idolatrous world.² Man has universally expressed his gratitude and fear by yielding up and offering to the gods the highest prized and most valuable of their gifts. The Arabians offered sheep and camels as sacrifices,³ and as late even as the third century the tribe of the Dumatians followed up the cruel practice of sacrificing annually a boy.⁴

The mission of Arabia seems, in a peculiar manner, to have been to produce and develop the Mahometan religion. The process, doctrines, and injunctions of this religion are mostly contained in the Koran or Alcoran, the Mahometan bible.

The Mahometans believe the Koran to be of divine original,⁵ eternal and uncreated. They affirm that the original draft has been from everlasting by the throne of God, written on a table of immense size, called the preserved table, on which are also recorded the divine decrees. Through the angel Gabriel a copy was taken,

¹ *Malte Brun*, II, 203. ² *Gibbon*, 908. ³ *Malte Brun*, II, 203. ⁴ *Gibbon*, 908. ⁵ *Modern Universal History*, I, 319.

and on the night of power, sent down to the lowest heaven, from whence it was revealed to Mahomet by parcels, some at Mecca and some at Medina, at different times, during the space of twenty-three years, as the exigency of affairs required. Whenever, in the course of his history, a new revelation was rendered necessary, as in his espousal of Zeineb, the wife of his adopted son,¹ the angel Gabriel was ever ready to bring one down, affirming, absolving, or directing, according to the wish of the prophet.

These revelations were recorded by his disciples on palm leaves² and shoulder bones of mutton, and thrown together into a chest where they were preserved without order or connection. It could hardly be expected that a volume could be collected in this manner without having parts of it contradictory and destructive of each other.³ Such was found to be the fact. To obviate this difficulty the Moslem doctors assert the doctrine of abrogation; claiming that God, in the Koran, commanded several things which were afterwards, for good reasons, abrogated and revoked, adopting as a general maxim,⁴ that any text of the sacred volume was abrogated or modified by any subsequent passage. Thus God was invested with the weakness of man, and the government of the universe was left to be guided and directed by the shifting course and current of events.

These loose and scattered fragments of palm leaves and shoulder bones were collected together about two years after the death of the prophet,⁵ by Abu Bekr his immediate successor, and published. The book was again revised by the caliph Othman about the thirtieth year of the Hegira.

The Koran is held by the Mahometan world in the highest possible veneration. No unbeliever must read or touch it, and if found in the possession of Jew or Christian it may be attended with fatal consequences.⁶ The Mos-

¹ Gibbon, 927. ² *Idem*, 913. ³ *Modern Universal History*, i, 321. ⁴ Gibbon, 913. ⁵ *Idem*, 913. ⁶ *Modern Universal History*, i, 325.

lems themselves never touch it without being first washed or legally purified. They never hold it while reading, below their girdles. They carry it with them to war, swear by it, and consult it on all weighty occasions. It is to them the book of books. The great doctrine which it proclaims, and which constitutes the main pillar of the Mahometan faith is, “*that there is only one God, and that Mahomet is the apostle of God.*”

The Moslems divide their religion into two parts, the one consisting of faith or theory,¹ the other of religion or practice. The first is summed up in a belief in one God; in his angels; in his scriptures; in his prophets; in the resurrection, and day of judgment; and in God’s absolute decree and predetermination both of good and evil. The second includes prayer and everything relative and preparatory to it; alms; fasting in the month of Ramadan, and the pilgrimage to Mecca.

In the first article, or the belief in one God,² the prophet trod in the footsteps of the Jewish theology. But the Jews had ceased to be a people, and in the pagan world polytheism universally prevailed. At the time and place, therefore, at which this was made, it was a startling announcement. It came in direct conflict with the creed of the Christian, because that established the trinity. It proclaimed a warfare against the magian faith, because that acknowledged two principles, the one of good the other of evil. It had a still severer contest with the sabian and other forms of pagan faith, because they held to a plurality of deities. Mahomet rejected as gods, stars and planets, on the principle that whatever rises must set; and idols and men, because whatever is corruptible must decay and ultimately perish, and whatever is born must die.

In the second article, or the belief in angels, there is a slight concession to the polytheism of his day. The highest of these, however (for there were different orders or grades), were not considered as objects of worship. They

¹ *Modern Universal History*, I, 326. ² *Gibbon*, 911.

were believed to have been originally created out of fire or light,¹ to possess subtle bodies free from animal functions; to be servants of God constantly in his presence, and executing his commands. They could assume various forms, and worship God in various postures. Some had it in charge to take an account of our actions here, others to convey the souls of men after death to the places assigned them, and others to preside over hell.

The principal of these angels were *Gabriel*, who was called the *angel of the revelations*, because he revealed to Mahomet the Koran,² *Michael*, who was the friend and protector of the Jews. *Azrael*, who was the angel of death, because he was supposed to separate men's souls from their bodies; and *Israfil*, whose office it will be to sound the trumpet on the day of the resurrection. The Moslems also believe that there are constantly two guardian angels attending on every man, and that they are changed every day. They also believed in genii, who were created out of fire, but of a grosser fabric than the angels, having the distinction of sex,³ eating and drinking, and being mortal. They were supposed by the Arabs to be placed at a small distance from the surface of the earth, and to haunt solitudes and deserts especially in the evening.

In the article of scriptures they believe that, previous to the Koran, God had made several revelations of his will to mankind, all which they consider as the word of God,⁴ and as having a divine original. The whole number of sacred books were a hundred and four, of which ten were given to Adam, fifty to Seth, thirty to Enoch, ten to Abraham, one, the Pentateuch, to Moses; one, the Psalms, to David; and one, the Gospel, to Jesus. The last, after which no more revelations were to be expected, was the Koran, given to Mahomet. All these, except the last four, they suppose to have been lost, and their contents entirely unknown. The three immediately preceding

¹ *Modern Universal History*, I, 326. ² *Idem*, 327. ³ *Idem*, 328, 329.

⁴ *Idem*, 329.

the Koran, viz: the Pentateuch, Psalms, and Gospel, they say have been so grossly corrupted by the Jews and Christians, that they can be no longer depended on.

In relation to the prophets, they were believed to be the messengers of God to mankind.¹ They were, according to the Moslems, endued with the power of performing miracles, were free from gross errors and great sins, and always professors of Islamism. The number of the prophets was variously estimated, some reckoning as many as two hundred and twenty-four thousand,² others one hundred and twenty-four thousand. Of these three hundred and thirteen were apostles, and six brought with them each a new dispensation, each successively abrogating the one that preceded it. These six were Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, Jesus and Mahomet. Those who were charged with revealing and establishing a new dispensation, had the first place assigned to them. Next came the apostles. Mahomet, according to them, was the noblest of the prophets, and the first of all creatures. Thus they prolonged the chain of inspiration from the fall of Adam to the promulgation of the Koran. All was perfected and summed up in Mahomet, through whom was made the last and crowning revelation.

The belief in a general resurrection and a future judgment was embraced in the faith of Islamism.³ Some embrace within this the race of genii as well as men. They suppose the existence of an intermediate state both of the soul and body between death and the resurrection. It was in this state that occurred what they termed the *examination of the sepulchre*, in which is ascertained the belief of the deceased concerning the unity of God and the mission of Mahomet. As to the soul, they hold that when it is separated from the body by the angel of death it enters into a state called *al bassakh*, or the interval between death and the resurrection. If the deceased was a good believer they say two angels convey his soul to heaven,

¹ *Modern Universal History*, I, 330. ² *Idem*, 331. ³ *Idem*, 332.

where a place is assigned to it corresponding to its degree and merit.¹ They divide the souls of the pious faithful into three classes. In the first class are the prophets, whose souls are admitted into paradise immediately. In the second are the martyrs, whose spirits rest in the crops of green birds, which eat of the fruits and drink of the rivers of paradise. In the third are others, concerning the state of whose souls before the resurrection, there is a great variety of opinions.

The Moslems do not believe that any of the faithful, however vicious or abandoned may have been his course of life, will perish everlastingly, but that infidels only will be doomed to remain forever in hell. They do not, however, exempt the faithful from all punishment. Those among them who have led wicked lives, they say, will be punished hereafter, in one of the stories or apartments of hell, in proportion to the number and guilt of the sins they committed here, after which they were allowed to participate in the joys of paradise. Some who are materialists believe in the resurrection of the body only; others who are spiritualists, in that of the soul; while the generally received opinion is, that both body and soul will be raised. The time of the resurrection, they say, is known to God alone,² although its approach may be known by certain signs which are to precede it. They believe that the resurrection will embrace the animal creation, and that judgment will be passed on them for their conduct towards each other while in this life.

They affirm that Israfil will blow the trump of the resurrection three times. The first is called the *blast of consternation*, at the hearing of which, all creatures in heaven and on earth, except those whom God shall exempt, shall be struck with terror. The second is the *blast of exanination*, when all creatures, both in heaven and on earth, except those specially exempt, shall die. The third is the *blast of resurrection*, when Israfil, Gabriel and Michael,

¹ *Modern Universal History*, I, 333. ² *Idem*, 334.

standing on the rock of the temple of Jerusalem, shall, at the command of God, summon together all the dry and rotten bones, and other dispersed parts of the bodies, not forgetting even the hairs and minutest parts of the body.

The first great rendezvous of the souls will be in the trumpet of the angel, from whence, on his blowing the last blast, they will fly forth like a swarm of bees, filling the whole space between heaven and earth, and then they will repair to their respective bodies then rising out of the earth, the first being Mahomet himself. They suppose that mankind will be raised perfect in all their parts and members, and in the same condition they were at birth,¹ naked and uncircumcised. When God shall appear to judge, the office of intercessor will be undertaken by Mahomet, after it shall have been successively declined by Adam, Noah, Abraham and Jesus, who shall beg deliverance only for their own souls. The books will be produced in which are recorded the actions of every person by their guardian angels, and the prophets will be required to bear witness against those to whom they were respectively sent. Then every one will be examined concerning his words and actions, how time has been spent, wealth acquired, and employed; bodies exercised, and knowledge and learning made use of.² Some say the day of judgment will last a thousand years, and some as high as fifty thousand. Some place it on this earth, others on another which they suppose will be composed of silver.

As a means of arriving with accuracy at the final judgment an immense balance will be produced, so vast in size that it can contain both heaven and earth, which will be held by the angel Gabriel, one of its scales hanging over paradise, the other over hell.³ Into the scales of this balance will be placed the books in which are written the words and actions of all the creatures to be judged, and sentence shall be given according as the good or bad actions shall preponderate. Then follows the mutual retaliation,

¹ *Modern Universal History*, I, 335. ² *Idem*, 337. ³ *Idem*, 338.

by virtue of which every creature will have satisfaction made to him of the injuries or wrongs which he may have suffered here. The method of making this satisfaction is full of curiosity. The amount of the injury being ascertained, a proportional part of the good works of the person who inflicted it is taken away from him and added to those of him who suffered it. If the inflictor of the injury should happen to have no good works placed to his credit, and hence be unable to compensate in that way, then the weight of his sins¹ will be loaded with an adequate share of the elements of the sufferer.² The brutes shall also take vengeance of each other and be afterwards changed into dust. After the rendition of judgment those entitled to paradise will take the right hand way, and those destined to hell the left.³ Both, it is said, must first pass over the bridge, Al Sirât, which is laid over the midst of hell, and is finer than a hair and sharper than the edge of a sword. Over this bridge the good will pass with the swiftness of the wind or lightning, Mahomet leading the way, while the wicked will soon miss their footing, and drop into hell.

The Moslems teach that hell is divided into seven stories or apartments,⁴ one below another, and designed for the reception of as many distinct classes of the damned. The first is assigned to the wicked Moslems, from which, however, they will ultimately be released; the second to the Jews; the third to the Christians; the fourth to the sabians; the fifth to the magians; the sixth to the idolaters; and the seventh, last and lowest, to the hypocrites, or those who outwardly profess some religion, but in reality possess none. Here a variety of torments will be suffered, arising mostly from intense heat and excessive cold. The infidels alone are liable to the weight of eternal suffering, the faithful continuing in hell from four hundred to seven thousand years, at the end of which they are to be released at the intercession of the prophet.

¹ Gibbon, 916. ² *Modern Universal History*, 338. ³ *Idem*, 339. ⁴ *Idem*, 340.

Between hell and paradise the Moslems suppose a partition wall to be erected, called Al Orf.¹ Before entering paradise, the faithful are to be refreshed by drinking at the pond of the prophet, described to be an exact square, and of a month's journey in compass. The water is supplied by two pipes from one of the rivers of paradise, and is whiter than milk, more odoriferous than musk, sweeter than honey, cooler than snow, and smoother than cream. Those who drink of it will never thirst more.

After refreshing themselves out of the pond, they next arrive at two fountains,² springing from under a tree near the gate of paradise, in one of which they wash themselves, and from the other drink in order to purge their bodies, and divest them of all excrementitious dregs. After this they are prepared to enter paradise, where their degrees of enjoyment are proportioned to their deserts. Although an impression has prevailed that women were denied souls by the Moslem faith, and could not participate in the joys of paradise, yet there is no doubt but that the Koran opens the gates of paradise to both sexes.³ It is supposed by many that good women will have a mansion assigned them in the regions of the blessed, different from that of the men, where they will enjoy all sorts of delights. Mahomet was careful not to go into too many particulars,⁴ such as specifying the male companions of the glorified females in paradise, as that might possibly disturb the relations of families here, by alarming the jealousy of husbands, or in some instances create uneasiness by bringing before the mind the idea of an everlasting marriage.

The Moslems suppose paradise to have been created before the world,⁵ and to be situated above the seven heavens, and directly under the throne of God. The earth that enters into the composition of paradise, some pretend, consists of wheat flour, or musk or saffron. Its stones are

¹ *Modern Universal History*, 342. ² *Idem*, 344. ³ *Idem*, 348. ⁴ *Gibbon*, 916. ⁵ *Modern Universal History*, I, 343.

pearls and jacinths; the walls of its buildings enriched with gold and silver, the trunks of its trees of gold. Some of its rivers are of water, some of milk, some of wine and others of honey. The garden is watered by a number of lesser springs and fountains, whose pebbles are rubies and emeralds, their earth being of camphire, their beds of musk, and their sides of saffron. Some of the fruits resemble those on earth, while others will be new and of an unknown species, and such as no one on earth ever saw.

All the faithful will enjoy such a profusion of delights as will altogether exceed their expectation and comprehension. These will consist of seventy-two most lovely wives at least, the houries,¹ as they were called from their large, brilliant black eyes, who, to virgin purity, add the most surpassing beauty, and the enjoyment of whose company will be one of the principal felicities of the faithful. Each is to have a tent immensely rich, a great number of servants, a vast variety of food served in dishes of gold, the most delicious liquors brought them in vessels of the same metal, wines without the inebriating quality, magnificent furniture and garments, a numerous train of attendants, and every thing that a sensualist or voluptuary can desire. Whether the black eyed houries were the creatures of paradise, born and nurtured there, or whether they are to be translated thither from this globe,² is a point in dispute among the Moslem doctors.

Thus is every sense to be gratified, every passion indulged; and in order that human nature may be able to sustain such an oppressive weight of pleasure without sinking under it, each man is to be endowed with the strength, endurance and capacity of a hundred men.

A perpetual youth is enjoyed by the faithful in paradise, and also by the infidels in hell,³ in order that they may be more sensibly alive to their torments. Thus the joys of paradise are made to consist of sensual delights, and to address themselves to the carnal, sensual man. To

¹ *Modern Universal History*, I, 344, 345. ² *Idem*, 344. ³ *Idem*, 345.

those, however, who had attained a high degree of sanctity in this life, was promised the beatific vision, or the favor of beholding God's face morning and evening, which was to give such exquisite delight as that all the other pleasures of paradise would be lightly esteemed in comparison. It would thus seem that spiritual as well as sensual enjoyments might be the reward of the faithful in the delightful gardens and by the side of the waters of paradise.

The only remaining article in the division of faith or theory is God's absolute decree, and predestination both of good and evil. In regard to this there is some diversity of opinion, but the Soanites maintain that whatever of good or evil occurs in this world, proceeds entirely from the divine will, is irrevocably fixed and recorded from all eternity on the preserved table.¹ This was a very convenient doctrine to be proclaimed by Mahomet. He could, and in a great measure did, still the murmurs of his followers after their defeat by strenuously enforcing the doctrine that the time of every man's death is decreed and predetermined by God; and that those who fell in battle could not have avoided their fate had they staid at home.² Thus as no amount of caution could avert their inevitable destiny, or for one moment prolong their lives, they were encouraged to fight desperately and without fear, for the propagation of their faith.

The four fundamental points of religious practice are prayer, fasting, almsgiving and pilgrimage to Mecca.

Under the first are included all those washings or purifications required as preparatory,³ on some occasions, of the hands, faces and feet, and on others of the whole body. If water cannot be obtained, fine clean sand may be sometimes used as a substitute. The Moslem religion has neither priesthood nor sacrifice.⁴ Friday in each week is set apart for public worship. The faithful all assemble in their mosques, and the imaum, a respectable elder, conducts in the pulpit the public exercises of prayer and preaching.

¹ *Modern Universal History*, I, 349. ² *Idem*, 349. ³ *Idem*, 349. ⁴ *Gibbon*, 914.

Mahomet was first required to impose upon his followers the obligations of fifty prayers a day, but on the interposition of Moses the number was finally reduced to five. Five times every day, viz: at day-break, at noon, in the afternoon, in the evening, and at the first watch of the night, on the announcement of the criers from the steeples of the mosques, the whole Moslem world sends up its prayer to God. On that announcement all the pursuits of business, pleasure and ambition for the moment stand still. The devout Moslem, whether at the mosque, in his house, in the street, at home or abroad, reverently turns his face towards the holy city, Meccà, and pours forth his prayer in short and fervent ejaculations. This being done he again turns himself to the pursuits or occupations he had temporarily abandoned.

Fasting is a duty strictly enjoined by the Moslem creed. During the whole month of Ramadan, from the time the new moon first appears to the appearance of the next new moon,¹ the Mahometans abstain from eating and drinking (and women), from day-break till night or sunset. In order to be of any avail, they hold it necessary

1. That the person who fasts should be a Moslem.
2. That he should have attained the age of puberty.
3. That he should labor under no mental disqualification.

While fasting, they suffer nothing to enter into their bodies, smell no perfumes, neither wash nor bathe, avoid swallowing their spittle; and some are so cautious that they will not even open their mouths to speak, lest they should breathe the air too freely. (According to the Mahometan doctors there are three degrees of fasting:

1. The restraining all parts of the body from satisfying their lusts.
2. The restraining the ears, eyes, tongue, hands, feet, and other members from sin.
3. The fasting of the heart from worldly cares, and refraining the thoughts from everything besides God.)

¹*Modern Universal History*, i, 355.

Another fundamental duty required by the Moslem creed, is the giving of alms. On this, great stress is laid in the Koran. The maxim of the Moslem is, that prayer will carry him half way to God;¹ fasting will bring him to the door of his palace, and alms will gain him admittance there. Alms were of two kinds, legal and voluntary. The first were of perpetual and indispensable obligation, the last were left to every man's free choice. Six things were considered requisite to render alms efficacious:² 1. That the giver be a Moslem. 2. That he be free. 3. That he be the lawful possessor of that out of which he gives alms. 4. That he possesses this in a proper quantity. 5. That he be in possession of it about a year. 6. That the cattle of which alms are given, be either fed by the proprietor, or sent to pasture by him.

To enforce the giving of alms, Mahomet is said to have declared, that whoever pays not his legal contribution of alms duly, shall have a serpent twisted about his neck at the resurrection.

The performance of one more additional duty was enjoined, and that was the pilgrimage to Mecca.³ This is esteemed by the Moslem world as a duty so necessary and indispensable, that one who dies without having performed it cannot be in a state of salvation. The performance of pilgrimages to Mecca was no new thing in the age of Mahomet. They had been, from time immemorial, performed by the pagan idolaters of Arabia, who were accustomed annually to perform their adorations, and practice their idolatrous rites at the shrine of the Kaaba. This was, therefore, in part, a concession made to the habits and practices of the ancient Arabians, and in part an institution well calculated to keep constantly before the mind some of the leading doctrines of the Mahometan faith.

These are the principal articles of the Mahometan faith and practice. It will be easily perceived that they were

¹ Gibbon, 914. ² *Modern Universal History*, I, 354. ³ *Idem*, 356.

drawn from several different sources. Mahomet has clearly laid under contribution the magian and Jewish doctrines as well as the Christian religion. He has extracted something from each, and been also, in many instances, indebted to his own imagination. In the different directions given to the faithful as to the place towards which they should turn when they offered up their prayers, shows clearly that the prophet was capable of varying his instructions to carry out the suggestions of an artful policy. At first they were directed to turn their faces toward the east, which was a concession to the magi, then towards Jerusalem, to conciliate the Jews, and lastly towards Mecca, to satisfy those who still professed the elder religions of Arabia. Such is the religion confided to Arabia to introduce and develop, and which has ever since been in the full tide of success in the eastern world.

Society.

The Arabians in form are thin, spare, and small; are well formed and extremely active, have dark hair and black eyes, and a brown complexion. Social life in Arabia is modified, as everywhere else, by climate, government, and the habits acquired in early education. The Arabians make every possible effort to push forward the young into a state of maturity.¹ Hence, it is said, they are never children. The boys are allowed to remain in the harem, among the women, where they follow childish amusements until the age of five or six years. They are then removed entirely from this scene of frivolity, placed in the company of men, and accustomed to think and speak with gravity. With music and dancing the Arabians have little or nothing to do.² They are considered indecent. As the use of wine and all intoxicating drinks is forbidden by the Koran, they are completely cut off from those sources of dissipation and pleasure which are so destructively open

¹ *Encyclopedia Perthensis*, II, 354. ² *Idem*, 355.

to the youth of Europe and America. Mahomet knew well the tendencies of his countrymen as well as of their climate, and therefore made that an article of religious faith, which, in every point of view, was right, politic and proper.

The Arab, subsisting on a temperate, and even an abstemious diet, living a life of almost ceaseless action under a serene and unclouded sky, preserves to old age the elasticity of his spirits, and possesses all the enjoyments of a lively sensibility. He possesses great volatility of character, is capricious and changeable.

The Arabians of fashion wear an expensive head dress consisting of fifteen caps one over another,¹ some being made of linen, and the rest of thick cloth or cotton. Over all these they wear a large piece of muslin called a sasch, ornamented at the ends, and flowing loose upon the shoulders. The common class of Arabs wear only two caps with the sasch carelessly bound on the head. The greater number of Arabs wear only a piece of linen about their loins, a piece of cloth about their shoulders, and a large girdle, and nothing else, their feet not even being protected by shoes and stockings; and the scanty clothes which they wear through the day serve also as their only covering during the night. In some provinces they veil their faces similar to what the practice is among the Egyptians. Those among them who desire to pass for men of learning, discover their pretensions by the bulk of their turbans.

The ceremonies attending marriages and births are few and unimportant. Those, also, attending interments are hardly worth recording.² Great simplicity of action characterizes their conduct on these important occasions.

The common posture in which the Arabs sit, is with their legs crossed under them.³ Before their superiors, and also at their meals, they have a practice of sitting upon their heels, with their knees touching each other.

¹ *Encyclopedia Perthensis*, II, 358. ² *Bell*, IV, 240. ³ *Idem*, 237.

They use neither knives, forks, nor spoons at their meals. Cutting is an operation never performed at an eastern table. The meat is divided into small pieces before it is brought forward. If too large it is torn by the fingers. They always wash before sitting down, and on rising up from table. A short prayer is repeated before sitting down, and an ejaculation, as, "God be praised," uttered on rising.

The ancient Arabians had many peculiar and somewhat curious manners and customs, some of which were confirmed and some abrogated by Mahomet. They practiced circumcision either on the eighth day, or as is more generally supposed, after the completion of the thirteenth year,¹ in imitation of the example of Ishmael. This custom was sanctioned and continued by Mahomet. It is said the ancient Arabs circumcised their daughters as well as their sons.

The ancient Arabians were extremely addicted to divination and augury. Any one starting on a journey carefully observed the first bird he met with. If it flew to the right he considered it as a good omen, and pursued his journey; if to the left, as a bad one, and he returned home. Some attached the same degree of importance to the motions of all other animals.

They had also a method of divination by arrows. Having selected sometimes seven,² but more commonly three, they put them altogether into a sack; on one was written "*Command me, Lord,*" on another, "*Forbid me, Lord,*" and the third was a blank. If the first was drawn, they regarded it as a favorable omen, and zealously prosecuted the enterprise then in contemplation; if the second, they came to a contrary conclusion, and abandoned it; if the third, they mixed them together and drew over again until a decisive question was given by one of the others. This method of divination was resorted to before anything of moment was undertaken. All this was condemned in

express terms by the Koran. So, also, were all kinds of games,¹ such as dice, chess, cards, etc.

The Arabians appear to be constitutionally jealous, and when one suspecting the fidelity of his wife went a journey, he tied together some of the boughs of a tree called al-ramtam; and if upon returning he found them in the same position, he judged she had been faithful to him, otherwise not.

When a she camel had brought forth twins ten times, they had a custom of cutting off one ear and giving her her liberty, but women were never permitted to taste of her flesh. Some other superstitious customs were entertained in relation to camels and sheep.

There was an inhuman custom prevailed among some of the ancient Arabs, particularly the tribes of Koreish and Kendah, of burying their daughters alive as soon as they were born,² if the parents apprehended they could not maintain them; or in some cases they offered them up to their idols, at the instigation of those who had the custody of their temples. The Koreish were accustomed to bury their daughters alive in Mount Abu Dalama near Mecca. This brutal practice was also prohibited by the Koran.

It appears to have been once a custom not uncommon among the Arabians to marry their father's wife, who, as they imagined, by a kind of hereditary right belonged to the oldest son,³ or, in case he was already provided for, to one of his brethren, but this was condemned by the most virtuous portion as an ignominious and shocking crime. Some of them married two sisters, which was also regarded much in the same light. The Arabians counted by lunar months, and regulated their calendar by intercalating a month every third year.

It was a very common practice among the Scenite or wandering Arabs to have mercenary tribes, who were hired by them for a time, marrying in one place, producing

¹ *Universal History*, xviii, 412. ² *Modern Universal History*, i, 365.

³ *Universal History*, xviii, 412.

in another, and bringing up their children in a third. The same practice to some extent still continues.

The ancient Arabians had a singular custom of entering into contracts.¹ Some one would seat himself between the two contracting parties, holding a sharp stone, with which he would make an incision into the palms of their hands. Then taking a piece of their garments, he would dip it into the blood which was issuing from their wounds and annoint with it seven stones which he had placed between them, during all the time invoking Dionisius or Bacchus and Urania, the two principal, or, as some say, only deities, of the ancient Arabians.

The Arabian character has ever been strongly tinctured with cruelty. In a community where robbery and rapine becomes a habit; where the hand of every member is against every man, and every man's hand against him, this ought not, perhaps, to excite surprise. Domestic feuds and factions, no less than foreign reprisal and robbery, has exerted its influence in moulding the Arabian character. These domestic feuds were more especially prevalent before all Arabia became subjected to the sway of Mahomet.² Tradition records the fighting of seventeen hundred battles in Arabia before the time of Mahomet. These were celebrated in prose and verse, and their recital excited in the bosoms of the descendants the same warlike passions that in their ancestors had led to blood and carnage.

An acute sensibility, which led to regard the insult or wrong done as of far greater consequence than the injury sustained, was the cause of many desperate and deadly quarrels among the Arabs themselves. A contemptuous expression relative to their women or their beards would be likely to result in a murderous affray. Among uncivilized nations almost universally, murder is atoned for by a fine or pecuniary compensation. Among the Arabians the relatives of the deceased were at liberty to receive such an atonement if they chose, or they might resort to the *lex*

¹ *Mayo*, II, 95, 96. ² *Gibbon*, 905.

talionis. If they chose the latter they were not limited to the murderer himself, but might select and slay, in his place, the best and most considerable of the race by whom the injury had been perpetrated.¹ This again naturally led to reprisals from the other side, and thus a sanguinary spirit may be indulged on both sides, which may continue unabated for years. There is, however, amongst them a maxim of honor,² which in all private encounters requires a reasonable equality of age and strength, and of numbers and weapons. Prior to the time of Mahomet, there was also an annual festival continuing for two or four months, during which all swords were sheathed whether drawn in domestic feuds or foreign hostility.

But while the vices of savage life are thus allowed to display themselves in the Arabian character, its virtues are not also wanting. That which stands forth more marked and prominent in its social bearings is the virtue of hospitality. The Bedouin of the desert esteems it a principle of honor never to injure a person who has placed himself within his power.³ He is free to plunder, and, in case of resistance, to kill the lone traveler in the desert; but the moment his tent is entered by any one claiming the rights of hospitality, he seems to have no other will or wish than to yield to those rights the utmost that can be required. Even an enemy is secure if he can fly for refuge into the tent.⁴ In the villages of the Tehama some public houses are found where travelers are lodged and fed for some days free of expense.⁵ Any person happening to come in while they are at their meals is invited to partake, without any distinction of religion or rank. Thus the ancient and primitive simplicity is preserved in the tent of the wandering Arab.

The dwellers in the cities of the happy Arabia have had their social character somewhat modified by a different manner of life,⁶ and by intercourse with foreign nations.

¹ *Gibbon*, 905. ² *Idem*, 906. ³ *Idem*, 906. ⁴ *Bell*, iv, 236. ⁵ *Malte Brun*, II, 218. ⁶ *Bell*, iv, 236, 237.

It is nevertheless in its great outlines the same. They exercise great courtesy in their manners, greater than most of the civilized nations of Europe. In this respect, however, the east is far superior to Europe. The courtesy exercised costs little and means less. In their mercantile dealings, especially with Christians, they are said to exhibit great duplicity, substituting fraud and finesse in the place of the open robberies and plundering propensities of the Bedouins.

The tents of the Bedouins are, in general, similar to those of the nomadic races that wander over the plateau of Central Asia. They have much the appearance of a tattered hut.¹ The material consists of coarse stuffs prepared by the women. Even the palaces of Arabians of rank in Arabia Felix display no exterior splendor. The poor spread their floor with straw mats, and the rich with fine carpets. No person ever thinks of entering a room without having first put off his shoes. The houses are divided into two parts, front and rear. In the front part, which is divested of ornament, are the apartments of the men. In the rear, which, among the wealthy, is set off with a profusion of decoration, are those of the women. Thus every house has its harem. Even the poor Bedouin of the desert divides his simple tent into two apartments by a curtain,² behind which the women are concealed. Where the circumstances are such as not to admit of having separate apartments for the women, no Arabian ever enters his house or tent with a stranger without first crying *tarik*,³ at which the women retire. The constraint to which Arabian women are subjected is much greater among the dwellers in cities than the wanderers in the wilderness. The pastoral life of the wanderer or Bedouin, affords them much greater freedom,⁴ and the desert is the general theatre of the keen passions depicted in the Arabian tales.

¹ *Encyclopedia Perthensis*, II, 356. ² *Malte Brun*, II, 218. ³ *Encyclopedia Perthensis*, II, 356. ⁴ *Malte Brun*, II, 220.

The portrait drawn by the Arabian poet of his lady-love is interesting, not so much as a specimen of poetry, as exhibiting his idea of female beauty.¹ “Her form is tall and slender like the rush which bends before the wind, or like the lances of the men of Yemen. Voluminous at mid-height, from right or left, she enters with difficulty by the tent door. Two firm pomegranates swell the alabaster white surface of her bosom. Her eyes are lively and tender like those of the antelope; her eyebrows arched; and her black hair, drawn together with a clasp, waves over the neck like the camels.”

As there is little freedom of intercourse between the sexes, especially among the dwellers in cities, and as all games of hazard are strictly prohibited by the Koran,² the Arab is compelled to spend his time in such a manner as would be almost insupportable to most Europeans and Americans. He either saunters at home among his wives and concubines, whose attractions are almost entirely sensual, and who would rather prefer his absence that they may be the less under restraint; or he wanders abroad, resorting to the coffee house or market, where he meets with others of the same character, and each little fitted to give or receive entertainment. Thus his life passes away without deriving from his social nature much that can relieve the past, or animate the present, or furnish hope for the future.

Government.

The form of government among the Bedouins, and prevailing the most universally in Arabia, is the patriarchal. This form is always interesting, as it comes down from the earliest periods of time, and brings to us ideas of the primitive political associations of men. Its elements are to be found in every family, and it, in fact, consists of little more than the extension of a family government over a tribe or nation.

¹ *Malte Brun*, 221. ² *Bell*, iv, 238.

In a family, the father is regarded as the natural head, and receives the voluntary obedience of his household. The relations of deference that exist between the father and his children, naturally led them to regard him as the centre of power and authority. In early times the life of man was more extended, and the founder of a family, before being called away, could, under ordinary circumstances, witness, collected around him, numerous descendants. These, by keeping together, and constantly associating with each other, would establish between themselves, as well as with their common head, ties not easily sundered. On the removal of the patriarchal head, the transfer of the regard, respect, and obedience of his descendants was easily made to his eldest son, who united more the qualifications of age and experience, and who, perhaps, for some time before his demise, owing to his great age and infirmities, had occupied his place. Thus would be gradually formed the tribe; all the members of which had descended from a common stock, were all connected with each other by the ties of kindred and intercourse, and all regarded the eldest in succession as entitled to the rights and prerogatives of their original ancestor. This is the simplest form, which, however, admits of deviations. Thus, instead of descending to the eldest born, the first that was born after the accession of his father to the patriarchal or kingly office was entitled to the succession.¹ This has been the case with several of the cities of Arabia Felix. Another deviation, not very uncommon, has been where the successor of the patriarch has been selected from among his sons. Neither these, nor any other deviations, have substantially changed the nature of the thing. It has ever been *influence* rather than *authority* that has been exerted, and *advice* rather than *command* that has been obeyed. Thus the political tie connecting the members of the tribe with the sheik or head, was little more than voluntary in its character, and might be created or abro-

¹ *Universal History*, xviii, 377.

gated at pleasure. The Arab always enjoyed a high degree of personal liberty. The bond that connects them with their sheik, is more one of affection than of authority. They are free to remain, or to quit his service at pleasure. The desert is ever an open home, where they can roam unconfined. There is probably less amenability to strict law, and a greater degree of liberty enjoyed by the Bedouins than by any other people in the world. The tribe is subject to many changes. Sometimes it is increased by the accession of new members;¹ at others, diminished by the withdrawal of old ones. Sometimes a weaker tribe is subdued and incorporates with the stronger; at others, two or more weaker tribes either amalgamate with each other, or form a league together for their common defense. Among some tribes, there are a number of sheiks, who, however, acknowledge a common chief,² called sheik of sheiks, and whose authority is limited by custom. This high dignity is hereditary in a certain family, but the inferior sheiks are at liberty to select the successor out of the family, disregarding age and lineal succession, and having reference alone to superior abilities. This right of election creates a feeling of dependence, on the part of the grand sheik, and leads him to treat the inferior sheiks rather as associates than as subjects. Little or no revenue is paid to him, his income being derived principally from the duties which he levies and exacts upon goods which are carried through his dominions.³ The inferior sheiks enjoy almost perfect liberty. If dissatisfied with his government, they depose him, or go away with their flocks and herds, and unite themselves with some other tribe.

When a tribe is so small as to be unable to defend itself, its resource is to place itself under the protection of a more numerous and powerful tribe,⁴ and to adopt its laws as their own. In this manner very powerful tribes are sometimes formed by the union of several small ones.

¹ *Encyclopædia Parthenensis*, II, 342. ² *Idem*, 343. ³ *Niebuhr*, II, 164, 165.
⁴ *Idem*, 167.

The petty princes of Arabia are very proud of their birth and family descent.¹ There is here no class of nobles, strictly so called, because there is no class enjoying certain civil privileges which may be equally conferred on others. The dignity of sheik is hereditary, and is not, therefore, communicable or capable of being conferred by any sovereign, prince, or even by a khaliph. It is founded on the customs of a pastoral people, who acknowledge no distinction of rank but that of the heads of families. These customs are a part of the traditional history of the tribe, and have been handed down from remote generations.

Of all the titles in Arabia, the most common is that of sheik, or, as it is sometimes spelt, *schieck*.² This title is variously applied. It is most commonly the title of a prince or noble, the head of his tribe. Sometimes it is given to a professor in an academy, to a man belonging to a mosque, to the descendant of a saint, and to the mayor of a town.

Another title is that of *sherriffe*, which is applied more particularly to the descendants of Mahomet, through Ali and Hassan.³ The holy city of Mecca, and also the cities of Medina, Iambo, Taaif, Sadie, Ghunfude, Hali, and thirteen others less considerable, in the province of Hedjaz,⁴ are under the dominion of the grand *sherriffe*. His power extends not to spiritual matters, which are managed by the heads of the clergy.⁵ What is peculiarly unfortunate, there is no order of succession determinately fixed, all the *sherriffes*, or descendants of Mahomet, through this line, being equally capable of aspiring to the sovereign power.⁶ This is productive of frequent revolutions and changes in the reigning *sherriffe*. The *sherriffes* are very numerous.⁷ Whole villages are found peopled with them. Two circumstances tend to increase their number; one, the practice of polygamy, and the other, the fact that the son of a

¹ Niebuhr, II, 204. ² *Idem*, 208. ³ *Idem*, 28. ⁴ *Idem*, 30. ⁵ *Idem*, 31.
⁶ *Idem*, 29. ⁷ *Idem*, 207.

woman of the family of Mahomet is entitled to enjoy that dignity. As a natural consequence of this, some are reduced to extreme poverty. In some provinces,¹ particularly in Hedjaz, they are treated with great respect, being considered the noblest of Mahomet's descendants, because they have made fewer intermarriages with strangers than the rest of the prophet's posterity.

There are also other reputed descendants and successors of Mahomet called imaums,² who exercise both a temporal and a spiritual power over their subjects. Their dominions lie in the fertile districts of country, and the government here more nearly resembles monarchy than any other.³ Such are the imaums of Sana and Mushat, and of some princes in the province of Hadramaut. These countries are intersected by large ranges of mountains, which are occupied by independent sheiks. In this way the settled and wandering tribes are generally found in the neighborhood of each other.

In the sheik form of government there is nothing of the feudal character. The sheiks possess no fiefs, but they have a kind of property in the persons of their several tribes. They are independent, although they pay a small tribute to the princes within whose dominions they dwell,⁴ which is a consideration for the use of the land they occupy.

All the despotism ever known in Arabia can be traced to the theocracy introduced by Mahomet. The imaums uniting both the temporal and the spiritual power within their dominions, have often found means to abuse the simplicity of their subjects, and to enlarge their own authority. But the genius of the people, their customs, and even their religion, are all adverse to the progress of despotism, and operate as so many restraints upon the exercise of power by the imaums.

The Arabians, although possessing a great degree of personal freedom, especially the wandering tribes, seem never to have thought of a republican form of government.

¹ Niebuhr, 206. ² *Idem*, 20. ³ *Idem*, 19. ⁴ *Idem*, 20.

What some seem to have regarded as a federative republic among them, has turned out on examination to be simply an association of several petty princes,¹ for the purpose of mutual defense against a common enemy.

The laws under which the Arabians live are few and simple. A patriarchal government is the last where laws are formally enacted and proclaimed, and there is probably less occasion for them than in any other form of government. In such a form, laws, seldom, if ever, emanate from the government itself. Law, in Arabia, resolves itself into the requirements of the code of honor, the customs and usages of the tribe, and the precepts and commands of the Koran. There is nothing more delicate than Bedouin honor,² or that requires to be sacrificed to it a greater number of victims. If one sheik says to another "Thy bonnet is dirty," or "The wrong side of thy turban is out," nothing but blood can wash away the reproach; and not unfrequently, not only the blood of the offender, but that also of all the males of his family. The customs and usages of the tribe, the social habits of the Arabians have been already alluded to.

The precepts and commands of the Koran, so far as the positive institutions of religion are concerned, have been already alluded to. There are many others besides these. The Koran, in imitation of the Jewish law, prohibits the eating of blood, and swine's flesh,³ and whatever dies of itself, or is slain in the name of an idol, or strangled, or killed by a blow or fall, or any other beast. The taking of usury is also strictly prohibited by the Koran,⁴ and this includes in it every species of extortion and illicit gain. The Koran permits the practice of polygamy,⁵ and allows a man to marry wives to the number of four.⁶ The husband is obliged to treat his wives suitably to their condition, and to dispense his favors equally among them. In practice only rich voluptuaries avail themselves of this

¹ Niebuhr, II, 21. ² *Idem*, 199. ³ *Modern Universal History*, I, 361, 362. ⁴ *Idem*, 362. ⁵ *Idem*, 367. ⁶ Niebuhr, II, 218.

permission, the Arabians generally limiting themselves to one wife. There are occasional instances of men marrying as many wives as the law permits by way of speculation,¹ in order that they may be supported by the profits of their labor. The Arabian women who are married enjoy a good deal of liberty and power in their families. They continue mistress of their dowries,² and of the annual income derived from these during their marriage. In case of divorce they retain their own property. Hence a poor man marrying a woman of fortune is dependent on her and dares not divorce her. Rich men, for this reason, and for the reason that they consider the children as more likely to be happy, prefer to match their daughters with poor men than with rich.³ There are no eunuchs in Arabia, nor are they as common through the east as has been by many supposed.⁴ Divorce, as well as polygamy, is allowed by the Koran. Wives are entitled to demand it when they think themselves ill used by their husbands.⁵ Divorces in Arabia are not near so frequent as might be apprehended considering the fiery nature of the Arabians, and that it depends so much on the volition of the parties. It is regulated a good deal by public opinion, which precludes the exercise of the right except for the strongest reasons.⁶

A Moslem may repudiate his wife twice without separating himself from her, and should he happen to repent, the repudiation goes for nothing.⁷ But if he divorces her a third time, he cannot take her again until she has been again married to another husband, and either survives or has been divorced by him. This has been remarked to have a good effect.

The punishment inflicted upon an unmarried woman in a case of fornication, is one hundred stripes and banishment for a year, and that inflicted upon a married woman in a case of adultery is stoning.⁸ A charge of adultery must,

¹ Niebuhr, II, 213. ² *Idem*, 214. ³ *Idem*, 215. ⁴ *Idem*, 217. ⁵ *Idem*, 214. ⁶ *Idem*, 213. ⁷ *Modern Universal History*, I, 367. ⁸ *Idem*, 368, 369.

however, be sustained by four male witnesses, and if a man accuse a woman falsely of that crime, or of fornication, he is to receive eighty stripes, and his testimony is forever thereafter rendered invalid.

The pagan Arabs denied widows and orphans any share in the inheritances of their husbands and fathers, under the pretense that those only should inherit who could go to war. The Koran orders otherwise.¹ In general a male is to have twice as much as a female, though to this rule there are some few exceptions.² Children were preferred first, and then the nearest relations of the deceased. The children of concubines and slaves are esteemed equally legitimate with those of the legal wives.³

All contracts are directed to be made before witnesses, and, if not immediately executed are to be reduced to writing and executed in the presence of two men of the Moslem faith,⁴ or, if they cannot be obtained, in the presence of one man and two women. The performance of all contracts is strongly insisted on by the Koran.

Murder may be compounded for by the payment of a fine to the family of the deceased, and freeing a Moslem from captivity.⁵ The next of kin to the deceased is at liberty to accept the satisfaction, or to have the murderer delivered up to him. Manslaughter is redeemable by the payment of a fine, and the freeing of a captive. If this is impossible to be done, a fast of two months together is ordered by way of penance.

Theft is punished by cutting off the offending part, the hand. In regard to personal injuries the law of retaliation is adopted from the Jewish law.⁶ This is seldom practiced, the punishment actually administered being a mulct or fine, which is paid to the injured party. For the punishment of minor offenses, resort is had to the infliction of blows.⁷

¹ *Modern Universal History*, i, 370. ² *Idem*, 370. ³ *Idem*, 371. ⁴ *Idem*, 371. ⁵ *Idem*, 372. ⁶ *Idem*, 373. ⁷ *Idem*, 373.

Philosophy.

The truths of science were but little known, nor was the power of thought largely manifested by the ancient Arabians. It was not until they had ceased wielding the sword in extending the boundaries of the Saracenic empire, and had settled down into comparative peace and quiet, that the native Arabian energies, having ceased to be expended in war, began to manifest their activity in the production of thought, the elimination of scientific truth, and in discoveries or inventions, its legitimate results.

History was successfully cultivated by the Arabians. Historians and chronicles were to be found in every state,¹ province and city. Historical and geographical dictionaries were invented. Each art and science had its history. Arabian money, antiquities, and inventions were subjects of historical research,² while medicine and philosophy had a greater number of historians than the other sciences. So much, at one period, was the Arabian mind given to history, that two histories of celebrated horses were written, and one of distinguished camels.

The Arabian mind has ever been peculiar in its development of thought, and its endeavors at the attainment of truth. There seems to have always been in it a love for the cultivation of the occult sciences, or those based upon weakness of the understanding and wildness of the imagination.³ Of these sciences there are several, but that of *Ism Allah*, or of the name of God, is esteemed the most sublime. The knowledge of this enables its possessor to discover what is passing in remote regions, to render himself familiar with genii, and to compel them to obey him; to dispose at pleasure of the winds and seasons; and to cure the bites of serpents, and many diseases and infirmities. The adept in this science can perform his prayers at noon in the Kaaba at Mecca, without leaving his own house at Bagdad or Aden. He procures sublime visions

¹ *Sismondi*, I, 39. ² *Idem*, 40. ³ *Niebuhr*, II, 281.

by shutting himself up in a dark place for a long time without eating or drinking,¹ and continuing to repeat aloud his prayers till he faints away. Recovering from the swoon and leaving the cave he relates the beatific visions he had seen in his trance, which generally consists in having had a view of God in his glory, of angels, of spirits of all sorts, and of heaven and hell.

Another of these pretended sciences is called Simia, which consists in teaching juggling tricks. These are performed by some orders of dervises,² and their feats consist in appearing to wound themselves with various instruments, such as piercing their bodies with lances, and driving pointed irons with mallets into their flesh.

The science of Kuna teaches the composition of billets, which being enclosed in small purses of skin, and worn on the head, arm, or breast,³ protect the wearer from the power of enchantment, and from all kinds of accident. At Diarbekir one was used to stop the unpleasant croaking of frogs, and at Aleppo for freeing the houses from flies. Their efficacy depended on the day, the hour, and the particular condition of the messenger who was sent for them, so that in the cases of failure there was no want of causes arising from the lack of some one or more of these essential conditions.

The science of Ramle is properly the art of fortune telling, which is practiced both by Jews and Mussulmen.⁴ In case of sickness the professors of it may be consulted, who return their answer after examining their book.

There is another occult science called Sihhr,⁵ which is pure open sorcery, and generally practiced for the purposes of mischief. To seduce a wife from her husband to a stranger, all that is requisite is to fix a certain billet on her door. The inhabitants of Oman profess to be peculiarly skilled in this execrable science.

In most of the branches of real science, the successful prosecution of which tests not only the facility, but also

¹*Niebuhr*, II, 282. ²*Idem*, 282, 283. ³*Idem*, 285. ⁴*Idem*, 286. ⁵*Idem*, 286.

the depth of thought, the Arabians have made less progress than might have been expected from their mental activity. They were early in the habit of examining the stars, particularly the fixed stars; but it was done for the purpose of obtaining a knowledge of their influences,¹ and not the laws by which they were governed. Whatever connection existed between the weather and the appearance of certain stars, was probably better understood by them than any other people. They also gave names to many of the stars which generally alluded to cattle and flocks.² Some of the names given by them were prior to the time of Job, and probably coeval with the first peopling of Arabia, as the Arabs were, from the beginning, a pastoral people.

During the flourishing period of Arabian thought and art, under the sway of the Abasside khaliphs, astronomy, and also other sciences, were cultivated. It must be confessed, however, that the Arabians added little to the mass of scientific knowledge. Still their activity and observation were not altogether barren of results. On the plains of Mesopotamia, where the Chaldæan had, ages previously, studied the stars,³ a degree of the earth's circle was measured with great accuracy, as an important element in arriving at the entire circumference of the globe. Their observation enabled them to draw up tables, known as the sabean tables, which were long held in high repute, but were subsequently supplanted by others founded upon stricter observation and more accurate calculation. The two principal astronomical facts that seem to be due to the Arabians, are the discovery of the motion of the sun's apogee,⁴ by Albategnius, and also the third inequality of the moon's motion, in virtue of which she moves quickest when she is at new or full moon, and slowest at the first and third quarter.⁵ These, however, they considered as of little importance, and the latter was even forgotten and

¹ *Universal History*, xviii, 406. ² *Idem*, 407. ³ *History of the Inductive Sciences*, I, 212; *Moors in Spain*, 259. ⁴ *History of the Inductive Sciences*, I, 340. ⁵ *Idem*, 228.

again rediscovered, six centuries later, by Tycho Brahe. That the knowledge possessed by the Arabians in astronomy, exerted but little practical influence, is apparent from the fact that their year consists of twelve lunar months;¹ their month commencing with every new moon, and when the sky is so clouded that they cannot see her rise,² they make no difficulty in beginning the month a day or two later. Although the true cause of eclipses is known to the astrologers, and all men of sense in Arabia,³ yet the common people still maintain the opinion that a huge fish pursues the planet which is eclipsed. In order to chase away this fish, women and children mounting upon the roofs of the houses, make a noise during the continuance of the eclipse, by beating upon brazen kettles and basins.

The great, and indeed the principal object which seems to have been had in view by the Arabians, in their study of astronomy, was the attainment of greater knowledge in astrology.⁴ This pretended science long maintained a high standing in the east, and, although the Koran forbids all Moslems to pry into futurity, by any form of divination, yet the Arabians have ever been attached to astrological investigation and practice.

Mathematical science, particularly the departments of arithmetic and trigonometry, received considerable improvements from the Arabians.⁵ The introduction into the former of the numerical characters,⁶ the employment of the digits, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 0, in the place of the cumbrous sexagesimal arithmetic of the Greeks, is due to the Arabians.⁷ In this particular they have rendered a service to science and the world, which it is difficult too highly to estimate. These numerical characters were not of their invention. They obtained them from India; but they gave them to Europe. Another improvement made

¹ *History of the Inductive Sciences*, I, 118. ² *Niebuhr*, II, 268, 269. ³ *Idem*, 271. ⁴ *Idem*, 271, 272. ⁵ *History of the Inductive Sciences*, I, 230. ⁶ *Moors in Spain*, 258. ⁷ *Sismondi*, 342.

by the Arabians was the introduction by Albategnius into calculation of the *sine* or half-chord of the double arc, instead of the chord of the arc itself, which had formerly been employed.

The sciences of mineralogy, botany, and zoology, were enriched by the Arabians.¹ They claim to have been the inventors of the science of chemistry, and some of the terms used, and many names of substances, as alcohol, alkali, etc., are evidently of Arabian origin.² The early nomenclature of that science indicates its Arabian origin. The two great objects that seem to have been had in view in their chemical investigations were alchemy and medicine.

The first bore to chemistry about the same relations that astrology does to astronomy. It assumed that all metals were compounded of the same elements, that all were more or less perfect,³ gold being the most so, silver the next, and so on; and that by proper means and processes it was possible to convert all other metals into gold. Gold was their king, and silver their queen; and hence when gold and quicksilver were combined, it was represented as a marriage between the king and queen, the product of which were their children. Gold was also their sun, silver their moon, copper, iron, tin, lead, their Venus, Mars, Jupiter, Saturn.

The processes used were generally mixture and heat, and these were clothed with a personal character, and spoken of as relations, struggles and victories. Some elements conquered, and some were conquerors. Some preparations were called magisteries, supposed to possess the power of changing one body into the substance of another. The works on alchemy or chemistry were entitled "*Of the Search of Perfection*," "*Of the Sum of Perfection, or of the Perfect Magistry*," "*Of the Invention of Verity, or Perfection*." These titles were affixed to the works of the celebrated Geber, the Arabian chemist. The substance

¹ *Sismondi*, I, 41. ² *Moors in Spain*, 264. ³ *History of the Inductive Sciences*, I, 303, 304.

supposed to possess this power of transmuting all the baser metals into gold, has been called the philosopher's stone, and was the anxious search of the Arabian chemists during the most enlightened period of Arabian history.

A delusion equally singular and extraordinary prevailed in the relation of chemistry to medicine. There also, it was supposed, a substance was attainable which would possess the powers of a universal medicine, having the gift of curing or preventing diseases; of prolonging life; and of producing bodily strength and beauty. This was supposed by some to be the same preparation that would transmute baser metals into gold,¹ but it is generally known under the name of the "elixir of life." The attainment of these substances was the great object of Arabian chemistry. Although there was an entire failure in the great end had in view in all their researches, yet there is little doubt but that in their investigations many important chemical truths were brought to light.

The Arabians paid much attention to the science of medicine,² and produced many eminent physicians. Their chief guides were Hippocrates and Galen. They attempted to reconcile the doctrine of these writers with the physiology of Aristotle, and introduced into their medical system many inconsistent tenets and useless refinements. They administered gold and silver and precious stones to purify the blood.³

Speculative philosophy was ardently, even passionately, cultivated by the Arabians. Schools, academies and colleges were founded and flourished under the dominion of the Abassides.⁴ Bagdad was the capital of letters, as well as of the khaliphs. At one period six thousand professors and pupils cultivated liberal studies in the college of Bagdad.⁵ Bassora and Cufa were also seats of learning, and even Balkh,⁶ Ispahan and Samarcand were the homes of

¹ *History of the Inductive Sciences*, I, 305. ² *Enfield's History of Philosophy*, 437. ³ *Moors in Spain*, 263, 264. ⁴ *Sismondi*, I, 31. ⁵ *Moors in Spain*, 249. ⁶ *Sismondi*, I, 31.

science. Alexandria boasted more than twenty schools for the propagation of philosophy. Cairo contained a great number of colleges. Even in Fez and Morocco the most magnificent buildings were appropriated to the purposes of instruction. But Spain, of all the countries of the west, was in a more especial manner, the seat of Arabian learning. Cordova, Granada, and Seville rivaled each other in the splendor and magnificence of their schools, colleges, academies, and extensive libraries. In the various cities of Spain, no less than seventy libraries were open for the instruction of the public at the very period when all the rest of Europe, except the light that feebly glimmered in the city of Constantine, was plunged into the deepest ignorance. By these means science, philosophy and the liberal arts were more or less cultivated throughout the Saracenic empire from the beginning of the ninth to the end of the thirteenth century.¹ During this period much of the literature and philosophy of Greece were translated into the Arabic language, and studied in their schools.

The first object of the Arabians seems to have been to perfect their own language.² To accomplish this, two rival schools were established, one at Cufa and the other at Bassora, in which rhetoric and grammar were extensively studied, and the Arabic language analyzed, reduced to rules, and rendered more complete and perfect as an instrument of thought and imagination.

The philosophy which met with a universal reception throughout the Saracenic empire was the peripatetic. The works of Aristotle were translated into the Arabic language, and a host of commentators speedily appear to render plain to the Arabian mind the works of the great master. Averrhoes and Avicenna are names which stand high on the records of Arabian thought,³ the first of whom was merely a commentator on the works of Aristotle, and the second was a physician of considerable eminence who corrupted rather than improved philosophy.⁴

¹ *Enfield*, 323. ² *Sismondi*, I, 32. ³ *Idem*, 40. ⁴ *Enfield*, 428.

The Arabian mind is described as being more ingenious than profound, and is attached rather to subtleties than to substantial truths.¹ "Their object was more to dazzle than to instruct. Their obscurity gave them, in the eyes of the vulgar, an air of profundity. They exhausted their imaginations in search of mysteries; they enveloped science in clouds, instead of penetrating into its real nature, and dissipating the obscurity produced by the grandeur of the subject or the weakness of the human intellect; an obscurity which is not the offspring of philosophy, but the obstacle over which it is the aim of philosophy to triumph. More enthusiastic than enterprising, they were willing rather to consider man as the oracle of all human knowledge, than to seek for it in the primary sources of nature. Aristotle was worshiped by them as a sort of divinity. In their opinion all philosophy was to be found in his writings, and they explained every metaphysical question according to the scholastic rules." With this character of mind, and possessing these views, it is not surprising that they should regard a subtle commentary on the work of the Stagyrte as one of the highest efforts of human genius.² But these commentaries generally failed in teaching or illustrating the doctrines of Aristotle. They gave to the philosopher a tinge of opinions borrowed from another source, that of mysticism. Their mania of discovering mysteries in the simplest things, and hidden meanings in the clearest phrases, threw such doubt and difficulty over the real doctrines of Aristotle that the philosopher, could he have appeared again upon the earth, could not have recognized his own philosophy.

The Arabian mind did not, in fact, present a proper soil into which to cast the seeds of philosophic truth.³ They had given the rein to the imagination, and wandered into the region of poetry and romance. Thus their fancy had been awakened, but their rational powers remained torpid, and their speculative tendencies inert. Their minds had

¹ *Sismondi*, I, 40. ² *Idem*, 41. ³ *History of the Inductive Sciences*, I, 277.

not been brought into conflict with each other in such a manner as to arouse into exercise all their dormant energies. They had not, like the Greek mind, had a gradual growth, up to the highest point of possible attainment. While still infants in philosophy, they were attempted to be fed with the same nutrient material that had sustained the Greek mind in its firm manhood. Hence we find their new wealth of philosophy rather encumbering them with its weight, than enriching and strengthening them with its sustaining power.

Hence probably may be derived one reason why the result of Arabian thinking has been of so trifling a character. They have been materially wanting in that which is the greatest of all philosophies, fruit. Notwithstanding their great activity, they have produced no men and no discoveries,¹ that have materially influenced the course and destinies of human knowledge. They followed their Greek leaders, generally with entire servility, rarely rising to the dignity of independent thought, or original conception.

They carried, it is true, the subtlety which they extracted from the peripatetic philosophy into a variety of interpretations of the Koran, which resulted in splitting the Mahometans up into a variety of sects,² and in the establishment of a new kind of philosophical theology, called the wisdom of words, or the science of reason, those professing it being called rationalists. These are described as "certain philosophical sciolists, who judge of things, not according to truth and nature, but according to their own imaginations,³ and who confound men by a multiplicity of specious words without meaning. This, in its character, bore a great resemblance to the scholastic philosophy, which, for so long a period,⁴ confounded and distracted the world with its obscure subtleties, and barren disputations.

Some new light has been thrown upon Arabian philosophy, or the development of Arabian thought, by the recent

¹*History of the Inductive Sciences*, i, 276. ²*Enfield*, 424. ³*Idem*, 425. ⁴*Idem*, 425.

translation from Arabic of a work of Algazāli, which has been baptized "Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit."¹ He flourished in the eleventh century. There is a marked similarity between his course of thought and that of Descartes given to the world some centuries later. He first passed through the dark and cheerless region of scepticism. When he would repose himself upon the evidence of the senses, reason interfered, and, aided by experience, contested its authenticity. They reported the shadow as substance, and as fixed and immovable, and the orbs of heaven as small points. Reason demonstrated the falsity of these reports. He then fled to reason, but the senses replied, "What assurance have you that your confidence in first principles is not of the same nature as your confidence in us? When you relied on us, reason stepped in and gave us the lie; had not reason been there, you would have continued to rely upon us. May there not exist some other judge superior to reason, who, if he appeared, would refute the judgments of reason, in the same way that reason refuted us? The nonappearance of this judge does not prove his nonexistence." Difficulties, of a nature somewhat similar, arose from the sleeping state. Its visions are to us, at the time, realities. We never suspect them untrue. The waking state discloses to us that they were nothing but visions. What assurance have we that the apparent realities of the waking state are anything more than the visions of the sleeping? They are true as respects our condition at the moment. So were the sleeping. But another condition may present itself which may be to our awakened state the same that our awakened state now is to our sleeping, so that, in respect to this higher condition, the waking is but sleep. This higher condition he suspects may be the ecstasy of the soufis.

He finally escaped the consequences of scepticism by taking refuge in the higher region of faith. He returned, as he says, to the admission of intellectual notions as the

¹ *Edinburgh Review*, xxvi, 178-84.

basis of all certitude. But this was not by systematic reasoning and accumulation of proofs, but by a flash of light which God sent into his soul. Whoever imagines that truth can only be rendered evident by proofs, places narrow limits to the wide compassion of the Creator. It is curious to compare the Frenchman's with the Arabian's means of escape from the depths of scepticism. They both agree in assuming certain intellectual notions as the source of all truth. Descartes founded their credibility upon revelations from within, Algazâli upon those from above. Descartes said, "I think, therefore I exist." Algazâli, "God exists, and he has revealed to me the fact of my existence."

Having thus escaped from scepticism he next engages in reviewing the different systems of thought prevalent in his day. They were:

I. The dogmatists, who ground their doctrines purely upon reason. These, he admitted, realized their aim, but that aim was not his.

II. The allegorists, who receive their doctrine from an imâum, and believe themselves the sole possessors of the truth.

III. The philosophers, whose great instrument is logic, and who propose to proceed upon the strength of demonstration. These, he attempts to refute by their own weapons.

IV. The soufis, who pretend to an immediate intuition, to whom the great body of truth is as directly open, as are material phenomena to the senses of common men. Soufism is not strictly a system of philosophy, nor a religious sect. It was rather a rule of life adopted for the attainment of a certain state or condition. This state or condition was a species of ecstasy.

The great aim of the soufist was to free the mind from earthly considerations, to purify it from all passions, and to leave it only God as a subject for meditation. High truths were to be attained here, not by study, but by transport, by a transformation of the soul during ecstasy.

The soul was regarded as an emanation from deity. Knowledge and being were regarded as identical. To *know* the divine intelligence, it was, therefore, necessary to *be* that divine intelligence, and that not as an emanation, but as an identification with it. The soul must be loosened from its corporeal prison, separated from individual consciousness, divested of its personality, and become absorbed in the infinite intelligence from which it emanated. This act of absorption was the ecstasy. Reminiscence became changed into intuition, the soul went back to its parent, to its God.

Some hold that ecstasy is not, like reason, permanent, but essentially transitory, and that the absorption into deity is also transitory. Others have gone beyond this, and declared that their absorption was permanent.

The intellectual intuition of the soufis reposes upon two assumptions. The one is, that the human mind, "in the spacious circuit of its musing," can soar into the supersensual supernotional regions. The other is, that reason, which serves so effectually as a guide in the sensual, notional regions of mental excursion, ceases to act as such in those illimitable spheres beyond.

The means by which this state or condition was to be arrived at was by fasting, by subjugation of the passions, by purging the heart from all mundane desires, in such a manner as to leave unclouded all the intellectual faculties.

Another term by which the state of the mind during ecstasy was designated was prophetism. This was held to be the fourth stage of intellectual development. It is singular that the three first stages correspond with the three elements in the psychology of Kant, and the fourth is similar to the intellectual intuition of Schelling and Hegel.

The first stage was that of simple sensation. The senses were regarded as the first inlets of knowledge.

The second stage was that of understanding. The third that of reason, in which there exists the perception of the necessary, the possible, the absolute, and those higher

objects with which the lower stages ceased to make him acquainted. "After this," says Algazāli, "comes a new period, when another eye is opened, by which man perceives things hidden from others, perceives all that will be, perceives things which escape the perception of reason, as the objects of reason escape the understanding, and as the objects of understanding escape the sensitive faculty."

Although the thinking process in Arabia has been represented as barren and profitless, yet many inventions or discoveries are claimed by the Arabians, or, at least, were derived from them.¹ Among these was the invention of paper. This had, from all antiquity, been manufactured in China from silk. When the city of Samarcand was taken by the Arabians about the year 704, an Arabian of the name of Joseph Amrou carried the process of paper making to Mecca, and employed cotton in the manufacture. The invention spread with rapidity through the Arabian dominions, and in Spain large manufactories were established, and flax was there substituted in the place of cotton as the material of its manufacture.

Gunpowder was known to the Arabians at least a century before any traces of it are found in the European historians. It was employed in the thirteenth century by the Moors in their wars in Spain, and some indications remain of its having been known by them in the eleventh century. The invention of the compass has been given alternately to the Italians and the French in the thirteenth century. It was known to the Arabians in the eleventh.

These several inventions, paper, gunpowder, the compass, have worked almost an entire revolution in education, and the evolution, progress and propagation of thought, in the art of war, and in navigation. They were not probably the inventions of the Arabians, but received from the further east, and by them communicated to Europe when she awoke from the slumber of the dark ages.

¹ *Sismondi*, I, 42.

The conquest of Alexandria by Amrou gave to the Arabians a philosophy, in the same manner that the appearance of Mahomet gave to them a religion. It is a remark, that has universal application to all nations, that in the earlier periods of their history the great elements of humanity become more or less blended together and enveloped with each other. This was the case among the Arabians in regard to the elements of religion and philosophy. The doctrines of the Koran and those of the Alexandrian school of philosophy became mingled up and blended with each other in a variety of ways. The product was Arabian philosophy.¹ Those professing it were, speaking in general terms, divided into two great sects or parties. The one was called idealists, who agreed with the Platonists of Alexandria, in holding that the world was eternal, and endeavored to unite this belief to their own prescribed religion. To this school belonged the soufis. The other were the dialecticians or reasoners, who assumed the positive doctrines of the Koran as their ground, and endeavored to explain, on philosophical principles, the origin of the world. They combatted the doctrine of the idealists. The union effected between the Koran and the doctrines of the Alexandrian school in producing the Arabian philosophy, was much the same as that effected between the doctrines of Christianity and those of the Greek philosophers in producing the schoolmen.

The Arabians translated into their language many of the Grecian writers, and thus preserved them from destruction. Europe, on its awakening and shaking off the slumber of the middle ages, received them from Arabia. Thus, although the course and current of Arabian thought failed to fertilize its own arid and desert regions, yet when it discharged its treasures upon the more genial soil of Europe, it prepared it for the reception of a nobler seed, and the production of a mighty harvest.

¹ *Tennemann's History of Philosophy*, 238-9.

Art.

Arabia seems never to have been destined to be the favored country of art. The arts of design, in particular, owe little to the genius, ingenuity and talent of the Arabians. Previous to the time of Mahomet these arts had made no progress in Arabia. They might be said to be unknown there. The knowledge of them, subsequently acquired by the Arabians, was owing to the people whom they subdued far more than to their own genius. The only one of these arts in which they can claim to have made any progress is the art architectural.

The Saracenic or Arabian style of architecture is particularly distinguished by light decorations and splendor. It is sometimes called the moresque or Moorish style. A flowery decoration, called arabesque, is common in the Moorish buildings of Europe and Africa.¹ The Moorish in the west seems modeled after the remains of Roman buildings found in Spain, while the Arabian of the east is more formed after the Grecian model.

The moresque architecture seems to possess no fixed rules, but regards lightness and elegance alone as constituting the fundamental laws of the art.² In variety of structure the architect is left to follow the bent of his own peculiar fancy. The remains of Moorish buildings in Granada, Seville and Cordova, cannot be looked upon without exciting admiration. This is particularly the case with the celebrated Alhambra, or palace of the Moorish kings, at Granada.

In the east, the mosque, or Mahometan house of worship, exhibits the purest specimen of the Saracenic style of architecture. One distinguishing feature is the peculiar form of the arch.³ It is an elliptical curve, and is both unphilosophical and insecure. It is found in the dome of the oriental mosque, which sometimes exhibits a large segment of a sphere, appearing as if inflated. At other

¹ *Encyclopedia Americana*, I, 342. ² *Idem*, IX, 66. ³ *Idem*, I, 342, 343.

times it is concavo-convex in its outline. Besides its dome, every mosque has one or more minarets, which are tall, slender towers, contrasting strongly with the appearance of the dome.

The arts of painting and sculpture seem never to have been cultivated by the Arabians.

From the great extension of the Saracen arms, it might be inferred that the art of war was well understood by the Arabians. This, however, would not probably be conceded by the military tactician. The Saracen mode of warfare was peculiar to themselves, and in open defiance of all the laws of tactics. The Greek and Roman charge was the steady effort of a firm and compact infantry, sustained by a force of cavalry.¹ The military force of the Saracens was formed chiefly, if not entirely, of cavalry and archers. The battles fought by the Greeks and Romans were continuous, sustained efforts, which were kept up, with little or no interruption, until victory declared for one or the other party. Those fought by the Arabians were interrupted, consisted more of single combats, and abounded in flying skirmishes. With them a great battle not unusually continued several days without any decisive event occurring to decide the victory. The battle of Cadesia, which decided the fate of Persia, lasted four days, and that of Tours, where they were compelled to relinquish the conquest of Europe, three. The Greek and Roman battles were a display of physical force urged forward under a rigid system of discipline, and in obedience to rules, which the wisdom of ages had sanctioned in reference to its disposition and manner of action. In the Arabian were seen more the efforts of undisciplined valor; the workings of a spirit wrought up to the highest degree of enthusiasm and fanaticism; like genius, making its own laws, and disregarding every other. Could the Arabian war spirit have been, and forced to act in subjection to rule, it would probably have been shorn of its power, and accomplished little.

¹ *Gibbon*, 987.

There is one singular fact in relation to their instruments of warfare, and that is their early use of gunpowder. The discovery of this destructive agent, which has effected so mightily a revolution in the arrangement and prosecution of warlike enterprise, has been generally attributed to a German chemist,¹ but it was known to the Arabians at least a century before any traces of it appear in European historians. In their wars in Spain,² it was frequently employed by them as early as the thirteenth century, and there are also some indications of its having been known and used by them in the fourth century. Whether they derived a knowledge of it directly or indirectly from the Chinese, who are supposed to have had a knowledge of it for several centuries prior to that era, or whether it was a discovery of their own chemists, is not, perhaps, now possible to determine.

The great majority of the ancient Arabians, before the time of Mahomet, could neither read nor write.³ Among such it may appear strange to look for the higher arts of oratory and poetry. And yet there seems little doubt but that these flourished in ancient Arabia, as well as under the sway of the later khaliphs. The truth is, these arts are not dependent for their successful cultivation upon the deep things of science, or a high degree of intellectual culture. In general, these bear to each other an inverse ratio. Oratory, the art of speaking well and effectively, or, in more general terms, eloquence, the art of persuasion; and poetry, the art of embodying in glowing terms the power, sublimity, and beauty of the ideal, may be found among rude as well as among polished nations, in the camp of the Bedouin, as well as in the court of the khaliph. Wherever are found human feelings, emotions and passions; and wherever nature spreads around her drapery in its variety and vastness, there the orator and poet readily find the materials for their high-wrought structures. It may

¹ *Sismondi*, I, 42. ² *Encyclopedia Americana*, VI, 105, 106. ³ *Universal History*, XVIII, 401.

well be doubted whether the Athenian assembly, or the Roman senate, in their brightest day, ever furnished higher or purer specimens of oratory than the council fires of the American savage. The clouds of heaven were infinitely greater agents in the hands of the orator and poet when they were the drapery of departed spirits, than when they were simply regarded as the collections of aqueous vapor.

The cultivation of the art of oratory has always been subject to one condition, and that is, that proper occasions for its exercise should be furnished. This has depended upon the religious, social and political institutions of the nation. In despotic governments there is, in general, no occasion for the practice of oratory, and hence the art is there never cultivated. In democratic or republican forms of government where the people are the great source of power, and their popular assemblies liable to be influenced by the powers of the public speaker, the art of oratory is cultivated with great success. In the patriarchal form of government, where great personal freedom is maintained, there is also occasion for the practice of this art. Hence its cultivation among the ancient Arabians.

The early Arabian orations were of two sorts, metrical and prosaic, the first resembling pearls or brilliant sentences¹ strung together by a metrical arrangement; the other, loose ones. They endeavored to attain excellence in both,² and whoever, in an assembly of the people, could persuade to a great enterprise, or dissuade from a dangerous one, or give other wholesome advice, was honored with the title of khuteb, or orator. The method adopted by the public speaker, seems to have been very different from that of the Greek and Roman orators. They had not any regular, connected discourse, commencing with the exordium and closing with the peroration. Their sentences were given forth like loose gems, glowing and brilliant, but without that relationship to others, or connection among themselves that is essential to a well

¹ *Universal History*, xviii, 401. ² *Idem*, 401.

ordered and connected discourse. This led almost necessarily to the cultivation of that kind of oratory which abounds in full and harmonious periods, in elegance of the expression, and acuteness of the proverbial sayings. The first leaders of the Moslem armies were in the habit of fortifying their faith, and increasing their zeal and courage, by oratorical addresses, which, no doubt, possessed much of the true spirit of eloquence.

After the age of Mahomet and his immediate successors, a revolution was effected in the cultivation of the oratorical art. Popular eloquence ceased to be any longer practiced. The occasion for its use ceased with the destruction of personal freedom. The despotism of the khaliphs supplanted the liberty of the desert, and even the leaders of the armies regarded it as beneath them to address orations to the people or the soldiers.¹ They came to rely less on their zeal and courage, and more on their obedience. The same kind of change was gradually effecting, that is almost invariably wrought out in the passage of a nation from some one of the stages of barbarism to a greater or less degree of refinement.

But oratory, although it ceased to be decked in the popular garb, nevertheless ceased not its existence. It arrayed itself in the panoply of literature, and went into the academy, or armed itself with the Koran and ascended the pulpit. Here it displayed the full beauty and harmony of the Arabian language. Poetry lent its brilliancy and prose its vigor, and orators were produced, such as Maleh, Schoraiph and Al-Harisi, who are said to have rivaled even Demosthenes and Cicero.²

Mahomet had himself set the example of preaching his faith in the pulpit. The practice of preaching in the mosques became an established custom among the Moslems. The name of khuteb, or orator, was appropriated to the sacred preachers, and that of khotbah, or harangue, to their sermons. Many of these sermons are still pre-

¹ *Sismondi*, I, 32, 33. ² *Idem*, 33.

served in the library of the Escorial,¹ and they are found in style much to resemble those preached by the Christians. The text was taken from the Koran, and the writings of the Mahometan doctors were made use of in opening, illustrating and strengthening the subject selected.

The poetic art was early cultivated by the ancient Arabians to a still greater extent than the oratorical.² It even preceded among them the art of writing, and was a very effective means at that early period, in preserving and polishing their language. In their poems were preserved their genealogies, the rights of tribes, and the memory of great actions.³ Accordingly, the appearance of a poet in a tribe was a subject of much congratulation. Entertainments were made on the occasion, women appeared dressed in their nuptial ornaments, who sang, to the sound of timbrels, the happiness of the tribe in having one to protect its honor, preserve descents, and transmit to posterity the memory of illustrious actions. Most of the knowledge they possessed on moral and economical subjects was contained in the works of their poets, and they were consulted, therefore, as a kind of oracle in cases of doubt and difficulty.

The ancient Arabians had a custom which served in an eminent degree to keep alive the love of poetry, and to strengthen, among the poets, the spirit of emulation.⁴ The tribes held an annual meeting at the city of Ocadh, which lasted an entire month. Here they held a mart or fair in which trade was carried on, and also celebrated a species of games in which poetical compositions were recited, and prizes awarded for the best performances. Seven of the most distinguished of these ancient poets have been celebrated by the oriental writers under the title of the Arabian pleiades, and their works were preserved and suspended around the Kaaba. There were reckoned three points of felicity among the Arabians, which were all matters for

¹ *Sismondi*, I, 33. ² *Idem*, 33. ³ *Universal History*, XVIII, 403. ⁴ *Idem*, 404.

public congratulation. These were the birth of a boy, the rise of a poet, and the fall of a foal of generous breed.

Mahomet, although he cultivated poetry, suppressed the fair and assembly at Ocadh, and from that time the Arabian muses were silent during the extension of the Saracenic empire, and until the reign of the Abassides.

Under the Ommiades of Spain and the Abassides of Bagdad,¹ particularly Haroun al Raschid and his successor, Al Mamoun, the Arabian poetry arrived at its highest degree of splendor. The strains of the Arabian muse have very generally embraced love poems almost without number,² and also elegies on the death of their heroes, or of their beauties. Their poetry was almost entirely lyric or didactic. The latter embraced some of the most abstruse branches of science, such as grammar, rhetoric and arithmetic. They had also heroic poems to celebrate the praises of their distinguished men, or animate the courage of their soldiers. But they had no epic poems. Their poetry rhymed like our own,³ and the rhyming is often carried further in the construction of the verse, while the uniformity of the sound is frequently echoed throughout the whole expression. In their lyric poetry they extend to the whole sentence that poetical harmony which already prevailed in each distinct expression or individual verse.

The Arabian style of poetry proclaims at once its eastern origin. There is displayed in it great subtlety and refinement of thought.⁴ Noble sentiments are clothed in graceful and elegant expression. Although the Arabians had great respect, and even reverence for almost everything Grecian, yet they despised their poetry which appeared to them timid, cold, and constrained. It was little fitted to oriental taste, which would rest satisfied with nothing short of what the Greeks and Europeans would consider an abuse of the imagination and the intellect. Bold metaphors, extravagant allegories, and excessive hyperboles entered as essential elements into their poetical composi-

¹ *Sismondi*, I, 33. ² *Idem*, 36. ³ *Idem*, 37. ⁴ *Idem*, 36.

tions. They are ever seeking to make the most brilliant use of the boldest and most gigantic images. They never could regard beauties as superfluities, although of constant recurrence, and nothing conducive to ornament could ever be thrown away. They burdened their poetry with riches to excite admiration at their display, and brought the poetic art the more strongly into view, the more they neglected natural sentiment. Thus their poetry was gorgeous but inflated; abounding in abruptness of expression, high sounding in terms, and reveling amid the depths of an imagination ever prurient in its splendid creations.

The dramatic art was unknown in Arabia. Although they possessed neither the epic nor the drama, yet they invented a peculiar kind of composition, which, to some extent, was a substitute for both. Allusion is here had to those curious tales known as the *Arabian Nights' Entertainments*. These tales had their birth under the sway of the Abassides, and after the Arabians, yielding the sword to the Tartars, Turks and Persians, devoted themselves to commerce, literature and the arts.¹ There is less therefore, of the warlike than of the mercantile to be found in their composition, differing very much in this respect from the romances of chivalry. Riches and artificial luxuries are made to enter into competition with the splendid gifts of the fairies. These tales transport us into the realms of marvels and of mysteries.² They create a new and interesting mythology, that of fairies and of genii; extending the boundaries of the world beyond the merely sensible, and multiplying the riches and strength of human nature, besides opening new sources of enjoyment. These tales readily found their way into the literature of the south of Europe, and, passing from tongue to tongue, and from nation to nation, have exerted a mighty influence upon the imagination and thoughts of widely extended masses of men. By throwing their charmed influence over the mind of youth, they acquired a mastery,

¹ *Sismondi*, 38. ² *Idem*, 39.

more or less extensive, over the subsequent developments of the individual. These have by no means yet lost their charm in the east.¹ They there constitute the treasure of a particular class of men and women, whose constant occupation it is to recite these tales to crowds of admiring auditors, who delight in exchanging unpleasant realities for the brighter dreams of fiction and fairy land.

Another art much cultivated in the court of the khaliphs was music.² The professors of this art were cherished, honored and rewarded. They are asserted to have invented the lute, and to have made use of the organ, flute, harp, tabor, and mandoline.

Thus art, in some of its various departments, is indebted, in no small degree, to the Arabians for its successful cultivation. The splendor that surrounded the court of the khaliphs, particularly of Haroun Al Raschid and Al Mamoun, could neither be produced nor sustained without scattering around profusely the gifts which art alone can bestow.

¹ *Bell*, IV, 254. ² *Moors in Spain*, 262.

CHAPTER XIII.

PALESTINE—ITS DESCRIPTION, HISTORY, INDUSTRY, RELIGION, SOCIETY, GOVERNMENT, PHILOSOPHY, AND ART.

Palestine.

Leaving Arabia, and advancing north, the next country is Palestine, the land of the Palestines, or the Philistines,¹ the early occupants of its western border, from whence was derived its name. The extent of this land has varied at different periods of time. It has never, however, been of large extent. Its length has been some two hundred miles, and its breadth varying from fifteen to eighty miles. On the north it was terminated by mountains which separated it from Phœnicia and Syria.² On the south lay Arabia, on the west the Mediterranean, and on the east Arabia.

Thus we find, laying side by side with each other, and separated only by an ill defined, and often imaginary boundary line, two nations, the Arabians and the Hebrews; both having existed from the remotest antiquity, both belonging to the same Semitic race, and speaking different dialects of the same Aramæan language, both derived in great part from Abraham, the same common ancestor, and yet whose history and civilization differs from each other as widely as their respective missions, the one being to develop the Mahometan, and the other the Christian religion.

The most striking feature in the physical geography of Palestine is its mountains.³ These produce great inequalities of surface, and no inconsiderable variety of climate. At the north, and forming its northern boundary, are the lofty mountains of Lebanon, with the cedar flourishing

¹ *Calmet's Dictionary*, 696. ² *Horne*, 161. ³ *Idem*, 175.

amid their perpetual snows, and the perennial streams diffusing fertility as they descend from their rugged sides into the plains below. Not far from the shores of the Mediterranean, extends Mount Carmel, and centrally, and about midway between the Mediterranean and the valley of the Jordan and Dead sea, are the mountains of Israel and of Judah,¹ while beyond the Jordan valley stretches the range of Mount Hermon, and the mountains of Gilead.

Many of these mountains abound in caves, and they anciently served as places of refuge for the inhabitants when overwhelmed by some fearful calamity.² They still furnish a shelter and place of protection to the Arabs.

The rocky summits of many of these mountains were anciently employed as altars, on which sacrifices were offered to Jehovah. They were also, in the times of Jewish idolatry, converted into places for idol worship. It is remarkable that mountains or "high places," seem always to have been sought after by the Hebrews as localities most desirable for worship. The law was given from the summit of Sinai. The Saviour was transfigured on a mountain. A mountain was the scene and witness of his temptation. The worship of the idolatrous Israelites was conducted in groves and high places. The Samaritans worshiped in a temple erected on the summit of Mount Gerizim. Abraham was about to sacrifice Isaac on Mount Moriah. The Jewish temple was erected upon the same mountain. The crucifixion occurred upon the Mount Calvary, and the ascension to heaven from that of Mount Olivet.

These mountains divided Palestine into a series of valleys and table lands, leaving two great plains,³ called the region about Jordan and the plain of Esdraelon or Jezreel.

There is only one considerable river, the Jordan or Gardan, the river of Dan,⁴ so called because it takes its rise

¹ *Horne*, 176, 177. ² *Idem*, 178. ³ *Taylor*, 36. ⁴ *Idem*, 172.

near the city of Dan on a spur of Mount Lebanon. Its course is about one hundred miles, running through the sea of Galilee, it is said, without mingling with its waters, and finally losing itself in the Dead sea or lake Asphaltites.

The sea of Galilee is a beautiful sheet of water, sweet, and abounding in fish, about sixteen miles by six.

The Dead sea is about seventy-two miles by nineteen, a body of bitter, saline water, impregnated with bitumen, and occupying the site of Sodom and Gomorah, and the other cities of the plain. The most memorable-valleys of Palestine are those of Siddim, Elah, and Hinnom, the plains those of the Mediteranean sea,¹ the plains, so called, in which stood the first five Palestine cities of Ascalon, Gath, Gaza, Ekron, and Ashdod, and the great plain or plain of Jezreel or Esdraelon, extending from Mount Carmel and the Mediterranean, to the point where the Jordan issues from the sea of Galilee.

The climate is less variable than in more western countries. The agricultural occupations of the Hebrews naturally led them in a division of the year corresponding with their employments.² They had their seed time and harvest, cold and heat, summer and winter. Their seed time lasted from the beginning of October to the beginning of December, weather cloudy, misty, and sometimes rainy. Their winter extended from the beginning of December to the beginning of February, cold, severe on the mountains. Their cold season commences at the close of winter, and continues to the beginning of April, weather cold at the commencement, but gradually grows warm, especially on the plains. Their harvest is from the beginning of April to the beginning of June, the weather for the most part delightful. Their summer continues from the beginning of June to the beginning of August, the heat all the while increasing. Their hot season is from the beginning of August to the beginning of October.

¹*Taylor*, 178, 179. ²*Idem*, 169, 170.

The heat during this time intense, especially in the plain of Jericho.

Palestine was a land of almost unsurpassed fertility. Its perennial harvest, the salubrity of its air, its limpid springs,¹ its rivers, lakes, and plains, its hills and vales, its serene climate, all combined with a soil of inexhaustible wealth, contributed to invest it with all the elements of immense fertility. It is said to have exceeded Egypt in the abundance of its productions. Besides wheat, rye, barley, beans, etc., it was the land of the palm, the date, the fig, the olive, the pomegranate, and the vine; producing, in exuberant luxuriance, almost every variety of vegetable from the cedar of Lebanon down to the cotton plant.

Few, if any, localities upon the surface of our globe, have been the scenes of a more varied history, or have, in the progress of centuries, gathered around them a more deeply interesting train of events, than the hills and valleys and plains of Palestine. Bright and beautiful as an eastern clime, seated upon the verge of the west, varied and glorious in its physical features, it brings down to us recollections of the Canaanite as he bowed before his idol deities, of the Hebrew as he worshiped the god of Abraham, of the Christian crusader and pilgrim as he knelt at the church of the holy sepulchre, and of the Arab as he adored the one God, and Mahomet as his prophet. The facts of Hebrew history and civilization are known with a much greater degree of certainty than those of other eastern nations, as they repose mostly, if not entirely, upon the authority of the sacred scriptures. Around these, therefore, is collected a light so bright and vivid, that in its effulgence stand revealed all their parts and proportions. The Hebrews are a kind of land-mark, by which we may be guided in our investigation in regard to other ancient and eastern nations and peoples. Through them light is also let in upon other nations that were connected with them,

¹ *Taylor*, 181.

in war or in the arts of peace. Were the Bible to be stricken out of existence, a wide blank would be left in ancient history, which, without another revelation, it would be impossible to fill up. It is, in fact, the light of truth reflected from the book of God that illumines the night of history.

Egypt had its marble monuments, Arabia its monumental man, who had remained there unchanged from the highest antiquity. Palestine also has a similar monument, but he is not there. Her man remains unchanged, and therefore monumental, but he no longer breathes her atmosphere, or traverses her vales and mountains. He is a wanderer in other lands, but still remains an Hebrew of the Hebrews.

Palestine was originally peopled by the descendants of Canaan, the youngest son of Ham and grandson of Noah.¹ He divided the country among his eleven sons, each one of whom became the head of a numerous clan or tribe. The occupation of the Canaanites continued for more than seven centuries. It was these whom the Hebrews were commanded to exterminate. Besides these, there were the Philistines, descendants of Misraim, from Egypt, occupying a small strip of territory along the sea-shore in the south-west of Palestine; the Midianites, at the north-east point of the Red sea, and also a point on the east of the Dead sea;² the Moabites and Ammonites, descendants of the incestuous offspring of Lot, dwelling on the east of the Jordan; the Amalekites, descendants of Ham, on the south coast westward of Jordan; and the Edomites, descendants of Esau, who possessed themselves of the country southward of Palestine and the Red sea.

In the year B. C. 1921, was seen wandering over the plains of Mesopotamia a nomadic shepherd famed for his wealth, wisdom and probity. All around him were sunk in gross idolatry. He alone was selected and made the subject of a call and a covenant, and with his flocks and

¹ *Horne*, 161. ² *Idem*, II, 15.

herds, left the land of his fathers, and journeyed westward toward the land of Palestine. This was Abraham the father of the faithful.¹ His descendants, of the Hebrew race, continued shepherds for about the period of five hundred years, four hundred and thirty of which were spent in Egypt. During their sojourn in this country they were in great part transformed from shepherds to agriculturists and artisans. They were compelled to labor and live in cities. During this period they probably adopted the religion of the Egyptians. About 1500 years before Christ appeared Moses, an instrument in the hands of God to terminate the bondage of the Hebrews, to give them the law, and to establish that peculiar political organization by which the religious, political, and, to some extent, social elements of the Hebrews, were bound up in a theocracy. Six hundred thousand Hebrews, besides children, left Egypt under the direction of Moses. Having wandered forty years in the wilderness, during which all those whose habits were formed in Egypt had been called away, they arrived on the borders of Palestine.

Here commences a new era in Hebrew history. The heroic period had now arrived. Under their leader Joshua, and others, who in subsequent times occasionally arose up amongst them,² they were to subdue their heritage in order peaceably to possess it. As fast as they came to possess it, they laid aside the shepherd and assumed the agricultural state. This was the period of the judges, which continued for about four hundred years. During all this time the condition of the Hebrews was unsettled, vacillating and uncertain. At one time a hero would rise up among them and become a successful instrument in the hands of God in defeating their enemies and oppressors, in restoring them to peace and quiet, and to the worship of the true God. Within a short time, they are again found abandoning the altars of Jehovah, and worshiping at the shrines of idol gods, and reduced to the condition of servitude. A system of

¹ *Heeren's Ancient History*, 35, 36. ² *Idem*, 36, 37.

rigid, and rather severe discipline, was adopted in reference to the Hebrews, and strictly carried out. Sinning, suffering, restoration to lost rights, rejoicing; new resolutions, declension again into servitude and idolatry, followed each other sometimes in rapid succession.

About the year 1100 was the commencement of the Hebrew monarchy, which continued for about five hundred years. The first king was Saul, who was anointed to the kingly office by Samuel. His successor, David, founded a new dynasty, and by his success in war established the Hebrew tribes in Palestine, and impressed the fear and dread of them upon the surrounding nations. Under him the Hebrews experienced great prosperity. He removed the seat of government from Hebron to Jerusalem, which he made his capital.

The reign of his successor and son, Solomon, was one of great outward splendor. He erected, at an almost incredible expense, the temple. He built and beautified the city. By monopolizing commerce, receiving tribute from subjects, tribes and nations,¹ and enforcing a system of taxation upon the Hebrews, he was enabled to enrich the metropolis by his expenditures, at the same time that the country, especially the remote parts of it, became oppressed and impoverished.

The result of this course of policy began to show itself before the death of Solomon, but was more especially manifested on the accession of his son, Rehoboam. The discontent produced an open rebellion, which resulted in detaching ten of the twelve tribes, in elevating Jeroboam to be king over them, leaving only the tribes of Judah and Benjamin subject to the sceptre of Rehoboam.

This separation occurred about the year B. C. 975.² The ten tribes together constituted the kingdom of Israel, and the two tribes that of Judah. Of these two Israel was much the larger and more populous, but Judah was the richer, and contained the metropolis, and the sanctuary, or

¹ *Heeren's Ancient History*, 40. ² *Idem*, 41.

temple. Thus the two were nearly equalized. These two kingdoms continued their separate and independent existence for about two hundred and fifty years. Their relative situation, and rival interests led them to be almost constantly at war with each other, and with very varied success. Their near equality in point of power, led to their being enabled to carry on wars with each other, without much danger of the one's totally subverting the other. The rise of the great empires in the interior of Asia, the Assyrian and Babylonian, finally terminated these kingdoms. About the year B. C. 722, Shalmaneser, king of Assyria, besieged and took Samaria, the capital of the kingdom of Israel, and transported the ten tribes into the interior of Asia, thus completely destroying or terminating the kingdom of Israel. It is somewhat extraordinary that no satisfactory traces of the ten tribes have ever since been discovered.

The kingdom of Judah struggled on for nearly a century longer, until about the year B. C. 588. The Babylonian empire was then in the ascendant, and its great king, Nebuchadnezzar, among his other achievements, took and destroyed Jerusalem, and the temple, and carried the Hebrews into captivity to Babylon, where they were kept for the period of seventy years. This method of depopulation, of entirely transplanting a whole people from the soil on which they had been reared, and the homes endeared to them by a thousand associations, among a foreign and hostile people, and bestowing their pleasant fields upon strangers, was certainly a novel and very effectual method of putting a final end to a people, and one much in harmony with the spirit of those times.

When the captivity of the Hebrews had run on to its terminus of seventy years, another power became the ascendant in the east, and Cyrus erected the Medo-Persian upon the ruins of the Babylonian empire. As foretold in prophecy, he restored the Hebrews to their country and their homes, and enabled them to rebuild their city and temple. From this period they are properly termed Jews. For about three hundred years after their return they

enjoyed a comparative tranquillity. They were under the immediate government of high priests nominally subject to Persia until the dismemberment of that empire by Alexander. After the downfall of the Persian empire, and the bursting of that of Alexander into fragments, the Jews became subject to the Seleucidæ who founded and ruled the Syrian monarchy. They suffered great persecution under some of the Syrian monarchs. Antiochus Epiphanes, in particular, undertook to Hellenize the Jews, and their stubbornness drew down from him a series of severe persecutions. The persecutions of Antiochus raised up the Maccabees about the year B. C. 167.¹ After a war of about twenty-six years, the Jews under their Maccabean leaders achieved their independence. Then was established the dynasty of the Asmonæans, a line of princes who, as priests and kings governed Judea for the period of one hundred and twenty-six years. A dispute having occurred between Hyrcanus and Aristobulus, a pretext was afforded to the Romans to interfere, and Pompey reduced Judea to the condition of a Roman province.

Julius Cæsar gave the prefecture of the province to Antipater, an Idumean, whose son, Herod, called the great, became king of the Jews under the Romans. He has been rightly stigmatized as a cruel, execrable tyrant, who burdened the people with excessive taxation, while his reign was one of great outward splendor. He made Jerusalem a place of great strength, and adorned it with palaces. He greatly embellished the temple. He reigned forty years, and being for some time previously aware that his death was inevitable, he resorted to a singular expedient to secure mourning when it should occur. In anticipation of that event he collected together the chiefs and principal men of the Jewish nation, and enclosed them in the Hypodrome at Jericho. He gave peremptory orders to his sister Salome that at the moment of his death she should cause them all to be slain. The order was not obeyed. The Herodian

¹*Calmet*, 455.

dynasty terminated about the year A. D. 44, at which time Judea sunk to the rank of a minor province of the Roman empire, and was governed by procurators sent from Rome. Thus it continued until the Jewish rebellion, which resulted in the total destruction of Jerusalem. Afterwards Judea was annexed to Syria until the reign of Adrian. The Jews then again rebelled from the Roman government, and being overcome were entirely driven away and dispersed.

To Jerusalem, the capital city of all Palestine, an unusual degree of interest attaches. It is situated in the hilly country of Judea, about forty-two miles east of the Mediterranean, and twenty-five miles west of the Jordan. It is remarkable that this city now is and for centuries has been regarded as holy by the three sects of Jews, Christians, and Mahometans.

The city is supposed to have been founded by Melchizedek in the year B. C. 2023.¹ It was originally called *Salem*, which means peace. About a century after its foundation it was taken by the Jebusites, a Canaanitish tribe, who enlarged it and built a citadel on Mount Sion. By them it was called Jebus.

The city was taken by Joshua in his conquest of Canaan, and inhabited by Hebrews and Jebusites together, until the reign of David, who expelled the latter and made it the capital of his kingdom under the name of Jebus-Salem,² changed for euphony's sake into Jerusalem. From that time it maintained its eminence for a period of four hundred and seventy-seven years, when it was taken and destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar. During the seventy years' captivity it lay in ruins, after which it was restored by Zerubbabel and his associates, and continued again to flourish for the period of five hundred and sixty-two years, when it was taken and destroyed by Titus.-

Jerusalem was built on four hills, called Sion,³ Acra, Moriah, and Bezetha, of which the three first were the principal. These were, in fact, projecting points of one

¹ *Calmet*, 522. ² *Idem*, 522. ³ *Idem*, 522.

large mountain called Moriah, or vision, because it was visible from a great distance, especially from the south. This mountain is a limestone rock, having steep ascents on every side except the north, surrounded with a deep valley, and encompassed with hills in the form of an amphitheatre.

Of the three principal hills above mentioned, that of Sion was the highest, and was situated on the southern side. On this hill was the citadel, the king's palace, and the upper city.¹ Moriah was a smaller eminence on the east of the northern part of Sion, and was separated from it by a valley over which was a bridge. On the summit of this was the temple. Acra lay north of Sion, and was covered by the lower city, which was the most considerable portion of the whole metropolis.

The city was nearly four and one-half miles in circuit. Its principal points of attraction were the temple, the palace of Herod, and the tower of Antonia.

The fortunes of Jerusalem have been of a singular character. After becoming the metropolis of the Hebrew nation, down to the time of its destruction by Titus, it was six times besieged and taken, four times without being sacked and destroyed, and twice with. It was first taken by Shishac, king of Egypt; second by Antiochus Epiphanes, king of Syria; third by Pompey, the Roman general; and fourth by Herod, assisted by the Romans. It was twice taken and utterly demolished, first by Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, at the time of the captivity; and second by Titus at the time of the Jewish rebellion. This was about the year A. D. 70, and is a memorable event in history.

The siege and destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, constitutes one of those striking events that stand out on the historic page in bold relief. The destruction of life was enormous, the Jews having a destructive war carried on between different factions within the city, while the

¹ *Horne*, 165, 166.

Romans were assailing it from without. On finally taking it by storm, the destruction of it was complete. So total was the destruction of the temple, that its very foundations were ploughed up by the Roman soldiers.

Jerusalem continued to lay desolate until the time of Adrian, who erected a city on a part of its former site, calling it *Ælia Capitolina*. This was afterwards greatly enlarged and beautified by Constantine the great, who also restored its ancient name.¹ During his reign the Jews made various efforts to rebuild their temple, which were always frustrated. Still further attempts were made under the Emperor Julian, but with no better success.

From the time of its destruction by Titus to the present, it has remained, for the most part, in a state of ruin and desolation. The Jews have never since been its masters. The Romans retained it until the rise of the Mahometan power, when the Saracens erected the Mosque of Omar on the site of the temple, and upreared the crescent on the place of the cross.

The next conqueror of the holy city was the crusader, who came from the west in martial array for the express purpose of wresting it from the sway of the infidels. After a series of heroic achievements and bloody battles, the arms of the crusader finally triumphed, the crescent paled before the cross, and in A. D. 1174, Count Baldwin was declared king of Jerusalem.² The Saracens afterwards retook the city, which subsequently fell into the hands of the Mamelukes, and ultimately of the Turks, its present masters.

Since the reign of Adrian, the Jews have almost entirely ceased to inhabit any part of Palestine. They have been wanderers and outcasts, inhabiting almost every country and clime, everywhere preserving, so far as circumstances would permit, their own peculiar manners, customs, and observances, claiming to be the children of Abraham, and holding in the highest reverence, Moses and the

¹ *Horne*, 168. ² *Idem*, 168.

prophets. Everywhere oppressed, downtrodden and reproached, they have succeeded in preserving their race in its original purity, unmixed with the blood of other races, being kept distinct for some important purpose yet to be developed, when that which is now prophecy shall become history.

Industry.

The Hebrews have exhibited much that excites some degree of surprise in their development of the element of industry. Generally the same people have always continued to follow the same industrial pursuits, and the instance is of very rare occurrence where a change has been effected in them. The Hebrews, however, have furnished such an instance.

Their first industry was pastoral. Abraham, the father of the race, and his descendants, for some generations, were shepherds. It has been stated that for the space of five hundred years the Hebrews led principally the shepherd life, although that must certainly be received with great qualifications, as the greater portion of this time was spent in Egypt, where they must have attended considerably to agriculture, and to the carrying on of some of the mechanic arts.

When the Hebrews, after their wanderings in the wilderness, took possession of Palestine, they adopted very generally, if not universally, the practice of agricultural industry. For this there were two obvious reasons :

1st. The surrounding nations were idolaters. The less the Hebrews, in the ordinary intercourse of business, were led to associate with them the less likely were they to adopt their idolatrous practices. Agricultural industry naturally led them to live a more secluded life, and to have less intercourse with their idolatrous neighbors than if they were occupied in traffic and commercial pursuits.

2d. The soil, situation, climate, and physical characteristics of Palestine, were all exceedingly well adapted to the

pursuits of agriculture. The soil possessed the elements of immense fertility. This is rendered sufficiently obvious from the numbers of inhabitants that once peopled Palestine. The arrangement of hill and valley, of plain and mountain, of sea and stream, was such as to invite the efforts of man in that direction. The climate was well adapted to those pursuits. Add to all these, their metropolis was an inland city, situated in a central part of Palestine. In relation to the kinds of industry pursued, they were

1st. The raising of large herds and flocks, the remnants of the shepherd's life. Many neat cattle were raised by the Hebrews.¹ The bulls of Bashan were celebrated for their strength. Oxen were used both for draught and for tillage. They were also employed to tread out the corn. Among the smaller cattle, sheep and goats were the most valuable, and were reared in great numbers, on account of their flesh and milk. The sheep were also of great value, on account of their wool.² Sheep shearing was a season of great festivity, and occurred twice in the year. The duty of the shepherds was to conduct the flocks to pasture; and protect them from the attacks of thieves and wild beasts.³ They were armed with a crook, and with a sling and stones.

2d. The cultivation of the soil and raising various products. The management of the ground and preparing it for seed varied little,⁴ in ancient times, from the present practice. The kind of grain sown were vetches, cummin, wheat, barley and rye. The fields in actual cultivation were anciently, and are still, guarded by watchmen who occupy a seat hung in a tree, or in a lodge or watch tower, made of planks, and whose duty it is to keep off birds, beasts and thieves. There were three months between their sowing and their first reaping, and four to the full harvest. The plough was early brought into use for the purpose of ploughing, and the reapers made use of sickles. The poor were allowed the liberty of gleaning,

¹ *Horne*, II, 175. ² *Idem*, 175. ³ *Idem*, 176. ⁴ *Idem*, 177.

and of carrying away the sheaves accidentally left. The carrying home the last load at the conclusion of the harvest was a season of joyous festivity, and celebrated with a harvest feast.¹

There were various methods of threshing or beating the corn out of the ear. Sometimes it was done by horses, at others by oxen, with their hoofs shod with brass. The most common method was to use the flail. The threshing floors were often places of considerable celebrity, especially that of Arumah the Jebusite, occupying the site of David's altar and of Solomon's temple. These floors were protected by a covering at the top to keep off the rain,² but left open at the sides to allow the air a free passage to carry off the chaff. The shovel and the fan were used for winnowing. The grain, after being threshed, was dried, and then ground usually at a mill. The grinding was usually the work of prisoners and captives. It was generally done in mills, and so important was this deemed that the Hebrews were strictly forbidden to take the nether or upper millstone in pledge.

The vine was extensively cultivated in Palestine. The vineyards consisted very commonly of a thousand vines, and were planted on the south side of a hill or mountain.³ The vintage occurred about June or July, following the wheat harvest and the threshing. The grapes were gathered with a sickle, and thrown into the wine vat or wine press, where they were probably first trodden by men and then pressed.

They had also large plantations of olives from which olive oil was obtained. The olive tree flourishes best in a barren, sandy, dry, and mountainous soil.

The social and political organization of the Hebrews, together with some of their peculiar institutions, were of a character eminently calculated to promote the pursuit of agriculture. Great care was taken to prevent large quantities from becoming the property of individual landed

¹ *Horne*, II, 177. ² *Idem*, 178. ³ *Idem*, 179.

proprietors. To prevent this contingency they resorted to equality of division. The whole country was divided, first among the several tribes; and in the second place an equal division was made among the individual members of each tribe.¹ Thus to every citizen was appointed a certain quantity of land; the right of cultivating it himself, and of transmitting it to his heirs. It is very obvious, however, that without some stringent regulations such equality could not be long preserved. Estates would be alienated and lost, and the inequality would continue to increase with the progress of time and improvement. To prevent this, and also for other beneficial purposes, the Hebrews had two very remarkable institutions. These were the sabbatical year and the year of jubilee.

The sabbatical year occurred every seventh year. It was carrying out more fully the principle of the sabbath. As the seventh day of the week was a sabbath, or day of rest unto man and beast,² so this was designed as a sabbath, or year of rest unto the land. In it there was no sowing nor reaping. The land lay fallow, without cultivation, and its spontaneous produce was enjoyed by the servants of the family, by the wayfaring stranger, and by cattle.

It began and ended on the month Tisri, or September, so that there might be sufficient time for gathering all the fruits of the earth of that year, and also for sowing it against the next year.³ The land, by this arrangement, would not lie fallow for two years together. To prevent the occurrence of a famine the land produced, during the sixth year, triple the quantity of its annual produce.⁴ Thus supplies were furnished for the seventh and eighth years.

Another peculiar feature of this year, was the remission or cancelment of all debts due from one Hebrew to another.⁵ This, however, did not extend to strangers, who were deprived of its benefit.

¹ *Horne*, II, 176. ² *Idem*, 128. ³ *Universal History*, III, 37. ⁴ *Horne*, II, 128. ⁵ *Universal History*, III, 37.

There was still another feature, showing the strong leaning of the Hebrews towards liberty while under the theocratic government. All Hebrew slaves were released from their state of bondage,¹ unless they voluntarily relinquished this privilege, and chose to continue in their former state. In the latter event they were brought before the judges, and had their ears bored in their presence, in token that they fully embraced a servitude that was perpetual, or that at least continued until the year of jubilee.² Those that chose to avail themselves of their liberty were dismissed with presents.

Another remarkable institution, exerting a direct influence upon the industry of the Hebrews, and affecting more or less the whole Hebrew polity, was the year of jubilee. This occurred every seventh sabbatical year,³ or at the end of every forty-nine years, or the fiftieth year. The beginning of it was fixed at the seventh month, Tisri,⁴ which is about the time of the autumnal equinox. It commenced on the tenth day of the month,⁵ in the evening of the day of atonement. During this year, also, there was no sowing or reaping, man, beast, and the soil all enjoying a year of complete rest.

The year of jubilee had three striking features, all of which, however, applied exclusively to the Hebrews,⁶ or to those who had been incorporated into their religion and commonwealth by circumcision.

1. All debts were canceled and given up.⁷

2. All slaves and captives were released. Even those who, at the sabbatical year, had chosen perpetual servitude, and had their ears bored in token of it, were liberated at the jubilee.

3. All estates that had been sold reverted to their original proprietors or to the families to which they had originally belonged. Thus no family could be doomed to

¹ *Universal History*, III, 37. ² *Idem*, 38. ³ *Horne*, II, 128. ⁴ *Universal History*, III, 40. ⁵ *Horne*, II, 128. ⁶ *Universal History*, III, 40. ⁷ *Horne*, II, 120.

perpetual poverty, for the family estate was incapable of being alienated for a longer period than fifty years.¹ The value of real estate in the market diminished in proportion to the near approach of the jubilee. This privilege was confined to the agricultural portions of Palestine, and did not embrace the real estate contained within walled towns, which, if not redeemed within the year, belonged to the purchaser.

The first nine days of the year were spent in festivity and rejoicing. On the tenth, the day of solemn expiation, the trumpets were ordered to sound,² and as they lifted up their voice throughout Palestine, liberty was proclaimed to the captive, freedom to the slave, and all those, who, by misfortune or adverse circumstances had been deprived of their inheritance, returned again, and resumed the possession of the fields and vineyards which had been the property of their fathers.

These two institutions, the sabbatical year, and the jubilee, seem to have been peculiar to the Hebrews. Their effect was to destroy slavery as a perpetual institution, to preserve, as far as possible,³ equality among the people, to prevent the property of the nation from being accumulated in a few hands, and to preserve the order of families. The sabbatical year continued to be observed after the Jewish captivity, but not the jubilee. The titles to the real estate were extinguished by the captivity, and the Hebrews who returned never acquired the identical property that had belonged to their fathers.

Since the dispersion, there has been again an almost entire change in the industry of the Hebrews. They have ceased being agriculturists, and have become mechanics, traders, and money dealers. The reason, probably, is to be found in the fact, that since the dispersion, they have been wanderers, having no permanent home. Their practice has generally been to remain in one country until oppression drove them to another. Landed property being perma-

¹ *Horne*, 128, 129. ² *Calmet*, 560. ³ *Idem*, 560.

ment, could neither be removed nor immediately disposed of without great sacrifice. They would, therefore, naturally direct their industry into such channels as would be likely, under their peculiar circumstances, to secure to them the fruits of it. Merchandise, and particularly money, could be easily transported from one country to another, and the knowledge of mercantile transactions, and of the mechanic arts was readily available to them, in any nation, or among any people. Thus the Hebrews, in the course of their history, have twice almost completely changed their industrial pursuits; once from the shepherd to the agricultural; and once from the agricultural to the mercantile and mechanic. This striking fact, so peculiar to the Hebrew race, contrasts strongly with that fixed and changeless character, which, in other respects, they have preserved from the time of Abraham to the present hour.

Religion.

In this essential element the Hebrews have answered a very important purpose. It seems to have been their peculiar mission to become the medium through which the true religion should be given to mankind. They were originally designated and called for this purpose, and through them divine communications were made. The miracles that attest the supremacy of the God of nature, were all performed through, or by reason of the Hebrews. On many of them was bestowed the gift of prophecy. The great plans and purposes of deity, in reference to the race, have been mostly developed through their agency.

The religion of the Hebrews exhibits different phases in different periods of their history, and yet these all seem to be connected with each other, and to form different parts of the same great scheme.

The first exhibition of it is under the patriarchs. Much of it was here seen in the light of tradition, but the evidence afforded by that was of a more reliable character according as approaches were made to its source.

The patriarchs were occasionally instructed in the will of God; they opposed idolatry and atheism;¹ they followed the lights which reason would suggest to honest hearts endeavoring to seek God and righteousness and truth. Circumcision was made use of by them as the seal of the covenant made by God with Abraham. They lived in the confident expectation of the coming of the Messiah, who was to be the delight of all nations. Such was the religion of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and the early patriarchs. They honored and worshiped God according to the dictates of their own judgment.

The era of Moses introduced a material change. The religion of the Hebrews acquired a fixedness of character. It was clothed with a strictly defined ceremonial. Days, feasts, priests and sacrifices were determined with great exactness.² The age, sex, color of victims; their number, qualities and nature; the time, means and occasions on which the sacrifices were to be made, were all prescribed with great particularity. Almost innumerable other particulars served altogether to make up the ceremonial law.

The Hebrews, while in Egypt, doubtless acquired a strong propensity to idolatry. The erection of the golden calf in the wilderness, in imitation probably of the apis or bull worship of the Egyptians, is strong evidence of this. This is more especially the case when we reflect that this was done in the midst of the numerous miracles wrought by God to effect their deliverance from Egyptian bondage.

During the administrations of Joshua and the judges, in the unsettled condition of the Hebrew nation, great laxity prevailed in their religious observances. A constant tendency was manifested to adopt the idolatry of the surrounding nations. Even when the monarchy was introduced, and the reins of government were drawn tighter, superstitions, which the Hebrews did not dare to exercise in public, were practiced in private. They sacrificed on

¹ Calmet, 456. ² *Idem*, 456.

the high places, and consulted diviners and magicians whose profession was the practice of sorcery and witchcraft. Solomon himself erected altars to the false gods of the Phœnicians, Moabites, and Ammonites, and most of his successors followed his example.

The Babylonish captivity brought the Hebrews to repentance and a renunciation of idolatry.¹ From that time they became more devoted to the service of the true God, and less inclined to the worship or toleration of false gods. So far as living up to strict observances would constitute religion, the Hebrews were never more religious than from the period of their return from the seventy years' captivity to the birth of the Saviour.

The religion of the Hebrews will be best considered under three heads, viz :

1. Sacred places. 2. Sacred persons. 3. Sacred ordinances.

First. Sacred places, there were

1. The tabernacle. And of this there were three, all previous to the erection of the temple by Solomon.

The first of these was erected by Moses, and called the tabernacle of the congregation.² In this seem to have been solemnized the first public offices of religion. In this Moses gave audience, heard causes, and made inquiries of Jehovah.

The second was also erected by Moses at the command of Jehovah.

The third was that erected by David in Jerusalem for the reception of the ark, when he received it from the house of Obed-edom.

Of these three the second was of much the most importance, being called by way of distinction, the *tabernacle*. It was erected on the first day of the month, in the second year after the departure of the Hebrews from Egypt, and was designed partly as the palace or residence of Jehovah, as king of Israel, and partly as the medium of public wor-

¹ *Calmet*, 456. ² *Horne*, 214.

ship. It was to the Hebrews, in substance, what the temple afterwards came to be. As it must accompany the Hebrews in their journeyings in the wilderness, it was a moveable chapel, and so constructed as to be readily taken to pieces and put together again at pleasure.¹ It consisted of two principal parts, viz: of a house or tent, varying but little in appearance from our modern tents, except that it was much larger, and of an open court that surrounded it.

The house, or tent, was in the form of an oblong square, thirty cubits long, ten broad, and ten high. The inside was divided by a veil, or hanging, made of linen richly embroidered, which separated the holy place from the holy of holies. In the first stood the altar of incense, the table of shewbread,² and the great golden candlestick containing seven branches. Into this the priests alone were permitted to enter. The holy of holies contained the ark of the testimony, or ark of the covenant as it is sometimes called. This was a small chest, or coffer, made of shittim wood, overlaid with gold, in which were deposited the two tables of the law, as well the broken as the whole ones, the pot of manna, and the rod of Aaron that budded. The lid or covering was wholly of gold, and called the mercy seat. At its two ends were two cherubim, or hieroglyphic figures³ (the form of which is now of impossible ascertainment), looking inward towards each other, with wings expanded, which, embracing the whole circumference of the mercy seat, met on each side in the middle. Here, both in the tabernacle, and subsequently in the temple, rested the shekinah, or divine presence, in the form of a cloud overshadowing it. Here God, in scripture phraseology, "*dwelt between the cherubim,*" and gave forth divine oracles in an audible voice, when consulted on behalf of his people. An oblong court surrounded the tabernacle, which was separated by curtains from the Israelitish camp. Nearly in the centre

¹ *Horne*, 215. ² *Idem*, 215. ³ *Idem*, 216.

of the court stood a capacious brazen vessel called the brazen laver, in which the priests washed their hands and feet previously to performing any of their sacred functions.

The tabernacle, having accompanied the Hebrews in their wanderings through the wilderness, on their arriving in Palestine, was set up first at Gilgal, afterwards at Shiloh; on being taken and subsequently returned by the Philistines,¹ it remained for twenty years in the custody of Abinadab, and afterwards three months in the house of Obed-edom, whence it was brought by David to Jerusalem, and subsequently deposited by Solomon in the temple. Here it is supposed to have been consumed in the destruction of the city by Nebuchadnezzar.

2. The temple. The first temple erected by Solomon stood on Mount Moriah, which was an eminence of a mountainous ridge called Mount Sion.² The tabernacle furnished the model for the temple, which was of much larger dimensions. After being pillaged by Shishak, king of Egypt, it was finally destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar, in the year B. C. 584.

The second temple was erected by Zerubbabel, on the return of the Hebrews from captivity, but was very much inferior to the first. This temple underwent a gradual process of decay during the lapse of five centuries, after which it was repaired or rebuilt by Herod the Great, who, for the space of nine years, employed eighteen thousand workmen upon it, adding to its magnitude, splendor and beauty. The second temple was inferior to the first in splendor and magnificence, and lacked five remarkable things that constituted the chief glory of the first. These were 1. The ark and mercy seat. 2. The shekinah or manifestation of the divine presence in the holy of holies. 3. The sacred fire on the altar, which had been first kindled from heaven. 4. The urim and thummim. 5. The spirit of prophecy.³

¹ *Horne*, 216. ² *Idem*, 218. ³ *Idem*, 219.

Both temples were erected upon the same site, a hard rock, encompassed by a frightful precipice. The height of the temple wall on the south side was stupendous. In the lowest places it was four hundred and fifty feet, and in some places higher. The material was hard white stone of prodigious magnitude.

The temple comprised the portico, the sanctuary, and the holy of holies, which was surrounded by spacious courts, making in all a square of half a mile in circumference. It was entered through nine magnificent gates. The first, or outer court, was called the court of the Gentiles, because beyond this, the Gentiles could not advance. Around this was a range of porticoes, or cloisters, one of which was called Solomon's porch. Within this was the court of the Israelites, which was divided into two parts, the outer of which was the court of the women, separated from that of the Gentiles, by a low stone wall or partition. From this court there was an ascent of fifteen steps into the inner, or men's court,¹ which was appropriated to the worship of the male Hebrews.

Within the court of the Israelites was that of the priests, who alone were permitted to enter it. From that a flight of twelve steps led to the temple, strictly so called, which consisted of three parts, viz: the portico, the outer sanctuary, and the holy place.

In the first were suspended the votive offerings made by the piety of individuals. The second, or sanctuary, was separated from the holy of holies by a double veil.² This corresponded with the holy place in the tabernacle, having in it the golden candlestick, the altar of incense, and the table of shewbread, consisting of twelve loaves, according to the number of the tribes.

The holy of holies was twenty cubits, thirty feet, square.³ No person was ever admitted into it but the high priest, and he, only once a year on the great day of atonement.

¹Horne, 220. ²Idem, 221. ³Idem, 222.

This magnificent temple was destroyed by the Romans in the year A.D. 73, on the same day of the same month in which the first temple erected by Solomon had been totally destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar.

3. High places were places appropriated to worship in groves, woods or mountains, first by the patriarchs, and afterwards by heathen idolaters.¹ By the latter these were made the scenes of diabolical and impure rites.

4. Proseuchæ or oratories were places built and resorted to for private devotion. They were generally erected in private retreats, and commonly on the banks of rivers, or on the sea shore.

5. Synagogues were buildings in which the Jews assembled for prayer,² reading and hearing the sacred scriptures, and various instructions. Their origin is not clearly ascertained, nor the period of time at which they were first erected. There was nothing peculiar in their structure, but various officers were connected with them, who had various duties assigned them. The rulers of the synagogue regulated its concerns, and gave the permission to preach. There was also an officer whose province it was to offer up public prayers to God for the whole congregation. He was called the angel of the church because he was their messenger to God. Besides these, there was the minister who had charge of the sacred books.

The service of the synagogue consisted of three parts, viz: prayer, reading the scriptures, and preaching. Prayer was first offered, for which many have thought the Jews had liturgies.³ Their present forms are very ancient. The scriptures consisted of the Pentateuch, the Psalms, and prophets, which were written on parchment, or vellum, and rolled round a stick, or, if very long, around two, one at each extremity. These were opened or unrolled, and portions of them read, after which was the preaching or exposition of the scriptures to the people.

¹ *Horne*, 222. ² *Idem*, 223. ³ *Idem*, 224.

One of the severest punishments inflicted was to be cast out of the synagogue,¹ or excommunicated, which amounted to shutting out from all benefit of the Jewish religion, and subjected the individual to reproach and infamy.

Second. Sacred persons. The whole Hebrew nation from their descent, and covenant relation to God, are often termed holy;² but like most of the nations of the east they had a particular class of men set apart and devoted to the offices of religion, constituting the priest caste. One particular tribe, that of Levi, was specially devoted to the service of God, on the establishment of the Jewish commonwealth. But while the rest of the tribe were employed in the inferior offices of the temple, the priesthood was reserved to the family of Aaron alone.³

The Levites were originally divided into three families, but were subsequently arranged by David into four classes. They were the ministers and servants of the priests, and their principal office was to wait on them in the services of the tabernacle, and subsequently of the temple.⁴ To support this numerous body of men forty-eight cities were assigned them on the division of the land of Canaan, out of which number thirteen were specially appropriated to the priests. To these were also added tithes of corn, fruit and cattle.⁵ The Levites paid to the priests a tenth part of all their tithes.

Next in point of dignity to the Levites, but superior to them, were the ordinary priests, who were chosen from the family of Aaron. They served at the altar, prepared the victims, and offered the sacrifices. They kept up the perpetual fire on the altar of the burnt sacrifices, and in the lamps of the golden candlestick in the sanctuary. It devolved on them to perform first in the tabernacle, and subsequently in the temple, everything directly connected with the service of God. In time of war they carried the ark of the covenant, sounded the holy trumpets, and animated the army to the performance of its duties.

¹ *Horne*, 225. ² *Idem*, 225. ³ *Idem*, 226. ⁴ *Idem*, 227. ⁵ *Idem*, 227.

The priests were divided into twenty-four classes, each of which was distinguished by a particular appellation.¹ Each one of these discharged in turn the sacerdotal office, going up for that purpose to Jerusalem on each successive sabbath until they had all attended in their turn.

To each order was assigned a president, and as each family consisted of a number of priests, they drew lots for the different offices they were to perform. To the priests were assigned not only thirteen of the Levitical cities for their residence, but also three thousand cubits of land around each. Their maintenance was derived chiefly from tithes and various other offerings. Peculiar dignities and influence were enjoyed by the high priest, who was placed at the head of the priest caste. To him alone it belonged to enter the holy of holies in the tabernacle,² and subsequently in the temple. To him was confided the supreme administration of sacred things. He was the final arbiter of all controversies. After the organization of the sanhedrim, he presided over its deliberation and action, and held rank next to the sovereign or prince. His authority was at all times very great, but more especially so when he concentrated in himself the regal and pontifical dignities. The latter dignity in its first institution, was held for life, provided the pontiff was not guilty of crime that merited deposition. During this period the high priesthood is supposed to have been elective.

During the latter part of the Jewish polity the election, and the right of succession were disregarded. The dignity, sanctity, and authority of the high priest were almost annihilated. The office was sometimes made annual, was not unfrequently sold to the highest bidder; to persons who had neither age, learning, nor rank to recommend them; sometimes even to those who were not of the sacerdotal lineage.

Another class of persons esteemed sacred or holy among the Hebrews were the prophets. The office and function

¹ *Horne*, 228. ² *Idem*, 229.

they performed was of no small importance in the Hebrew economy. The names or terms given to the expositors of the law varied at different periods of time. Of these there are three periods. The first was from Adam unto Moses,¹ the second from Moses to the end of the Babylonish captivity, and the third from the return from Babylon to the advent of the Saviour and subsequently.

In the first period, at the commencement of it, Adam was both priest and prophet in his own family. In succeeding generations the first-born supplied these two offices, and, during the patriarchal times, united also with these the kingly office. In the second period although a private catechetical exposition of the law belonged still to the masters of families, still the public ministerial exposition of it was confided to a class of men composed of priests and prophets.

In the third period, prophecy had ceased, the office of expounding scripture was more common, and in the place of the prophets,² came a multitude of other expositors, called, in general, teachers of Israel, and going frequently under the particular designations of wise men, scribes and disputers.

The prophets among the Hebrews were eminently distinguished.³ They appear as if raised up by God in an extraordinary manner, and for the performance of the most sacred functions. They were often called seers, discovering things yet in the future, declaring the will of God, and announcing their divine messages both to kings and people. The office of the prophet was by no means confined to the prediction of future events.⁴ It was also a part of their duty to instruct the people, and to interpret the law of God. Hence the terms, prophet and prophecy, are often synonymous with interpreter, or teacher, and interpretation, or teaching.⁵ They were, in fact, the divines, the philosophers, the instructors, and the guides of the Hebrews in piety and virtue.

¹ *Moses and Aaron*, 23. ² *Idem*, 24. ³ *Horne*, 230. ⁴ *Idem*, 231. ⁵ *Calmet*, 740.

God usually communicated his will to the prophets by inspiration, which consisted in illuminating the mind, and exciting them to proclaim what he had dictated. He also communicated information to the minds of the prophets by dreams and visions. There were various media through which the mind of the prophet was acted upon, influenced and inspired.

The prophets generally lived retired, in some country retreat, or in a sort of community, where both they and their disciples were employed in study, prayer and labor.¹

Their habitations were plain and simple. In everything their poverty was conspicuous. Their frugality appears throughout their history. They carried on no trade for gain, nor did they undertake the performance of labor that was too laborious, or inconsistent with the repose and reflection required by their office. They seldom led lives of celibacy, the more generally having wives and children. But in the societies of the prophets there were neither women nor wives.

The prophets had seminaries of learning, termed schools of the prophets,² where religious truths, or the divine laws, were particularly taught. Malachi was the last of the prophets under the Old Testament dispensation, and it is remarked that as long as there were prophets among the Hebrews, there were no sects or heresies among them, although they often fell into idolatry. As the prophets were inspired, and proclaimed the immediate will of God, the Hebrews had no alternative but either to obey that will and receive their interpretation of the law, or to deny the God of their inspiration, and take refuge in idolatry. Afterward when uninspired men, the wise men, scribes and disputers became the expositors of the law, as they seldom agreed in their opinions, numerous sects and parties sprung up as a natural result.

Third. Sacred ordinances. These embrace sacred things, as sacrifices and offerings, sacred times and seasons, and sacred obligations and duties.

¹ *Calmet*, 741. ² *Horne*, 231.

I. Sacred things, as sacrifices and offerings. These were divided into four classes, viz: bloody, unbloody, drink and oblations of different kinds.

1st. The bloody offerings were those which were properly termed the sacrifices, being living creatures offered up to God in the way of worship.

The victims thus sacrificed were required to be clean, and such as might be eaten.¹ They consisted principally of oxen, sheep, goats, and doves. Those sacrificed must also be without blemish, and must never have borne the yoke. The method of divesting of life was by the effusion of blood. The victim being immolated by the priest, the blood was caught in a vessel, and partly sprinkled upon the altar, by which the atonement was made. The remainder of it was poured out at the foot of the altar. Sacrifices were offered at first, at the door of the tabernacle; but after the erection of the temple, they were all offered in that. The sacrifices were of various kinds, such as

1. Burnt offerings or holocausts, which were free will offerings, wholly devoted to God, according to the primitive usage among the patriarchs. The victim offered was a bullock without blemish, a male of the sheep or goats, a turtle dove or pigeon, according to the person's ability. This was a peculiarly expressive type of the great atoning sacrifice afterwards offered up on Calvary, for the sins of the world.

2. Peace offerings were also free will offerings, and were offered up in token of reconciliation between God and man. They were either eucharistical, that is,² offered as thanksgivings for blessings received, or were offered for the impetration of mercies. The offerings consisted either of animals, or of bread or dough, and the victims might be either male or female, provided they were without blemish.

3. Sin offerings were for all sins actually committed whether through ignorance or against knowledge, and

¹ *Horne*, 232. ² *Idem*, 232, 233.

which must subject the offender to punishment unless they were expiated.¹ They consisted generally of a sin offering to God, and a burnt offering, accompanied with restitution of damage.

4. Trespass offerings were made where there existed a doubt whether the law of God had or had not been violated. They appear to have been nearly the same as sin offerings. In both, the person offering placed his hands on the head of the victim, confessing his sin over the sin offering, and his trespass over the trespass offering; the animal being then considered as vicariously bearing the sins or trespasses of the person who brought it.

All these were occasional, having reference to individuals. Besides them there were others that were national and regular, being daily, weekly, monthly and annual.

The daily sacrifice was a burnt offering, consisting of two lambs,² which were offered every day, morning and evening, at the third and ninth hours. They were burnt as holocausts, but by a small fire. The morning sacrifice was to make atonement for the sins committed during the night; and the evening, for those committed during the day.

The weekly sacrifice was equal to the daily, and was offered in addition to it on every sabbath day.

The monthly sacrifice was made on every new moon, or at the beginning of every month,³ and consisted of two young bullocks, one ram, and seven lambs of a year old, together with a kid for a sin offering, and a suitable bread and drink offering.

The yearly sacrifices were those which were offered on the occasion of the great annual festivals. These were the paschal lamb at the passover; those offered on the day of pentecost, or of first fruits; on the new moon or first day of the seventh month; and on the day of expiation.

2nd. The unbloody sacrifices or meat offerings, were taken entirely from the vegetable kingdom.

¹ *Horne*, 233. ² *Idem*, 233. ³ *Idem*, 234.

3rd. Drink offerings were simply an accompaniment to both bloody and unbloody sacrifices, and were never used separately. They consisted of wine, which was partly poured upon the brow of the victim, and partly allotted to the priests who drank it.

4th. Besides those already enumerated, there were various other oblations, which were ordinary, voluntary or prescribed.

The ordinary were

1. Of the shewbread, the loaves of which were placed hot, every sabbath day, upon the golden table of the sanctuary before the Lord.

2. Of incense, composed of several fragrant spices, which was offered twice daily upon a golden altar.

The voluntary were the fruits either of promises or vows. The latter were of two kinds.

1. The vow of consecration, when anything was devoted to God, either for sacrifice or for the service of the temple.

The vow of engagement which occurred when persons engaged to do something that was not, in itself, unlawful,¹ as not to eat of some particular meat, not to wear some particular habits, etc.

The prescribed oblations were first fruits or tithes.

As an undeviating rule all the first fruits both of fruits and animals were consecrated to God. These first fruits were offered from the feast of pentecost until that of dedication. The Hebrews must have offered to God the new sheaf, before they could gather in the harvest. They also paid tenths or tithes of all they possessed. These were collected from all the fruits of the earth, particularly of corn, wine, and oil, and were rendered every year, except the sabbatical year.

II. Sacred times and seasons. These consisted of various festivals which were instituted by Moses at the divine command for the purpose mainly of perpetuating the memory of the many wonders wrought by God in favor

¹ *Horne*, 235.

of the Hebrews. This renders them not only valuable as religious observances, but also as the evidence of facts made up mostly of miraculous interferences of Jehovah in favor of his people, the Hebrews.¹ These sacred times and seasons occurred either weekly, monthly, annually, or after a certain number of years.

1st. The sabbath, or every seventh day, was appropriated to sacred repose, and was originally instituted to preserve the memory of the creation of the world. It commenced at sunset, and closed at the same time on the following day.

2d. The feast of the new moon, or beginning of months, was celebrated as a festival. It was proclaimed with the sound of trumpets, and several additional sacrifices were offered.

Besides these, there were three other *great festivals*, as they were termed, viz: the passover, the feast of pentecost, and the feast of tabernacles,² each one of which continued for seven, and one for eight successive days. All the males of the twelve tribes were bound to be present at these grand festivals, during which their lands were secured from hostile invasion.

3d. The passover was the first and most eminent of these festivals, and was instituted the night before the departure of the Hebrews from Egypt,³ being designed as a perpetual memorial of their signal deliverance, and of the favor of God *in passing over* and sparing their first-born, when he slew the first-born of the Egyptians. This was also called the feast, or the days of unleavened bread, because that was the only kind of bread allowed to be eaten during the seven days of the feast. The appellation, passover, belongs more particularly to the second day of the feast, viz: the fifteenth day of the month Nisan. It was ordained to be celebrated on the anniversary of the deliverance of the Hebrews. The rites with which this festival was celebrated may be found stated in the twelfth

¹ *Horne*, 236. ² *Idem*, 237. ³ *Idem*, 238

chapter of Exodus. Some suppose the Saviour imitated this in the institution of the eucharist. The paschal lamb clearly typified Jesus Christ,¹ his sufferings, and death; not a bone was to be broken, a circumstance in which there was a remarkable correspondence between the type and the anti-type.

4th. The feast of pentecost was celebrated on the fiftieth day from after the first day of unleavened bread,² or of the passover. Its object was a festival of thanksgiving for the harvest, which commenced immediately after the passover. The form of thanksgiving is given in the twenty-sixth chapter of Deuteronomy.

5th. The feast of tabernacles was instituted to commemorate the dwelling of the Hebrews in tents while they were wandering in the wilderness. It was also a part of its object to return thanks to God for the fruits of the vine and of other trees which were gathered about this time. During the whole of this festival they were obliged to dwell in tents, which anciently were pitched upon the flat, terrace like roofs of their houses. One of the ceremonies performed at this feast was the libation, or pouring out of water, drawn from the fountain or pool of Siloam, upon the altar.

To these three annual festivals, Moses added two others, viz :

1. The feast of trumpets, which was held on the first and second days of the month Tisri, which was the commencement of the civil year of the Hebrews.³ This feast derives its name from the blowing of trumpets in the temple with more than usual solemnity. On this festival they abstained from all labor, and offered particular sacrifices to God.

2. The fast or feast of expiation, or day of atonement, which was observed by the Hebrews as a fast, in which they abstained from all labor, and from all food afflicting their souls. The sacrifice of the atonement was the most

¹ *Horne*, 239, ² *Idem*, 239. ³ *Idem*, 240.

solemn, imposing and important of all those ordained by the Mosaic law. It was offered on the tenth day of the month Tisri, by the high priest alone, for the sins of the whole nation. On this day only, in the course of the year, was the high priest permitted to enter the holy of holies,¹ which could only be done after due preparation and performance of the proper rites, under pain of death. All others were excluded from the tabernacle during the entire ceremony, which prefigured the grand atonement to be made for the sins of the world by the Saviour. The particulars are detailed in the sixteenth chapter of Leviticus.

Besides these annual festivals, which were instituted by divine command, the Jews, in later times, introduced several other feast and fast days, such as the feast of purim or of lots,² to commemorate the deliverance of the Hebrews from the machinations of Haman, and the feast of dedication to commemorate the purification of the second temple after its profanation by Antiochus Epiphanes.

The extraordinary festivals occurring after a number of years are the sabbatical year and jubilee which have already been mentioned.

III. Sacred obligations and duties. These are embraced in oaths, vows and purifications.

1. Oaths. These, when voluntary, were pronounced with the right hand elevated. When executed judicially or otherwise, the person to whom it was put, answered by saying amen, amen. The Jews were in the habit of swearing by the altar, by Jerusalem, etc., and they considered them as possessed of small binding force unless the sacred name of God was introduced.

2. A vow was considered as a religious engagement, or promise, voluntarily undertaken by a person towards Almighty God.³ To render it valid it must be actually uttered by the mouth.

The most solemn was the *cherem*, or irremissible vow, which was accompanied with a form of execration, and

¹ *Horne*, 240. ² *Idem*, 240, 241. ³ *Idem*, 242.

was entered into previous to the devoting to God of hostile cities, against which they intended to proceed with great severity, as in the case of Jericho. The object seems to have been to inflame the minds of the people to war.

The more common vows were of dedication and of self-interdiction or abstinence.¹ The first related chiefly to the bringing offerings to God, and the second to abstaining from wine, food, or any other thing.

3. The purifications of the Hebrews were various, and related either to persons or things dedicated to divine worship. These are prescribed with great particularity in the Mosaic law.

Thus it will be seen that the Hebrew religion consisted, and still consists, in the strict observance of a ceremonial law, which prescribes, with almost infinite minuteness, the various steps to be taken and forms to be followed in their manner of worship. One obvious effect of this has been to bind the Jews together as a people, and to draw between them and the rest of the world an effectual line of separation.

The assembling together at Jerusalem, three times a year, of the whole nation of the Jews, and their participation in the same great national festivals, had the effect to make them all acquainted with each other; to interest them in each other's welfare; to imbue them all with the same sentiments and ideas; to transfuse into them the same spirit; to unite them in the same common bonds; and to hand them all over to the same common destiny. This may serve, in a great measure, to account for the fact that the Hebrew race, so far as the Jewish branch of it, embracing the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, is concerned, has ever preserved its identity to itself, and its distinctness from every other, since the time of Abraham. Everything in their religion conspired to bind them thus together, and to preserve them from intermixing, blending, and losing their Hebrew identity while living among other nations.

¹ *Horne*, 243.

Thus they present the singular fact of a race that has been scattered over the whole earth for the period of eighteen centuries, wandering from one country to another, finding their temporary abodes among the snows of the north or the sands of the south, and yet as distinct, as identical with itself, as when its members gathered themselves joyously together from all parts of Judea at Jerusalem to celebrate the passover or pentecost. They are thus made to present a living tie to bind the present to past generations, a thread, by following which, the labyrinth of history can be safely and satisfactorily explored.

The Hebrew ceremonial was altogether of a typical character.¹ It prefigured the priesthood and kingdom of Christ, and the privileges and happiness of his followers. The leading facts in their history, come in aid of their cumbrous ceremonial in rendering the whole more typical in its character. Their bondage in Egypt, their miraculous deliverance; their passage through the Red sea; their wanderings in the wilderness; their entrance into the promised land; and, in a more particular manner, their priests, ceremonies, circumcision, sacrifices, festivals, particularly their passover, were all predictive figures of Christ's coming, of the establishment of Christianity, and of the worship, sacraments, and excellence of the gospel. The Hebrews were under the Old Testament dispensation. To them it was given to develop and complete that dispensation, all which was necessary for the introduction of the new. It was necessary for the law to precede the gospel, and to have its full development. This was the mission of the Hebrew. Having accomplished that, and given birth to the gospel, his nation disappears. His race, however, has never passed away, but in all lands has ever continued to furnish its living witnesses to the great truths of the scriptures. The Christian religion, although introduced through the agency of the Hebrew, is not, or never

¹ *Calmet*, 457.

was, his religion. It was given to the Hebrew alone, to develop the type, the Old Testament dispensation, but to man, to all the elements of the race combined, to develop the archetype, the gospel dispensation.

The religious creed or belief of the Jews, may be summed up in thirteen articles of faith, which are the following :

I. That there is a God, creator of all things; ¹ the first principle of all beings, able to exist without any other part of the universe; though without him nothing in the world can exist.

II. That God is one sole and indivisible being, but of a unity different from all other unities.

III. That God is incorporeal, and that he has no corporeal quality whatsoever, either possible or imaginable.

IV. That God is from all eternity, and that all things existing, himself only excepted, had a beginning in time.

V. That God alone is to be served and worshiped, and that no other being is to be served or worshiped, either as mediator or intercessor.

VI. That there has been, and may still be, prophets qualified to receive the inspirations of God.

VII. That Moses was a greater prophet than any other, and that the degree of prophecy which God honored him with, was peculiar, and far above what he granted to the rest of the prophets.

VIII. That the law which Moses left them, was entirely dictated by God himself, and that it does not contain one syllable belonging to Moses, and consequently that the explanation of those precepts handed down to them by tradition came wholly from the mouth of God, who delivered it to Moses.

IX. That this law is immutable, nor can anything be either added to, or taken from it.

X. That God knows and directs all human actions.

XI. That God rewards such as observe his law, and punishes them who transgress it; that the best and greatest

¹*Picard's Religious Ceremonies*, 104, 105.

reward is the life to come, and the severest punishment the damnation of the soul.

XII. That a Messiah shall come, endowed with a far greater merit than all the kings that have lived in the world before him; that though his coming be delayed, none ought therefore to doubt this coming, nor fix a time for it, much less pretend to guess at it from scripture, since there never will be any king in Israel, but such as shall be of the line of David and Solomon.

XIII. That God shall raise the dead.

Society.

It is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to draw a line of distinction between the religious observances, laws, and the social customs, habits and forms of intercourse of the Hebrews. All the developments of their social life seem but the evolutions of some sentiment, or observance contained in their scriptures or Talmud.¹ Of these the latter, which is the great depository of the doctrines and opinions of the Jews, is held in the highest estimation. The writings of their learned rabbis, although often abounding in strange conceptions, contradictory statements and puerilities, have, notwithstanding, exercised a mighty influence over the entire social life of the Hebrews. If we assign to the religious element the consideration of their religious observances, and to that of government the consideration of their law, very little will remain to be considered under the element of society. With the Hebrew, religion was the great central element, and its direct influence, therefore, will be found thoroughly diffused into every other. Hardly an action of his life, whether in the pursuits of industry, the movements of society, or the developments of art, but what have direct reference to this as the crowning element.

Although there is great uniformity in all the Hebrew customs and observances, and ever has been since the time

¹ *Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, 1107.

of Abraham, yet all these are not considered of equal authority, nor are they all observed after the same manner. They are divided into three orders, the first of which comprehends the precepts of the written law, or that which is contained in the five books of Moses. The second is derived from the oral law, and this is of verbal origin,¹ having been for a long time handed down by tradition, and finally embraced in the comments made by the rabbis and doctors upon the Pentateuch, and to a great number of constitutions and rules, called commandments of the doctors. This is the Hebrew Talmud.

The third order called customs, is of comparatively recent introduction, and consists generally of all such as the Jews have received and adopted from the people among whom they reside.² They differ with the different people among whom their residence is cast. They are considered as less binding than the other orders. The two first are universally received, and considered of binding obligation among all the Hebrews.

The Hebrew house was, and still is, in the east, erected after the eastern style of architecture.³ The streets there are usually narrow, the better to shade them from the sun; and sometimes they have a range of shops on each side. The entrance to a house from the street lay through an outer porch into a square court which was open to the weather.⁴ This was strewed with mats or carpets, and was the usual place for receiving large companies at nuptials, circumcisions, and on other occasions. Surrounding the court is a cloister, over which is a gallery, with a balustrade, or piece of lattice, or carved work, going around it, to prevent accidents. From the cloister we are introduced into apartments of the same length as the court. Within is an inner porch, which is at the entrance into the main building. The gates were always shut, and guarded by a servant acting the part of a porter. The roofs were flat, as they still are in the east, and were generally formed of

¹ *Picard*, i, 35. ² *Idem*, 36. ³ *Horne*, 251. ⁴ *Idem*, 251.

earth, spread evenly along, and rolled very hard in order to exclude the rain. Upon this surface grass and weeds would grow freely. These roofs are surrounded by a wall, breast high, to prevent persons from falling. The back part of the house was allotted to the women, and in Arabia is called the harem, and in the Old Testament, the palace. The palace or harem of Solomon was an inner and separate building.

The Jews have a singular custom when they build a house of leaving a part of it unfinished,¹ agreeable to the precepts of the rabbis, and this is done in remembrance that Jerusalem and the temple now lie desolate. At least, he that builds must leave a cubit square of the wall free from lime, and upon this must be written either these words of Psalm cxxxvii, "If I forget thee, oh Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning," or the words, "Zecher la chorban," which means "a memorial of desolation." In their houses they have neither painting, figure, image, or statue, in strict compliance with the prohibition, "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image."²

The size of the house and the number of apartments in it varied with the ability of the owner and the number of the family.³ The frequency with which the Hebrews bathe leads to their providing baths in their houses.

The furniture of their houses was very simple, particularly in the earlier ages. The poorer classes had but few articles, and those such as were absolutely necessary. In general, their kitchen furniture must be bought new, as otherwise they have no security but that others who are not Jews may have used it,⁴ and if they have, some forbidden meats may have found their way into the vessels, the juices of which may have penetrated into them. Hence, if earthen, they must be thrown away, and if of metal or stone, being less porous than earthen, it may be

¹ *Picard*, I, 36. ² *Idem*, 37. ³ *Universal History*, III, 177, 178. ⁴ *Picard*, I, 37.

sufficient to pass them through the fire, or steep them in boiling water.

Different utensils are used by them both for the kitchen and table, some serving only for milk,¹ and such food as is made of it, and others for meat, for they cannot at the same time eat both meat and milk. They were accustomed to sit on mats and skins instead of chairs, and the same articles, on which they laid a mattrass, answered the purpose of bedsteads, while their upper garments served them for a covering. The more opulent had fine carpets, couches or divans, and sofas, on which they would sit, lay, and sleep.² The frames of their couches were sometimes inlaid with ivory, and the coverlids were rich and perfumed. The Hebrews seem originally to have adopted the custom of sitting at their tables, but afterwards they are found universally reclining while taking their meals, resting on their side, with their head towards the table, so that their feet were accessible to one who came behind the couch.

The Jews never eat the flesh of any four-footed beast that does not part the hoof and chew the cud,³ such as the cow and the sheep. They never eat rabbit, hare, or swine's flesh. They eat no bird of prey, or reptile. They do not eat the fat of beef, lamb or kid, nor the sinews of the thigh. They never eat the blood of beast, or bird. The butcher's art with the Jew is learned with much study and acquired with much practice. They have books which they must study,⁴ and in difficult cases must, in addition, consult with learned rabbis. A proper time must be chosen.⁵ A knife that cuts well and has no blotches in it, is selected and made use of; this and nearly all the other requisites being based upon the principle, that in the act of destroying life, all that is possible of the blood is to be drawn away from the body. In killing the larger beasts, their feet must first be bound in remembrance of Abra-

¹ *Picard*, I, 37. ² *Horne*, 252. ³ *Picard*, I, 57. ⁴ *Purchas's Pilgrimage*, 212. ⁵ *Picard*, I, 58.

ham's binding Isaac.¹ After killing them they cut out all the large veins and sinews, and also all the suet.

They cannot, at the same meal, eat both flesh, and cheese or milk, because it is said, "Thou shalt not seethe a kid in his mother's milk."² This they apply to all kinds of beasts, and to all sorts of milk. They never dress meat with anything made of milk, and never eat during the same hour, flesh and cheese, from the apprehension that some flesh might remain between the teeth, and thus get mixed with the cheese. The vessels used for meat are never made use of for things composed of milk. They have even different knives for these things.

In regard to their dress, they are forbidden to clothe themselves in any stuffs that are woolen and linen mixed together.³ They never even sew a woolen garment with thread, or a linen garment with wool. In the early periods of Hebrew history they built their own houses, and their wives and servants spun,⁴ wove, and made their own clothes, baked their bread, and dressed their meat. Great plainness characterized their food and clothing.

In regard to their clothing, the most simple and ancient garment was a tunic.⁵ This was a piece of cloth, most commonly linen, which encircled the whole body, descending down as low as the knees, and was bound with a girdle. Under this was worn a shirt or under garment, over it a mantle or upper garment. The last is a piece of cloth nearly square, several feet in length and breadth, which was wrapped round the body, or tied over the shoulders. The law regularly requires every garment they wear to have four corners, and to each corner a fringe hanging down, called zizit.⁶ This fringe is commonly made of eight woolen threads twisted together, with five knots on each of them, which takes up half the length of it. That part that has no knots in it, being unraveled, falls into a kind of fringe. This concerns the men only,

¹ *Purchas*, 212, 213. ² *Picard*, i, 58. ³ *Idem*, 38. ⁴ *Universal History*, III, 188. ⁵ *Horne*, 253. ⁶ *Picard*, 39.

and they are now generally content with wearing a piece of square stuff, with a fringe at the four corners, under their clothes.

They wore sandals on their feet, and a species of mitre, similar probably to the modern turbans, on their heads.¹

A heavy head of hair was considered a great ornament, which was combed, set in order, and annointed on all festive occasions. The beard was also considered a great ornament. The dress of the women differed from that of the men. The materials differed in quality, and the women wore a veil.

Every male child is carried from the house to the synagogue and circumcised on the eighth day after its birth.² This is attended with the performance of many ceremonies. The first-born, if a boy, belongs to the priest, according to the precept, "Sanctify unto me all the first-born," and "all the first born of man amongst thy children shalt thou redeem, etc." This the father is compelled to redeem from the priest by the payment of money.³ This is done when the child is thirty days old, is attended with many ceremonies, and is a day of rejoicing.

The children of the Hebrews are brought up with great care and circumspection. They are not allowed to go bare-headed.⁴ They must from their infancy wear the girdle that divides the heart from the parts below, so that the heart may not take notice of what passes below it. They are early instructed in the study of the law and the whole scripture. As soon as they can talk they are taught to read, and afterwards, without any principles of grammar, to translate the Bible into the language of the country in which they live. Grammar is seldom made use of amongst the Jews. From reading and translating the Bible they proceed to read some of their interpreters upon the Bible, and from thence to the Misna and Talmud, which they take to be the best foundation of their studies. They are early taught to pronounce the name of God

¹ *Horne*, 253, 254. ² *Picard*, 83, 84. ³ *Idem*, 85. ⁴ *Idem*, 225.

with great reverence, to honor their parents and superiors, and religiously to observe the precepts of the synagogue.¹ When a child has attained the age of thirteen years and one day, he is declared of age by his father in the presence of ten Jews, and then he possesses the legal capacity of acting for himself, and can make and perform his own contracts. After that the sins he commits are on his own account. Previously they were on the account of his father. With respect to girls, they are accounted women when they arrive at the age of twelve years and one-half.²

The birth of a son was celebrated as a festival,³ and solemnized in succeeding years with great demonstrations of joy. The first-born son possessed peculiar privileges. He was entitled to a double portion of the estate; was the high priest of the whole family; and could exercise an authority over those who were younger, similar to that possessed by a father. The custom was for the sons to remain till the fifth year in the care of the women; after which the father took charge of them, and they began to be instructed in the arts and duties of life, and in the law of Moses.

Every Jew is obliged to marry.⁴ The time fixed upon for that event to take place is eighteen years of age. A man living unmarried at twenty is accounted as living in sin.

Polygamy seems always to have been tolerated among the Hebrews,⁵ but not authoritatively commanded. The concubines were secondary or inferior wives. Their children did not inherit the father's property, except on failure of issue by the primary, or more honorable wives.

Among the Hebrews, and generally through the east, marriage was looked upon as a kind of purchase which the man made of the woman he desired to marry.⁶ On the one hand the wife brought a portion to her husband, and on the other, the husband gave to her, or her parents, money or presents.

¹ *Picard*, i, 225. ² *Idem*, 86. ³ *Horne*, 256. ⁴ *Picard*, i, 78. ⁵ *Horne*, 254. ⁶ *Idem*, 255.

No particular formalities were enjoined by the law of Moses, to create the marriage tie. Mutual consent, followed by consummation, was deemed sufficient. There was a previous espousal or betrothing, which was a solemn promise of marriage, made by the man and woman, each to the other, at such a distance of time as they agreed upon. This was done sometimes by writing, sometimes by the delivery of a piece of silver to the bride, in the presence of witnesses, as a pledge of their mutual engagements. This was generally done when the parties were young. After such espousal the woman continued with her parents several months, if not years, at least until she arrived at the age of twelve years, before she was brought home and her marriage consummated. If, during the time intervening between the espousal and the marriage,¹ the bride was guilty of any criminal correspondence with another person, contrary to the fidelity she owed to her bridegroom, she was treated as an adulteress.

The nuptial solemnity was celebrated with great festivity and splendor.² The marriage festivals lasted an entire week. The particular ceremonies attending the marriage are not so completely Hebrew, or of so peculiar a character, as to require a special enumeration.

A domestic institution of the Hebrews, slavery, was found already established when Moses promulgated the law. Slaves were acquired in various ways, as, 1st. By captivity. 2d. By debt; as when persons were sold for the payment of their debts.³ 3d. By committing theft beyond their power of restitution. 4th. By birth. 5th. By being stolen and reduced to slavery. All the legal consequences that now attach to slavery, were attached to it in the earlier periods of the Hebrew history. Their acquisitions belonged to their masters; their marriages were at their will, and their children were slaves. They were for the most part employed in tending cattle, or in rural affairs.⁴

¹ *Horne*, 255. ² *Idem*, II, 162. ³ *Idem*, 165. ⁴ *Idem*, 166.

To mitigate as far as possible the severity of their fate, many wise laws were enacted by Moses: They were to be treated with humanity. If a man struck his servant or maid causing death, he was to be punished by the magistrate. A slave losing an eye or a tooth by a blow from a master, acquired his or her liberty in consequence.¹ All slaves were to rest from their labors on the sabbath, and on the great festivals. They were to be invited to certain feasts. Slaves might be released on the sabbatical year, and at the great year of jubilee all were released. If a Hebrew was sold to a stranger or alien, his relations were to redeem him, and he was to make good the purchase money if able, paying in proportion to the number of years that remained until the year of jubilee. If a slave of another nation fled to the Hebrews, he was to be received hospitably, and on no account to be given up to his master. Notwithstanding these salutary provisions, the condition of slaves was sufficiently wretched, and was probably more so under the Roman dominion than at any prior period.

In regard to the domestic customs and usages of the Hebrews, like other orientals, they were very exact in the observances of outward decorum. At meeting and parting, their salutations and expressions of regard,² and their reciprocal wishes of happiness and benediction on each other, were tedious and tiresome. "The Lord be with thee," "The Lord bless thee," "Blessed be thou of the Lord," and "Peace be with thee," were the ordinary formulæ of salutation. In the latter ages of the Jewish polity, much time appears to have been spent in the rigid observance of these ceremonious forms,³ for which the modern inhabitants of the east still continue to be remarkable. Respect was shown to persons on meeting, by the salutation of "Peace be with you," and laying the right hand upon the bosom;⁴ and if the person addressed was of the highest rank, by prostration to the earth. It has

¹ *Horne*, II, 166. ² *Idem*, 168. ³ *Idem*, 168. ⁴ *Idem*, 169.

been for time immemorial, a custom in the east, to send presents one to another. The approach to a prince or person of distinction was through the medium of a present.

When any person visited another, he stood at the gate and knocked or called aloud, until the person on whom he called admitted him. The conversation indulged in by the orientals, was principally in the gate of the city. Here was an open space fitted up with seats,¹ where people could amuse themselves by witnessing those coming in and going out, or noticing such trifling occurrences as might be brought to their notice, or attending to the judicial trials which were carried on at the gates.

Visitors were always received and dismissed with great respect. Water was brought them on their arrival to wash their feet and hands, after which the guests were annointed with oil. The Hebrews, in common with all the orientals, made a frequent practice of bathing. For this purpose it is probable that public baths were constructed in Palestine.

The Hebrews rose about the dawn of day, and breakfasted soon after. They dined about eleven the forenoon, and supped at five in the afternoon. Their ordinary beverage to drink, was water drawn from the public wells and fountains, and which was denied to no one.² The patriarchs were accustomed to take their meals under the shade of trees, a practice still adhered to by many of the orientals. The ancient Hebrews at their meals had each his separate table. The ceremony of washing hands before sitting down at table,³ and upon rising up is still practiced by the Jews. The women did not appear at table in entertainments with the men.

In Palestine, and in the east generally, there were no inns. Hence hospitality was enjoined as a sacred duty, and cheerfully practiced by the Hebrews and orientals. Hence also those who journeyed were in the habit of providing themselves with every necessary.

¹ *Horne*, II, 170. ² *Idem*, 172. ³ *Idem*, 173.

The occasions of festivity among the Hebrews were drawn from the events of domestic life.¹ Weddings, seasons of sheep-shearing and harvest home, all furnished occasions of rejoicing. The birth-days of their sovereigns were also among the number. Military sports and exercises were common in the early periods of Hebrew history. These had the effect of teaching the Hebrew youth the use of arms, and of inspiring, among them, a martial spirit.² This was necessary through all their early struggles for national existence. Subsequent to the conquest of Alexander the great in the east, many of the gymnastic sports and games to which the Greeks were so attached were introduced among many of the orientals.³ Public games were first introduced into Jerusalem, and a gymnasium erected there by the high priest Jason in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes. This was one of the means resorted to during the reign of that monarch to Hellenize the Hebrews. This attempt raised up the Maccabees, who finally succeeded in putting an end to these spectacles, and in restoring the divine worship, and observance of the Mosaic laws and institutions. They were, nevertheless, revived under Herod, who built a theatre at Jerusalem, and also an amphitheatre without the city, erecting also similar edifices at Cæsarea, and appointing the celebration of games. These consisted of wrestling, chariot-racing, music, and combats of wild beasts, either with each other, or with men condemned to death.

The Hebrew had a strong love of life, and hence the instances of suicide among them are few in number. The Jews when sick many times cause public prayers to be made for them in the synagogue,⁴ and change their name as an indication of their change of life. When dangerously ill, the Jew makes a confession to ten witnesses, one of which is a rabbi, of all the sins he may have committed. When the sick person is in very great danger, they never leave him alone,⁵ but sit by him night and day, thinking it meri-

¹ *Horne*, II, 189. ² *Idem*, 190. ³ *Idem*, 190. ⁴ *Picard*, I, 101. ⁵ *Idem*, 101.

torious to be present at the separation of soul and body. When the sick man expires, the person present rends some part of his clothes, according to the ancient custom.¹ The eyes of the deceased were closed by the nearest of kin, who gave the parting kiss to the lifeless corpse.

According to the Hebrew law, a dead body conveyed a legal pollution to everything that touched it, even to the very house and furniture, which continued for the space of seven days. Immediately after decease, the corpse was thoroughly washed, and, if not immediately buried, was laid out in an upper room or chamber. The bodies of persons of distinction were frequently embalmed, a process they probably derived from the Egyptians. Besides the custom of embalming persons of distinction, the Hebrews commonly used great burnings for their kings, composed of large quantities of aromatics,² of which they made a fire as a triumphant farewell to the deceased. In these fires they were in the habit of burning their bowels, their clothes, armor, and other things belonging to the deceased. They very rarely, and only for particular reasons, burnt the dead bodies themselves.

The Hebrews attached great importance to the burial of their dead. To be deprived of it was thought to be one of the greatest dishonors that could be done to any man.³ It is reckoned in scripture as one of the calamities that should befall the wicked. The humanity of ancient nations seems always to have been sufficient to allow their enemies to bury their dead.

Prior to the era of Moses the funeral took place a few days after death. In Egypt a longer time elapsed, as was necessary where the process of embalming was performed. The poorer classes were carried forth to interment lying on an open bier or couch, not screwed into a coffin. This is the practice in the east at the present day. The rich, and persons of rank, were carried forth on more costly biers.

¹ *Horne*, II, 198. ² *Idem*, 198. ³ *Idem*, 199.

The funeral obsequies were attended by the friends of the deceased, both men and women, who made loud lamentations for the deceased. Sometimes some were hired on the occasion. The dirges sung on these occasions were often accompanied by musical instruments. The number of persons who assisted at the funeral obsequies was in proportion to the rank of the deceased, and the estimation in which his memory was held. This was agreeable to the ancient customs of the east.

It was usual to honor the memory of distinguished individuals by a funeral oration or poem. The suicide was entitled to no funeral obsequies. Persons of rank had distinct sepulchres to themselves in which they were interred, but the common people were buried in a public cemetery.¹ The Hebrews often had family sepulchres in places contiguous to their own houses, and generally in their gardens. It seems that an old custom once prevailed among the Hebrews and some other eastern nations, to put the tears shed by the surviving relatives and friends into lachrymatory urns, and to place them on the sepulchres as a memorial of their distress and affection. These vessels were of different materials and moulded into different forms. Some were of glass, some of earthenware, of diminutive size and delicate workmanship. Sometimes their sepulchres were distinguished by monuments. Over those whose death was infamous or attended by some remarkable circumstances, a great heap of stones was raised.

A funeral feast commonly succeeded the Hebrew burials. The usual tokens of mourning were rending of garments, putting on sackcloth, sprinkling dust on their heads, wearing mourning apparel, and covering the face and head.² They bewailed their misfortunes on the roofs or platforms of their houses. Sometimes the nearest relative would visit the grave of the deceased and weep there.

¹ *Horne*, II, 201. ² *Idem*, 202.

Government.

In the element of government, as in that of industry, there have been great changes. The first form of government properly belonging to the Hebrew polity was the patriarchal. This prevailed under Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, until the commencement of the bondage in Egypt.

In this form the sovereignty resided in the patriarch.¹ He was the first king, and his descendants were the first subjects. He had the power of disinheriting his children, and of punishing them with death. He could also pronounce upon them his blessing or his curse, which was regarded as a high privilege, and the exercise of it attended with important consequences.

The eldest son succeeded to the father, and thus this dignity was transmissible in the line of primogeniture. The priestly office was united to the kingly; so that the patriarchal dignity embraced as well the sacerdotal, as the monarchical elements.

During the sojourn in Egypt, the Hebrews had become so numerous as to render it necessary to appoint over them magistrates or governors invested with more extensive authority. They were termed elders, being chosen on account of their age and wisdom.

On the departure of the Hebrews from Egypt, they came under a new species of government, called a theocracy, where the exercise of the supreme power was exclusively vested in Jehovah, or in his oracle, who alone could enact and repeal laws. This not only fulfilled the purposes for which all good governments are instituted,² viz : to preserve order, protect rights, and redress wrongs, but also in addition to all that, to set apart the Hebrews as a peculiar people, and one having an important mission to perform. The fundamental principle of the Mosaic law was the maintenance of the doctrine and worship of one true God, and the prevention of polytheism and idolatry.

¹ *Horne*, II, 40. ² *Idem*, 41.

In the theocracy of the Hebrews, God was the great law-giver. Moses was the medium through which it was given, and it was to be of perpetual force and obligation. The judges, through whom the law was administered, were usually taken from the tribe of Levi, the chief expounder being the high priest. The Levites were more especially devoted to the study of the law, and were the learned men of the Hebrews. In difficult cases God could be directly consulted by urim and thummin. The will of God was also frequently made known in a direct manner through the medium of the prophets, whose mission was duly attested, and to whom the people were bound to hearken. In all these cases, the exercise of sovereign power was lodged in Jehovah alone.

The political organization, through which power was administered, partook largely of the democratic element. When laws were promulgated the whole congregation was convened to receive them. It differed, however, from a democracy, because in that, all power resides with the people and is exercised by them, whereas here, the power resided in Jehovah and was exercised through a democratic element.

All the descendants of Abraham kept together in a body according to their tribes and families.¹ Each tribe formed a little commonwealth of itself, having its own separate political organization, but still united by ties of intimate relationship with the great Hebrew nation. Each tribe had its own independent chief magistrate, under whom were the princes or heads of families.

Tribes sometimes acted as distinct and independent nations.² The judges were appointed by Moses, and held a right by virtue of their office to be present in the congregation or convention of the state. After the Hebrews became established in Palestine, certain judicial officers were chosen by the people in every city, who were called judges.³ These, in succeeding ages, were taken from the

¹ *Horne*, II, 41. ² *Idem*, 42. ³ *Idem*, 42.

Levites, as they were best skilled in the law of the Hebrews. During their wanderings in the wilderness, Moses established a council or senate of seventy to aid him in the government of the people. It was in imitation of this that the Hebrews, after their return from the Babylonish captivity, instituted the sanhedrim, or great council of seventy, at Jerusalem.

After the death of Joshua, and the elders of his council, the government was committed to certain supreme magistrates, termed judges. Their authority was not only judicial, but also legislative; extending to peace and war, and in no respect inferior to that which was afterwards exercised by their kings.

At length the demand was made for a king, and in contemplation of that, certain laws had been prescribed by Moses. The choice was to be left with the people with the condition that they should always elect a native Israelite.¹ Neither were they to elect any one not chosen by God. The kings administered justice sometimes themselves, and sometimes through their judges. They had the power of life and death, and the right of making war and peace. But the powers they exercised were not enjoyed by them as sovereigns in their own right. They were the viceroys of Jehovah, who was still the Hebrew legislator.

The government continued a theocracy, as well under their permanent administration, as under that occasionally exercised by the judges.² One, and the chief point of difference, was that the course of the judges was generally directed by urim, and that of the kings either by direct inspiration of God to themselves, or to the prophets.³ When the promise was made to David that the crown should be hereditary in his family, it was a departure from the fundamental maxim of the monarchy, that the kings should be elective, and be placed over the people by God.

¹ *Horne*, 43. ² *Idem*, 43. ³ *Calmet*, 455.

The Hebrew kings sometimes nominated their successors, and sometimes admitted them as partners in the government during their life time,¹ and various ceremonies attended the inauguration, which was performed with great pomp. The king was first anointed with holy oil,² and then proclaimed by the sound of the trumpet. The inviolability of the king's person appears to have been a maxim in their law soon after the establishment of royalty. The king was distinguished from others chiefly by the royal apparel, the crown, the throne, and the sceptre.

After David, the kings governed according to their own will,³ few of them observing the rules of the theocracy. The theocratic government, however, still continued to be maintained, as well by the vengeance executed against the wicked kings, as by the good princes who obeyed the commands of Jehovah.

The revenues of the monarch were derived principally from the following sources :⁴

1. Voluntary offerings or presents according to ancient oriental custom.

2. The produce of the royal flocks pastured, many of them, in the deserts of Arabia.

3. The produce of the royal demesnes consisting of arable lands, vineyards, olive and sycamore grounds, etc., which had many of them been the property of state criminals, and were confiscated to the sovereign.

4. The tenth part of all the produce of the fields and vineyards.

5. The tribute imposed upon conquered nations, paid partly in money, and partly in agricultural produce.

6. The customs paid to some of the kings, especially to Solomon, by the foreign merchants, for the privilege of passing through his dominions, in their mercantile expeditions.

The most important officer under the kingly government was the prime minister, who stood second to the king.

¹ *Horne*, II, 43-4. ² *Idem*, 44. ³ *Calmet*, 458. ⁴ *Horne*, II, 46.

There were also royal counselors or privy council, such as the old men who stood before Solomon while he lived. The prophets were also, in some respects, royal officers, as they were often consulted by the monarch.¹ There was also the recorder, who was the remembrancer or writer of chronicles, and the scribe, who appears to have acted as secretary of state, issuing the royal commands and registering acts and decrees.

There were also the governor of the palace, the princes of the provinces, the king's friend or companion, the king's life-guard, and the king's harem, all performed their different parts either in the administration of the government, or in constituting the royal equipage.

During the Babylonish captivity the Hebrews seem not to have supported any regular form of civil polity.² After the return, and while they were subject to Persia and Greece, or the successors of the Macedonian conqueror, the government was a kind of aristocracy, the high priest being at the head, but with a power extending only to matters relating to the law and religion.

A change is again presented under the Asmonæan princes,³ which consisted in a partial return to the theocratic form of government. The kingly and sacerdotal power became united in the same individual, and the kingdom was a kingdom of priests. This unison of power constituted a singular kind of polity, which resulted in yielding a stricter obedience to the laws of Moses, and a more entire devotion to religious services. It has been accordingly remarked that the commonwealth of the Hebrews was never more in earnest to perform the laws of God, or more exempt from those crimes denounced by the prophets, than under the Asmonæan line of princes.

The kingly government was restored by the Romans, and continued for a brief period under Herod. After his death, his kingdom was partitioned, and Judea soon became a Roman province governed by Roman procurators.⁴ These

¹ *Horne*, II, 47. ² *Calmet*, 455. ³ *Idem*, 456. ⁴ *Horne*, II, 52.

collected the imperial revenues, and had also the power of life and death in capital causes. They were Romans, and sent not by the senate, but by the Cæsars themselves. Under these governors the situation of the Jews became more and more deplorable.¹ The country was distracted with tumults and overrun with robbers. Justice was sold to the highest bidder. Even the office of high priest was exposed to sale. These abuses led to the revolt of the Jews, the destruction of their temple and capital, and the dispersion of their race.

In relation to the laws of the Hebrews, they were of a three-fold character, viz: moral, political and ceremonial. So far as the first was concerned, they might well challenge perpetual endurance. The second would be bounded by the continuance of their nation. The third was typical of the coming Messiah. One of the earliest codes of law was that delivered by Jehovah to Moses on the summit of Mount Sinai. The principles contained in the decalogue, so comprehensive in their scope, and yet so precise and definite in their particular injunctions, have lain at the foundation of much of the jurisprudence of all civilized nations. These are of a moral nature, and possess, therefore, the element of perpetuity. The great body of the code was either political or ceremonial.

The Jewish rabbins divide the whole law into six hundred and thirteen commandments. These they again divide into precepts and prohibitions.² Of the first, they number two hundred and forty-eight, as many, say the rabbins, as a man has members in his body. Of the latter, they reckon three hundred and sixty-five, the number of days in the year, or, as they say, of veins in a man's body. In order, therefore, to the perfect fulfilling of the law, every member of a man must every day perform one of the precepts, and omit one of the things prohibited. The women are only subject to the prohibitions, and, as some maintain, to only a limited number of these, because of

¹ *Horne*, II, 53. ² *Purchas*, 183.

their household occupations and subjection to their husbands. One inference they drew from this was, that God designed thereby to inculcate, that not a day of life should be suffered to pass without meditating upon his law,¹ nor any member of our bodies be enjoyed, which is not consecrated and employed in his service. The laws against idolatry, and to secure the worship of the true God, were direct and unequivocal. Much of the political and ceremonial law of the Hebrews has already been alluded to in the consideration of their industry and religion.

The means by which the laws were promulgated, varied at different times.² Moses and Joshua announced the laws to the people. Under the regal government they were publicly proclaimed by criers. In the distant provinces, towns and cities, they were made known by messengers or couriers, specially sent for that purpose. These proclaimed them at the gates of the cities, and in Jerusalem at the gate of the temple.

In regard to the administration of justice in the early ages of the world, the gate of the city was the seat of justice,³ where conveyances were made, complaints heard, and public business transacted. In the time of the Saviour, courts of justice were held by the Jews in their synagogues, where they punished offenders by scourging.

On the establishment of the Hebrews in Palestine, Moses commanded the appointment of judges and officers in all their gates, throughout their tribes, for the dispensation of justice in the neighboring villages. The priests and Levites, from their knowledge of the law, and old men called elders, administered justice to the people. From inferior tribunals appeals lay to a higher court in cases of importance.

After the captivity a reorganization took place in the judicial establishment,⁴ and two classes of judges, inferior and superior, were appointed. In more difficult cases, appeals were brought either before the ruler of the state, or before the high priest.

¹ *Universal History*, III, 7. ² *Horne* II, 47. ³ *Idem*, 54. ⁴ *Idem*, 55.

In the age of the Maccabees a supreme judicial tribunal was instituted, which was called the sanhedrim.¹ It was a great council composed of seventy or seventy-two members. The president was the high priest, under whom were two vice presidents, the first called the father of the council who sat on the right, and the second called the wise man sat on the left. The other assessors or members were composed of the following, viz: 1. Chief priests being partly such as had executed the pontificate, and partly the princes or chiefs of the twenty-four courses or classes of priests. 2. Elders, princes of tribes or heads of families. 3. Scribes or men learned in the law.

This tribunal had an extensive authority. It decided all cases which were brought before it by appeal from inferior courts, and took cognizance of the general affairs of the nation. It could exercise jurisdiction in capital cases until Palestine became subject to the Roman power, but not afterward.

Besides this tribunal, there were smaller councils, each consisting of twenty-three persons, who heard and determined petty causes.

It seems to have been the practice to hear and determine causes and to execute judgment in the morning. The Talmud prohibited capital causes from being heard in the night, nor would it permit the institution of an examination, the pronouncing the sentence, and the carrying of it into execution on the same day. The execution of it must at least be deferred until the day following. Neither would it permit judgment to be executed on festival days.

Judicial procedure, among the Hebrews, was summary, as has ever been the general practice in Asia.² It was also simple, each party managing his own cause, without the aid of advocates.

One witness was insufficient to prove a crime which would subject the perpetrator to the punishment of death.³

¹Horne, II, 55. ²Idem, 55. ³Idem, 56.

Such proof could only be established upon the oaths of two or three unimpeachable witnesses.

During the earlier periods of the Hebrew history, a very singular method was adopted for eliciting the truth in a case of suspected adultery. The woman was first brought to the tabernacle, afterwards to the temple, where the bitter waters of jealousy were administered to her. This was holy water, impregnated with wormwood, into which the priest put some of the dust of the floor, or pavement, together with the words of the curse written at full length, which were to this effect.¹ That if she had been guilty of adultery, those waters should swell and burst her belly, and rot her thigh; but, if she was innocent, they should have no power to hurt her. These words being read aloud to her, if she persisted to go on with the trial, she answered, amen. The very words of the curse were then blotted out in the bitter water, which was given her to drink. The result was that if guilty the water did burst her belly, and rot her thigh, and she expired soon after drinking it. If innocent, she came off unhurt, and triumphant. This is probably the foundation of the celebrated trial by ordeal, which was so popular and so much resorted to in Europe during the dark ages.

The sentences of the judicial tribunals were only pronounced in the day time;² and the interval that ordinarily occurred between the pronouncement of the sentence and the execution of it was very short.³

The Hebrews, in the early periods of their history, had no public executioners. Persons of distinguished rank not unfrequently put the sentence in execution upon offenders. When a capital sentence was to be executed they gave the criminal some wine in which incense was mingled, in order to stupefy and intoxicate him.

In relation to crimes and their punishment.

As the government of the Hebrews was a theocracy,⁴ one of their highest crimes was idolatry. This was the wor-

¹ *Universal History*, III, 137, 138. ² *Horne*, II, 56. ³ *Idem*, 57. ⁴ *Idem*, 61.

ship of other gods, and was not only a crime against Jehovah as God, but was also high treason against him as their king or ruler. This crime might be committed in a number of different ways; as 1. By actually worshiping other gods besides Jehovah. 2. By worshiping images whether of Jehovah or of the gods of the Gentiles. All image worship was forbidden. 3. By prostration before, or adoration of such images, or of any other created thing revered as a god. 4. By having altars or groves dedicated to idols, or images. 5. By offering sacrifices to idols. 6. By eating offerings made to idols.

Idolatry, when an individual sin, was punished capitally by stoning to death.¹ When a whole city became idolatrous, it was considered in a state of rebellion against the government. Its inhabitants and all their cattle were to be destroyed, and everything with the city itself to be burnt.

Blasphemy, which was speaking injuriously of the name, attributes, government and revelation of Jehovah, was a crime against him and also against the state,² and was therefore punished capitally by stoning. The false prophet was also stoned to death. The practice of divination, or the conjecturing of future events from things which were supposed to presage them was strictly forbidden. The diviner was to be stoned, and the one consulting him, was to have such punishment inflicted on him as God had reserved for that purpose.

Perjury was considered as a sin against God to whom the punishment of it is left.

Crimes against parents and magistrates constituted no inconsiderable portion of the criminal law of the Hebrews. The cursing of parents, the using of rude and reproachful language towards them; and the striking them,³ was punished with death. This indicates the spirit of the patriarchal age, when fathers enjoyed great rights over their families. The utterance of curses or reproachful words

¹ *Horne*, II, 61. ² *Idem*, 62. ³ *Idem*, 197.

against magistrates and persons in authority was prohibited, but no particular punishment is specified.

The crimes against property were theft, man-stealing, and the denial of anything taken in trust, or found.

The punishment imposed upon the thief was to make double, and sometimes higher, restitution.¹ If he was unable to make it, he was sold for a slave, and payment made to the injured party out of the purchase money.

Man-stealing, or the stealing of the person of a free born Hebrew, was punished with death.

Where there was a judicial conviction of having denied anything committed to his trust, or found by him, his punishment, like that of theft, was double restitution.

As to crimes committed against the person, the first on the list was murder. The Hebrew legislator indicated four marks, or circumstances, to distinguish it from manslaughter, as

1. When it proceeds from hatred or enmity.
2. When it proceeds from thirst of blood.²
3. When it is committed premeditatedly and deceitfully.
4. When a man lies in wait for another, falls upon him and slays him. The punishment of murder was death.

Manslaughter, also, had its marks, circumstances, and distinctions, as

1. When it takes place without hatred or enmity.
2. Without thirst for revenge.
3. When it happens by mistake.
4. When it happens by accident.

Its punishment was confinement to a city of refuge. Adultery was punished with death.

Where a person was convicted of having borne false testimony against an innocent man,³ he was condemned to suffer the same punishment to which, had the charge been true, the accused would have been subjected.

The laws were enforced by various sanctions or punishments. These were both capital and noncapital. Among

¹ *Horne*, 198. ² *Idem*, 199. ³ *Idem*, 199.

the former was slaying with the sword. The particular manner in which this was done seems to have depended upon the executioner. To this punishment the murderer was doomed. The Hebrews had a peculiar institution in their cities of refuge. These were six in number, and distributed over the land of Palestine. In every case of homicide, whether accidental or intentional, the manslayer could, if not overtaken, make his escape to a city of refuge. The next of kin to the person slain was called the *goël* or blood-avenger, and on him devolved the duty of slaying the homicide. If the homicide had been unintentional and therefore innocent, and the *goël* overtook and slew the unfortunate manslayer before he could reach a city of refuge, he was not considered to be guilty of blood. If he could reach a city of refuge he experienced immediate protection. An investigation was then had to determine, whether the death had been deliberately planned and perpetrated, or whether it occurred accidentally.¹ If the result showed it to have been the former, he was judicially delivered over to the *goël*, who was at liberty to terminate his life in any way he should choose. If the latter, then the man-slayer continued to reside in the city of refuge until the death of the high priest; yet if the *goël* found him without the city, or its suburbs, he was still at liberty to slay him without being guilty of blood.

Stoning to death was a very common punishment, so much so, that whenever the law condemned a man to death without naming the kind,² this was always understood to be meant by it. This was the punishment for incest, sodomy, bestiality, ravishing a betrothed virgin, blasphemy, sabbath-breaking, witchcraft, idolatry, and other crimes of a like nature. This punishment was executed without the city.

Burning, according to the Mosaic law, was to be inflicted upon the daughters of priests who were guilty of inconti-

¹ *Horne*, 201. ² *Universal History*, III, 130. ³ *Idem*, 131, 132.

subjected to this punishment. The method of inflicting it was two-fold, viz : burning with fire and pouring melted lead down the throat of the criminal.

Beheading was a punishment appointed for murderers, and for the inhabitants of towns that had fallen into idolatry.

Precipitation, or casting headlong from a window, though rarely used, yet seems to have been practiced on certain occasions.¹

Among the noncapital punishments were :

1. Scourging, which was a common corporal punishment under the law.² It was generally inflicted with a scourge consisting of three lashes, so that thirteen blows inflicted forty stripes save one.

2. Retaliation, or returning like for like, was the punishment of corporal injuries to another.

3. Restitution of things stolen, and for various other injuries done to the property of another person.

4. Compensation to an injured party to induce him to withdraw or discontinue his suit; but this was forbidden in the case of murder and homicide.

5. Imprisonment, though not enjoined by Moses, was practiced during the Jewish monarchy and in the time of the Saviour.

6. The most severe of all was excommunication, or exclusion from sacred worship. This was both a civil and an ecclesiastical punishment.³ It had different degrees of severity. The first was simply casting out of the synagogue, and was in force for only thirty days. In the second, or anathema, the excommunicated party was delivered over to Satan, and devoted by a solemn curse. The third degree was called *maranatha*, and intimated that the party had nothing more to expect but the terrible day of judgment.

The individuals excommunicated were shut out from all social intercourse, debarred the privilege of divine worship, and subjected to various civil disabilities.

¹ *Horne*, 202. ² *Idem*, 200. ³ *Idem*, 201.

Philosophy.

The nature and constitution of the Hebrew mind never seems to have fitted it for any considerable reach or power of thought. It was little given to speculative philosophy, and still less, if possible, to the investigations of science. The fact was, and still continues to be, that religion was the main, central element with the Hebrews, and that every other was made more or less subservient to its full development.

Schools were early established among the Hebrews,¹ but they were "schools of the prophets." These were first erected in the cities allotted to the Levites, and were as early as the age of Samuel. These scholars or disciples were styled "sons of the prophets," over whom presided some venerable, inspired prophet, who was called their father. They lived together in a society or community, and were instructed in the knowledge of the law, in the principles of their religion, and also in the sacred art of psalmody or prophesying, with harps, psalteries and cymbals. These schools continued until the Babylonish captivity. The synagogues succeeded to the schools of the prophets, but independent of these, it appears in the time of the Saviour that eminent Jewish doctors had their separate schools. The Jews of that era, like the Greeks, had their wise men, calling themselves the children of wisdom. The heads of sects were called fathers, and the disciples, sons or children.

Some of the Jewish teachers appear to have had private lecture rooms; but they also taught and disputed in the synagogues, and in temples, wherever they could find an audience. The teachers were self-constituted, and received no other compensation than what was voluntarily offered them. Their subsistence was generally acquired by the practice of some art or handicraft. Any disciple might propose questions upon which the teachers would remark and give their opinions.

¹*Horne*, II, 184.

The doctors or teachers generally sat in giving their instructions. Sometimes, like the Greek philosophers,¹ they were accustomed to have their disciples around them, wherever they went, and to discourse to them as opportunities were furnished.

The Hebrews, in the later period of their history, were divided into sects, of which the principal were the Pharisees, the Sadducees and the Essenes. These were rather religious than philosophical in their composition, opinions and modes of belief. Philosophy, like every other element among the Hebrews, was subservient to religion; and it was principally through the medium of these sects, that the latter gave to the former, her forms of thought and modes of belief.

These sects had no existence prior to the Babylonish captivity.² Previous to that event, the Hebrews were wholly absorbed in the study of their law and in the cumbersome forms of their ceremonial worship. It was not until the schools of the prophets had closed, that those of the sects originated. We meet with few traces of the latter, until the era of the Maccabees, when the leading thinkers among the Jews, led off in these three celebrated sects.

Of these the Pharisees were the most numerous and powerful. The term is derived from a Hebrew word signifying *to separate*, because they held to a separation from the rest of the world in regard principally to the food,³ clothing and religious ceremonies.⁴ The sect was limited to no family or class, but embraced some of every tribe, family and condition.

One of the chief distinguishing features of the Pharisees was the strict observance of the oral law, which they believe to have been given to Moses on Mount Sinai by an archangel,⁵ and to have been transmitted to posterity by seventy elders to whom he committed it. This law, which was made up of traditions, they exalted above the written law, paying to it a superstitious reverence, and affecting great

¹ *Horne*, II, 185. ² *Idem*, 143. ³ *Idem*, 144. ⁴ *Calmet*, 721. ⁵ *Idem*, 721.

sanctity of manners. By these means, particularly their assumption of superior sanctity, they acquired great credit and influence with the people, and obtained the highest offices both in the state and priesthood.

The following were the principal tenets or modes of belief of the Pharisees. They held that by strict observance both of the written and oral law a man might not only merit and obtain justification of God,¹ but that he might also perform works that might entitle him to something beyond that. Fasting, almsgiving, ablutions and confessions, according to their belief, are a sufficient atonement for sin. Thoughts and desires are not in themselves sinful unless they are carried out into action. God is the creator of heaven and earth, and governs all things, even human actions, by his providence. They ascribed all things to fate or providence, yet not so entirely as to take away the free will of man,² though fate does not cooperate in every action. Man can do nothing without divine influence;³ which does not, however, destroy the freedom of the human will.

The soul of man they held to be spiritual and immortal, and that there would be a resurrection of the body. That rewards and punishments will be dispensed to the virtuous and vicious in the invisible world beneath the earth. That the wicked shall be confined in an eternal prison, but the good will obtain an easy return to life. They also believed in the existence of other spirits or angels, both good and bad, besides the soul of man. They also appear to have believed in the metempsychosis, or transmigration of souls, which was probably derived from the oriental or Egyptian philosophy. They held that God was bound to bless the Jews on account of the merits of Abraham, the practice of circumcision,⁴ and the many sacrifices they offered up to him.

The peculiarities of their manners grew out of their singular observances. They were particularly exact in

¹ *Calmet*, 722. ² *Horne*, II, 144. ³ *Calmet*, 722. ⁴ *Horne*, II, 144.

observing the rites and ceremonies of the written and oral law;¹ extremely rigid in their discipline, in watchings, fastings and ablutions; were overscrupulous to avoid every kind of ritual impurity. Some practiced mortification and austerities to preserve the purity of the body, depriving themselves almost entirely of sleep, from the fear that, during its continuance,² they might involuntarily become unclean or polluted. Some slept, or attempted to, on sharp stones or thorns, others on narrow planks not exceeding twelve fingers in breadth, in order that should they sleep too soundly, they might fall upon the ground and awake to prayer.

They made long and frequent prayers, not only in the synagogues and temple, but also in the public streets.³ They made broad the phylacteries on the borders of their garments, in which they wrote sentences of the law. They were assiduous in making proselytes, were ostentatious in their charities, but under this sanctimonious cover, were full of vanity, avarice, licentiousness, and impiety.

The books of the Talmud mention several distinct classes of Pharisees, and among others, the truncated Pharisee, who seems destitute of feet, scarcely lifting them from the ground, that he might appear lost in profound meditation. There was also the mortar Pharisee, who wore a deep cap in the shape of a mortar, permitting him only to look upon the ground, to the end that his meditations might not be disturbed. The striking Pharisee must needs shut his eyes as he walked to avoid the sight of women, by means of which he often struck his head against some hard substance.

The sect of the Pharisees has never been extinguished. The greater part of the Jews of the present day are of this sect. They, equally with the ancient Pharisee, are devoted to their traditions,⁴ which they call the oral law. They attribute everything to destiny, except what depends on human liberty. They believe everything to be in the

¹ *Calmet*, 722. ² *Horne*, II, 145. ³ *Calmet*, 722. ⁴ *Idem*, 722.

hands of God except the fear of God; that is, acts of devotion and piety, which depend on free will.

The sect of the Sadducees originated about the same time as that of the Pharisees. The term is derived from Sadok or Zadok who lived about 263 years B. C. The following are the principal tenets of their belief: There is no resurrection, and neither angel nor spirit.¹ The soul of man, although a reasonable one, is nevertheless mortal, and perishes with the body.² It has even been imputed to them that they believed God to be a corporeal substance, and that they rejected the prophets. They deny that there is such a thing as fate or destiny, or an overruling providence,³ maintaining that all men enjoy the utmost freedom of action, and possess the absolute power of doing either good or evil, according to their own choice.⁴ As a natural consequence of this belief, they were severe in their judgments upon the conduct and actions of men. As they admitted neither rewards nor punishments in another life, they were inexorable in their punishment of the wicked. They adhered strictly to the law, and to the enforcing the observance of that to the very letter. They totally rejected the traditions, or oral law of the Pharisees. Their belief was, in almost every respect, the direct contrary of that of the Pharisee.

The Sadducees were much inferior to the Pharisees in number, but many of them arrived at high degrees of eminence.⁵ Several of them were advanced to the high priesthood. A small number of Sadducees are found among the Jews at the present day, but they are accounted as heretics.⁶

The third sect was that of the Essenes or Essenians. There is much doubt respecting their origin.⁷ By some they are supposed to have originated from Egypt. They were dispersed chiefly through Palestine, Syria and Egypt. They differed from both the Pharisees and Sadducees in

¹ *Horne*, II, 145. ² *Calmet*, 775. ³ *Horne*, II, 145. ⁴ *Calmet*, 776. ⁵ *Horne*, II, 146. ⁶ *Calmet*, 776. ⁷ *Horne*, II, 146.

doctrine and practice. They believed in the immortality of the soul, although they denied the resurrection of the body. Their belief respecting the state of the soul after death,¹ was that the souls of good men ranged the Elysian fields,¹ while those of the wicked were confined in Tartarus. They believed in the existence of angels, and that everything was ordered by an eternal fatality, or chain of causes.² They carefully kept their word,³ performed their promise, and avoided swearing. They observed the sabbath with great particularity. They are stated to have numbered about four thousand in Judea. Some occasionally resided in cities, but they generally preferred the country at some distance from the sea-shore, where they might remain uncorrupted by conversation with strangers, and prosecute, without interruption, the pursuits of agriculture.

The Essenians were divided into two classes: 1. The *practical*, who lived in society. Some of them married and reared up families of their own, although they generally relied upon obtaining the children of others, and then of infusing into them their own spirit and principles. These frequently dwelt in cities and their neighborhoods, following husbandry and other useful and innocent occupations. 2. The contemplative Essenes, who have been sometimes called *therapeutæ* or physicians, although they confined themselves to diseases of the soul, devoted themselves wholly to meditation, and resided entirely in the country. These entered into the depths of contemplative life, were beings of mysticism, and held converse with things invisible.⁴ So profound was their abstraction, and so lofty their elevation, that they pretended to be able to penetrate into the nature of angels, and assign them proper names, or rightly to interpret those already given them. They also sought to pry into futurity, and to predict future events.

What is, perhaps, the most singular about the Essenians is, that they were probably the first to originate and adopt

¹ Calmet, 385. ² Horne, II, 146. ³ Calmet, 385. ⁴ Horne, II, 146.

the communist doctrine of living in common.¹ They are described as living in society, and eating and drinking in common, provision being made for the whole community. Each society possessed a common chest, in which everything necessary for the support and clothing of each member was kept. The earnings of every one were brought into the common stock, and any one falling sick or becoming disabled, was supplied out of the common fund. Priests of distinguished merit were chosen to be receivers of the estates and revenues of the society, and who were likewise charged with their distribution. They thus dried up at their source the springs of avarice, and in their ordinary living confined themselves to the simplest fare, abhorring voluptuousness as a fatal poison. Such were the Essenians, a people who seem early to have experimented upon some of the principles involved in the elements of social life, and perhaps with as much success as many who have, in a long course of ages, succeeded them.

There were other sects among the Jews, such as the Herodians, Samaritans, Galilæans, Zealots, etc.; but they were rather political than speculative and doctrinal, and have, therefore, little to do with the forms of Hebrew thought.

The Hebrews have furnished no contributions to science, nor have they ever been adepts in secular learning. They have possessed learned rabbins; but their powers of investigation and research were confined to expositions of their law. They have not been deficient in energy of thought; but it has been expended on the scriptures and the Talmud, so entirely has everything been framed in reference to the mission they were sent to accomplish.

Art.

The Hebrew mind seems to have been as little fitted for the exercise of the arts of design as for power of thought. It will very generally be found, that where the element of

¹ *Calmet*, 585, 586.

philosophy has been actively and largely developed, that of art has also had devoted to it a corresponding share of attention. So, also, where the former has experienced but a slight development, the latter has exhibited but few of its beautiful or sublime creations. Where the solid materials of thought are wanting, there is slender material for art to weave her fabrics, or erect her structures.

Very few of the arts are indebted to the Hebrew mind for their origin or progress. Although the first temple might be cited as a beautiful and splendid specimen of the early triumph of the architectural art, yet it will be recollected that it was mostly, if not entirely, the work of foreign artificers. The art itself has clearly never received any considerable accessions or advancement from any efforts of the Hebrews. The arts of design, such as painting, sculpture, engraving, etc., are, if possible, still less indebted.

The art of war was slightly, if at all, advanced by the Hebrews; but we have, perhaps, through the medium of the scriptures and other writings, more authentic means of information in relation to the practice of this art by them, than by other ancient nations.¹ Their arms were offensive and defensive, the former being swords, short, crooked, broad and sharp, girded upon the thigh; spears, javelins, or short pikes; bows and arrows, and slings. The latter were the helmet for the head, the breast-plate, coat of mail, target and shield. They had also greaves or boots to protect the feet and legs.² The material of which these weapons were commonly made, was of brass, sometimes also of iron and steel.

Palestine was, in general, a mountainous region, so much so as to be altogether better fitted for the evolutions of infantry than of cavalry. Hence, the latter never seems to have formed any considerable portion of the Hebrew armies.³ Still less they seem to have employed chariots armed with scythes, as these are never of value in battle except in an open campaign country.

Universal History, III, 179, 180. ² *Idem*, 181. ³ *Idem*, 182.

The wars of the Hebrews were of two kinds,¹ either such as God commanded, or such as were undertaken by their chiefs and princes upon other occasions. Their manner of commencing an offensive war was to offer certain articles of peace, the refusal of which was interpreted as a declaration of war. When the object was to recover lost territories, they generally first made a demand of them. When they were attacked by enemies, they usually, although not always, sent to expostulate with them.

After the Hebrews left Egypt, all the men from twenty years of age and upwards, until the age of fifty, were liable to the performance of military service.² It was little better than a militia establishment. Whenever a war was resolved upon, a summons was sent to every tribe,³ upon which all liable to military service were obliged to repair to the place of general rendezvous, with their arms, and also with provisions for a month. Here, a certain number, according to the exigency, was drawn out and the rest sent back. Those that were retained were allowed to return as soon as they had either accomplished or failed to accomplish what had called them together.

No regular forces, composing a standing army, were kept on foot until the time of the monarchy. David kept always on hand, a large standing army.⁴ So long as the military system consisted of a mere militia establishment, the Hebrews received no pay for their services. Afterwards, and under the monarchy, both officers and privates were paid by the sovereign. During the continuance of the militia system, every man provided his own arms. Afterwards, under the monarchy, the sovereigns formed depots whence they supplied their troops.

The officers of war, under the kings, were the head or general of the army, the princes or generals of each tribe, the commanders of thousands, of hundreds, of fifties, of

¹ *Universal History*, III, 185. ² *Horne*, 210. ³ *Universal History*, III, 179. ⁴ *Horne*, 211.

tens, and of threes. Their method of carrying on warfare, in which the art of war is principally displayed, differed but little, if anything, from that of other nations.¹ They had admirable methods of marching and encamping; and in regard to their order of battle, Jewish writers state that they ranged their army into one single line of a considerable depth, sometimes between twenty and thirty deep. On the front of these were placed their light armed men, their archers, spearmen, and slingers, who began the battle with a terrible shout, at the same time sending thick showers of arrows and stones upon their enemy's front, in order to cause terror and confusion, and stop the rushing in of their chariots, by wounding both the horse and the driver. The Hebrews appear, in general, to have been a brave people, but to have lacked that perfect discipline that contributed so much towards rendering the Romans the masters of the world.

The only arts which the Hebrews seem to have cultivated with much success, were those of music and poetry. These have been justly called twin sisters, and afford to each other mutual aid. They can probably be the best and most successfully cultivated together.

The musical art was cultivated with great ardor and success by the Hebrews.² Its powers were not only invoked at the services of the temple, but also at the coronation of their kings, on receiving the glad tidings of victory, on the triumphal returns of their generals, at their feasts and entertainments, and at their public festivals. The Hebrew monarchs had their private music. It appears that female, as well as male musicians, found employment in the services of the temple. They were generally the daughters of the Levites.

In relation to the nature of their music³ we have no certain knowledge. That it was both vocal and instrumental, is beyond question. It is extremely probable that the voices were accompanied by instrumental music.

¹*Universal History*, III, 184, note G. ²*Horne*, II, 183, 184. ³*Calmet*, 660.

They had different kinds of instruments. They were :
1. Wind instruments, such as flutes, trumpets, and the organ.¹ 2. Stringed instruments, and of these there were the harp, lute, instruments of three, eight, or ten strings.² 3. Such as were beat either by the hand, or with a stick, as the tabor, drum, kettle-drums, and such like.³

To what degree of perfection vocal or instrumental music attained among the Hebrews, or what was its particular nature or excellence, we have no very precise knowledge.⁴ Should we allow ourselves to draw inferences from the effects produced, we should arrive at conclusions highly satisfactory in relation to the force, power, richness, energy and influence of the Hebrew music.⁵ It seems to have been resorted to for the purpose of sweetening the temper, composing and allaying the passions of the mind, reviving the drooping spirits, and dissipating that moody melancholy, that at times weighs down the mental faculties. The dark spirit that, in its atmosphere of gloom, rested upon the mind of Saul, took wing and hastened its flight when the pleasant harp of David sent forth its strains of rich and varied music.

When the spirit of prophecy was invoked, and Elisha was desired to unveil the future to the eye of Jehoshaphat, he required a minstrel to be brought unto him,⁶ and when he played, "the hand of the Lord came upon him," and the future yielded up its secrets. No inference can be derived from this that the music imparted the gift of prophecy, but only that it disposed the faculties and spirit of the prophet to receive the revelation from on high.

Among the Hebrews, dancing was a very usual accompaniment of music. At the feasts, on occasions of public triumph, and at all seasons of mirth and rejoicing, the dance circulated joyously in glad companionship with their strains of music.⁷

¹ *Universal History*, III, 204, note. ² *Horne*, II, 185, 186. ³ *Calmet*, 661. ⁴ *Idem*, 660. ⁵ *Horne*, II, 268. ⁶ *Idem*, 184. ⁷ *Idem*, 184.

But that which, perhaps beyond all others, excites our admiration, is the art of poetry as practiced and perfected by the Hebrews. Poetry, as the language of nature, and the medium through which human passions make themselves known and felt, is earlier than prose. Unfortunately, we have few specimens preserved of the early poetry of the eastern nations. The Hebrews, in this respect, have been more fortunate than others. This has been owing to the peculiarity of their mission. Inspiration not unfrequently selected poetry as the medium through which it was communicated. It thus tended to ennoble and sanctify, and bathe in the light of heaven, an instrument around which hung all of the lofty and ideal, the beautiful and sublime, that appertained to earth.

The volume containing this inspiration could not pass away. The lays of its divinely inspired poets have therefore come down to us.¹ We have the songs of Moses, and of Deborah, and of Hannah; those of David; the thanksgiving of Hezekiah; the book of Job; a great part of the prophet Isaiah; and the lamentations of Jeremiah. In poetry was chanted the song of praise and thanksgiving; and, not unfrequently, in numbers flowed forth the soul of prophecy. In these works of the inspired poets are found sentiments the most pure, descriptions the most sublime, and conceptions the most beautiful and grand, that are anywhere to be met with in any language. We undoubtedly fail in preserving in the translation the full beauty that was contained in the original, and yet where shall we look for more expressive figures, or more splendid imagery, or vaster conceptions, or more truly beautiful and sublime thoughts than to Moses, and to Isaiah, and to David. No one but an Hebrew poet ever thought of "making the clouds his chariot," or of describing him as "walking upon the wings of the wind." It has been expressively said that "There is nothing so sweet, so tender and pathetic, and at the same time nothing so grand, so majestic, so

¹ *Universal History*, III, 193.

terrible, and so harmonious, as the poetic part of the Bible, to which all the heathen verse is lame and flat.”

The true nature of the Hebrew verse can hardly now be ascertained.¹ The grand characteristic of Hebrew poetry is described as a parallelism, that is, a certain equality, resemblance or relationship, between the members of each period; so that in two lines or members of the same period, things shall answer to things, and words to words, as if fitted to each other by a kind of rule or measure.

Of the different kinds of Hebrew poetry there is

1. Prophetic poetry, or that peculiar to the prophetic books.² 2. Elegiac poetry, of which specimens are to be found in the book of Job, in the Psalms and in the Lamentations of Jeremias. 3. Didactic poetry, or that which delivers moral precepts in elegant verse, as the book of Proverbs. 4. Lyric poetry, which is designed to be accompanied with music, as in the book of Psalms. 5. Idyl, a short pastoral poem, the Psalms affording instances. 6. Dramatic poetry, as the book of Job and song of Solomon. 7. Acrostic, or alphabetical poems, consisting of twenty-two lines, or twenty-two systems of lines, periods or stanzas,³ according to the number of letters of the Hebrew alphabet, as may be found in Psalms, Proverbs and Lamentations. .

¹ *Horne*, 108. ² *Idem*, 110, 111. ³ *Idem*, 111.

CHAPTER XIV.

PHŒNICIA AND SYRIA—DESCRIPTION, HISTORY, INDUSTRY, RELIGION, SOCIETY, GOVERNMENT, AND PHILOSOPHY.

Phœnicia and Syria.

In advancing northward from Palestine we enter the land of the Syrian and Phœnician. The limits of this region do not appear to have been definitively fixed.¹ It may be, perhaps, described with sufficient accuracy as being bounded by Mount Amanus on the north, by the Euphrates on the east, by Arabia and Palestine on the south, and by the Mediterranean sea on the west.

Phœnicia is properly the maritime portion of Syria.² It is a small region of country, being only about one hundred and twenty miles in length and twenty in breadth, skirting the eastern shore of the Mediterranean sea. To compensate, however, for its small extent, it offered very unusual facilities for the successful prosecution of commercial and business enterprise. Its entire coast was lined with bays and harbors, while its mountains and bold promontories jutting into the sea, were everywhere covered with a rich forest growth, supplying almost inexhaustible material for the construction of habitations and ships.

Syria was of much larger extent, and much more diversified in its climate and facilities. It contained but one large river, whose waters were turbid and unfit for domestic use, and whose frequent rapids rendered it of little utility for the purposes of navigation.³ There are several minor streams in the valley where lies the city of Damascus, which are remarkable for the limpidity of their waters and the abundance of fish.

¹ *Taylor*, 29. ² *Heeren's Researches*, II, 8. ³ *Taylor*, 30.

Syria contains high mountains, extensive plains and arid deserts.¹ Mount Taurus, Libanus and Antilibanus, are covered with snow, while other parts, without winds or shade, languish beneath an oppressive heat, which enfeebles both the mind and the body. Among the hills, at the foot of the high mountains, refreshing breezes circulate which follow the course of the valleys, especially that in which rolls the river Orontes, infusing new life into the inhabitants.

The soil of Syria exhibited great diversity.² On the mountain was reared the lofty cedar of Lebanon, once so revered as to be an object of worship.³ There were two large valleys of mineral salt, which added greatly to its natural wealth. The soil was, probably on the whole, better fitted for pasturage than agriculture. Taking into consideration its arid deserts, its plains, its mountainous and wooded regions, it was better fitted for nomadic and commercial, than agricultural life; and this fact has more or less influenced its history and developments.

It has been made a question, whether the Phœnicians and ancient Canaanites, were originally the same or different people. While very respectable authorities are in favor of identity of origin, others of equal or superior weight are in opposition; ⁴ and the total difference of character between the fierce and intractable Canaanitish warrior, rejoicing in his prancing steed and chariot of iron, and the unwarlike Phœnician, wholly devoted to commerce, and manufactures, and the arts of peace, very strongly favor the idea of separateness of origin. While the Canaanites may be considered as the original occupants of the country, the Phœnicians are emigrants at a comparatively recent date.⁵ Hamitic races starting from Egypt or from Babylonia, seem to have been the first to people Western Asia. They were the original founders of most of the towns. Semitism has been traced to Baby-

¹*Anquetil*, I, 86. ²*Idem*, 87. ³*Taylor*, 30. ⁴*Rawlinson*, IV, 200, 201.

⁵*Idem*, 202.

lonia as its origin,¹ and from this primitive seat it spread itself northward and westward. Asshur went forth from Babylonia, and Abraham from Ur, and from the same quarter the Aramæan tribes, which are found to have gradually ascended the Euphrates. There is also sufficient reason to believe that the Phœnicians, like the other Semitic races in these parts, the Jews and the Aramæans, were emigrants from their abode on the Persian gulf. There is also a tradition of this early emigration. The period at which it occurred has been placed in the thirteenth century before Christ,² at a time when the Semitic influence in the world seemed greatly increasing.

The primeval Canaanites were of the race of Ham, and probably originally spoke a dialect closely akin to the Egyptian.³ But before the journey of Abraham into Canaan, the inhabitants had by some means become Semitized, as the Canaanitish names of the time are Semitic. This may have been owing to movements in Mesopotamia and about the Persian gulf, and to the influx of emigrants from those quarters. From some cause Semitism was already predominant in Syria and Palestine at the date of the arrival of Abraham.

As early as 2000 years B. C., while as yet Abraham was sojourning among them,⁴ the Syrians were a people dwelling in cities. They did not form one nation under one government, but were dwellers in cities, each one of these, with its contiguous territory, having its own chief or king.

The city and kingdom arising the earliest into general notice, was Damascus. This is one of the most celebrated cities in Asia, situated in a beautiful,⁵ fertile, and well watered valley, known among the orientals as the orchard of Damascus. It is one, if not the oldest city in the world, having existed as such in the time of Abraham, and notwithstanding its calamities, which at times have almost

¹ Rawlinson, iv, 203. ² *Idem*, 205. ³ Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, I, 537.

⁴ Heeren's *Universal History*, 34. ⁵ D'Anville's *Ancient Geography*, I, 382.

caused its utter annihilation, it continues to this day a great and splendid city of some 140,000 inhabitants.

The kingdom of Damascus rose upon the ruins of that of Zobah,¹ having been founded by Reson, its first king. The Syrians, in general, were anciently, and have ever continued to be, a feeble, effeminate, people.² After the reign of Reson, the Syrian kingdom of Damascus attracts little attention until the reign of Benhadad.³ His wars, for the most part, unsuccessful with Ahab, king of Israel, render him more known. He was deprived of his crown and life by Hazael, one of his generals. Under him this ancient Syrian kingdom touched the highest summit of its glory and power. He took and pillaged Jerusalem, and subjugated Israel and Judah, compelling their monarchs to yield up to him several important provinces, and to pay him tribute.⁴ He also took Elath on the Red sea, and, by establishing there a centre of trade, added much to the commercial prosperity of his kingdom.

Most of these advantages were lost under his son, Benhadad II, but the Syrians again recovered their power temporarily under Rezin.⁵

The Syrians and Israelites having united their forces against Ahab, king of Judah, the latter sought the protection of Tiglath-pileser, king of Assyria,⁶ who, marching against Damascus, besieged and took the city, carried the inhabitants into captivity, and put an end to the ancient kingdom of Syria, B. C. 740.

Syria from this period of time continued to constitute a mere province of the Assyrian, Babylonian and Medo-Persian empire, until the overthrow of the latter by Alexander. It then passed under his dominion, and at his death, in common with the other provinces of his vast empire, became a subject of contention among his generals.

A new empire was destined to arise out of the ruins of the Macedonian, to be called from Syria, one of its pro-

¹ *Universal History*, II, 299. ² *Anquetil*, I, 88. ³ *Idem*, 93, 94, 95. ⁴ *Taylor*, 31. ⁵ *Idem*, 31. ⁶ *Taylor*, 31.

vinces, the Syrian, or, as it is frequently denominated, the Syro-Median empire. This was founded by Seleucus Miator, the son of Antiochus. From him its monarchs have been called the Seleucidæ. The date of its foundation is B. C. 312.

Seleucus was a great conqueror. He was at first governor of the province of Babylon, from which he was expelled by Antigonus. While Antigonus was employed in Asia Minor he returned, and in the course of ten years extended his dominion over all Upper Asia.¹ So uninterrupted was his career of conquest that in B. C. 307, he found himself in possession of all the countries between the Euphrates, Indus and Oxus. Two years after, he invaded India, advanced to the banks of the Ganges, entered into a contract with Sandrocothus, the Indian monarch, and succeeded in establishing commercial relations between India and Upper Asia, which were long afterwards kept up to their mutual benefit.

Thus the Syro-Median empire in its commencement, and until the battle of Ipsus, B.C. 301, extended over the fertile provinces of Upper Asia, the elder seats of Assyrian and Babylonian civilization.² That great battle broke forever the power of Antigonus, and added Syria,³ Cappadocia, Mesopotamia and Armenia to the already extensive dominion of Seleucus. The course of empire now traveled westward from the banks of the Tigris and the Euphrates to those of the Orontes. Syria was made the chief province of the empire, and Antioch, a city built by Seleucus, its capital.

Very different would have been the destiny of the race of the Seleucidæ, and possibly of civilization and human progress itself, had Seleucus been content with the dominion of Upper Asia, and expended his power in rendering compact and permanent the empire he had founded in these ancient seats of an early civilization.

His relations would then have been with the eastern, instead of the western world, and his dominion, if properly

¹ *Heeren's Universal History*, 238, 239. ² *Idem*, 240. ³ *Taylor*, 153, 154.

established, might have long continued. His extension westward, and removal of the seat of empire to Syria, were attended with two results. The one was the utter impossibility of establishing any very permanent authority over so many different provinces, brought together by conquest, and differing widely from each other, in many of their civil, social and political modes of life. The other was, that by this means, the whole Syro-Median empire was brought into direct relations with Egypt and the western world; and that the Roman power, then fast gaining the ascendancy, must, in its sweep eastward, at no very distant day, overthrow the dominion of the Seleucidæ. This, in fact, happened after about two centuries and a half of almost continual agitation.

The battle of Ipsus was succeeded by about eighteen years of repose to Asia. This period was occupied by Seleucus, in erecting cities, and adorning and beautifying those already erected. He built two Seleucias, one on the Tigris, and the other on the Orontes, and Antioch on the Orontes, which he made his capital. He was versed in the arts of peace as well as those of war. He organized his empire, parceling it out into seventy-two satrapies, but bestowed them principally upon foreigners.

After this interval of peace, a war broke out between Seleucus and Lysimachus, occasioned by an ancient jealousy existing between them. The usual good fortune of Seleucus did not forsake him. At the battle of Corupe-dion, B. C. 282, Lysimachus was overcome and slain, and Asia Minor added to the Syro-Median empire. As Seleucus was passing the year after from Europe into Asia, to add Macedonia to his dominion, he was assassinated by Ptolemy Ceraunus. With him originated and departed the splendor of the empire he had founded.¹

During the reign of his son and successor, Antiochus Soter, a singular event occurred in Asia Minor. By the invitation of Nicomedes, king of Bythynia, about the year

¹Heeren, 242.

B. C. 277, a numerous body of Gauls came into Asia Minor, and settled in Galatia. All the efforts of Antiochus were unsuccessful in dislodging them, and they finally succeeded in establishing there, their language and manners.

The race of the Seleucidæ continued to reign over some parts of the empire founded by Seleucus, for about two hundred and sixty-three years from its foundation. The particulars of the history of this race are possessed of little interest. Wars carried on for conquest, or for slight and trivial causes; rebellion and dismemberment of the provinces, especially the remoter ones; intestine troubles, and domestic dissensions, offer little to interest or instruct the philosophic reader of history.

The reign which was the longest, the most celebrated, and the most crowded with action in the Syrian history,¹ next to the founder, was that of Antiochus III, surnamed the great. This was a reign of thirty-seven years duration, from 224 to 187, B. C. After the death of Seleucus the weakness in the head invited rebellion in the distant members. Soon after the accession of Antiochus, an insurrection was set on foot by the satraps of Media and Persia. This was quelled by the appearance of the monarch in person. So also, was an insurrection headed by Achæus in Asia Minor.

Arsaces III, king of Parthia, seized Media, which led to an expedition of Antiochus into Upper Asia. A compromise was finally effected by which Parthia and Hyrcania were in form ceded to Arsaces. A war with Bactria was also followed by a peace, by the terms of which, the Bactrian king, Euthydemus, retained his crown and lands. After this Antiochus undertook an expedition against India, which he prosecuted far into the interior.² These expeditions had the effect to reestablish the dominion of the Seleucidæ in Upper Asia, except in the countries now formally resigned.

¹ *Heeren's Universal History*, 244. ² *Idem*, 245.

Ever since the partition of the dominions of Alexander, the Ptolemies of Egypt had held possession of Phœnicia and Cœlosyria, which were of great importance to Egypt for the purpose of furnishing seamen and shipping. This important portion of Syria, Antiochus succeeded in wresting from Ptolemy and adding to his own dominions. He soon after effected the conquest of the greatest part of Asia Minor, and the Thracian Chersonesus.

These movements drew after them important consequences. They had the effect to bring into conflict the powers of the east and the west, with the same result which has almost always attended the collision of those powers. Rome began to be the rising power of the west. She had triumphed over Carthage, and a mass of ruins occupied the site of that once noble and flourishing city. The great enemy, Hannibal, who had sworn against her eternal enmity, had found refuge in the court of Antiochus, and was endeavoring to rally the powers of Asia to crush the rising republic of Europe.

The advice of Hannibal was to muster the powers of Asia, and, pouring them upon Europe, invade the Romans in their own dominions.¹ Antiochus preferred taking a different course, and to wait in Asia the Roman invasion. He did so, and experienced a total defeat on the Sipylus at Magnesia, by which the power of the Syrian empire was forever broken. A peace soon after followed by which Antiochus agreed: 1. To evacuate the whole of Asia Minor. 2. To pay 15,000 talents, and to Eumenes of Pergamus, 400. 3. To give up Hannibal and some others to the Romans. Much of the territory given up by this treaty was bestowed by the Romans upon the kings of Pergamus; thus creating a rival power to that of Syria, which would be in the interest of Rome. Antiochus was finally assassinated in the year B. C. 187.

The only remaining Syrian monarch, who has figured much in history, was the second son of Antiochus III, who

¹ *Heeren's Universal History*, 246.

on his accession assumed the surname of Epiphanes, or illustrious, although his acts very little entitled him to that epithet. He was educated at Rome, having been given as a hostage by his father. His great effort was to unite the Roman popular manners with the Syrian luxury, by which he rendered himself both hated and contemptible.

He first became engaged in a war with Egypt caused by the conflicting claims of both kingdoms to Phœnicia and Cœlosyria. In this war he was successful. He gained two victories over the Egyptians, conquered all as far as the walls of Alexandria; obtained possession of Ptolemy Philometor,¹ the rightful heir to the throne, and who had been driven from Alexandria by his brother Physcon, and concluded with him an advantageous peace.² After his return the two brothers made their peace with each other, and united their arms against Syria. Antiochus renewed the war, and a second time invaded Egypt, but was compelled to resign his conquests, and return by the imperious command of the Romans. We next find him endeavoring to establish a uniformity of worship throughout his dominions, and to Helenize all his subjects. This religious intolerance, so unusual at that age, was probably prompted by a love of splendor, and by his avarice, as it afforded him a pretense for sacking the temples. His outrages were more particularly directed against the Persians and Jews.³ He profaned in a horrid manner the Jewish temple; entered with sacrilegious feet the holy of holies; sacrificed on the holy altar a hog which the Jews held in complete abhorrence, and caused the water in which it had been boiled to be sprinkled over the temple.

The consequence was that the Persians and Jews both raised the standard of revolt.⁴ That of the Jews was raised by the Maccabees and led to the independence of that nation, and to the consequent weakening of the Syrian monarchy. Antiochus first hastened to suppress the insur-

¹ *Heeren's Universal History*, 247, 248. ² *Taylor*, 157. ³ *Anquetil*, II, 244, 245. ⁴ *Taylor*, 157.

rection in Upper Asia, but being severely defeated, he died of vexation on his road to Babylon.

Further details of Syrian history fail in giving anything of interest. They exhibit nothing but the usual round of civil wars, domestic dissensions, successful usurpations, treachery, murder, assassination, poisoning, in fact, the entire catalogue of crimes. Through these several agencies the Syro-Median empire finally became dismembered, and the race of the Seleucidæ found a termination. Syria became a Roman province, B. C. 64. Syria has never since been an independent state. From the Roman it passed under the dominion of the Greek emperors of Constantinople. It was wrested from them by the Saracens soon after the banner of Mahomet was unfurled, and his followers began to entertain the prospect of foreign conquest.¹ After being possessed for some time by the Saracens, the crusaders poured in from the west, and for a brief period drove out the Saracen and retained themselves the possession. The sultans of Egypt dispossessed the Christians, and, in their turn, abandoned it to the rising destiny of the Turkish race.

The Phœnician history has been of an entirely different character from that of the Syrian. It has been essentially modified by the developments of the Phœnician people in the elements of humanity, particularly in that of industry. It has belonged, in fact, rather to Europe than to Asia.

Phœnicia, although consisting of a very small tract of land, never constituted one state or kingdom; and has, therefore, no individual history. It contained several cities with their contiguous territories, and among these leagues were formed,² by which means the supremacy was secured to the more powerful cities.³ Each city had its own distinct government and sovereignty, the league being rather federal than national in its character. The city of Sidon was for sometime at the head of the Phœnician cities. It was probably the oldest commercial city of the world. Its first king was Sidon, the son of Canaan.

¹ *Luffman*, 98. ² *Heeren's Universal History*, 31. ³ *Taylor*, 30, 31.

Having become tributary to the Persian power, it finally revolted, and Darius Ochus, the Persian monarch, marched against it for the purpose of destruction.¹ Having obtained possession of the city by treachery, the inhabitants mostly destroyed themselves by setting fire to their houses and themselves perishing in the flames. Thus perished Sidon, and, although it was afterwards in part rebuilt, yet its glory had departed never to return.

Tyre, often called the "daughter of Sidon," arose to a much higher degree of prosperity than its mother city. There were two Tyres. The first was built upon the mainland, and our first acquaintance with it commences with King Hiram, the contemporary with Solomon. These were in the habit of proposing to each other enigmas to be resolved, a species of mental exertion in much esteem among the ancients.

We know little of the history of the Tyrian kings. The avarice of Pygmalion prompted him to slay his brother-in-law in order to possess himself of his treasures,² but his widow, the famous Dido, concealed them from her brother, until she was enabled to carry them off in a vessel, and, together with a number of followers who accompanied her, founded the city of Carthage in Africa. Tyre in its prosperity excited the jealousy of the neighboring monarchs, and underwent two sieges, one of five and one of thirteen years. These occurred during the reigns of kings but little known. A third siege was undertaken by Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon. This was prosecuted with such vigor that the Tyrians finally abandoning the hope of making a successful defense, put to sea in their vessels, and left the conqueror to wreak his vengeance on the empty houses. They afterwards rebuilt on a small island at a little distance from the site of the first city, and fortified it in a very strong manner. It is said that during a time of public calamity an insurrection occurred among the slaves, who, having put to death their own masters, and the whole

¹ *Anquetil*, I, 101, 102. ² *Idem*, 102, 103.

free population, took immediate possession of their houses, property and wives.¹ One slave only spared the life of his master, Strato. The slaves decided to elect for their king he who should first see the rising sun. While all were looking towards the east for that purpose, the slave who had saved his master, by his advice, looked toward the west, and first caught his earliest rays as they were reflected from the public buildings of the city. The slaves, learning that this was really the work of Strato, created him their king, and in his descendants the crown continued for several generations.

It was the island city of Tyre which interposed the first, and it might be said the only formidable obstacle to the victorious career of Alexander. He first endeavored to carry it by assault. Finding that impossible, he undertook to connect the city with the mainland by carrying a dyke or mole across the sea. The Tyrians defended themselves with indomitable bravery.² Their divers dispersed the stones thrown into the sea by the Macedonians to construct the mole. In their boats they tore away the trees and beams which had been driven in to fix the blocks of stone. When finally driven to a close engagement they drove off the assailants with fiery darts, or caught them with long hooks, and dashed them down between the mole and the city. They poured upon them boiling oil, and burning sand, which, entering between the joints of the armor, caused the most exquisite torture. The city was finally taken after a seven months' siege. The inhabitants were mostly put to the sword, and the city demolished. Since the destruction of Tyre, none of the Phœnician cities have occupied any prominent part in general history.

Two reflections naturally suggest themselves from the consideration of Phœnician history :

1. The ruin of those cities scattered along the Phœnician coast has not resulted from internal causes of decay.³ It

¹ *Kenrick's Phœnicia*, 360, 361. ² *Anquetil*, I, 105, 106. ³ *Kenrick's Phœnicia*, 455.

has been their subjugation by barbarians, and the desolation that followed it, that has almost totally obliterated the art, science, commerce and civilization of this early people.

2. It does not follow as a result of this history that commercial pursuits tend to national deterioration or destruction. Tyre flourished as a commercial city during twenty-five centuries. The riches it accumulated tempted the cupidity of invaders, and it fell when it ceased to be able to afford them adequate protection. It rose again by its commercial activity, and would probably, even under Turkish sway, have maintained its standing in the business world, had not the discovery of the Cape of Good Hope and of America, led the trade of the world into new channels leaving the eastern shores of the Mediterranean of little importance in the carrying on of general commerce.

Industry.

We have already remarked that the Phœnicians seem to have had confided to them a special mission; and that was to develop those portions of the element of industry that were embraced in commerce and manufactures, particularly the former. Agricultural industry we have seen early developed by the ancient Egyptians. Between the Egyptians and Phœnicians, manufacturing industry was, to a considerable extent, developed. Commercial, was almost solely confided to the Phœnicians.

No people in the ancient eastern world could be more favorably situated for successfully carrying on commercial pursuits than the Phœnicians. Their country was a narrow strip of land about one hundred and twenty miles in length, by twenty in breadth, lying along the eastern shore of the Mediterranean sea. The coast had numerous indentations, serving as excellent bays and harbors. In the back ground lay some mountain ranges on which flourished lofty forests, from which were obtained abundant materials for the building of ships. Frequently spurs of well wooded

mountains would jut out into the sea, forming bold and lofty promontories.

The coasts were also studded with islands, on which cities were sometimes built, and commercial establishments founded. Thus situated about in the centre of the world, its people, if industrious and enterprising, would not be long in establishing commercial relations both with the east and west, with the east by caravan, and with the west by navigation.

The Phœnician land trade east, which was carried on by caravans, was divided into three branches. These were:

1. The Arabian, which included the Egyptian, and also that carried on in the Indian seas.¹

2. The Babylonian, which also embraced the commerce with Central Asia, and northern India.

3. The Armenian, including the trade with the Scythian nations, and the countries of the Caucasus.²

The first of these three branches was probably the most important. That part of Arabia to which this trade was carried on was Yemen, the southernmost part of the Arabian peninsula. This was important, not only on account of its own productions,³ but also as the great staple of Indian and Ethiopian merchandise. It was the land of spices and perfumes, of frankincense, of myrrh, of cinnamon, cassia and ladanum. From them also were obtained gold and precious stones, ivory and ebony; some of these probably came from Ethiopia, and some, especially ebony, from southern India. This trade was carried on by means of caravans.⁴ The northern Arabs were in ancient times great traveling merchants.

The Syrian and Arabian deserts were then, as now, occupied by tribes of nomade nations,⁵ wandering about with their flocks and herds, and living in tents. These were found at no great distance from the Phœnician cities. They were the common carriers of that early

¹ Taylor, 33. ² Heeren's *Reflections*, II, 91. ³ *Idem*, 94. ⁴ Taylor, 34.

⁵ Heeren, II, 101.

period. They formed the caravan, which, in the days of Tyrian glory, was composed in the same manner as it is at present. Merchants then, as now, traveled together in bands organized like an army,¹ having their goods packed upon the backs of camels. These were escorted by armed forces, sometimes supplied from home, at others consisting of one marauding tribe hired to protect the caravan from the exactions and attacks of the rest.

The Phœnician trade with Egypt was principally overland, at least so long as Thebes in Upper Egypt was the seat of government. When Memphis rose into importance,² an entire quarter of the city was assigned to the merchants of Phœnicia, and the trade by sea to the mouths of the Nile, acquired a constantly increasing consequence.

One consequence of this caravan trade was, that great commercial centres, furnishing markets for the merchandise, which the caravans exported, were on the borders of the desert.³ In the territory of ancient Edom, grew into opulence and power the city of Petra, where became accumulated, in great abundance and security, a variety of wares brought from the southern regions. This remarkable city, after flourishing in splendor for some time, disappeared, and for several centuries the place of its location was unknown. Modern travelers have again brought it to light, having discovered its rocky ruins at the foot of Mount Hor. By cutting through the solid rocks, a passage was obtained into a narrow valley, in the commencement of which, lay the ancient city of Petra.⁴ Along the bottom of the valley flowed small streams, while on its sides the overhanging rocks often intercepted the sight of the heavens. So completely flanked was this valley that a small number of resolute men might here defend themselves successfully against an army. Here are found temples and sepulchres hewn out of the rock, probably of a remote origin. As early as the age

¹ *Taylor*, 34. ² *Idem*, 34. ³ *Heeren*, II, 104. ⁴ *Idem*, 105.

of Alexander, Petra was the staple of the Arabians for their spice and frankincense trade.

The caravan road lay along the Arabian gulf, and seventy days were consumed in traveling from Yemen to Petra.¹ There have been also the remains of other cities, besides that of Petra, discovered east of the lake of Tiberias, and the Dead sea,² which were probably brought into existence, and owed their prosperity to this ancient commerce. The ruins of Gerasa, Gardara and Philadelphia, have been brought to light, some of them little inferior in magnificence to those of Palmyra.

Decayed temples, colonnades, and amphitheatres, show the former grandeur and opulence of these cities, when they were the seats of Indian Arabian commerce. From all the facts that can be collected, it seems clear that Arabia was the great seat of the Phœnician land-trade,³ and that through this a connection existed with the rich countries of the south, Ethiopia and India. This commerce was altogether carried on by barter. It is everywhere spoken of as an exchange of merchandise against merchandise,⁴ and even the precious metals are only considered as such.

The commerce with Egypt formed a second branch of the southern land trade of the Phœnicians. Their acquaintance with Egypt was early formed.⁵ It existed even in the patriarchal age, as is evident from the Mosaic records.

The second great branch of the Phœnician trade spread towards the east. Under it was included their commerce with Syria and Palestine,⁶ with Babylon and Assyria, and with the countries of eastern Asia. The Phœnician territory was mountainous, and but little adapted to agriculture. The ancient Hebrews were devoted to agriculture. Corn was produced in great abundance, and Palestine was the granary of the Phœnicians. This explains the good understanding and lasting peace that prevailed between the

¹ *Heeren*, II, 106. ² *Idem*, 110, 111. ³ *Idem*, 111. ⁴ *Idem*, 112. ⁵ *Idem*, 113. ⁶ *Idem*, 116.

Phœnicians and the Hebrews. They also looked to Palestine for oil and balm.

The trade with Syria varied according to the different parts of the country where it was carried on, a part being agricultural, a part adapted to the cultivation of the vine, and a part offering facilities to the nomadic life, and the breeding of cattle. From the pastoral tribes that wandered with their flocks over the Syrian and Arabian deserts was obtained the finest of wool.¹ This wool was probably improved by the heat of the climate, the continual exposure to the open air, and the great care that the nomades bestowed upon their flocks.

The great point of the eastern trade was with the city of Babylon. This was one of the most ancient channels of trade, and, although subject to occasional interruptions, in consequence of the great revolutions of interior Asia,² yet it was kept up for a long period of time. The route itself through which it was carried on lay through a long uninterrupted desert. In it are found vestiges which denote its course and magnitude. The ruins of Palmyra and Balbeck exhibit to this day the links of that commercial chain which connected Tyre and Babylon.³ The Jewish annals ascribe the building of both these cities to Solomon. Balbeck lay in a fruitful valley between Libanus and Anti-libanus. Palmyra was situated in the midst of the Syrian desert, three days' journey from the Euphrates on an oasis or gem of the desert.

The third branch of Phœnician trade was the northern or Armenian, including the trade with the Scythian nations and the countries of the Caucasus. One of the principal articles of the commerce carried on through this branch, was slaves. Cappadocia, together with the Caucasian districts,⁴ were, perhaps, the earliest seats of the slave trade in the ancient world. At the present day, the harems of the Turkish and Persian nobility are mostly filled with beautiful slaves from Georgia and Circassia. The Phœ-

¹ Heeren, II, 118. ² *Idem*, 120. ³ *Idem*, 121. ⁴ *Idem*, 124.

nician commerce in this detestable branch of trade, was very extensive.

Another great source of attraction in these regions, were the mines.¹ The metal which was most frequently found, and which very much abounded in those regions, was copper. Armenia was also a land abounding in horses.

The northern trade was carried on principally by barter. It was not prosecuted by caravans, as the route lay through inhabited countries,² and in part or wholly followed the royal highways running from Upper Asia to Sardis and the Mediterranean.

Although the land trade carried on through these three different routes, or branches, must have been very extensive, yet the sea trade of the Phœnicians was altogether more important than their land trade. The one followed as an extremely natural, if not necessary consequence of the other. The one gathered up commodities from different regions of Africa and Asia,³ and accumulated them in vast quantities in the cities and commercial depots that lined the Phœnician coast. These, too numerous to find consumers, demanded a further transport. Whoever collects should also distribute.

This demand of accumulated commodities for a market, although it tended much to increase, yet did not probably originate the sea trade of the Phœnicians. That trade had its foundation in piracy.⁴ In the time of Homer, the Phœnicians seem to have been robbers or merchants, according to circumstances. They sold to the Greeks, trinkets, beads, and baubles, and in return, kidnapped their boys and girls, whom, if not redeemed at heavy ransoms, they sold in the slave markets of Asia. This, however, was in the infancy of the Grecian states. Some of them came early to possess a navy of sufficient strength, to repress piracy. They soon grew up to be rivals and political enemies to the Phœnicians. There were always, however, some articles, and those of a costly description, which the

¹ *Heeren*, II, 125. ² *Idem*, 126. ³ *Idem*, 58. ⁴ *Idem*, 59.

Phœnicians only could supply to the Greeks.¹ Such were perfumes and spices imported from Arabia, and which the Greeks absolutely required in their sacrifices to the gods. They also supplied them with the Tyrian manufactures, its purple garments, its rich apparel, its jewels, trinkets, and various ornaments which they could nowhere else so well obtain.

The most important feature in the Phœnician commercial policy was its system of colonization.² This, as an aid to commerce, is first brought to view as a successful effort of Phœnician industry. Here we first notice the spread of nations by colonization. We have seen empires extended and enlarged by conquest; and we have noticed the forcible transplanting of an entire people from their own to foreign lands. This forcible method of extending nations over the surface of the earth, was more in harmony with the feelings and sentiments of man in the earlier periods of his history. We are happy to find the Phœnicians adopting the mild and peaceable method of colonization.

A close examination of this system will disclose many beneficial results. The colonists, as a compensation for the hardships attending new settlements, usually have the enjoyment of a large amount of political freedom. As their existence in their new location depends upon their own efforts, they are led to bring early into requisition their more active powers, and hence learn to invigorate them by their exercise. New situations and positions originate new ideas, and these become possessed of the elements of great activity. New plans and enterprises may be undertaken; new theories tested; new social and political systems originated and tried, in a land where everything is new.

Failures there are never fatal, and hence experiments in politics and social life may be tried without hazard. New ideas in morals, in politics, and in social life may find their way back to the mother country, and there become so many active agents in improvement and progress.

¹ *Heeren*, II, 61, 62. ² *Idem*, 23.

The fact is, that nearly in all ages civil liberty has gone forth from the bosom of colonies. From the Phœnician colonies at Carthage and Gades to those of the British at Jamestown and Plymouth, the effect of colonization has ever been to nourish the spirit of freedom and give rise to the enjoyment of a larger liberty.

A commercial state lives in its colonies. The old cities of Sidon and Tyre passed away; but their expiring vision rested upon their numerous colonies springing up in so many different places, and bearing about them the freshness and vigor of early and free existence. So also were the institutions of Europe to fulfill their mission and pass away, and London and Paris become like Babylon and Nineveh, the seeds of her civilization, which she has scattered so bountifully over both the eastern and western hemispheres, would quicken into a rapid growth, until they, in their turn, would produce their abundant and glorious harvests.

Thus the benefits of civilization would become perpetuated;¹ for while among one people it was dying out from extreme age, among another would be exhibiting its ripened fruit, another would display its blossoms, and another still its earliest buds. Like the human race its old age and manhood and youth and infancy coexist together.

The causes of colonization are various, but are principally three in number.

1. Redundancy of population. In large commercial cities the increase is from two sources. 1. The natural increase; and that would be somewhat in proportion to the easy circumstances of the people,² which would be likely to be rendered easier by commercial pursuits. 2. The fresh accessions from foreign population, which naturally flow to great commercial centres where a great diversity and extent of business furnish so many, such a variety of employments. These together tend to make an overgrown population the curse of large trading cities. This calls for the depleting remedy of colonization.

¹ *Heeren*, II, 25. ² *Idem*, 30.

2. The fact that a city enjoys commercial prosperity implies that there is some degree of social and political liberty enjoyed by the people. The numerous business pursuits, essential to commerce, cannot be successfully prosecuted without an adequate share of this liberty. This again, like every other good, has its evils, the most prominent of which is the formation of parties and factions, leading necessarily to much domestic disquiet and dissension. Hence colonization is required as the safety valve through which the ambitious and bustling spirits of the day are worked off, leaving the elements that remain less contentious and belligerent. In this manner many fiery spirits are got rid of, who, if they had remained, would have caused constant commotions and frequent explosions in the community.

3. The successful prosecution of commercial pursuits in the age of Phœnician prosperity rendered the planting of new colonies a matter of necessity. They served as so many commercial establishments, which concentrated in themselves the trade of the country in which they were established. They served as great depots of merchandise, and were essential or necessary to enable the mother country to carry on an extensive and profitable trade. Although the two first mentioned causes contributed their proportional share, yet the last was the most instrumental among the Phœnicians in causing colonization.

The direction of Phœnician colonization, like the course of civilization, was from east to west, and along the shores of the Mediterranean. Their sea trade could not well follow any other course. The eastern islands of the Mediterranean,¹ Cyprus and Crete were first colonized; then the islands of Sicily and Sardinia; next the northern shore of Africa, Utica, Carthage; and lastly the southern coasts of Spain, Gades and other places.

These, however, were unequally colonized.² The Phœnicians had their colonial dominions, which they made

¹ *Heeren*, II, 33, 34. ² *Idem*, 34.

the principal seats of their trade. To these belonged more especially Carthage and the northern shore of Africa, and also Gades, and the southern and western parts of Spain. Their settlements on Sicily and Sardinia, islands of the western Mediterranean, were regarded rather as stations for their more distant navigation, than as large commercial centres themselves.

Many of the Phœnician colonies, favored by their situation,¹ soon became independent of the mother country. The Phœnician cities, from which this stream of colonization had proceeded, were situated, not in the centre, but at the extremity of their colonies. They could not, therefore, so easily influence or control the movements of their colonial dependencies; and their object seems never to have been the exercise of political influence, but the extension and multiplication of their commercial facilities. These would be about equally as well answered, whether the colonies were dependent or independent. The relations of Tyre with her colonies were generally limited to the ties of commerce, and the obligations of a common religion.² While the first were carefully preserved, the last furnished a strong band that knit the whole together. There was not only a common worship among these of the same national gods, but there were also the same feasts and sacrifices, at which ambassadors, sent expressly by the different cities, joined and assisted.

Some of the Phœnician colonies were planted very early. The migration of Cadmus into Bœotia, and the building of Thebes, was about 1500 years B. C.³ It was the era of Moses, and prior to the exodus of the Hebrews out of Egypt. The foundation of most of their colonies occurred in the flourishing period of Phœnicia, that is, from the reign of David to that of Cyrus, from the year B. C. 1000 to B. C. 550.

It was during this period, that the trade and navigation of Tyre made such astonishing advances. Utica, Carthage, Leptis, etc., were all founded during this period.

¹ *Heeren*, II, 35. ² *Idem*, 36. ³ *Idem*, 37.

One of the great theatres of Phœnician colonization was the Spanish peninsula.¹ They made it the great object of their navigation, and the principal seat of their commerce. The parts of Spain that were colonized were situated in the southern part of the present Andalusia, on both sides of the strait, from the mouths of the Guadiana, at both sides of the Guadalquivir, to the frontiers of Granada, and even Murcia. Within this district of country must be sought the celebrated Tartessus, Carteia, and Gades, as also the pillars of Hercules.² The last were probably applied to the rocks Calpe and Abyla, upon which Gibraltar and Ceuta now stand. Tartessus, or Tarshish, probably included the whole of the south of Spain, that was subject to the control of the Phœnicians. Next to Tartessus or Tarshish,³ the island of Gades is deserving of attention. The Phœnicians generally made it a practice to select islands at short distances from the continent for their settlements, as these proved the most secure staples for their wares. At a small distance from the Spanish coast, and beyond the pillars of Hercules, were situated two small islands in the Atlantic ocean, the largest being about nine miles in circumference.

On this remotest point of the then known world, beyond which expanded westward the immeasurable waste of ocean, was built a city which became one of the most remarkable in the world. This was no other than the city of Cadiz, and owing to its peculiarly happy situation, it has continued a remarkable city to the present day,⁴ notwithstanding the political and commercial changes that have successively swept over the face of human affairs.

Another remarkable city was Carteia, called frequently Calpe, which stood in the neighborhood of the present Gibraltar. There were also the cities of Malacca and Hispalis the present Malaga, and Seville. Besides these, Phœnician villages were thickly strewn over the country,⁵

¹Heeren, II, 43. ²Idem, 44. ³Idem, 46. ⁴Idem, 47. ⁵Idem, 48.

which was almost everywhere Phœnicianized. More than two hundred places were said to be of Phœnician origin.

The time at which these different colonizations were made cannot be arrived at with much certainty. Gades is said to have been founded at the same time with Utica. The foundation of Utica took place two hundred and seventy years before that of Carthage.¹ This would carry back the foundation of Gades to about eleven hundred years before the Christian era, or one hundred years after the Trojan war. The settlements once commenced, continued to grow and increase in proportion as a more enlarged commerce rendered them necessary.

The Tyrians also planted colonies on the western coast of Africa,² founding, according to some, a number of cities there. Tradition also reported a large island, supposed to have been the Madeira, which was taken possession of by the Phœnicians beyond the pillars of Hercules, these last being understood to form the boundaries of the world as known to the ancients.

Along the northern coast of Africa extended a chain of colonial cities,³ of which Utica was probably the most ancient. Next came Carthage, then Adrumetum, Trysdus, Great and Little Leptis, and others of less note, all which became allies of Carthage, forming with it a federative state.

Traces of the Phœnicians are also found on the Persian and Arabian gulfs. The necessity of having settlements here became realized when the Phœnician land trade through Asia had reached the coasts of the Indian ocean.⁴

Thus did this remarkable people everywhere perpetuate themselves by the establishment of colonies, which formed commercial centres, through which their commerce became very extended and much diversified. This peaceful extension contrasts strongly with the bloody progress made by the Medes,⁵ Assyrians, Babylonians and Persians in their military expeditions. We see here no cities over-

¹ *Heeren*, II, 48, 49. ² *Idem*, 52. ³ *Idem*, 54, 55. ⁴ *Idem*, 55. ⁵ *Idem*, 57.

thrown, no regions depopulated, no countries rendered desolate, but everywhere flourishing colonies, agriculture, and the arts of peace, mark the victorious career of the Tyrian Hercules.

All these colonizations were only a means for the accomplishment of an end, viz: an extended and lucrative commerce. It was directly with their colonies that their commerce was principally carried on, the colonists themselves carrying on a trade with the interior of the countries on the coasts of which they were planted. The establishments made by them upon the great islands of the Mediterranean were little more than stations for more distant voyages.¹

One of the great objects of the Phœnicians was to obtain possession of the precious metals.² Although much of their land trade was carried on by barter, yet they regarded the precious metals as the highest object of commercial pursuit. These represented the value of things, and, like other commercial states in their infancy, they looked upon the possession of that as of more importance than the things themselves. Hence their efforts and great anxiety to establish relations of commerce with those countries in which there were mines of gold and silver. This was more particularly the fact with ancient Spain.

Spain was the Peru of antiquity. She was to Phœnicia what Peru has, in modern times, been to her.³ She abounded in gold and also in the less precious metals, and she was altogether the richest country in the old world for silver. These mines were found in the district called by them Tartessus or Tarshish. Silver was there most abundant. It is said that when the Phœnicians first visited Spain, they found silver so abundant, that after freighting their ships with it, they made out of it their most common utensils.⁴ Artificial mine works were at first unnecessary, as the ore lay exposed to view, and a slight incision was only necessary to obtain it in abundance.

¹ Heeren, II, 62. ² *Idem*, 63. ³ *Idem*, 63. ⁴ *Idem*, 64.

After the removal of that which could be so easily obtained, it became necessary that the mines should be worked, and then the wretched Iberian natives were reduced to slavery and compelled to work them; thus having visited upon them the same lot that the Spaniards have since visited upon the wretched and unoffending natives of Peru.

The mines worked in Spain were mostly productive of silver. Besides this, mines of gold, lead and iron were discovered.¹ Tin mines were also opened by the Phœnicians on the northern coast of Spain. Besides its mines, the southern part of Spain was possessed of great fertility, Fine wool was raised there in large quantities, and corn, wine, oil, wax, and various fruits were produced and perfected beneath the mildness of the Spanish skies.

The system of commerce carried on by the Phœnicians with their Spanish colonists was a system of exchange, of barter,² the same that marks the first commercial intercourse of all nations. The Tyrian wares were exchanged directly for the Spanish productions, and the precious metals, not as money, but as merchandise.

The Phœnician colonies in Spain were not only the instruments through which they carried on their commerce with the Spanish peninsula, but they also constituted ports at which vessels could be fitted out on more distant adventures.³ From Gades their vessels started for the tin islands, and the amber coasts. Where these islands and coasts were situated is now a matter of much doubt, as the Phœnicians always succeeded in covering their distant adventures with a deep veil of impenetrable mystery. The British isles are supposed to have been the principal seat of their tin trade, and the coast of Russia on the Baltic sea, that of the amber.

The sea trade of the Phœnicians not only extended west along all the coasts of the Mediterranean, and from thence to unknown parts,⁴ but also eastward along the

¹ Heeren, II, 66. ² *Idem*, 67. ³ *Idem*, 68. ⁴ *Idem*, 71.

two south-western gulfs of Asia, the Arabian and the Persian. The trade here was to the celebrated Ophir, which some suppose to have been the island of Ceylon, others the happy Arabia, and others some part of the eastern coast of Africa.¹ It was probably the general name for the rich countries of the south; those lying on the African, Arabian and Indian coasts. The commodities imported by them were ivory, precious stones, ebony and gold, also apes and peacocks, showing that these were the countries from which they were obtained,² particularly Ethiopia and probably India.

The commerce of the Phœnicians had its sources of supply in part from their own home manufactures. The raw materials from which these were made were principally obtained from abroad,³ as their own territory was far too contracted to supply all that was necessary to satisfy the demands of their numerous and widely scattered customers. Among these manufactures, their celebrated purple garments may claim to hold the highest rank.⁴ The colored garments of Sidon and the Tyrian purple were among the principal articles of luxury in remote antiquity.

There were two kinds of dyes: the one a vegetable dye composed of various vegetables; the other an animal one, obtained from the juice of a shell fish. This last comprised a great number and variety of colors, not simple purple only, but light and dark purple, and almost every shade between. There were two species of testaceous animals made use of for this dye; the one was found in cliffs and rocks,⁵ the other by fishing in the sea. Both were found in great quantities on the Phœnician coast, and extending along the course of the Mediterranean sea. It was not the juice of the whole animal that was made use of, but a substance, called the flower, was pressed from a white vein or vessel in the neck, and the remaining part was thrown away as useless.

¹ *Heeren*, II, 73. ² *Idem*, 74. ³ *Idem*, 83. ⁴ *Idem*, 85. ⁵ *Idem*, 86.

The art of dyeing in purple was not exclusively confined to the Phœnicians, but the scarlet and violet purples of Tyre seem to have been reckoned superior to those of any other country.¹

Almost all kinds of stuff, cotton, linen and silk, were susceptible of taking the purple dye. Woolens were more particularly adapted to its reception. The dyeing was performed in the wool, previous to its being woven into fabrics, and was usually repeated.² Sometimes the bright scarlet, and sometimes the violet tint were obtained. The Phœnicians could throw a peculiar lustre into their color by making other tints play over it, and producing a kind of shot color, which had the effect to render it wonderfully attractive.

Not only dyeing, but weaving, was also practiced among the Phœnicians. The principal weaving manufactories were, in earlier times, at Sidon. Afterwards other Phœnician cities, especially Tyre, carried on extensively this branch of manufacture.³

Glass was also made by the Phœnicians. They have the reputation of having been the original inventors of this commodity,⁴ and they long enjoyed its exclusive use and sale. The glass manufactories were principally at Sidon, and in the neighboring Sarephta, where they were continued during a long succession of centuries. Glass was very little used in antiquity compared to what it is at present.

Besides these more substantial manufactures, there were also ornaments of dress, implements,⁵ utensils, baubles, and gewgaws which should rank as the products of Phœnician industry. All these found a ready market among rude and uncultivated people, and were particularly convenient in the carrying on of trade by barter, in which commerce at that period was mostly carried on.

¹ *Heeren*, II, 87. ² *Idem*, 88. ³ *Idem*, 88-9. ⁴ *Idem*, 89. ⁵ *Idem*, 90.

Religion.

In the early idolatry of the ancient Phœnicians and Syrians, particularly of the latter, there is a strong resemblance in its general features to that of the Assyrians, Babylonians, and Chaldæans. The deities worshiped, were, in many instances, the same, and the forms and rites by which the worship was rendered, were not materially different. The Belus of the Babylonians or Chaldæans, the Bel of the Hebrews, and the Baal of the Phœnicians, were one and the same deity. He it was, who, in the origin of things, is reported to have cut the chaos and darkness in the midst, divided the earth and the heavens from each other,¹ and reduced the world to order; but seeing it deserted and unpeopled, he commanded one of the gods to cut off his own head, and mix the earth with the blood that issued from it, whence proceeded men and the various species of animals; Belus himself perfecting the sun, moon, stars, and the five planets.

Ancient Syria embraced a wider extent of country than that constituting the province of that name.² Besides that, it also included Phœnicia, Palestine, and Mesopotamia. This was the theatre of early idolatry. This idolatry was of the sabian, not of the magian cast.

The father of Abraham, some 2000 years B.C., was a manufacturer of idols. Laban the Syrian, was a worshiper of idols. The zeraphims, which were the objects of his worship, are supposed to have been private idols of the human figure,³ of very different sizes, and occupying the same position with the penates, or household gods of the Greeks and Romans. Some suppose them to have been objects of religious worship; others, that they were talismans, which were used in divination. In conformity with the last it is asserted that the object of Rachel in taking along with her the zeraphim of Laban,⁴ was to deprive him of the means of ascertaining by divination the course which

¹ *Bell's Pantheon*, I, 128. ² *Montfaucon*, II, 243. ³ *Mayo*, II, 148. ⁴ *Idem*, 149.

Jacob had taken. Some Jewish writers state that the zeraphim were human heads placed in niches,¹ and consulted as oracles.

Derceto, or Atergatis, was a Syrian deity, whose temple stood near the city of Ascalon, on the border of a deep lake. Her statue had the face of a woman,² the rest of her body resembling a fish, to account for which a very ridiculous fable is assigned by the Syrians.³ The ancient Syrians never ate fish, but paid them a kind of religious worship, the reason of which is said to have grown out of the existence and worship of this deity. Some, however, allege other reasons for it.

If Derceto, the mother, led the Syrian to adore the fish, the famous Semiramis, the daughter, was not less fortunate in leading him to adore the pigeon.⁴ The fable which led to this adoration, reports that she flew away under that figure, and hence the pigeon became consecrated among the Assyrians, who bore them in their ensigns. The inhabitants of Ascalon had a profound reverence for pigeons. They would neither kill nor eat them, under the apprehension that they were deities. The inhabitants of Tadmor or Palmyra, in ancient Syria, worshiped two gods,⁵ Aglibolus and Malachbelus, under the form of two figures of young persons, between whom is a tree supposed by some to be a pine, and by others, a palm. These two deities are supposed to represent, the one the sun, and the other the moon.

The cabiri, that is, great, powerful, pagan deities, were gods of a high antiquity.⁶ Who they were, is a matter of great doubt and difficulty. Their name indicates that they were of Phœnician origin,⁷ although their first appearance, so as to attract much attention, was in the island of Samothrace. They were probably carried there by the Phœnicians in some of their early sea voyages.⁸ There were many mysteries connected with their worship. These were celebrated at Samothrace, and derive their name from

¹ *Bell's Pantheon*, II. 271. ² *Bell*, I, 229, 230. ³ *Mayo*, II, 134, 145. ⁴ *Idem*, 105, 106. ⁵ *Idem*, 107. ⁶ *Idem*, 127-9. ⁷ *Bell*, I, 145. ⁸ *Mayo*, II, 127, etc.

that island. They were hideous mysteries, sometimes called orgies.

It has been stated, that at the celebration of these mysteries, they slew one of the initiated.¹ The obscenities that accompanied them must have been very abominable, since the ancients who were acquainted with them, protest that they dare not reveal them.

Among the idols of great repute was that of the god, Rimmon, whose temple was at Damascus.² He seems to have been the principal god of the Damascenes.

The Syrians, like the Assyrians and Babylonians, seem to have adopted the early habit of deifying their kings. They deified Ben-hadad II, under the title of Adad or Ader, who was long considered as their most glorious and auspicious god.

The Syrians also had a deity, a goddess, called Babia, from whom children and young people were called babias; from which some suppose the English word babies, to have been derived.

The Syrian idolatry underwent very considerable changes when Syria was conquered and transplanted by Tiglath-pilesir,³ the Assyrian. A new idolatry was introduced, or many additions were made to the old. Very considerable changes were no doubt made, as the country successively passed under the Assyrian, Babylonian, Persian, Seleucidian and Roman yoke. The particulars of these changes are now unknown, and if known, would fail to possess much of interest.

At Hieropolis, or the holy city, was located the temple of the great Syrian goddess,⁴ although, who she was, is utterly unknown. This was a remarkable temple. On one side of it were obscene columns, in the form of priaps, lifting themselves up into the atmosphere, some say three hundred cubits, and some three hundred fathoms, which last is utterly improbable. The temple was built after the manner of Ionian temples, the porch being adorned with

¹ *Mayo*, II, 134. ² *Universal History*, II, 282. ³ *Idem*, 283. ⁴ *Idem*, 283, 284.

golden doors. The whole temple glittered with gold, particularly the roof. The air was strongly impregnated with perfumes, so that all who frequented it acquired, if not the odor of sanctity, at least some other that was probably as good: It had its sanctuary, into which but few of the priests even were admitted. Within the sanctuary were the statues of Jupiter and Juno, as the Greeks styled them, although the inhabitants called them by other names. These were of gold. Juno sat upon lions, and Jupiter was supported by bulls. The latter resembled the Grecian Jupiter, but the former was made to participate in the qualities of statues representing Minerva, Venus, Luna, Rhea, Diana, Nemesis, and the destinies. She held in one hand a sceptre, in the other a distaff, on her head rays and a tower, and she was girt with the cestus or girdle of Venus. She wore a great variety of gems, and among others the lychnis, which was said to shine the most by candlelight, and by means of it she is stated to have illuminated the temple by night. This statue seemed to look at the person on whatever side of it he stood.

Between these two was another golden statue,¹ called the *Sigu*, which was twice every year carried in procession to the sea side. On the left hand was the throne of the sun, but it had no statues. Next after this was the statue of Apollo, not a mere stripling, but with a large beard, for they could not endure any god under age. This was the only idol covered with clothes. Next stood Atlas, then Mercury, then Lucina. On the right hand was placed Semiramis pointing to Juno, supposed to be in token of her humility for having once placed herself above the gods, not excepting Juno. Next to her was Helen, then Hecuba, Andromache, Paris, Hector, Achilles, Nereus, Philomel and Rogne, Tereus, another Semiramis, Combabus, Stratonice, Alexander, and Sardanapalus. Under this temple was a cleft where, according to tradition, the waters were drained off at Deucalion's flood.

¹ *Universal History*, II, 285.

Near the temple was a lake, where were sacred fishes, some of which would come at one's bidding. In the midst stood a stone altar, which seemed to swim.

The most extraordinary appurtenant to the temple was its oracle. Here were images that seemed to move, sweat, and deliver oracles as if alive.¹ Noises were frequently heard in the temple when it was shut up. Apollo was the chief oracle. He gave his own responses. The other idols gave theirs' by their priests. As he was the only god clothed, a suspicion was created that he was a living person concealed under that covering.

The revenues of the temple were drawn from Arabia, Babylonia, Cappadocia,² and Cilicia, as well as Phœnicia and Syria. The priests were very numerous, above three hundred attended the sacrifices alone. There were also consecrated orders, as minstrels, who were skillful in the touch of several instruments, Galli or eunuch priests, and frantic women. The Galli had voluntarily made themselves eunuchs, acting upon the story of Combabus.

They sacrificed twice a day, to Jupiter in silence, to Juno with great noise of minstrels and singers. Twice a year, a man climbing up to the top of one of the priaps remained there seven days.³ He drew up the offerings from below with a chain, as also what he had occasion for during the seven days of his continuance on the top. It was understood that during those seven days he had a more immediate intercourse with the great goddess.

Several festivals were connected with this temple. Among them was one observed in memory of Deucalion's flood. This was performed twice a year. It consisted in bringing water from the sea side into the temple, then pouring it out,⁴ and allowing it to run off by the hole or cleft already mentioned. The ceremonies practiced at the sea side are said to have been very extraordinary, but have never been told.

¹ *Universal History*, II, 286. ² *Idem*, 286, 287. ³ *Idem*, 288. ⁴ *Idem*, 289.

There were also other deities worshiped among the Syrians, but a particular notice of them would be of little use. The principal deities adored in Phœnicia, were Astarte and Adonis, and also the Tyrian Hercules.

Astarte and Adonis are supposed to have been a princess and prince of ancient Tyre,¹ who so endeared themselves to their subjects that they were deified after death. This, as we have seen, was by no means uncommon among the people of the east. It was an opinion very generally received in early times that the souls of great men, such particularly as had taught the necessary arts, had, at death, gone to reside in the stars, and the Phœnicians were, therefore, easily persuaded that the Adonis had taken the sun, and Astarte the moon, for their mansions. Hence also, in process of time, the adoration paid to these luminaries, and it may more particularly account for the worship paid them often under the names of ancient princes and heroes.

There are many fables relative to Adonis and Astarte, which are now possessed of little interest. Astarte seems to have been the Venus of the Phœnicians, and also to have had many of the qualities of Juno. The most striking fable, and that which gives origin to many of the forms and ceremonies in the worship of these deities, is that representing Adonis as the son of Myrrha by her father Cinyras, a prince of Cyprus, the mother being afterwards transformed into a tree, bearing myrrh, in Arabia.

The young Adonis when grown up, was very beautiful,² and went to reside at Byblos, in Phœnicia. Astarte, or Venus, there saw and entertained for him a violent passion, leaving the mansions of the gods to follow him in the forests of Mount Lebanon, where he occupied much time in hunting. Mars, jealous of this preference, and in revenge, aided by Diana, sent a wild boar to destroy Adonis. He descended into Pluto's kingdom, where he inspired Proserpine with a similar passion. Venus endeavored to procure

¹ *Mayo*, II, 110. ² *Idem*, 111.

his return, but the goddess of hell refused to give him up. A compromise was finally effected, by which he was to remain on earth six months with Venus, and six months with Proserpine in the infernal regions.

Another fabulous account represents him as going into Egypt, applying himself to the improvement of the Egyptians,¹ teaching agriculture, and enacting many judicious laws relating to landed property. Astarte, or Isis, was his wife, and passionately attached to him. Adonis having gone into Syria, while hunting in the forests of Mount Lebanon, was wounded in the groin by a boar. Astarte was thereupon so thoroughly penetrated with grief, that the people believed him dead, and all Egypt and Phœnicia bewailed his death. Through the skill of his physician, Cocytus, he recovered, and their mourning was changed into rejoicing. The memory of this event was sought to be perpetuated by an annual festival, in which they first mourned for the death of Adonis, and then rejoiced for his subsequent return to life. After the death of both, the Egyptians represented them under the figures of an ox and a cow, which was in consequence of their devotion to agriculture. This fable clearly assimilates Adonis and Astarte to the Egyptian deities, Osiris and Isis.² There were too many points of resemblance to admit of their being accidental. While, for instance, the festival of Osiris was celebrated in Egypt, another like it was kept in Phœnicia for Adonis. There was also mourning for them both as dead, and then rejoicing as though they had risen again. The Egyptians, during the festival, placed upon the Nile, an osier basket, in which was a letter, which, by the course of the waves, was conveyed near to Byblos, in Phœnicia, where, on its arrival, the people gave over their mourning for Adonis, and began to rejoice for his return to life.

There were also other resemblances, such as Osiris and Isis being symbols of the sun and moon in Egypt,³ and Adonis and Astarte in Phœnicia, and both Isis and Astarte

¹ II, 112. ² *Idem*, 113. ³ *Idem*, 114, 115.

being represented on monuments by a cow's head, or at least Astarte by the skin of that animal. There are, however, sufficient differences in the statements, as to justify the conclusion that there were four different personages, although there were many points of resemblance between them.

There is said to have been a river near Byblos, that bore the name of Adonis, where they washed the wound of that prince. At a certain season of the year, the waters of this river were stained red by the soil blown into it from Mount Lebanon.¹ This the people regarded as a change produced by the blood of Adonis, and this was the season chosen for the celebration of his festival. The whole city at first, went into mourning, and exhibited signs of great grief and affliction. This continued until the last day of the festival, when their mourning was turned into joy, and every one rejoiced as if Adonis had risen to life. The first was called the *disappearance*, and the second the *discovery*. This ceremony continued eight days, the same length of time that it continued in Lower Egypt.

The worship paid to Astarte, pure at first, came afterwards to be blended with infamous rites. She was chiefly worshiped in the sacred groves.² Those consecrated to her were always near the temple of Baal, as her worship was blended with his, and while bloody sacrifices were offered to him, and sometimes even human victims, she was presented with nothing but cakes, liquors and perfumes. But in further honoring her, they abandoned themselves to the vilest prostitutions, either in tents that were made for the purpose, or in the caverns that were in her consecrated groves.

Besides sacred groves, she had also her temples.³ One of the most ancient of these that was dedicated to her, was at Ascalon. She had others also in the islands of Cyprus and Cythera. The goddess Astarte was the Asta-

¹ *Mayo*, 116. ² *Idem*, 122. ³ *Idem*, 123.

roth of the Hebrew writers.¹ She is made frequently to appear under the figure of a woman having for her head-dress, an ox's head with the horns. These were probably to represent the moon's increase and decrease,² for she appears to have been consecrated to that planet, and adored as queen of heaven.

Hercules was the great and ancient god of Tyre. His Tyrian name was *Melkarth*. He was claimed to be as old as the Tyrian city. He is stated not to have been the Grecian Hercules,³ but another far more ancient, and who was a Tyrian hero. The Tyrians anciently represented him in no form, and in his temple there were no images, which would seem to afford proof of his great antiquity. This last seems to have been departed from, in the age of Hiram. His worship was very generally established among the Phœnician colonies, and served as one of the strong bonds or ties by which those colonies were bound to the mother country.

In relation to the manner of worship, that paid to Hercules was performed with great solemnity. The assistants were all clad alike,⁴ in Egyptian linen. They offered incense to him with a loose flowing garment, with bare feet, and heads shaven. The fire on the altar was never allowed to go out. Women were not permitted to enter the temple, and swine were carefully kept from approaching it.

Baal had his prophets and his priests in great numbers. There were four hundred and fifty of them fed at the table of Jezebel alone.⁵ They offered to him burnt offerings and sacrifices, and were accustomed to dance about the altar with violent gesticulations. When by this exercise and the violent straining of their voices, they had succeeded in working themselves up to the extremest pitch of frenzy, they began to cut their bodies with knives and lancets. They then commenced prophesying, as they called it, which

¹ *Mayo*, 123. ² *Universal History*, II, 336. ³ *Idem*, 339. ⁴ *Idem*, 343. ⁵ *Idem*, 341.

consisted in wildly raving, as if they were possessed by some invisible power.

They are charged with the barbarous custom, in earlier times, of sacrificing human beings,¹ and those, too, that were the most dear to them, to avert the anger of their offended deities, especially when their country was laboring under any public calamity. This savage custom, also, seems to have prevailed among some of their colonies, especially the Carthaginians.

Astarte, as well as Baal, had her many priests, or prophets. Not fewer than four hundred of them fell to the share of Jezebel alone. They were called prophets of the groves, and hence it is inferred that she was principally worshiped in a grove.² Groves seem, in fact, to have been deemed sacred in early times.

When she was adored as the moon, or queen of heaven, they offered up to her cakes, and burned incense, and poured out to her drink offerings. She had a temple at Byblus, where she was worshiped as the Venus of Adonis. There such women as would not conform to the custom of shaving their heads at the annual lamentation for Adonis,³ were bound to prostitute themselves one entire day for hire, and to present the money, thus earned, to the goddess. She, also, had a temple at Aphac, on Mount Libanus, which was a perfect sink of lewdness, a school of the most shameful lust. The men were sunk into the most degenerate effeminacy, to comfort the mournful goddess.

She had, doubtless, other temples and other rites, but little is known in relation to them.⁴ She is called the goddess of the Sidonians, but her principal temple seems to have been that at Tyre, built by King Hiram. The idolatry of the Phœnicians, and also of the Syrians, seems to have been of a mixed character, having relations with that of the Assyrians and Babylonians, that of the Egyptians, and that of the Grecians.

¹ *Universal History*, 341. ² *Idem*, 342. ³ *Idem*, 342. ⁴ *Idem*, 343.

. We know little of the religion of the Phœnicians, except what regards its externals, what spiritual conceptions, if any, they attached to names and rites, or what moral influence was exerted over the people, by means of it, we are in utter ignorance. While their speculative philosophy was atheistic, there exists no trace of a belief in God, as an intellectual principle distinct from matter. The doctrine of a future life and retribution seem to have been unknown. The religious system of Phœnicia exerted little influence in historic times on the belief of other nations, or on the art and literature of the ancient world.¹

Society.

Little is positively known concerning the forms of social intercourse, and the manners and customs of the Syrians and Phœnicians. Considering the development of industry, especially its manufacturing and commercial forms, which was effected by the Phœnicians, it is a matter of some surprise that so very little is known relative to the development among them of the social element.

As the Phœnicians, by the richness and splendor of their dyes, by the extent of their manufactures, and by the greatness and universality of their commerce, contributed far more than any other very ancient nation, to furnish splendor in dress, and to extend the luxuries of life through the greater part of the old world, it is not to be supposed that they were themselves indifferent to this splendor and these luxuries. The disposition to possess will never be wanting, where the necessary knowledge exists, and the means are enjoyed. The civilized world must be greatly indebted to the untiring industry of the Phœnicians; and to the great advances made in all the forms of civilized life, in consequence of their industrial arts, and commercial pursuits. And yet nothing remains to us to render us acquainted with their own social forms, or their manners

¹ *Kenrick*, 329, 330.

and customs. No writer that has come down to us, has recorded them. They have not, like the Hebrews and Arabians, perpetuated their own existence, and their own social peculiarities and manners, to the present day. Nor have they, like the ancient Egyptians, written them upon stony tablets, to have them proclaimed, in after centuries, to the wondering ears and admiring eyes of new races of men. Thus have these social forms and manners and customs perished with those who used them. Conjecture may be plausible, and inference apparently just in its deductions, and yet they may be as various as the numbers who conjecture and infer. They can never effectually supply the place of real well established facts.

The Syrians are stated to have been an effeminate people, much given to tears, and rather remarkable for their method of mourning for the dead.¹ This was done by hiding themselves for many days together in caves, or other dark places, excluded from the light of the sun. This effeminate temper of mind is said to have always been, and still is, one of the characteristics of the Syrians.

Government.

The earliest form of civil government in Syria and Phœnicia with which history makes us acquainted was the kingly, which probably was derived from the ancient patriarchal government. What leads to this inference is not only its great antiquity, but the further fact that the whole country was split up into a very great number of little sovereignties,² consisting of cities with small contiguous tracts of territory adjoining them.³ These cities were governed by heads of families, called kings. Of these there were great numbers, not only in Syria and Phœnicia, but also in Palestine, the ancient Canaan, prior to its settlement by the Hebrews, and also in Mesopo-

¹*Universal History*, II, 292. ²*Heeren*, II, 13, 14. ³*Universal History*, II, 281.

tamia. We also witness the same kind of political organization at the earliest periods of which we have any knowledge. Some of these petty kingdoms occasionally obtained a preponderance over others, and assumed to exercise over them a degree of authority. This authority did not extend to any interference with the internal condition of the subject cities, or with the manner in which the governments in them were formed or administered, but only to the exaction of tribute and subsidies in time of war. Syria,¹ while independent, and left to itself, never became organized into one state, or one monarchy. The preponderance of no city in Syria is as distinctly marked, and as clearly authenticated as that of Damascus.² The kingdom of Damascus was established by violence, and, under Hazael, it succeeded in extending its dominion over all Syria. So, also, under the Seleucidæ, Syria became the seat of a great empire, its form of government being similar to the old despotisms of Asia.

The Phœnician cities were colonies one of another. They either colonized for the purpose of trade,³ or in consequence of civil dissensions. The oldest of them was Sidon, so called from the first-born son of Canaan. Sidon was the parent of Tyre. A civil broil drove off another colony which founded Arvath. Tyre soon became the more powerful, and, in its turn, sent off colonies to form other settlements and cities. In this manner all the Phœnician cities were successively founded and completed along the coast, from which, in their turn, colonies proceeded forth to effect more distant settlements. Phœnicia, like Syria, never became one state, but was always divided into a number of separate cities, each with its own little territory around it.

Although the Phœnician cities had each its own internal organization and government, which was independent of every other, yet alliances were very frequent among them.⁴ They had common interests to defend, and it

¹ *Heeren*, II, 14. ² *Universal History*, II, 282. ³ *Heeren*, II, 10. ⁴ *Idem*, 15.

seems probable, that at certain times, all the cities of Phœnicia formed one confederation, at the head of which Sidon originally stood, and subsequently Tyre. These alliances are known to have existed as early as the Mosaic period. The same principle prevailed among the Phœnician colonies; and Carthage in Africa, and Gades in Spain, stood at the head of similar confederations in their respective districts. The tie of a common religion served to strengthen the bonds of political association, the Tyrian Hercules being both the national and colonial deity. These alliances and associations were much subject to change, as the active pursuits of commerce and other branches of industry stimulated by those pursuits, would create new commercial centres, and thus give unexpected changes to human affairs.

Tyre was in its most flourishing state, from the period of Solomon, to that of Cyrus.¹ During this period of time it was the dominant city of Phœnicia, and stood at the head of its confederated cities. Its wealth, its influence, and its power fairly entitled it to assume this station among its sister cities.

When Persia became the dominant power, the bond by which the Phœnician cities were linked to Tyre became loosened, and they rendered their tribute to Persia instead of Tyre. Still Tyre continued to maintain its rank as the chief of the Phœnician cities.

As to the internal government of the Phœnician cities, the distant antiquity in which they flourished, precludes our having any great extent of accurate information upon that subject.² There can be no doubt but that each had its own proper form of government, and was, in this respect, perfectly independent of every other.

There is also little doubt but that the chief power and authority was placed in the hands of kings, and that hereditary descent was the principle which regulated their succession. The sanction of the people, however, seems to have been

¹ *Heeren*, II, 16. ² *Idem*, 18.

necessary, and to them the right of election devolved, in a vacancy of the throne.¹ So also in Tyre, and probably in the other principal cities, a powerful aristocracy existed along with the monarchy. So the earliest accounts we have of the Philistines, are of the "lords of the Philistines," indicating that there also, the aristocratic principle prevailed. It is not possible to say, on what the distinction of nobility was founded in Phœnicia. Much, probably, depended upon birth, the descendants of those who had been most eminent in the early ages of the state, retaining a superiority in after times. It is obvious, also, that in which the elements of activity prevailed to so great an extent as they did in those commercial emporiums, political parties many times fomented revolutions, by which new families were raised to the throne. This seems to have been especially the case in Tyre. When the throne became vacant,² the place of the sovereign was supplied by elective magistrates, called judges, *saffetes*, who exercised the function of royalty, but without hereditary succession. The royal dignity was preserved under the dominion of the Persians, the monarchs being tributary to the Persian princes, and obliged to furnish money and ships, and aid in their military expeditions. The other Phœnician cities, Sidon, Aradus and Byblos, had their own proper kings, as well as the city of Tyre.

The government of the Phœnician cities, although kingly, was far from being of that despotic kind which generally characterized the governments of Asia. The monarchical power was so limited as to render them a near approach towards the republican form.³ Industry, especially of the commercial character, can only thrive and prosper in an atmosphere of liberty. A spirit of enterprise and activity is required for the prosecution of a large maritime commerce, which is totally inconsistent with the existence of a despotic government. New ideas and habits are produced, and grow out of commercial

¹Kenrick, 267. ² *Idem*, 268. ³ *Idem*, 19.

pursuits equally irreconcilable with such a government. The frequent political changes which occurred in those cities, the revolutions which gave birth to the sending off of colonies, were all totally at variance with the pressure and deadening effect of Asiatic despotism. Here, therefore, in the element of government, we find ourselves in proximity with Europe, and especially with Greece. These cities, in this respect, formed a connecting link between Asia and Europe.

Slaves formed no inconsiderable part of the population of the Phœnician states. The free citizens being so much engaged in commerce, the employment of slaves was greatly demanded, and these their commerce and navigation enabled them to procure from all parts of the ancient world.¹

Although the proof is by no means clear, yet there is some evidence that a republican form of government existed in Syria at a very early period of time. Damascus is spoken of as without a chief,² and as if the power was lodged wholly with the people in the time of David. So also, it is said, that the *Syrians of Damascus*, not the *king of Damascus*, sent an army of upwards of twenty thousand men to the relief of Hadadeser, king of Zobah.

Next in order to the kings in the Phœnician cities stood the magistrates.³ These, together with the kings, sent the ambassadors. There seems, at times, to have been held a general congress of the great Phœnician cities, at which the kings in council with the synedrim deliberated upon the affairs of the confederacy. A common assembly of the three principal cities met at Tripolis.

The authority of the kings was besides very much limited by religion. The priests formed a numerous and powerful class, and imposed many restraints upon the monarch. Among a people, like the Phœnicians, where so much depended on the sanctuaries and religion, the priesthood could not well fail of exercising a very great

¹ Kenrick, 271. ² *Universal History*, II, 281. ³ *Heeren*, II, 20.

influence in the affairs of government. Although the institution of caste seems to have been unknown in Phœnicia,¹ yet the priesthood formed an exception. The chief priesthood was probably hereditary, and was held by persons of royal blood. The dignity of high priest at Tyre, was next to that of the king. The inferior priests were also very numerous and influential. From the operation of all these causes, the kingly power was much limited, and the Asiatic despotism very much softened down, and deprived of its most offensive features.

Philosophy.

We have but slight and imperfect knowledge of the Phœnician and Syrian development of the element of philosophy. The language there spoken, was, perhaps, the oldest in the world. It became a distinct tongue, as early as the days of Jacob,² and was probably that spoken by all the patriarchs from Noah to Abraham.³ There were three dialects: 1. The Syriac, properly so called, the most elegant of all, and spoken in Mesopotamia and outer Syria. 2. The dialect of Palestine,⁴ spoken by the inhabitants of Damascus, Mount Libanus, and the inner Syria. 3. The Chaldee, or Nabathæan dialect, the most unpolished of the three, and current in the mountainous parts of Assyria, and in the villages of Irak or Babylonia.

Neither the Syrian nor Phœnician minds seem to have been adapted to the development of systematic thought, or to any methods of philosophizing. We do not find amongst them any instructors, or any schools of philosophy. There seems to have been little disposition to speculate, or to give themselves up to cool contemplation, or deliberate, calm investigation. Amongst the Phœnicians in particular, the most active business habits must have been acquired in the prosecution of their manufacturing and mercantile pursuits. These must have been more or less adverse to

¹ *Kenrick*, 272. ² *Universal History*, I, 348. ³ *Idem*, II, 292. ⁴ *Idem*, 298.

deliberate, systematic thinking. The spirit of gain was rife among the people. Competition was active, and every possible effort made to secure or increase the stores of wealth. Philosophy could expect little from such a spirit, or from habits thus engendered. Manufacturers, mariners and merchants have little time, and less disposition to investigate the truths of science, or frequent the calmer walks of philosophy.

The Phœnicians undoubtedly acquired a practical acquaintance with those matters of science, that were necessary in the prosecution of their industrial pursuits.¹ They were masters of astronomical truth, so far as a knowledge of celestial phenomena was useful in navigation. So far as a knowledge of numbers was necessary in their mercantile transactions, they were mathematicians. Beyond the line of immediate practical application, they were but poor proficient in the attainment of philosophical truth.

Moschus, or Mochus, who lived before the time of Pythagoras, is claimed to have been a native of Sidon. To him is ascribed the origin of that system of philosophy, called the atomic, which rose into celebrity under the Grecian philosophers, Leucippus and Epicurus. It is said that Pythagoras, during his residence in Phœnicia, derived his doctrine of monads from the atoms of Moschus. A full consideration of all the evidence goes rather to show that the corpuscular philosophy was not of Phœnician origin.²

Another writer alleged to have been Phœnician, but in regard to whom there is great doubt and difficulty, is Sanchoniathon. He is supposed to have flourished, prior to the Trojan war, and about the reign of Semiramis. Fragments of his works are pretended to have been preserved, and to have come down to us. The most celebrated was his cosmogony, in which he is made to state, that the first principle of the universe, was a dark and spiritual or windy air, or a spirit of dark air,³ and a turbid, obscure chaos; and that these were infinite, and for many ages,

¹ *Enfield*, 83. ² *Idem*, 34. ³ *Universal History*, i, 23.

unbounded. That when the spirit was affected with love towards its own principles, and a mixture followed, that conjunction was called desire. That this was the beginning of things, but the spirit was not cognizant of its own production. From this conjunction of the spirit came môt, or mud, or a corruption of a watery mixture, and of this came the seed of all creatures, and the generation of the universe. That there were certain animals which had no sense, from which proceeded intelligent animals, called zoplasemin, or the contemplators of heaven, being formed alike in the shape of an egg: immediately môt, with the sun, moon, stars, and larger constellations shone forth. That the air being intensely heated by the great degree of heat communicated to the sea and earth, winds were generated, and clouds, and great descents and defluxions of the heavenly waters; and when they were separated, and drawn from their proper place by the heat of the sun, and all again met in the air, and dashed the one against the other, thunders and lightnings were engendered, and at the thunder's sound, the intelligent animals awoke, and were greatly terrified, and male and female moved in the earth and in the sea.

This cosmogony appears to have been eminently material; and, indeed, to have dispensed entirely with an originally intelligent, spiritual principle. It professes to have taken its materials from the writings of Thoth or Hermes. But there is much doubt in relation to the real existence of Sanchoniathon, and many suppose that he was a fiction, and his alleged fragments spurious.

Although philosophy stands little indebted to the Phœnicians for its development, yet the fact, that through their agency, the alphabet was furnished to Greece, is of itself sufficient to create deep and lasting obligations. Cadmus, who was a native of Sidon, and contemporary with Moses, about the year B. C. 1493, founded Thebes, in Greece, and introduced the letters of the Phœnician alphabet, then sixteen in number, out of which was gradually formed the Grecian.

Art.

Neither the Phœnicians nor Syrians accomplished much in the development of art, in the light we here consider it. The useful arts, such as dyeing, weaving, manufacture of glass, etc., find their proper place in the development of industry. That the Tyrians, in the age of Solomon, had made advances in the architectural art greater than the nations around them is evident from the fact that their artificers were employed in the erection of the Hebrew temple. In the practice of this art, therefore, there can be little doubt but that the Phœnicians excelled. It would, nevertheless, be impossible to state in what that excellence consisted, or what amount of progress they really made in advancing the art towards perfection. No remains have descended to us to acquaint us with their style of architecture, or to bear upon their time-honored forms, evidence of the taste and skill of the Phœnician architect. Hence, our real sources of knowledge must be few in number, and our conclusions correspondingly doubtful and unsatisfactory.

In relation to the fine arts, sculpture, painting, all the arts of design, we know nothing of the extent to which they were cultivated in Phœnicia. Of the higher arts, as they may be termed, such as those of music, eloquence, oratory, poetry, etc., we are about equally ignorant. We may infer that a people so advanced in many of the forms of civilization as we know the Sidonians and Tyrians to have been, could not be ignorant of music, and some of the higher arts, but still we have nothing to rely on as evidence but the inference. The probability is, that the bustle of business, and the devotion to industrial pursuits, had the effect to prevent the bestowment of much attention upon the higher arts, which are the fruits of an advanced civilization.

The art of war derived little or nothing in its advancement from the contributions of the Phœnicians. They were more given to the cultivation of the arts of peace

than those of war. The Tyrians, in the noble defenses they made successively against Nebuchadnezzar and Alexander the great, demonstrated that they possessed both courage and resources, and were masters of all the means of defense then known or in use. They also displayed their ingenuity in devising some not previously thought of. It is obvious, however, from the whole course and current of their history, that the things of war occupied, to but small extent, their attention and thoughts.

There is one art that stands vastly indebted to the Phœnicians, very greatly more so than to any other Asiatic nation, and that is the art of navigation. This is an art they may almost be said to have created. By their long continued practice of it they acquired great skill, and advanced it as near perfection as the astronomical knowledge they then possessed, and the instruments then known, would admit of.

All antiquity accounts the Phœnicians the inventors of navigation. As early as the era of Abraham, about 2000 years B.C., they were considered a powerful people,¹ and their vessels visited the coast of Greece. As early as about the year B. C. 1250, their vessels were seen coming out of the Mediterranean,² and, passing the pillars of Hercules, entered the Atlantic ocean.

Originally they had only rafts, or boats of the simplest structure. They made use of oars to conduct these weak and light vessels. The construction of ships became gradually perfected,³ and they were made of larger capacity, as navigation extended itself and became more important. The increase in size rendered it necessary to have more hands and more art to work them. The industry and ingenuity of man increase in proportion to his wants. The most important discovery in the art of navigation, was the use of the wind in propelling forward a vessel,⁴ and the invention of masts and sails to render its use the most available. There is little doubt but that the Phœ-

¹ *Goguet*, I, 296, 297. ² *Idem*, II, 296. ³ *Idem*, 299. ⁴ *Idem*, 299, 300.

nicians were the first to resort to these means, and thus to press the wind into the service of man in urging forward the vessel on the liquid element. Their vessels had oars also as well as sails, the latter to be used when the winds were favorable, and the former to be had recourse to, when they were contrary and during calms.

Ships of war were probably first brought into use by the Phœnicians.¹ As early as the Trojan war about 1200 years B. C. they distinguished two kinds of vessels, one destined for commerce, and the other for naval expeditions. The construction of these was different. The war ships were long and pointed; while the merchant vessels were of a round form. They had their holds large, to be able to carry more goods. They drew but little water, carried but little sail, and were much at the mercy of the winds. Hence they were slow and uncertain. They never quitted the coasts except it were a matter of necessity.

We know nothing of the particular methods and practices made use of by the Phœnicians to direct their navigation.² History has failed to transmit these down to us, and hence all conjectures in regard to them must be vague and unsatisfactory. However imperfect they may have been, it is certain that by their employment the Phœnicians were enabled to undertake and successfully perform some astonishing voyages.

Besides their regular and fixed voyages,³ they were also in the habit of fitting out expeditions for discovery. In one of these latter expeditions they discovered the isle of Thasos, opposite the Thracian coast, where were productive gold mines that amply rewarded them for their time and labor in finding and working them.

The most wonderful voyage which they ever undertook and successfully accomplished was no less than the entire circumnavigation of Africa.⁴ This was undertaken under the auspices of Pharaoh Necho, king of Egypt, and a record of it is preserved in Herodotus. They started from

¹ *Goguet*, II, 300. ² *Idem*, 302. ³ *Heeren*, II, 75, 76. ⁴ *Idem*, 76, 77.

the Arabian gulf or Red sea, made some stops sufficiently long to sow and reap in the course of their voyage, and returned through the pillars of Hercules and the Mediterranean in the third year. This is a voyage almost incredible to be seriously undertaken and accomplished at that period of time, but one fact mentioned by the historian as incredible to him, tends most strongly to confirm it, and that is that in this circumnavigation they had the sun on the right hand, that is, on the north of them, which must have been the fact when they crossed to the south of the equator, although to the historian who had never been in that position the statement was incredible.

“Thus the Phœnicians,” says Heeren,¹ “carried the nautical art to the highest point of perfection at that time required, or of which it was then capable; and gave a much wider scope to their enterprises and discoveries, than either the Venetians or Genoese during the middle ages. Their numerous fleets were scattered over the Indian and Atlantic oceans, and the Tyrian pennant waved at the same time on the coasts of Britain, and on the shores of Ceylon.”

¹ *Heeren*, II, 82.

CHAPTER XV.

ASIA MINOR.

In leaving the countries bordering upon the Mediterranean, Egypt, Arabia, Palestine and Phœnicia, the next regular step or stage in the history of civilization would carry us to Greece. It is really the Grecian development of the great elements of humanity that should next claim the attention. Before passing to this important topic, a brief notice should be taken of Asia Minor.

Asia Minor, or Anatolia, is a large extent of country extending westward from the basin of the Euphrates, and bounded on the south, west and north by the Levant, Ægean and Euxine seas. It is a peninsula pointing westward, and in that respect differs from most of the peninsulas of the world, which point to the south.

Asia Minor, in its great physical features, is a miniature representation of Asia. Like the continent, its interior is an elevated plateau,¹ surrounded by mountain ranges of great, though of varying height. The western part presents vast saline plains, and lakes which have no outlet, whilst the eastern part has a diversified surface of ridges, valleys and plains. The large plains in the interior alternate with mountain ranges,² whilst on every side the interior plateau or upland is surrounded with belts of mountains. The northern slope presents a delightful and diversified aspect, being intersected with mountain ranges,³ romantic glens and charming dales. The same, in general terms, may also be said of its western and south-western slopes. But the southern slope towards the Levant, presents nothing attractive, being a narrow, barren plain, bounded by the steep and rugged brows of Mount Taurus.

¹ *Bell*, iv, 99. ² *Idem*, 102. ³ *Idem*, 90.

This peninsula is also watered on the same principle as the continent of Asia. Rivers are formed on the summits or slopes of the mountain ranges, which find their way to some one of the seas that bound the peninsula. On the north are the most considerable, the Iris, the Halys and the ancient Sangarius, which pour their waters into the Euxine sea. On the west are numerous streams, the principal of which are the Hermus and Meander, which wind their way to the Ægean sea. The latter used frequently to undermine its banks, by which the proprietor would sometimes lose some portion of his land.¹ This gave rise, among the ancients, to a singular custom, consisting in the losers instituting proceedings against the river in case of loss from that cause, and receiving indemnity from the tolls established along its course. Those which run south into the Levant are the shortest and the most rapid. There are none here of any considerable size or importance.

Asia Minor, in ancient times, included a great number of petty states, whose boundaries varied at different periods of time.² In the northern part, along the shores of the Propontis and Euxine, beginning from the western side, the chief countries were Mysia, Bithynia, Paphlagonia and Pontus. In the centre were Lydia, Phrygia, Galatia, Lycaonia, Isauria, Cappadocia and Armenia. In the south, on the shores of the Levant, were Caria, Lycia, Pisidia, Pamphylia, and Cilicia. In Mysia, and the north-west part of Asia Minor, on the coast, was Troas, or the lesser Phrygia. There were the two small streams, the Simois and the Scamander, the Trojan plains and the city of Troy itself.

Along the countries which skirt the Euxine sea, Bithynia, Paphlagonia and Pontus, were numerous Greek colonies planted during the flourishing age of Grecian commerce. The entire west coast of Asia Minor was colonized by the Greeks, whose commercial cities in Ionia,

¹ *Malte Brun*, II, 68. ² *Taylor*, 27.

Æolia and Caria, were the most flourishing free states of antiquity, before they were brought under the Persian yoke.

Galatia received its name from a large body of Gauls, who entered that country in the third century before the Christian era. They observed a singular custom at their funerals, which was to write letters to the deceased, and then throw them into the fire to burn, under the belief that the person to whom they were addressed would, by these means be enabled to read them in another world.¹

The three kingdoms that are the most deserving of notice, were the Trojan, Phrygian, and Lydian. Of the first, the ancient city of Troy was the capital,² which was seated on a rising ground, near the foot of Mount Ida, and about five miles from the sea shore. Out of the long siege, and final destruction of this city by the Greeks, and the events subsequently occurring, have grown three great epic poems, which, to a great extent, have served as models to all that came after them. These were the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* of Homer, and the *Æneid* of Virgil; the two a splendid sample of Grecian, and the third of Roman poetic art.

The taking and destruction of Troy was about B.C. 1184. The story of Troy, its heroic defense, and its ultimate overthrow, is derived from tradition and the songs of poets. The invading fleet of the Greeks is stated at 1,200 vessels, and the number of forces at 100,000.³ The contest was not only with the Trojans, but with their allies also, which included the greatest part of Asia Minor, besides forces from Thrace and from Assyria and Ethiopia. The cause of it was the refusal of the Trojan king, Priam, to give up Helen the wife of Menelaus, king of Sparta, who had been seduced and carried to Troy by Paris, his son. The siege was of ten years continuance. It resulted in the taking and entire destruction of Troy, the slaughter of most of its people, and the dispersion of the remainder into other and distant parts.

¹ *Purchas's Pilgrimage*, 322. ² *Universal History* iv, 465. ³ *Idem*, 498.

In relation to the industry of the Trojans, little, if anything, remains beyond mere inference.¹ Their country seems to have been stocked with many useful commodities, and to have abounded with all things necessary to life. This is evident from the immense number of people it supported, and the large armies that were kept on foot there for so long a period of time.

Their commerce, for so early a period, must have been extensive.² Their country, extending over all the western coast of the Hellespont, and embracing the isles of Tenedos, and Lesbos, was very favorably situated for commercial pursuits. They had good ports, and skillful builders of ships. The riches of Priam, the grandeur displayed at his court, the splendor of many of the Trojan heroes, are consistent only with a very advanced state of industry when compared with the very early period at which Troy flourished and fell.

The religion of the Trojans was similar to that of the Phrygians with the addition of certain portions of the Greek mythology. Cybele, esteemed as "the great mother of the gods," was worshiped on the hills of Ida, Dindymum, Berecynthus, and Cybele, from the last of which she derived her name.

Apollo had a temple in the citadel of Troy.³ So also had Minerva or Pallas, in which was the famous pallasium, or wooden statue of the goddess, holding in one hand a buckler and in the other a spear, and in relation to which an oracle proclaimed that Troy could never be taken while it remained in the city. This coming to the knowledge of the Grecian invaders, Diomed and Ulysses, it is said, contrived to remove it, after which the city fell into their hands. Venus was also counted among the Trojan deities.⁴ So also was the Sminthian Apollo, a deity worshiped under the form of a field mouse.

Their manner of worship is but little known.⁵ To Neptune the sailors sacrificed a black bull, and oxen, also

¹ *Universal History*, iv, 476. ² *Goguet*, ii, 305. ³ *Universal History*, iv, 472. ⁴ *Idem*, 474. ⁵ *Purchas's Pilgrimage*, 326.

rams and hogs, to Mercury cloven tongues. To the dead they also sacrificed black sheep over a ditch or hole in the ground, with wine, water, and flour, thinking that the souls drank the blood. They observed auguries, thunders, dreams, oracles of Apollo, and other superstitions.

Very few of the forms of society among the Trojans have come down to us. They appear to have been curious and voluptuous in their dress, habits, and habitations.¹ The Trojan ladies made great use of perfumes. They rubbed their bodies with odoriferous essences, and perfumed their habits. Their clothes were both various and in great number. They devoted to their toilette much art and time. The princesses were served by a great number of female slaves.² These were the only domestics known in the east. The women had their separate apartments, and never appeared in public except when covered with a veil. Their occupation seems to have been sewing, embroidering, and working different works in frames. The men, during the latter periods of Trojan history,³ must have been luxurious and effeminate. Paris is represented as entirely taken up with the care of dressing his hair. The dance and the feast seem to have been of common occurrence in the court of Priam.⁴

We know nothing in particular of their form of government or laws. Its form was clearly monarchical, and the crown was hereditary.⁵

Of their philosophy nothing is preserved.

Of their arts we are almost equally ignorant, except we may infer from the fragments of their civilization that have reached us, that many of the arts, such as those of music and architecture, were known to them. In their stout resistance to the united forces of Greece, they certainly displayed considerable knowledge of certain parts, at least, of the art of war.

¹ *Goguet*, II, 377. ² *Idem*, 378. ³ *Idem*, 378. ⁴ *Idem*, 379. ⁵ *Idem*, 5.

Phrygia occupied nearly the centre of Asia Minor. Its ancient history is made up principally of obscure traditions. In its historical events, it was little, if at all, connected with other nations.¹ The Phrygians seem originally to have been a powerful people, as we collect from the fragments of them found dispersed over Europe. It was the descendants of the Phrygian Pelops that gave the name of Peloponesus to that part of Greece.

Most of the Phrygian kings were named either Midas or Gordias, but the precise order of their succession cannot be ascertained. Gordias I, was originally a peasant, and founded the city of Gordium. The Phrygians, unable to agree in the choice of a king, finally resolved that they would raise to the throne the first man who should come to the temple of Jupiter, riding in a cart.² This proved to be Gordias, whom they immediately saluted king. He dedicated his cart in the temple, and to it fastened the yoke with a knot so intricately tied that the oracle promised the empire of the world to him who should unloose it. This was the famous gordian knot, which Alexander the great, finding himself unable to unravel, finally untied by cutting it with his sword. In the reign of Midas V, Phrygia became a province of the Lydian empire.³

Little is known relative to the industry of the ancient Phrygians.⁴ With surrounding seas and excellent harbors, and a country well stocked with many choice and useful commodities,⁵ and the reputation of having been, for some time, masters of the sea, it is generally supposed that they carried on pretty extensively commercial pursuits. As, however, very little of Phrygian history has been preserved, little can be known of any certainty in relation to it. Antiquity ascribes to Midas, one of the Phrygian kings, the invention of the anchor, so necessary to stop the progress of ships.⁶

The Phrygians also passed in antiquity for the inventors of wagons with four wheels,⁷ so commodious for carrying

¹ *Taylor*, 28. ² *Anquetil*, I, 309. ³ *Taylor*, 28. ⁴ *Anquetil*, I, 307. ⁵ *Universal History*, IV, 445. ⁶ *Goquet*, II, 304. ⁷ *Idem*, 304.

merchandise by land. An ancient tradition attributed to Demodice, wife of Midas, the invention of coining money. All these would seem to indicate that the Phrygians were much given to trade.

In the element of religion, the ancient Phrygians were greatly addicted to superstition.¹ They worshiped many idols, but their principal deity was the goddess Cybele, whose origin and history has given occasion to several fables that are now possessed of little interest besides being immoral in their tendency. She is called "the great mother of the gods,"² and is represented as sitting in a chariot drawn by four lions, crowned with towers, holding a key in her hand, and attired with a garment seeded with flowers of different colors.

The mythologists interpret Cybele to mean the earth;³ the lions that draw her chariot denote her empire over all sorts of animals, which she both produces and nourishes; her crown of towers is emblematical of the towns and cities built upon the earth; the key she holds in her hand intimates that the earth, which, during the winter, is in a certain manner locked up, begins to open in the spring, and the seeds to shoot up; her garment variegated with flowers of various colors, is a symbol of the earth beautifully enameled with all kinds of flowers; and finally Saturn, that is, time, is feigned to be her husband, to signify that the earth produces nothing but in time.

This goddess had her peculiar priests, ceremonies and sacrifices.⁴ The priests were called by various names, but that by which they were most generally known was the Corybantes. They were also in part called Galli from the river Gallus, which flowed through Pessinus, where this goddess had a magnificent temple. These priests, or those at least known under the name of Galli,⁵ were all eunuchs, the waters of the river Gallus being fabled to

¹ *Universal History*, iv, 446. ² *Idem*, 449. ³ *Idem*, 449. ⁴ *Idem*, 450. ⁵ *Idem*, 452.

inspire them with such a frantic enthusiasm as to induce them to perform the operation upon themselves without any reluctance. They were not allowed to drink wine, abstained from bread, held oaths to be unlawful on all occasions, and after death were placed on a stone ten cubits high.

The ceremonies were most or all of them commemorative of fabulous events in the history of the goddess. At certain stated times they carried her statue about the streets, dancing and skipping around it, working themselves, by means of violent gesticulations, up to the height of frenzy, and then cutting and slashing their bodies with knives and lancets, appearing seized with a divine fury. They also annually wrapped a pine tree in wool, and, with great solemnity, carried it into the temple of the goddess. On these occasions the priests were crowned with violets.¹

The victims immolated, were a bull and a she goat, and at Rome a sow was yearly sacrificed to her, a priest and priestess from Phrygia having been first obtained to make the sacrifice.

The Phrygians had also other deities besides Cybele.² Among these was Bacchus, by them styled Sabasios, and also Adagyus, the son of Venus and Mercury. Some also reckon the Cubiri among the other deities.

Little remains to enlighten in reference to Phrygian society.³ They deemed themselves the most ancient people in the world, and even the Egyptians, it is said, conceded to them the greatest antiquity of any nation in the world, challenging for themselves only the second rank.⁴ They are described as superstitious, voluptuous and effeminate, without prudence or forecast, and of a temper extremely servile. Their music is alleged by some to have led to effeminacy. They are said to have been the first inventors of divination by the singing, flying and feeding of birds.⁵

¹ *Universal History*, iv, 452. ² *Idem*, 453. ³ *Idem*, 442. ⁴ *Idem*, 443. ⁵ *Idem*, 453.

They made use of some dances and songs in solemnizing the festivals of their gods, and sometimes also on other occasions.

The government of Phrygia was monarchical, the crown being hereditary.¹ All Phrygia was at times subject to one prince. At other times, it seems to have been divided into several petty kingdoms.

In relation to philosophy and art nothing remains to attest the progress of the Phrygian mind either in power of thought, or in carrying out original conceptions into any of the multiplied forms of art.

Lydia, as a province of Asia Minor, is situated centrally, and in the western part of the peninsula. Its dimensions varied very much at different times. Under its latter kings, and at the time of its greatest glory, it extended from the river Halys to the Ægean sea. Its chief city was Sardis, situated at the foot of Mount Tmolus on the banks of the river Pactolus. This city is famous as having been the seat of the last Lydian king, Cræsus, and also as furnishing the immediate cause of the war between the Persians and the Greeks in consequence of its having been taken and burnt by the latter.

The Lydians were anciently called the Mæonians. Three dynasties reigned over them successively. That of the Atyadæ, which terminated in the person of Omphale, B. C. 1232.² Next the Heraclidæ, which terminated with Candaules, who was murdered at the instigation of his queen by Gyges, a Lydian nobleman, B. C. 727. The dynasty founded by Gyges was that of the Mermnadæ, under whom Lydia rose to great power. Under Aidys, the second of the dynasty, hordes of Cimmerians devastated Asia Minor, continuing their ravages for about half a century. They were finally driven out by Alyattes, the father of Cræsus, who finding himself successful against the Cimmerians, waged a six years' war against the Medes then growing in power

¹ *Universal History*, iv, 444. ² *Taylor*, 28.

under Cyaxares. A great battle was about to decide the contest when the combatants were separated by the consternation created by a total eclipse of the sun, B. C. 601.

Under Cræsus, the Lydian empire embraced nearly all Asia Minor west of the Halys. He was rich to a proverb, and the magnificence of his court at Sardis far exceeded that of any Lydian prince who had gone before him. He finally came in conflict with the rising power of Cyrus, the founder of the Persian empire, by whom he was defeated, his city taken, his empire dismembered, and Lydia became but a province of the Persian empire about the year B. C. 550. It has never since regained its independence.

We know little of the industry of the ancient Lydians. From the fact that the last days of the monarchy were crowned with splendor,¹ that the last monarch was the richest in the world, that one or two instances are given of private persons possessing immense wealth, it has been a matter of strong inference that the Lydians were very successful in following commercial pursuits. This was probably the fact, but it reposes rather on inference than any direct proof.

The soil of the country was exceedingly fruitful,² and amply repaid the toil of the husbandman in its cultivation. It abounded in all sorts of grain, and is celebrated for its excellent wines. It was enriched with several mines, which are said to have been productive in the time of Cræsus.

The religion of the Lydians was much the same as that of the Phrygians.

We have little knowledge of the Lydian character and state of society except what is derived from Herodotus.³ The Lydian character is supposed by many to have varied at different periods of time. Under Cræsus, and some of his predecessors, they were a warlike people.⁴ Their arms consisted in part of long spears, such as were anciently used by cavalry. They had the credit of excelling all

¹ *Universal History*, vi, 114, 115. ² *Idem*, 113. ³ *Idem*, 112. ⁴ *Idem*, 113.

other nations in horsemanship. They punished idleness as a crime, and inured their children to hardships from their infancy.

After reduction under the Persian yoke, their character was much changed. They wore long vests, and applied themselves to such arts and callings only, as had a natural tendency to debauch their manners and enervate their courage.¹ Hence they became voluptuous and effeminate, unfit for action, and given up to idleness, pleasures and diversions.

One singular fact is stated, and that is that they were in the habit of prostituting their daughters. That they had no other fortune than what they could earn in this way,² and that after they had by these means acquired a competent dowry, they were allowed to marry whoever they chose.

They are said to have been the first people who coined gold and silver for the purpose of facilitating commerce,³ and the first, also, who kept inns, or houses of public entertainment. It has also been asserted that they were the inventors of the game of dice, of dancing, and of various kinds of musical instruments, to which they had recourse to assuage their hunger by diversions during a great famine. Of all this, however, there is considerable doubt.

The Lydians are supposed to have followed the general Asiatic custom of reclining at their meals,⁴ and they were also somewhat peculiar in their sepulchral monuments. The tomb of Alyattes, the father of Cræsus, was a mound or tumulus of earth, raised upon a solid mass of masonry, and surmounted by five pyramidal columns or cones. Herodotus states the fact that during the reign of the Lydian king Atys, a great famine prevailed in Lydia, in consequence of which his son Tyrrhenus led off a colony which landed on the Italian shore and spread their con-

¹ *Universal History*, vi, 112, 113. ² *Idem*, 113. ³ *Anquetil*, i, 319. ⁴ *London Quarterly Review*, 1844-5, 21, 32.

quests into the interior. This account has been doubted, and very generally disbelieved. The remains of the ancient Etruscans, a people of Italy, that have been brought to light, and the discoveries made there, have all tended to confirm this statement of Herodotus, and to identify the Etruscans with the Lydians. The great resemblance discovered between the sepulchral monuments of the two,¹ have been considered as affording the strongest proof. Should this ultimately come to be firmly established, the Etruscan remains may probably reveal to us much more knowledge than we now possess, relating to the society, manners, customs, and general civilization of the Lydians.

In relation to government, the Lydians appear always to have been governed by kings, whose authority was despotic, and crown hereditary.²

Of the philosophy and arts of the Lydians, nothing of any importance remains. The great wealth possessed by some of them at the time their empire was the most flourishing, or soon after its fall, and the curious antiquities that are coming to light in ancient Etruria, seem to indicate that the Lydians attained, in some respects, to a pretty high degree of civilization. Of the particulars of it, however, we are still in ignorance.

There are other parts of Asia Minor, besides those possessed by the Trojans, Phrygians, and Lydians, that are objects of interest. The kingdom of Pontus, during the first century before the Christian era, and under the reign of Mithridates, VI, called the great, exhibits much that is interesting, so far as its outward history is concerned. The wars, which, for a series of years, he carried on with the rising power of Rome, although they ended in his total defeat and destruction, have, nevertheless, given his name to immortality. The contributions of Pontus to civilization, have been of little or no importance.

¹ *London Quarterly Review*, 1844-5, 32. ² *Universal History*, vi, 111.

The Greek settlements in Ætolia and Ionia, on the western coast of Asia Minor, skirting the Ægean, have contributed not a little to the progress of civilization. They belong, however, to Greece, and will come up for consideration in the developments of the Grecian era.

We now bid adieu to Asia, to follow the course of civilization as it travels westward to Europe. It is strange to remark how exceedingly small the progress man has yet made in separating and developing the elements of humanity. Had the march of civilization stopped here, how very trifling would have been the sum total of human attainment. It is true, in Egypt, industry, so far as its agricultural feature was concerned, and art in its largest and roughest forms, had achieved their separation, and were in part developed. In Phœnicia, industry became still more completely separated, and more perfectly developed. In the main, however, the elements have been blended with each other and have existed in a mingled mass. The two that have generally been the most prominent, and exercised the most influence have been religion and government. Around these have centered the others, and to advance them each seems to have furnished its own particular contribution. Industry has lent its wealth, society its forms of social intercourse, philosophy its powers of thought, and art its own creations. These have contributed to invest government and religion with great pomp and power, and to enable them to exert a mighty influence over the human mind. The one may be said to have reigned, and the other ruled in the affairs of men.

And we only see government and religion themselves exhibiting their worst possible forms. The one has made man a slave, the other a creature of destiny. We have as yet scarcely seen a single moral element appearing in history. So far as government is concerned, we have seen nothing but an unbroken succession of despotisms. The destruction of kingdoms, dismemberment of empires, or overthrow of dynasties, has brought no real or substan-

tial change. The same crushing despotism has still laid its mighty fetters on the body, mind and soul. Man, it is true, has frequently moved in masses, but it has been under the sway of the same despotic will.

Religion has been not less perverted than government. With one or two exceptions, nothing of the spiritual could be discerned in it. Its mission was not to man's spiritual nature. There was little or nothing in it that could appeal to his moral nature. It came to a world lying in sin, only to lead man further from God. It was, in great part, the homage rendered by man's sensual nature to idols of his own creation. Its influence was mainly degrading instead of elevating. It served, it is true, to fill what would otherwise have been a great void in human nature, but the misfortune was, that it left man worse than it found him. From these sweeping remarks we must, of course, except the Hebrews, whose special mission was to develop this element.

Under such combined influences it is not perhaps surprising that man has yet made so little progress. In bringing out all its resources, and in solving all its problems, civilization pays little regard to the cycles of time. It has, at its command, all time and all space. It could, therefore, well afford to stamp upon Asia the same everlasting features; to create there the same eternal round; to render it, through all time, the same terrible treadmill; to give everything there a fixedness and durability, as if it were, at the very outset, forever stereotyped.

The great and chief element of activity in man has hitherto been wanting, and that is freedom; freedom in thinking, speaking, willing and acting. This element we have never yet fairly encountered, although we found some approximations towards it in Phœnicia, and also among the Bedouin Arabs. We shall find it exerting its full strength and power under the mildness of a Grecian sky, in the balm of a Grecian atmosphere; in the variegated beauties of a Grecian landscape; in the diversified qualities of a Grecian soil. The mountain, the stream, the bay, the

harbor, unproductive Attica and fruitful Messenia, all furnished motives for action. Man did there act, and thus became acquainted with his own powers, and the extraordinary qualities with which his God had endowed him.

In leaving the realms of the east, therefore, we are to proceed from inertia to action; from where man was nothing to where he is everything; from despotism to democracy; from union to separation; from envelopment to development; from Asia to Greece.

END OF VOL. I.

