

THE  
PRINCETON REVIEW.

APRIL, 1861.

---

No. II.

---

---

ARTICLE I.—*Education; Intellectual, Moral, and Physical.*  
By HERBERT SPENCER, Author of "Social Statics," "The Principles of Psychology," &c. New York: D. Appleton & Company. 1861.

THIS book is a reprint of four articles first published by the author in different British Quarterlies. The first, entitled, "What knowledge is of most worth?" was published in the *Westminster Review*, nearly two years ago, and was immediately reprinted in this country, both in the *Eclectic Magazine*, and the *New York Times*, thus showing its decided power to command attention. The second, on "Intellectual Education," was first published in the *North British Review*. The third and fourth, on "Moral Education," and "Physical Education," were first published in the *British Quarterly Review*. It is only necessary to read these works to see that the author is furnished with various and affluent knowledge, is a clear and vigorous thinker, and is master of a simple and nervous style. He has already distinguished himself by works on "Social Statics," "Principles of Psychology," and "Essays: Scientific, Political, and Speculative." He is now about publishing a sort of encyclopediac survey, or what may perhaps more properly be called a fundamental and comprehensive out-

and already, dashing the waves from her prow, she is far on her way towards her desired haven. Such is our Presbyterian church under the impulse and full efficiency of her covenant education.

---

ART. IV.—*The History of Herodotus*, a new English version, edited with copious Notes and Appendices, illustrating the History and Geography of Herodotus, from the most recent sources of information; &c. By GEORGE RAWLINSON, M. A., late Fellow and Tutor of Exeter College, Oxford; assisted by Colonel Sir Henry Rawlinson, K. C. B., and Sir J. G. Wilkinson, F. R. S. 4 vols. 8vo. London. 1859. Reprinted New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1859.

ANCIENT oriental civilization had no historian of itself as a whole; but when it was drawing to a close, and the various characters of the drama were arrayed upon the stage, in a final group, a spectator appeared, who drew them, as they stood, with a pencil of light, and handed down the picture to posterity. The final attitude and character of the old epoch, its last grand effort of sovereignty and first admission of a rival, were thereby recorded, while the two parties still stood face to face, and the old had not yet submitted to the new. Before the Greek world, at length, a broad area of reliable fact was established in the past, and a clear starting point for subsequent history. Few junctures in the progress of nations have ever occurred of equal importance, and none has met with a more suitable delineator.

The reputation of Herodotus has been subjected to a remarkable, if not a singular fortune. Undeniably, and at all times, the most attractive of classical historians, the degree of credence awarded to him has varied with the intelligence and culture of his readers. In passing under so many judgments, from the approbation of contemporaries and the supercilious skepticism of later Greeks, down, through the wondering belief or the helpless doubt of less informed and less intellectual generations,

to the interrogatories of reviving learning and the more comprehensive views of recent criticism, his work has received the various treatment of an epic story, of substantial truth, of libellous romance, of a medley of fact and fiction, and of the most valuable, though not faultless, narrative of the period of which it treats. Its honesty has been successively admitted, doubted, impugned, taken as oracular, rejected, questioned, tested, and finally, at the end of more than two thousand years, established by the most irrefragable evidence. In order to estimate his work aright, we need to view him in his relations to the literary progress of history, to the period whose events he recorded, and the world he instructed.

Ancient Greek historians belonged to two classes or series, differing in spirit, in dialect, and in aim. The object of the older was to entertain, that of the latter to instruct. The former was epic in spirit, the latter was philosophical. The dialect of the former was Ionic, of the latter Attic. The series of epic historians flourished from about the middle of the sixth century B. C., to the last quarter of the fifth, when the founder of critical history appeared. They are divided by the period of the Peloponnesian war. Accustomed, as we are, to decisions drawn from the critical school, it is not easy for us to judge fairly, or even to think ourselves into a position from which to judge fairly, of the earlier class. To that end it becomes necessary to consider the position of literature in ancient Greece, and the models, if any, which the older historians had to follow.

What knowledge Greeks possessed of Egyptian, or Hebrew, or Phœnician prose, we are unable to say; it is not possible that they could have been entirely ignorant of it, but, in their own language, they had no prose writing as ancient as their epic poems. Brief notes of great or memorable events were kept on record in public archives, such as lists of Olympic victors, of Spartan kings, prytanes of Corinth, ancient treaties, determinations of boundaries, and other records of a like nature, but nothing that could be called prose narrative. Earliest Greek history had therefore to be moulded into shape from such materials, and by the example of epic tales. The one presented a continuous and flowing narrative, and the other carefully

recorded facts. It naturally retained some of the features of both, and, as might be expected in such a case, not those features which were best in each; rather the fabulous character of the poem, with the baldness of the register. And the aim was, in the first instance, as truly to entertain by recital, as it had been that of the epic rhapsodist. Of Cadmus of Miletus there is not now an extant fragment, and of Acusilaus of Argos, only few, but the titles of their works coincide with the report of them in indicating a nearness of kindred to epic subjects. Cadmus's narrative of the settlement of Ionia belonged to a similar class of topics with the siege of Troy, the preliminary movement to the settlement of the adjoining Æolic States; and Acusilaus, in rendering Hesiod into prose, clung closer still to the spirit of the past. Hecataeus of Miletus, Pherecydes of Leros, and Charon of Lampsacus, and others, cultivated the new form of composition, gave greater range to their inquiries, and sought more careful conformity to the truth of fact. And it may be a matter of safe inference that they also carried forward the culture of style. But, in the fragments of their works which remain, the rude, curt, and bald manner of the register still prevails; while no tact is evinced in discriminating fact from fiction. And yet, notwithstanding these defects, their loss is deeply to be regretted. Historians of the present day would be too happy to have the chance of selecting from such masses of material, to find fault with the style, or with the lack of any principle of criticism, which would have made their number fewer. This remark will apply with special force to the works of Hecataeus, inasmuch as a large part of his writings recorded his own geographical and ethnological observations, and that extending to a great part of Asia, Egypt, and Libya, as well as Europe.

One of the grand difficulties with primitive historians was the lack of a connected chronology and of a common era. How were dates to be assigned, and the true chronological relations of events determined? It is likely that most of them floated entirely at sea, as loosely as the epic poets. Many of the episodes of Herodotus are rendered unmanageable from that cause. Though containing a chronology within themselves, it is disjointed from that of his proper subject. This difficulty Charon

of Lampsacus first met in his history of the Prytanes of Sparta, and Hellanicus of Lesbos, in one of his works, attempted to surmount by adopting the order of the priestesses of Juno in Argos. In other respects also, it is probable that Hellanicus carried forward the improvement of his art. In selection and arrangement of his materials, he expended more care and judgment than the earlier historians. Like Hecataeus, he was also a traveller into foreign countries, and part of his numerous works consisted in description of the lands and nations to which his journeys extended. Hellanicus was a contemporary of Herodotus, and by several years survived the opening of the Peloponnesian war. But even he, as appears from extant fragments, was not emancipated from the cramped and bald style of the primitive registers, nor from the habit of writing without criticism of his materials.

The place of Herodotus, in the sequel of such a series of historians, was therefore that of him who, improving upon, and by all the labours of his predecessors, carries his art to its proper perfection. He introduced no new style of composition, is truly one of the primitive epic series, aims at the same ends as his predecessors, and adheres to the Ionic dialect; but he succeeded in combining all the proper excellences of that style, and in maturing the whole into the utmost perfection it was destined ever to attain. For, after Thucydides had declared the principle and set the example of critical history, with such force and majesty and severity of science, it was impossible that succeeding efforts, however far short they might come of maintaining the lofty position thus assumed, should ever again succeed after the manner of the old epic simplicity. As Thucydides was the founder of critical history, so the work of Herodotus is the final and culminating effort of the preceding epic style. Herodotus is the father of Greek history, not as being the first to write history, but as the first who carried it to excellence.

His subject is the rise and progress of the Medo-Persian empire; and the main plot, as we may call it, is the conflict in which the states of Greece were involved thereby. It was a subject, which concerned the whole civilized world, and extended to much beyond those bounds. All Asia, from the plains of India to the coast of Ionia, and from the Caucasus to the Ara-

bian Sea, as well as Egypt, Æthiopia, and a great part of northern Africa, was either absorbed in, or annexed to, the new empire. And in Europe, the then wilds of Hungary and Southern Russia had been overrun by its armies, and Thrace, Macedonia, Thessaly, and the Ægean islands had been reduced, or had submitted to recognize its superiority. The history of that vast empire comprehended the history of many subordinate nations, some of which had once been leaders in civilization.

On the other hand, the work of setting forth the successful resistance of Athens and Sparta, imposed the dependent task of narrating a great part of the foregoing history of each of those states, and of their more important allies and European rivals, for, at least, a century before.

The event to which the whole narrative tends, and in which it terminates, was of universal interest, and still so recent as to have lost nothing by the lapse of years, except the petty details, which would have detracted from its grandeur. The historian was himself born in the midst of the conflict and partook of the enthusiasm which it excited. And the date of his manhood was just far enough removed from it, to command a complete view of the whole battle ground, and to fairly compare the movements of both parties. Chronologically, the wars with Xerxes stood to Herodotus as those of the first Napoleon stand to us. At the same time the facts were far from trite to the public for which he wrote. Hecataeus and others perhaps, had gone over some of the ground, but their habits of writing were not to be relied upon, and in laying before his countrymen a view of nations beyond the immediate neighbourhood of Greece, Herodotus did not feel free to assume that they were rightly acquainted with any of the previous events.

After mentioning the hostile attitude in which Europe and Asia had stood towards each other from ancient date, and thereby giving intimation of what the issue is to be, he enters upon the history of Lydia, through the subjugation of which the Persians first came in contact with the Greeks. Having carried that narrative down until the conquest of Lydia by Cyrus, he proceeds, in the most natural order, to set forth the means whereby the Medes and Persians had, at that date become the lords paramount of Asia. Following chronological order, he recounts the

previous history of the Medes, as far as he could learn about it; then the legends of the early life of Cyrus, the revolt of the Persians from the yoke of Media, and the union of the two nations. Then taking up the campaigns of the united forces, under Cyrus, from the conquest of Lydia, he goes on to narrate the course of the war whereby the Ionians, and other nations on the Ægean coast, were subdued; throwing in, as is his wont, episodic accounts of each. Turning from those achievements of the lieutenants of Cyrus, he next follows the great general himself to the siege and capture of Babylon, and afterwards, on his unfortunate and final expedition against the Massagetæ.

As the great exploit of Cambyses, the son and successor of Cyrus, was the conquest of Egypt, and as Egypt was the most interesting of all countries to the Greeks, Herodotus, at this point, dwells to great length upon the description and history of that country and of the neighbouring parts of Africa. The whole of his second book and part of the third, are thus occupied. Next follows the death of Cambyses, and the troubles attendant upon the succession, in the sequel of which Darius the son of Hystaspes came to the throne. The organization adopted by Darius leads to an account of the revenues of the empire, as well as to a general description of its extent and divisions.

Soon after he came to the throne, Darius found it necessary to punish Orætes, satrap of Sardis, for the murder of Polycrates and Mitrodates, and for other acts of cruelty and injustice. He was thereby led into that series of events whereby his ambition was directed against Greece, while his success in reducing the revolt of Babylon, completely crushed the last struggles of opposition to his rule, at the seat of his power.

The campaign of Darius in Scythia gives the historian occasion to describe that country and people, otherwise so scantily known to the Greeks of his day; and a Persian expedition into North Africa as far as Barca, leads to a similar description of what the Greeks called Libya, especially of Cyrene and Barca. With the fifth book he takes up the movements of the Persians in Thrace and Macedonia, and proceeds to the revolt of the Ionians. The Ionian appeal to the European Greeks for help, brings before his reader the States

of Sparta and Athens. And in the progress of that revolt to its defeat, many portions of Greek history, especially touching those two States, are woven into their proper places. The punishment designed for Athens, on account of her part in aiding the Ionians, was averted by the issue of the battle at Marathon. And the sixth book, in which these events are given, closes with the death of Miltiades. The seventh is almost entirely occupied with the celebrated expedition of Xerxes, until after the battle at Thermopylæ. A more concentrated interest actuates this and the remaining books. Fewer digressions occur. One grand action enlists the attention, as if all the rest of mankind had stood still, awaiting the result. In the eighth book are arrayed, in most effective grouping and delineation, the momentous events of, and connected with, the invasion of Attica, the capture of Athens, and the battle of Salamis. And the ninth consists of a similar handling of the military movements of the succeeding year, which resulted in the battle at Plataea, and the naval engagement of Mycale, whereby the Persians were expelled from Europe, and the independence of Greece defended; and, we may add, whereby the integrity of European civilization was secured.

No grander subject ever occupied the secular historian's pen; and its importance, however highly estimated by contemporaries, has magnified before the eye of the world with the lapse of ages. Who shall even now attempt to compute the value of that conflict, whereby the paralysis of Persian rule was averted from Europe, and that freedom maintained, which gave to the world the refining and elevating influences of Athens, her philosophy, her literature, her arts, her self-government, her enterprise, and the reflex of these in Rome, and repeated more or less in all the most flourishing nations of succeeding times, and which has contributed so large an ingredient to modern prosperity? It was such a crisis as cannot often occur.

The work of Herodotus thus becomes a general history of the area of civilization and its borders, as far as materials were accessible to the author, down to the battle of Mycale, and final expulsion of the Persians from Greece. It is thereby possessed, at once, of unity of purpose, and plan, and great diversity of details.



Only a small proportion of the narrative reaches to a high antiquity. It is chiefly concerned with events which occurred in the sixth, and first twenty-one years of the fifth centuries before Christ. In the preliminary remarks, and in many of the episodes, facts, and legends of greater antiquity are introduced, but the proper subject of the work is contained within those chronological limits.

On most heads which he touches, Herodotus evidently gives all the information which he possessed, and deemed worthy of record; but on some, his collections were so extensive, that only a part is given, with the intimation that the rest is reserved for another occasion, or another work. Thus, his notices of the history of Babylon are very scanty, inasmuch as he contemplated a separate history of that country.

The style of the work is flowing and graceful in an eminent degree, while imbued to the very core with antique simplicity. Its structure as a work of art, approaches the symmetry and proportion of an epic poem, a resemblance which the many episodes go rather to sustain than to impair. Consisting of most carefully investigated facts, such is the presentation of them, in the very colours of life, and so true to the order of nature, as to effect a romantic interest not inferior to the brilliant fictions of the *Odyssey*.

That the facts of which it consists were not recorded without honest and laborious efforts to ascertain their reality, can be shown from internal testimony. Besides the works of his predecessors, of which it is clear that he had made himself master, Herodotus had also ransacked the public archives, and the temple records of all those places in Greece, which promised anything to the subject in hand. Written documents, however, on much of what he treats, were not to be obtained in his native country. He could not sit down in his study, collect his authorities around him, and make up his judgment with confidence that he possessed all the means thereto in already recorded testimonies. In by far the greater number of cases his materials had to be collected by himself from foreign countries; those countries had to be visited by his own observation, their respective national records to be examined by his own inquiries of their official custodians, their popular and sacerdotal

legends, taken down from his own hearing, and the necessary geographical details, by travelling over the ground himself. The labour of thus preparing a work of such range, at a time when travelling was so difficult and tedious, goes far to evince the honesty and love of truth of him who undertook it. No doubt much of that earnestness and native grace, which pervades the work of Herodotus, is due to the fact that it is the growth chiefly of his own personal observations and inquiries.

Born in or about the year 484 B. C., when Halicarnassus, his native city, was under the dominion of Persia, it is probable that he spent the earlier part of his youth as a Persian subject; and thereby may have enjoyed as his birthright the protection of that government in his travels. These were pursued over a large part of that empire. He ascended the Nile as far as Elephantina, carrying his inquiries to great length and minuteness into the history, government, religion, manners, and customs of Egypt. He travelled also into Cyrene, to the island of Zante, to Dodona, and the opposite coast of Italy. On the east, he went into Phœnicia and Assyria, and visited the country and city of Babylon. The whole southern and western coast of Asia Minor, and most of the islands of the *Ægean*, as well as Greece proper, underwent his personal observation: also parts of Thrace and Scythia, and the shores of the Black Sea, to some extent, both northern and southern, as far as Colchis. After many years spent in travel, he took up his residence in Athens, where it is probable that he first read publicly some portions of the work which he was then engaged in writing. Subsequently he joined an Athenian colony, which settled in Thurium, on the south-eastern coast of Brutium, in Italy. There it is probable that he spent the remainder of his days, excepting some brief excursions, like that to Attica, about 436 B. C., employed in completing the structure of his history, and working into its texture the results of his multifarious researches. And beyond the bounds of his own travels, he had collected such reports and descriptions of other travellers as he could anywhere obtain.

That his work was really published, in the first instance, by being read, in portions before an audience, we have not a doubt, notwithstanding all that has lately been written to the contrary.

Even had we no direct and special testimony thereto, it would be difficult for an unbiassed mind, thoughtfully versed in the pre-Athenian literature of Greece, and in the style of Herodotus, to believe that his work was not written for the very purpose of being so read. All Greek literature, up to that date, had been written with a view to public delivery. The epic was chanted by the professional rhapsodist. The dithyramb was performed by a chorus. All other kinds of poetry were either chanted or sung. Philosophy was taught in song, in conversation, and in lecture. Greece had great orators before she could boast of any writings in prose. The drama, which reached its prime in the days of Herodotus, was the very culmination of that oral literature, the union and harmony of all its possible excellences. The view to recital before an audience is a feature that distinguishes the more ancient Greek literature from the more recent, as well as from the Egyptian and Hebrew, and perhaps all others that preceded it. An exception may be made of some portions of the Hebrew; but in Greece, until the latter part of the fifth century B. C., everything was shaped with a view to the popular ear. That such was the practice of the historians who preceded Thucydides, is testified unequivocally by that author himself, in those passages where he blames them for having more regard to the ear of their auditors than to the truth. Indeed it was largely due to this practice that, although reading was perhaps not a common accomplishment in those days, the Greek populace were so far superior to their neighbours in point of intelligence and taste. Such literary entertainments were of frequent occurrence in all the principal cities. And hence, nothing is more likely than that the historian, who brought the epic style of history to its highest excellence, should have presented his work before his countrymen in the way in which all previous literature had been published.

To this consideration must be added the popular and attractive manner of the work itself, evidently designed, not like that of Thucydides, for the studious reader alone, but to interest and instruct the popular mind. In fact this condition is almost necessary to account for some of the peculiar features belonging to it.

It by no means follows that we are to believe that he wrote

every word of his history in some particular year, and then never touched it again, or that he read it all through at one recital, or that every person assembled at the games must have listened to him, if he read at all, or that he really read at any of the games, as some have ridiculously assumed; the number of ancient testimonies to the fact that he did read his work in public is such as not to be accounted for on any other hypothesis than that of the ancient belief of the fact. Such a work is not to be dashed off at a heat. It doubtless cost years of composition. And what was to hinder his recital of the more entertaining passages of what he had written, long before the whole was complete? Were not the epic poems recited in precisely that way—that is, by portions? It was the very method to which the Greeks of his day were accustomed, and to which the structure of his work is eminently adapted.

With his sincere regard for truth and solemn natural piety, Herodotus combined much of the spirit of the logographer, which regarded history in the light of an entertainment. Accordingly he yielded free play to his unrivalled narrative powers, and dwells with evident gratification upon tales of romantic interest. We have no reason to say that he ever permitted that taste to pervert his representation of facts; but it leads him to give in detail what might otherwise have been summed up in brief, and to recount legends of which a critical author would have used only the outline, or indicated the bearing. At the same time, it is proper to say for him, that a legend, if told at all, is best for whatever historical value it may have, if given in its own shape and manner. Were it his practice indiscriminately to set down tradition as indubitable fact, there would have been ground to censure either his unfaithfulness or his credulity; but so far is the case otherwise, that no historian more frequently confesses that the best he has been able to learn, does not meet his own credence. His fidelity is in nothing more apparent than in the scrupulousness with which he relates what he does not himself understand. Well for history that the oldest extant historian of Greece was honest without being critical; and that the founder of criticism confined himself to the events of his own time. Had it been otherwise we should have lost many an interesting fact of the prior antiquity, which Thu-

cydides would certainly have rejected, but which to the eye of modern science reveals important truth.

Investigations so extensive as those of Herodotus were beyond the capacity of his countrymen to estimate. Few Greeks deemed foreign affairs of such importance as to take the trouble to verify them, or even possessed the means of so doing. Unless it may have been Aristotle, or some of the scholars of Alexandria, none of his ancient critics were furnished with information competent to measure that of Herodotus; while the soaring self-esteem of later Greeks indisposed them to make any allowance for their own incapacity. The more honest wondered and admired, the more pretending sneered, or sought to pick insignificant faults in a work, which they were impotent to weigh as a whole. These remarks will apply equally to the frivolous charges of the pseudo-Plutarch, and to the more favourable but hardly less puerile judgment of Dionysius. It is only as the result of recent research that juster notions have been established of Herodotus, touching either his merits or the nature of his faults.

It would be too much to assume that modern geographical features, in all cases, coincide with the ancient, which Herodotus describes, or that in disinterred ruins, we have the means of completely restoring the structures, which he beheld in their beauty, or that the monuments of the past, which have been recently deciphered, are all, or even the best authorities of the kind, to which he had access; but this we claim, that large and invaluable materials have, within the present generation, been added to the illustrations of Herodotus, furnishing better means of rightly estimating his rank as a historian, than we ever possessed before.

The chief sources from which these materials are drawn, have been laid open by comparative philology, by the deciphering of ancient hieroglyphic and cuneiform writing, by antiquarian research, by the labours of minute scholarship addressed to history, and by enlarged geographical and topographical observation.

Of these agencies, the first mentioned is due to British dominion in India, and sprang out of a scientific study of the Sanscrit language by European scholars. In 1784, the

Asiatic Society was founded at Calcutta, by Sir William Jones, who had gone out from England in the previous year. Its object was the cultivation of the languages, literature, and history of Asia, and especially of India and the further East. Previously it had been known to some European scholars that Sanscrit was the ancient language of the Brahmins, in which were written their laws and religious ritual. Sir William Jones was the first European to address himself to its study with a true philological purpose. His observations were given to the world through the journals of the Asiatic Society. In the course of a few years he, together with Halhead, Colebrooke, Wilkins and others, had laid open its grammatical structure, carried investigation far into its literature, published their views of its importance, not only to the service of the East India Company, but to general philology, and to enforce their opinion of its value, accompanied their announcement with translations of some Sanscrit books.

Those early explorers of Brahminical lore were most surprised and delighted to find in the ancient language of a people so far separated from European contact, the most remarkable resemblances to European languages, in words and inflections which reminded them of Greek, of Latin, and even of their own English tongue. Sir William Jones was the first to announce the philological value of the discovery. The subject was taken up by scholars in both India and Europe. In Sanscrit was found the reconciliation of Greek and Latin. It was obviously related to both, and threw light upon both. The whole Germanic class of languages were soon shown to be similarly related to it, and thereby their kindred to the Greek and Latin came out the more clearly. A knowledge of Persian, so important to British officers in the East, discovered similar relations to the Sanscrit and German in that language. In short, Sanscrit was found to occupy a central point, from which a large group of languages, including most of the European, could be studied with the greatest advantage. It was the key to the whole.

Comparison of those languages with each other was a step inevitable in the process of thinking, while further investigation continued to enlarge the boundaries of recognized affinities.

Principles and laws of affiliation and variety in language, more comprehensive than had previously been conceived of, were consequently established—principles, which in another aspect became laws of ethnic growth, dispersion and reunion, thereby revealing facts touching the state of human society long antecedent to the earliest written history. Thus arose the new and still progressive science of comparative philology. It was between 1816 and 1819 that its position as such was distinctly assumed. In the former year appeared Bopp's "Conjugation System of the Sanscrit, Greek, Latin, Persian, and German languages." This was the real foundation. In 1819, Bask's Classification of the Indian, Median, Lithuanian, Slavonic, Gothic, and Celtic languages, as all belonging to the Arian family, the publication of Wilson's Sanscrit Dictionary, the establishment of Schlegel's "Indian Library," and the first instalment of Grim's "Teutonic Grammar," vastly enlarged the structure, and determined its value.

At the same time, the Hebrew, Arabic, and other branches of the Semitic group, were undergoing a similarly thorough analysis in the light of comparative philology, and successful entrance was made upon the Chinese and other languages of the farther East. It was also during that active first quarter of our century, that physical geography, under the auspices chiefly of Humboldt and Ritter, claimed for herself a new niche in the temple of science; and that Pritchard, almost by the force of his own strong arm, molded into proportions worthy of its name, the Natural History of Man, and by calling in the aid of geography and philology, drew also the outlines of the resultant science of ethnology.

While these new sciences were springing into existence, a key was unexpectedly found to the long lost meaning of Egyptian hieroglyphical writing. The first efforts to decipher the Rosetta Stone were made in 1814, and in 1819 its secret was successfully elicited, and in a few years afterwards was presented to the world in a practical shape. The new field of scholarship thus thrown open, has well repaid the labours of the many illustrious men who have given themselves, with a noble enthusiasm, to its culture; among whom may be men-

tioned Champollion, Wilkinson, Rosellini, Lepsius, and the late lamented Bunsen.

The latest, and perhaps the most ingenious achievement of the series, is the deciphering of the arrow-headed characters of Assyrian and Persian monuments. Here no Rosetta Stone furnished a key. A number of inscriptions on ruined structures, on rocks in the mountains, and on bricks and cylinders, alone presented their mysterious signs to the eye. Nothing was given as a known starting point; what the nature of the written signs, whether symbolic or alphabetic, and what the language sealed up in them, alike unknown. Conjecture alone could take the first step; and no doubt, many a fruitless attempt was made, many a step taken, which had again to be abandoned, before a footing was obtained on solid ground. Although the method was indicated, to some degree, by Grotefend as early as the year 1815, no real progress was made until about five and twenty years ago. The acumen and perseverance of Burnouf and Lassen, in Europe, addressed to copies of Persian inscriptions, and of Major, now Sir Henry Rawlinson, in the East, in presence of the monuments themselves, ultimately succeeded in deducing the alphabetical nature of cuneiform writing, and in satisfactorily translating the Persian variety.

But a difficulty has been encountered which was not at first anticipated. It is found that no less than three languages, belonging to three fundamental divisions of mankind, the Arian, Semitic, and Turanian, are represented in these writings, and in connection therewith, some difference in the style of the writing itself. The discoveries in Assyria have brought this matter more prominently to light, and, while enlarging the resources of cuneiform scholarship, have made to its task an unexpected addition. In the main, the Persian variety may be said to be satisfactorily deciphered, but the Assyrian and Babylonian, although important facts have been obtained from them, present several points which are still subjects of investigation. It is to be hoped that, under the continued scrutiny of the same ingenious scholars, the whole will be finally cleared up.

Preceding and contemporaneously with these discoveries in



the writing of antiquity, explorations have been going on to a great extent among the ruined buildings, cavern tombs, and other monuments, to which the writings belong. From the French savans, who accompanied the army of Napoleon, down to the Prussian expedition, conducted by professor Lepsius, and the volunteers of private enterprise, some of whom are still at work, a host of industrious explorers have laid open the evidences of many centuries of civilization in Egypt; while the labours of Botta and Layard, on the sites of ancient Assyrian cities, have spread similar stores before the readers of the cuneiform writings. Among the former, an American should not fail to record the name of Dr. Abbott, whose invaluable collection of Egyptian antiquities has recently been added to the treasures of the New York Historical Society. Perhaps it is due to our extravagant system of advertising, that a matter presented with modesty is overlooked. The curiosity, which yearly takes many of us to Egypt, has not, it would appear, found out the treasure nearer home. Often as we have visited those rooms, we have never seen more than one or two visitors there; yet it is asserted, by competent authority, that one might travel from one end of Egypt to the other, without finding so much of Egyptian antiquity as is laid before his eyes in that one collection.

During the same early years of our century, a new and superior style of historical criticism was introduced by Heeren and Niebuhr, and by themselves expressly applied to ancient history. After such example, minute scholarship learned the art of eliciting from incidental remarks, and fragments of classical authors, information touching the earlier antiquity, which had previously lurked there unsuspected. That art, which has given shape to such works as Müller's Dorians and Movers' Phœnicians, would seem to be most aptly prepared to take hold of the new materials thus laid to her hand, and to apply them to the purpose of filling up the blanks which time and violence have made in the records of our race.

Now all these discoveries and improvements most intimately belong to the field of history handled by Herodotus. Upon no other classical author do their rays converge so largely. A scholar cannot glance at their results without perceiving

their bearing and importance to the elucidation of that author. It might almost be said to be chiefly due to Mr. Rawlinson's good fortune, that he has been in a position to carry out, sooner than any other could, a design which must have suggested itself to many. But that remark would not be just, without also admitting that he has used his good fortune to excellent purpose; and has executed, with the very essential aid of his two celebrated coadjutors, a work, for which the learned world, and, we hope, also the general reading public, must owe him lasting favour.

On the first book, which contains the history of Lydia, Media, Persia, and the first siege of Babylon, the amount of commentary and dissertation is the largest, consisting of copious notes, and an appendix, which amounts to fully half the volume, consisting of eleven essays with additional notes. Of these essays, the first is a critical treatment of the history of Lydia in the light of minute historical scholarship. The third handles, in a similar manner, the history and chronology of the Median Empire, in which some of the benefits of Assyrian researches and Arian philology are turned to account. The second treats of the geography, physical and political, of Asia Minor, drawn chiefly from the works of Leake, Hamilton, Fellowes, and Rennell. The fifth is a short essay on the ancient Persian religion. The fourth, sixth, and tenth, are from the pen of Sir Henry Rawlinson, and treat of the ten Persian tribes, of the early history of Babylonia, and of the religion of the Babylonians and Assyrians. They consist of almost entirely new material, the fruit of his own studies of Persian, Babylonian, and Assyrian monuments. It is unnecessary to remark upon their importance, or the interest which they possess for the student of antiquity. The seventh and eighth essays restore, at considerable length, the history of the Assyrian Empire, and that of the later Babylonian. Their value consists in the skill with which the fruits of antiquarian research and discovery have been woven together with those of classical scholarship and the narrative of Herodotus. In the ninth, we have a treatment of the geography of the countries lying between India on the east, and Armenia and the Mediterranean and Red Seas on the west, drawn chiefly from the

recent works of Chesney, Layard, Robinson, Kinneir, Burnes, and Rawlinson. And the eleventh, on the ethnic affinities of the nations of Western Asia, owes its existence to the labours of the new philology, and researches into the natural history of man. Over the whole treatment of this book the supervision of Sir Henry Rawlinson is apparent, not only in the presence of essays and notes from his pen, but also in the reverent eye to his discoveries, which characterizes all the rest, and in the occasional occurrence of a paragraph, sentence, or clause, appended by him to remarks of the editor.

Copious and valuable also are the illustrations and additions to the second book, which treats of Egypt. In this case the mass of recently discovered material is so great, that it was important to exercise judicious selection of what was most to the point, in order to avoid the evil of overloading the text. Good judgment is manifested in the selection made. The foot notes are copious, but apposite, both literary and pictorial, and are followed by an appendix of eight chapters, on the antiquity, ethnology, religion, writing, amusements, science, and ancient history of Egypt. By far the greater number of these notes, and the whole of the appendix, are the work of Sir Gardiner Wilkinson. In fact, the editor seems to have consigned the second book almost entirely to the hands of that long experienced and most reliable of Egyptologists; and has evinced his own good judgment in so doing.

The same illustrious pen pursues the course of the third book, as far as it pertains to Egypt and the adjoining desert. It also appears in the appendix to the same book, in an essay on the worship of Venus Urania, in Scripture called Astaroth, throughout the East. Three other essays with additional notes make up the rest of that appendix, treating of the Magian revolution, of the Persian system of administration and government, and of the topography of Babylonia, followed by accounts of the standard inscription of Nebuchadnezzar, and of the labours of M. Oppert at Babylon, with a copy of the Behistun inscription, and a translation of the same into English.

Of the fourth book, the first one hundred and forty-three chapters concerning the Scythian expedition of Darius, and the country and people of Scythia, including an outline of

ancient geography, receive their illustration from the pen of the editor, drawing from classical scholarship, recent travels and researches, some of which were made during the late Crimean war. A few notes have the initials of Sir Gardiner Wilkinson. These inviting marks occur more frequently in the latter part of the book, where the author returns to the north of Africa, and the borders of Egypt. In the appendix are three essays on the Cimmerians of Herodotus, and the migrations of the Cymric race, on the ethnography of the European Scyths, and on the geography of Scythia.

Upon the fifth and sixth books the annotations are fewer. The subject, more familiar to ordinary readers, did not require the same amount of commentary. Two essays in the appendix to the fifth book, present the early history of Sparta and of Athens. And following the sixth are two, on the circumstances of the battle of Marathon, and of the traditions respecting the Pelasgians, with a note on the derivation and meaning of the proper names of the Medes and Persians.

The seventh book, especially in the grand review of his forces by Xerxes, furnishes more occasion for illustrative remark and commentary. And the appendix to it includes essays on the obscurer tribes contained within the empire of Xerxes, and on the early migrations of the Phœnicians, one little tract by Sir Henry Rawlinson, on the Alarodians of Herodotus, followed by a copy of an inscription on the sepulchre of Darius, and a long and valuable note on the family history of the Achæmenidæ.

To the eighth and ninth books, as conversant with what is completely within the range of well known Greek history, fewer notes have been added, and no appendices. The additions of most importance are the notes on Delphi, Salamis, Plataea, and on the inscription recently found on the stand of the tripod, dedicated by the Greeks at Delphi, out of the Persian spoils.

Prefixed to the whole is an outline of the life of Herodotus, drawn from his own work, and from otherwise known history of the times in which he lived, and of the places where he resided: also two chapters on the sources from which he compiled his history, and on his merits and defects as an historian. Under all these heads, large use is made of the excellent work

of the late Colonel Mure; but with that discrimination, which needs to be applied to the opinions of that much lamented scholar.

In the additions thus made, we are furnished with matter of great historical value, bearing upon Herodotus in various ways. In some cases they correct his mistakes. Thus, in respect to the kings of Egypt, it is now clear that he must have misunderstood the chronological arrangement, and that he has put a part of the Memphite dynasties last, which really belonged to the first series, and otherwise presented, as in immediate succession, princes actually separated by many intervening reigns. His geography, as respects the countries less familiar to his own observation, has also received important correction. The essays on that subject have been prepared with good judgment, and contain a clear and concise summary of what has been ascertained by the latest and best authorities.

In other cases these discoveries expose the falsehood of the historian's informants, and almost demonstrate their motives in misleading him. Thus, the Egyptian priests "concealed from him altogether the dark period in their history, the time of their oppression under the Shepherd Kings, of which he obtained only a single dim and indistinct glimpse, not furnished him, apparently by the priests, but by the memory of the people. They knowingly falsified their monuments by assigning a late date to the pyramid kings, whom they disliked, by which they flattered themselves that they degraded them. They distorted the true narrative of Sennacherib's miraculous discomfiture, and made it tend to the glorification of one of their own body." And they succeeded in concealing all other invasions of their territory by the kings of Assyria and Babylon, even when subsequent to the settlement of Greeks in their country.

More frequently, however, these discoveries vindicate the historian's truth, against the aspersions of Ctesias and others. Professing to derive his relation of oriental affairs from examination of Persian archives, during a residence of seventeen years at the court of Artaxerxes, Ctesias proceeded to contradict Herodotus, "whenever he could do so without fear of detection. He thus acquired to himself a degree of fame and of consideration to which his literary merits would certainly

never have entitled him." "By the most unblushing effrontery he succeeded in palming off his narrative upon the ancient world as the true and genuine account of the transactions, and his authority was commonly followed in preference to that of Herodotus, at least upon all points of purely oriental history. There were not wanting, indeed, in ancient times, some more critical spirits, *e. g.*, Aristotle and the true Plutarch, who refused to accept as indisputable the statements of the Cnidian physician, and retorted upon him the charge of untruthfulness, which he had preferred against our author. It was difficult, however, to convict him of systematic falsehood until oriental matters of an authentic character were obtained, by which to test the conflicting accounts of the two writers. A comparison with the Jewish Scriptures, and with the native history of Berosus, first raised a general suspicion of the bad faith of Ctesias, whose credit few moderns have been bold enough to maintain against the continually increasing evidence against him. At last the *coup de grace* has been given to his small remaining authority by the recent cuneiform discoveries, which convict him of having striven to rise into notice by a system of 'enormous lying' to which the history of literature scarcely presents a parallel." On the other hand, the statements of the same monuments are found to sustain the honesty of Herodotus and Berosus.

Of course the advancement and general diffusion of knowledge has completely dispelled the necessity for contradicting some notions which the ancient historian took pains to refute, as well as some others which he admitted; but a most interesting result is that modern science and discovery, in some instances, demonstrate the correctness of what he declares he could not believe, and, in so doing, bear testimony to his fidelity in recounting even what his own faith rejected, when he did not feel free to withhold it. At the command of Pharaoh Necho certain Phœnicians sailed out of the Red Sea, down the eastern coast of Africa, and returned, after the lapse of two years, by way of the Straits of Gibraltar. One particular in their report, Herodotus says he could not believe, that, when rounding the southern point of Africa, they had the sun on their right hand. His incredulity on this point was the

incredulity of his age; but, while proving that such voyages were not of frequent occurrence, it gives the most indubitable evidence that a Phœnician expedition had rounded the Cape of Good Hope more than two thousand years before Vasco de Gama.

In some cases, they explain, from natural causes, what appears mythical in his handling, and was regarded as mysterious by himself. But by far the most valuable use is, that they carry the view of history, with greater or less distinctness, to a depth of antiquity of which Herodotus had no knowledge, revealing the existence of a long period of primitive civilization of which he knew little save the decline. Ethnology, following up the footsteps of human language, and the characteristics of races, through a dreary waste of unrecorded time, determines, somewhat vaguely, but yet with certainty, great ethnic movements which constitute the basis of nations and the starting-points of history. It beholds the Hamitic and Semitic races in their original homes and primitive culture, and the Arian in the general course of its migrations more than a thousand years before the rise of the Median Empire, the point from which the main action of the work of Herodotus begins. Antiquarian industry and hermeneutic skill have explored the track of empire, prior to the rise of Persia, up to the very verge of original dispersion, and established most important epochs of which Herodotus had never heard. Ruins, of course, are fragmentary; and of these fragments there are many to which we can yet assign no chronological place; but, after all, the mass of the legible and connected is such, upon many epochs, as to furnish a breadth and a certainty of information which even written history by itself could not afford. Whatever debate there may be on the subject of greater Egyptian antiquity, no person, competent to form an opinion on the subject, will now deny that monumental evidence has restored to their proper order in history the dynasty founded by Shishak, five hundred years before the time of Herodotus, that of the Ramesses several centuries before Shishak, that of the Sesortosens, long anterior to the Ramesses, as well as that of the still more ancient pyramid-builders of Memphis, reaching to more than seventeen hundred years before the

Greek historian visited that country. Of all that time, the Egyptian priests had records in their keeping, but what they told Herodotus was, in many particulars, erroneous, if not deliberate fiction, as appears from the discovery of the records themselves. They may, indeed, have communicated to him more than he either understood or remembered; but certain it is, that after all contained in his book, the existence of that long period of prior Egyptian history is a real discovery to us. Nor is that discovery merely a list of kings; there is far more in it going to illustrate the state of society, than to restore the order of dynasties.

Cuneiform scholarship is of a later date, but to it also are we already indebted for a large extension of the field of historical knowledge. By aid of a remarkable sequence of dates found among the inscriptions, a positive chronology has been established, upon a few important points, for Babylonian and Assyrian dominion, up to the nineteenth century before Christ; from which it is possible to look beyond, into still greater antiquity, upon certain earlier events, of dimmer outline and less ascertainable place, but not less certain existence, as far as a Babylonian prince, whose approximate date, whose name and title, correspond closely to the Chedorlaomer of Scripture.

Few and far apart are the facts yet ascertained of ancient Babylonian and Assyrian history; but they give us points of truth where formerly we had nothing, or, worse than nothing, fictions of Greek fabrication covering up or misrepresenting even the traditions of the country. At some epochs, especially from about the twelfth century B. C., to which belongs the cylinder of Tiglath Pileser I., the earliest contemporaneous monument yet brought to light as belonging to the Assyrian empire, a considerable amount of valuable information has been recovered, touching several nations of western Asia, and throwing light upon Scripture narrative not less than upon that of Herodotus.

A similar work has been executed for Phœnician antiquity, by the labours of minute scholarship, and especially by the indefatigable investigation and discriminative tact of Movers, who, although called away before his contemplated task was



done, has left an invaluable legacy to history. We regret that Mr. Rawlinson has not seen fit to draw more largely from this quarter. It really belonged to the demands of his undertaking to give a connected view of what has been ascertained on the subject of ancient Phœnicia, such as he has given for Egypt and Assyria. During the same long period when the two great monarchies founded upon the agricultural wealth of the alluvial plains on the Nile, and on the Euphrates, and Tigris, were vying with each other for dominion over the world, the Phœnicians, commanding the sea-coast, actually conducted the commerce of the world, and constituted themselves the principal channel of intercourse among its nations, carrying their enterprise even to India and Ethiopia, and, contrary to the belief of Herodotus, to the British isles, and to the Baltic Sea, and round the Cape of Good Hope.

Perhaps the most valuable of the additions thus made to the learning of Herodotus, consists in the settlement of so many points of ethnic affinities, whereby a broad foundation has been laid for philosophical history, where formerly all, which was not a blank, was in helpless confusion.

In effect of the discoveries, from which these elucidations of Herodotus are drawn, a whole period of civilization is restored to history; not in all its proportions, nor in all its features; but substantially and distinctly enough to determine its place and extent, its character in the main, that it was of long duration, and the nature of its bearing upon that which came after. That period extends to more than fifteen hundred years back, from the rise of the Persian empire. It is the same to which Old Testament history and literature belong. Until recently we had very little knowledge of it, except from Scripture. Out of the vast mass of its writings, Hebrew literature alone had come down to us intact, as to its sacred canon. And such was our ignorance of the epoch out of which those Hebrew books came, that many of us found it hard to believe that they could be as old as the marks upon their face claimed for them. Within the recollection of men still young, learned critics could argue that writing was unknown at the date commonly assigned to Moses, and some very ingeniously conjectured that it might have been a revelation to that prophet. We can now look with

our own eyes upon roods of autograph, five hundred years older than Moses, with the evidences upon them of still more ancient literary culture. The information derived from these sources bears, in fact, more largely and directly upon Scripture than upon Herodotus, and goes to connect the two in a most interesting manner, thereby bringing the old Greek author into the number of commentators upon the word of God. So distinctly has this fact been perceived by the editor of the work before us, that he has already published a volume\* to expound and apply it: although, as to that, we are constrained to say that it is not equal to the service he has done for the Greek.

As already remarked, the work of Herodotus pertains, in the main, to only the latter part of that ancient period, inasmuch as the Medo-Persian empire was that which, in overrunning and subduing the whole of its area, absorbed the vitality of all its members. And consequently when Persia died, the whole ancient oriental world died also. Herodotus narrates the rise and prosperity of that empire and closes with the beginning of its decline. From the invasion of Greece, the Persian empire never recovered; that calamity exhausted her resources, destroyed her best troops, and, worst of all, dispelled the might of her self-reliance. The conquest achieved by Alexander, about one hundred and fifty years later, was only the crushing of a hollow shell. Before the rise of Persia, the Egyptians, Phœnicians, Hebrews, Assyrians, and Babylonians had all seen an end of their respective epochs of prosperity, and were already sinking into disorganization. That fate was averted by throwing around them the firm compression of the laws of the Medes and Persians. Until that work was effected, the Medo-Persian arms were invincible. Their first step beyond it, met the barrier which they were destined not to pass. It was there stood the boundary between ancient oriental civilization, and that which arose under the auspices of Greece.

Such another historical crisis did not occur until Rome, by a greater effort, having discharged a similar office for the Hellenic world, on a greater scale and over a longer period of

\* The Historical Evidences of the truth of the Scripture Records stated anew, &c., in eight lectures delivered in the Oxford University pulpit, at the Bampton lecture for 1859, by George Rawlinson, M. A. London, 1859.

decline, handed down her dominion to the broader civilization of modern times. And that event has also received its historian from the first maturity of the succeeding epoch. Herodotus is not, in any sense, a Gibbon, but he stands to his oriental subject, as the greater modern does to the mightier empire, whose departing glories he records.

Until lately, the only antiquity which we distinctly recognized was that which lay behind the decline of Rome; we are now favoured with a somewhat more competent insight into the character, duration and proportions of that which lay behind the decline of Persia. From the later we inherit the Greek and Latin classics; from the earlier the Hebrew Scriptures. As every discovery in the antiquities of the later is turned to account in elucidation of the classical authors, so let us hope that competent hands will be found to employ the knowledge, now revived, of the earlier epoch, with similar effect upon the ancient books of revelation.

---

ART. V.—*The Apostolic Benediction.*

THE full form of the Apostolic Benediction is found only at the close of the second Epistle to the Corinthians: "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all." In most of the Epistles it is used in an abridged form; "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all;" and in several, it is still more abridged, "Grace be with you all."

The Spirit of Christ takes up the natural and conventional usages of men, and consecrates them to his own spiritual purposes. We may observe as an instance of this, how the Christian form of greeting comes in the place of those which only expressed a natural sentiment of civility; and how it is thus made to suggest and to convey the substantial blessings of the gospel. As in parting compliments, so in introductory salutations; where common usage says "Greeting," or expresses the