

lected in an epigraphical journey the year before.

Dr. Sterrett had already been initiated into epigraphical work in a journey in 1883 with W. M. Ramsay, the indefatigable explorer of Phrygia. As both desired to make further explorations in the fall of 1883, they agreed to go together so far as their plans would allow, starting from Tralles, on the Mæander, not far from Ephesus. The first part of their route through Caria, across the southwestern corner of Phrygia, and as far as Isparta (Baris) in north Pisidia, was investigated both topographically and epigraphically by both Mr. Ramsay and Dr. Sterrett, it being agreed that all copies of inscriptions found should belong to Dr. Sterrett, while all road-notes and rights of map should go to Mr. Ramsay. The maps in this volume, made by Kiepert, cover a large part of Northern Cappadocia, Galatia, and Southern Cappadocia, although the routes are also in part shown on the maps of Cilicia, Lycaonia, Pisidia, and Isauria which accompany Dr. Sterrett's other volume of the Wolfe Expedition. These new maps, quite reconstructing what was before imperfectly known, are of prime importance, and will control the cartography of the region until scientific surveys are made.

Inscriptions are not generally very inspiring reading, even to the specialist. The collecting of them requires great physical endurance, great patience, much experience, and a quick eye. What an epigrapher should not be is indicated, but not stated, in the notes in Nos. 38-87, many of which inscriptions had been previously copied and published in the *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*, by MM. Collignon and Duchesne of the French School at Athens. Their readings are proved by Ramsay and Sterrett to have been hasty and careless, omitting not only letters, the beginning and end of lines, even whole lines (pp. 41, 56), but also entire inscriptions—thus saying of one square cippus (p. 101) that it is "inscribed on two sides," when, in fact, it has long inscriptions, quite legible, on all four sides. This is not the only case of such blunders; an equally bad one is noted on page 93, where, in addition to omitting one of the inscriptions on a stone, they make a blunder of fifty years in the date, by supposing the Cibyric era to begin 25 B. C., instead of 25 A. D. It is of great importance that such work be thoroughly done, as archaeologists are naturally indisposed to go over a territory which it might fairly be supposed had been recently explored by other scholars. The work of French explorers in Asia Minor during the last ten years has shown too much of this hurried and imperfect character. It is much better to take a small district and do it thoroughly. Indeed, the present trip of Dr. Sterrett covers more ground than could be fully explored, and his expedition the next year shows that he had partly learned this lesson.

Among the geographical results obtained we can mention the settling of the location of a dozen ancient towns by epigraphic evidence. Of these the most important is Tavium, fixed at Nefezkieui. The value of this discovery is seen in the fact that seven Roman roads diverged from this Tavium, and the settlement of its locality fixes many other places. The first milestone on one of these roads was found at Nefezkieui. Among other places located by epigraphic proof we notice Heraclea (No. 14), Sebastopolis (No. 25), Antioch in Pisidia (No. 92), Hadrianopolis approximately (No. 160), Pappa (Nos. 175-177), Sarromæna and Sobagena; also Mount Prien and the River Korax (Nos. 352-354). The long series of Roman mile-stones in the Trans-Antitauran region, beginning with

No. 269, are of prime importance for the history of the country under the Romans. They locate the Roman roads between Comana Aurea and Melitene, and prove that Melitene was the starting-point of the roads in Eastern Cappadocia, and consequently a provincial capital under the Romans. This is a surprising fact, for, considering the great religious and political importance of Comana, one would naturally have expected to find Comana the starting-point of the Roman roads. These mile-stones give the names of the governors of the provinces, and of the emperors under whom they ruled; and it is not uncommon to find three inscriptions, one over another, on the same surface, made by successive governors who repaired the roads, the whole three being decipherable by a skilled epigrapher.

Among the more curious points brought out, we may mention that No. 21 shows descent reckoned from the mother, and possibly suggests the survival of a primitive family system among the Lycians. But this would require more evidence, as we know of cases among the Armenians of Asia Minor in which little *gentes*, named after an ancestress of mark or wealth, have grown up within a few generations. The "Pisidian gods," whoever they may be, come to light in Nos. 28-30, being invoked to punish any one who shall injure the monuments. These inscriptions also show a peculiar syntax, the dual for the plural; but not so strange as the syntax of another inscription (No. 207) in which the nominative, genitive, and accusative are all used in the same regimen after *ὅν*. But this is no more than might be expected in a region where we find untranslatable Phrygian inscriptions (Nos. 175, 180). Nos. 56-58 give us more of the oracles used in astragalomancy, of which we have a portion in the volume of the Wolfe Expedition. Five dice were thrown. We translate a single oracle:

"An ace, three threes, and a six.
"The time is not yet favorable, but rest and make no vain attempt;
"And be not like the lioness that brings forth blind cubs,
"But plan a season of repose, and God shall give you guidance."

Nos. 243 and 245 are curious riddles; but as Dr. Sterrett gives them on the authority of a Greek physician who professed to have copied them, we shall hold them open to suspicion. Nos. 379 and 380 are interesting, as giving us further knowledge of the Caius Julius Philippus under whom Polycarp suffered martyrdom.

The volume leaves just one thing greatly to be desired. Dr. Sterrett took with him as photographer Mr. J. H. Haynes, who made several hundred pictures of ruins and scenery. There are not a few of these inscriptions that would have been much elucidated by the pictures that belong with them. We presume it is the expense that has prevented giving views of the wonderful volcanic cones, honeycombed with troglodyte dwellings. Some of the most desirable of these pictures, however, like the so-called Hittite sculptures of Eyuk or the splendid Seldjuk remains at Sultan Khan, hardly belong to the zone of antiquity discussed in this volume. If Dr. Sterrett could publish a selection of these pictures in an atlas, they would have a special archaeological and artistic value.

Kiepert's labor on the maps, and Hirschfeld's long review of Dr. Sterrett's former volume, which has appeared in the *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* since our own notice was published, show the value put on our countryman's work by the two best German authorities on Asia Minor. It is greatly to be regretted that

he was compelled to leave this congenial work—congenial to so few, and in which he is the sole American representative—to seek remunerative employment. Miss Wolfe, by the gift of a thousand dollars, added the fruits of a year's labor. The explorations in this volume were aided to the extent of a hundred and fifty dollars by a gift from gentlemen in Boston; but the expedition cost Dr. Sterrett personally more than ten times that amount. The men who are willing and competent to make original investigations are so rare that it is a serious loss to the reputation of American scholarship if the lack of some Mæcenas to supply the necessary funds compels them to waste such special talents and training at the teacher's desk.

Euterpe: Being the Second Book of the famous History of Herodotus. Englished by B. R., 1584. Edited by Andrew Lang. London: David Nutt. 1888. 8vo, pp. xlviii., 174.

As early as the time of Aristophanes, Herodotus was parodied and ridiculed as an inveterate story-teller; and Aristotle calls him, with some contempt, a recorder of myths or popular tales. The second book, which sketches the life and manners of the Egyptians, their religious cult and practices, and some portions of their history, is full of legends which floated on the current of the Nile in the fifth century B. C. The blindness of Pheron, and his cure by the magic efficacy of virginity; the golden gift which Rhampsinitus won at dice from Isis in the under-world; the treasury of the same monarch, and the consummate knavery of the thievish master-builder and his sons, which reappear in Greece and Hindostan, as well as in the Arabian story of Ali Baba and the Forty Thieves; the strange legend of Helen in Egypt; the marvel of the Phoenix; the tragic tale of the daughter of Mycerinus, and the device by which, to cheat the oracle, he turned day into night and doubled his allotted span of years—these and many more are excellent examples of folk-lore, whether Egyptian or foreign, whether detected in the making, or arrested on that mysterious pilgrimage from land to land which so puzzles and baffles the antiquarian. For this reason, and for its account of the religion of the earliest civilization in the world, Mr. Lang has chosen the 'Euterpe' to form one of the series which he is editing, and which began with Perrault's 'Popular Tales.'

The introduction discusses the religion of Herodotus and the question of his good faith. The latter, as we have intimated, was impugned early and often, not only in set treatises, but by casual sceptics who were too indolent to verify the facts of the historian or to heed his cautions. The caprice of criticism went so far that, while Juvenal takes the canal of Xerxes for a Grecian lie, Pliny accords to the Phoenix the honor of a grave and scientific description. Mr. Lang's essay deals chiefly with certain charges recently made by Professor Sayce in his edition of the first three books of Herodotus, entitled 'Ancient Empires of the East.' These charges are very serious and, indeed, fundamental. "Plagiarism," "affectation of knowledge," "deliberate deception," "flagrant literary dishonesty and prevarication," are some of the phrases with which the learned professor browbeats the unanswering shade of Herodotus. If they are proved, we ought to say good-bye to the "Father of History."

But, in the first place, Professor Sayce's manner does not beget confidence. He is very positive; there are no shades or degrees in his knowledge; he states matters of pure conjecture for matters of fact. He knows just where

Herodotus falsified, just where his notebook failed him, where his "dragomen" deluded him. If Herodotus withholds the name of Osiris, apparently from motives of reverential awe, it is really because he was hiding his ignorance; if he does not mention Sophocles, it is "because he had not learned him at school." These whimsical speculations, which are worth propounding as after-dinner paradoxes, are answered by Mr. Lang with a patience and urbanity which they hardly deserve. Historians like Grote and Curtius, and editors like Stein, have no such verdict to give of the character of Herodotus; indeed, he carries his own credentials. His careful readers generally become his friends. They are won by his large and humane spirit, his simplicity and good sense, his diligent curiosity, and the love of truth that is transparent through his narrative. Nowhere can they discover the shifty, vainglorious, dishonest personage, half knave and half dupe, whom Professor Sayce detects in the first three books, and who, he strangely enough admits, may be trustworthy in his history of the Persian invasion.

When we come to details, it is to be noted that the Egyptologist criticizes as history what our author expressly gives out as current tradition. "I am telling you here," he says in the 'Euterpe,' "what was told to me. Let every man adopt what seems credible to him. It is my purpose throughout my work to record what I heard from my several informants"; and this warning, given in general, he repeats from time to time, by one sign-post or another, with the most conscientious frankness and assiduity. This means, of course, that he was not professing to give history, in a strict sense: he was observing manners and customs and collecting traditions; he was doing, in fact, all that could be expected of a highly intelligent and painstaking traveller, who visits many countries without a knowledge of their language, and without access to original documents and inscriptions. The tools of later research, of the linguist and the archaeologist, were not in his hands. No man was ready at that time to write a scientific history of the East or of Egypt. As Professor Maspero justly remarks of the 'Euterpe':

"He was not writing a history of Egypt. Indeed, with the best of opportunities, he could have given us only a few lists of dynasties, and have taught us nothing more than the original texts teach us to-day. On the other hand, we should have lost those marvellous narratives, with their occasional broad naïveté, which he has so charmingly repeated to us, on the faith of his guides. We should not have known Phéron, nor Proteus, nor Rhampsinitus; and this, I believe, would have been a great loss. The monuments tell us, or will some day tell us, what was done by the Ramesses, the Thothmes, and the Cheops of the real world. Herodotus lets us know what was the common talk concerning them in the streets of Memphis."

The curiosity of Herodotus, to whom no trait of human nature was uninteresting, was keener, perhaps, in matters of religion than in any other subject. By training, and probably by inheritance, he was learned in mysteries and oracles and ritual. He easily identifies certain duties and rites of the Egyptians with those of his own country, and naturally concludes that they were borrowed from the oldest civilization known to him. "The hypothesis of borrowing," says Mr. Lang, "has always been a favorite with the learned." It must, of course, still be admitted, in cases where it is supported by sufficient reasons. Unquestionably, Adonis, and Aphrodite as a goddess of the sea, came from the Phœnicians; nor can we refuse the unsophisticated evidence of the Homeric hymns, and of early poetic legend sustained

by historic probabilities, that the worship of Dionysus and Demeter and Apollo was imported at some early period. When, however, we widen our circle of facts and resemblances beyond those known to Herodotus, when we find, for instance, the rites of the Aztecs and the Zunis strikingly similar to those of Babylon and Egypt—we are driven to the theory which Mr. Lang has fortified in his 'Myth, Ritual, and Religion,' and which we have already discussed in reviewing that work.

The present edition of the 'Euterpe' is limited to 500 copies. The material and make-up of the volume, like that of the 'Cupid and Psyche' which preceded it, is as harmonious and attractive as a bit of rare old china. The translation chosen by Mr. Lang, with his delicate sense of literary fitness, was first printed in 1584. The translator is unknown, though the initials B. R. may stand for Barnaby Rich. He abounds in racy colloquialisms, such as, "to serve with the same sauce," "in a bad box," "I'll pipe ye such a dance," "as true as the man in the moon." His work entirely absolves itself from all care and burden of exact scholarship. He revels especially in a good story, and tells it with a delicious freedom which sometimes amounts to entire independence of the author. Compared with his slang and exuberant loquacity, the Ionic grace of Herodotus shows severely simple. But his ease and vigor and the antique flavor of his vocabulary smack of Mandeville and Marco Polo, and match to a nicety that enchanted dawn of travel and discovery which will never more return so long as Kiepert and the ordnance-maps endure.

Historical Review of the Legislative Systems Operative in Ireland, from the Invasion of Henry II. to the Union. By the Rt. Hon. J. T. Ball, L.L.D., D.C.L. Longmans, Green & Co.

THIS terse, able, and calmly written book is purely retrospective. The author eschews all reference to present politics. None the less is it a valuable contribution towards the formation of clear views regarding the settlement of the Irish question. We are not aware of any other work in which the history of the legislative systems operative in Ireland is so clearly traced. We see that probably before, and certainly after, the time of King John, legislative assemblies (under the name at first of councils and afterwards of Parliaments) were convened by the Kings of England in Ireland. Originally all who attended them were personally summoned. In the reign of Edward I. counties were empowered to send representatives. A similar privilege was soon after extended to some cities and towns. The number of counties, cities, and towns thus privileged increased along with the extension of English rule. Originally the members of these assemblies met and deliberated together. At a later date they divided into two houses. The development of the representative principle was slow and imperfect. Until the reign of Henry VIII. the natives were practically excluded; until the reign of Elizabeth neither Ulster nor Connaught enjoyed more than occasional representation, and then only to the extent of two members in the case of the former, and four of the latter. The Commons in the Parliament of James I. (called in 1613) were increased by 100 members. No qualifications of race were required from either electors or elected. The inhabitants of the kingdom were, without distinction, nominally at least, "taken into his Majesty's gracious protection." The constitution of the Irish Parliament was then a counterpart of the English. Its capacity of

action was very different. It was subject to the restraints of Poynings's law, under which the approval of the Privy Councils of Ireland and England were necessary before it could pass any valid enactment. It was also checked in its action by the assumption of authority on the part of its English rival to legislate for Ireland.

Under the Commonwealth no legislative assembly met in Ireland. We have germs of the idea of union in there being a certain number of members called by Cromwell to his Parliament. Under Charles I. and under William III. and Anne, the English Parliament in express terms legislated for Ireland over the heads of the Irish Parliament. After the union with Scotland, the Parliament of Great Britain distinctly declared that it had full power and authority to bind the kingdom and people of Ireland. From the Restoration, therefore, the legislative system operative in Ireland was basely subservient to the English in all that concerned the welfare of the Irish people. It was, in the words of Grattan, "a squabbling, fretful sectary, perplexing her little wits, and firing her furious statutes with bigotry, sophistry, disabilities, and death."

Mr. Ball traces the growth of the spirit of independence in Ireland through Molyneux and Swift, the life of the Volunteers, and the establishment of Parliamentary independence under Grattan in 1782. He marks the course of events and tendencies which culminated in the union, and impartially gives the arguments for and against that measure. It is difficult to rise from this portion of the work without being impressed with the faults and failings of the Constitution of 1782. It did not stand, because it could not stand; much less could it have stood the increasing complications and closer pressure of later years. Unless Irish statesmen had shown a clearer appreciation of the situation than they did between 1782 and 1800, especially upon such occasions as the discussion of Orde's commercial propositions, a closer and more workable relation between the countries, if not effected by bribery in 1800, would have been effected by force later on. It is impossible to turn over the pages of this book without believing that Pitt and Castlereagh and Cornwallis acted with a sincere belief that their Union would ameliorate and elevate the condition of Ireland. If the experience of eighteen years brought to light the flaws in Grattan's Constitution, so has the experience of eighty-eight years (whose history is outside the scope of Mr. Ball's book) proved the weakness of Pitt's Union. Let us hope that whatever rearrangement of the relations between the countries the future has in store will prove of a happier and more permanent character.

Mr. Ball appears to us too hard upon the character and doings of James II.'s Irish Parliament. It appears to us to have been broader and fairer in its spirit towards all classes of the community than those which succeeded it under the houses of Orange and Hanover. To Irishmen there must be touches full of deep pathos in every book relating to the history and constitutions of their country. In happier times to come, they will perhaps be able to read with greater equanimity than can Irishmen of the present day such passages as those which occur in one of Grattan's speeches given at considerable length by Mr. Ball, when he dwells with fervor upon the then position and glories of Ireland: "You [the Irish Parliament] are the greatest political assembly in the world; you are at the head of an immense army; nor do we only possess an unconquerable force, but a certain unquenchable pub-