

THE
BIBLIOTHECA SACRA.

ARTICLE I.

THE CYROPAEDIA OF XENOPHON: ITS HISTORICAL CHARACTER, AND ITS VALUE IN THE ILLUSTRATION OF SCRIPTURE.

BY REV. J. EMERSON, PROFESSOR IN BELOIT COLLEGE, WIS.

It is a habit with a modern school of historical critics to exalt Herodotus and depreciate Xenophon. This preference has arisen, probably, from political, quite as much as from critical, considerations; and if it cannot be met except by showing that Xenophon had the same sympathy for popular right, and the same faith in democratic institutions, which are the honor of our historians, and were, so far as in his time they could be, the inspiration of Herodotus, we must leave him under the ban. But if we allow, in his behalf, as well as in the case of his teacher Socrates, and his fellow pupil Plato, that a man may be more conservative than we, and yet speak the truth, we may reconsider the question of his veracity as a historian, especially in view of evidence which has come to light since Niebuhr's day.

It is common to speak of the Cyropaedia as a historical romance, in which we cannot distinguish between the truth of history and the invention of the author, and which, therefore, cannot be considered as authority for any historical fact — which, indeed, its author never intended to be received as history. It is certainly true that Xenophon had a moral

object in view in the book, and so had Herodotus, and so has every other man who has soul enough to be worthy to write history. Xenophon tells us¹ that he has found Cyrus the kingliest man in history, and therefore has carefully inquired into the facts of his life and character, and presents the result in his work. He certainly had some excellent opportunities for such inquiries, and no doubt he improved them, and would have us believe that his book presents correctly the image and the career of the man. He would have been an exception among ancient historians, if he had not filled out his outlines by conversations and speeches of his own composition; and it would be strange if in him, as well as in Herodotus, we did not often find the thoughts of a Greek, rather than of a Persian. But all this would not show that he has perverted those historical facts which he assures us that he has sought out with so much care. He claims to write history. We must judge of his claim by an examination of his work. As a literary Athenian, he must have been acquainted with the work of Herodotus, who precedes him by a short generation, and he himself quotes Ctesias in his *Anabasis*.² But, with these two works before him, he gives us a history differing widely from either of them. He is, then, either a bold inventor, or an original authority, depending upon evidence which he considered superior to theirs.

The leading objection to the accuracy of Xenophon's history of Cyrus has been, that it differs from that of Herodotus. To this it has been replied, that Herodotus himself admits³ that his is only one of four stories of Cyrus which had come to him; so that Xenophon's may be another of the four. This candid statement of Herodotus is certainly of very great force, as invalidating any argument based upon the reliability of the account which he has himself given. But we can hardly believe that the story given by Xenophon could have come to the ears of the Halicarnassian. For he tells us that the monstrous tale which he gives was the one of the four

¹ *Cyropaedia*, i. 1. 6.

² *Anabasis*, i. 8. 26.

³ Herodotus, i. 95.

which seemed to him most like the simple truth. Of course, he could not have heard such a plain history as Xenophon gives, but was compelled to make the best he could of the stories in which Oriental invention revelled, and with which it delighted to entertain the eager Ionic curiosity. It was somewhat as if one should try to make out a history of Haroun-al-Raschid from the Arabian Nights. From such romantic materials he has produced the best history which could be expected from a man so honest and so credulous. It is excellent authority for the existence of certain splendid facts, but not for the precise characters or times of those facts. We may accept his testimony, even without other support, as proof, for example, of the existence and commanding influence of Nitocris; but his silence is no evidence against the existence of Nebuchadnezzar, much less of Belshazzar, or of Cyaxares the son of Astyages.

We have, however, another Greek author, from whom we might expect a more reliable history of the foundation of the Persian empire. Ctesias of Cnidus was for seventeen years physician to the Persian king; he was in the army of Artaxerxes-Mnemon, as Xenophon was in that of Cyrus the younger at the battle of Cynaxa; and after his return to Greece in 398 B.C., he published a history of the Assyrian and Persian empires, which he professed to draw from official documents. Of this history we now have only meagre fragments. But they vary so widely from all other evidence, that they are regarded as of very slender authority. And yet it is hard to believe that, with his opportunities for investigation, he has chosen to substitute a mere imposture for the history which he might have written. Perhaps it will be more fair to suppose that he has given, as well as he was able to understand it, the scheme of history which was accepted at the court of Artaxerxes-Mnemon; and its variance from other authorities, may be explained by a fact of which we are continually reminded in Persian matters, namely, that — to borrow an expression from their own inscriptions — “the lie was abounding in the land,” notwithstanding the

needful, but hardly successful, drill of the children in truth-telling.

That the discrepancy respecting Cyrus is especially great between Xenophon and Ctesias may arise from the fact that, while Ctesias was court physician to Artaxerxes, Xenophon was a volunteer follower and ardent admirer of the younger Cyrus. Probably Ctesias depended upon the statements of courtiers, or upon popular tales or romances, rather than upon any personal examination of ancient records; while Xenophon derived his accounts from the officers of Cyrus. With regard to Xenophon this is continually evident. He quotes songs,¹ as well as prose statements, and uses such phrases as "they said"² in quoting his authorities. He tells us stories which savor not of the study at Scillus, but of the Oriental soldiers' mess. There is a remarkable, characteristic difference in tone between the two narratives of Xenophon and of Ctesias. In Ctesias the elder Cyrus is depreciated with a systematic bitterness. Everything, from his birth to his death, is clothed with a meanness and baseness which might have served as a model for the libelers of Cromwell or Bonaparte; while in the Cyropaedia we find a somewhat analogous liberty taken with the ancestry of Darius, son of Hystaspes. Probably we shall not be mistaken in supposing that the party of the younger Cyrus aimed to gather around their favorite the enthusiasm with which Medes, as well as Persians, regarded their commander, whom they considered as reproduced in his namesake; while to Artaxerxes and his court the name of Cyrus became odious, and it was their inclination, as well as their interest, to strip it of its fascination. The story of Ctesias certainly reads like a libel, which never could have had a place in public documents, but which, after living and growing through some generations of malcontents, is at last received into favor by a corrupt and jealous court.

It is as follows, if, as seems most probable, we find it in Nicolaus of Damascus,³ and in Photius:

¹ Cyropaedia, i. 2. 1.

² Ibid. i. 3. 4, etc.

³ Müller's Fragments, 66.

“Cyrus was son of Atradates, a Mardian robber, and of Argoste, a keeper of goats. He entered the service of a courtier of Astyages, and at length gained a position near the person of the monarch. A dream of his mother, similar to that of Astyages respecting Mandane in Herodotus, is interpreted by a Babylonian prophet as portending his rule over Asia. By his influence Atradates is made satrap of the Persians. As Cyrus is entering the country of the Cadusians on an embassy, he meets a slave, named Oebares, carrying a basket of manure. By advice of the Babylonian, he makes Oebares his companion; and from this time he continually attends Cyrus as a kind of evil spirit, urging his ambition, and by energy, craft, and crime leading him on to empire. He urges Cyrus to contrive and prepare a revolt of the Persians. He murders the Babylonian, that he may tell no tales, as they are on their way to Persia, where they find an army already assembled by Atradates. After several defeats, in one of which Atradates falls, the rebels are victorious, and Oebares hails Cyrus as emperor.”

Thus far Nicolaus of Damascus. Ctesias, as given by Photius,¹ continues the story.

‘Astyages flees to Ecbatana, where he is concealed by his daughter Amytis and her husband Spitamas, but reveals himself to save his grandchildren from torture. He is confined by Oebares, and released by Cyrus, who pays to Amytis the honor of a mother, and afterwards slays her husband and takes her to wife. Bactria takes up arms for Astyages, but, learning of his kind treatment, accepts the rule of Cyrus and Amytis. Then follow wars with Sacae and with Croesus, told in similar spirit, but with different incidents from those in Herodotus. Afterward, at the instigation of Oebares, a eunuch leaves Astyages to die with hunger and thirst in the desert. The crime is revealed by a dream, and the eunuch is put to death by Amytis with the refinements of Oriental cruelty; and Oebares, fearing a like fate, starves himself to death.

‘Cyrus is mortally wounded, in battle with the Derbices

¹ Bibliotheca, 72.

and Indi, and dies after a reign of thirty years, leaving Cambyses emperor, and his other son Tanaoxarces satrap of the Choramnians, Parthians, and Carmanians.'

On the other hand, Xenophon tells us, that Cyrus was son of a king, Cambyses of Persia, and of Mandane, daughter of Astyages, king of the Medes, that he was educated at the courts of both monarchs; that he became, by his personal qualities, commander of the armies of the Medes and Persians, and gained the empire of the East for his uncle Cyaxares, whose daughter he married, and thus became by regular succession heir of the Median, as well as of the Persian monarchy. These are the two extreme stories, probably neither of them the invention of either Greek who tells it, but that which each found current in the circle in which he moved. That of Herodotus seems to be partially an attempt at compromise between them: that Cyrus was son of Cambyses, a noble Persian, and Mandane, daughter of Astyages; was exposed on a mountain and reared by Mithradates, which may be another form of the name, Atradata, and finally brought to court, and that he afterwards headed a revolt of Persians, by which Astyages was dethroned and Cyrus made king of Persians and Medes, and at last emperor of Asia.

It would be too much, even for modern historical audacity, to assume to find the truth in such a case. Our present question is whether Xenophon's statement is a fiction of his own, or a result of historical inquiry.

His statement of the parentage of Cyrus is peculiar in its form. "It is *said*¹ that the father of Cyrus was Cambyses, king of the Persians, while it is *agreed* that his mother was Mandane, daughter of Astyages, who was king of the Medes." Accordingly, we find that Herodotus has heard of Cambyses as father of Cyrus, but not as king of Persia; and it would seem that the courtiers of Artaxerxes-Mnemon gave him a father, who was not a king, nor even of noble family or tribe, but a Mardian, and a robber at that; but, while they claim that his mother was no princess, but a goat-herd girl,

¹ Cyropaedia, i. 1. 2.

they seem to be compelled to resort to the device of making him first adopt the daughter of Astyages as his mother and then take her as his wife, for the purpose, we may conjecture, of making their peace with the prevailing story, that Cyrus was the son and was also the husband of a princess of Media. It may well have been true that the Persian nobles, whom Xenophon saw, did deny that there was any question as to the mother of Cyrus, while they could not deny the difference of statement respecting his father, for which our author has so carefully left room in his record.

The issue between the three authorities respecting the name and rank of the father of Cyrus is so distinct that it may fairly be taken as a test question as to their respective claims to confidence. It has within a few years been determined by the evidence of inscriptions of Cyrus himself and of Darius Hystaspis, with a decisiveness which leaves no further room for doubt. Every scholar now agrees that upon this point Xenophon is thoroughly correct. But scholars have not always observed how much this agreement carries with it. It brands the entire story found in Nicolaus Damascenus as a libel so gross that we need pay no further attention to it. The account given by Herodotus of the early life of Cyrus, originally extremely absurd in itself, is further weakened by the proved error respecting the rank of Cambyses, and by the violent improbability of any such treatment of the son of the king of Persia and of the princess who was, according to it,¹ the heir of the Median crown. Xenophon's further statement that Cyrus was educated in the constant favor of each court, has certainly the greatest verisimilitude, and has now the advantage of the testimony of the only author who has been proved to be correct in the previous test.

Xenophon next introduces Cyaxares, son of Astyages and uncle of Cyrus, whom we do not find in either of the other stories. Herodotus, indeed, says that Astyages had no son.² Which is right? If we examine the statement of Herodotus

¹ Herodotus, i. 109.

² Ibid. i. 109.

we shall find first that it occurs only, and that incidentally, in the midst of the monstrous fable of the exposure of the infant prince; and, secondly, that it is inconsistent with the whole drift even of that fable. For why should Astyages, when already old enough to be a grandfather, be so terrified at the prospect that a grandson, yet unborn, was to become lord of Asia, except upon the supposition that he had some other heir, who was to be displaced by the fulfilment of the dream? If we seek for any probable basis of truth for the fable we shall hardly be able to find it, unless in some machinations of jealous partizans of another and prior heir, whom we may imagine to have attempted some plot at the court of the aged Astyages to set aside the brilliant Medo-Persian prince, from a destiny which his abilities must have foreshadowed. Thus we seem to need Xenophon's Cyaxares in order to give any chance of historical basis for the fable of Herodotus. We may also say that the story of Ctesias,¹ that Cyrus took the daughter of Astyages first as mother and then as wife, admits of no other explanation so natural as this, that it arose from the perversion of the historical facts, which we find in Xenophon, that Cyrus was the son of Mandane, and afterward married the daughter of Cyaxares, or possibly a younger sister of Mandane,² whose name may have been Amytis. Consequently, when the feeble character of Cyaxares had faded out of memory, so as to be unknown to the light courtiers of Artaxerxes, the two princesses are confounded in the grotesque style given in the fiction; a confusion which becomes worse confounded by giving the princess the name of Amytis, the Median queen of Nebuchadnezzar, unless, indeed, we recover here the name of the daughter of Cyaxares and wife of Cyrus. So far, then, as Herodotus and Ctesias are concerned, we may say that their ignorance does not prove the non-existence of such a character as Cyaxares, while the existence of such a prince is indicated by the fact that it is the only way by which we can account for certain anomalies in their own systems. The probabilities in favor

¹ Photius, 72.

² Cyropaedia, viii. 5. 28.

of Xenophon are confirmed by the testimony of Aeschylus,¹ who represents a Mede as first emperor of Asia, who is succeeded by his son, and he by Cyrus; and it seems to us to be made certain by the evidence of scripture, of which we shall speak in its place.

If we are correct in sustaining the testimony of Xenophon in the points already considered, it will be seen that his authorities are proved to have been of a very different and a higher order than those for either of the other accounts. Out of a mist of Oriental exaggeration, both of eulogy and of calumny, they give us a history, which not only has the air of truth, but is able to stand severe tests of historical accuracy. It may be fair already for us to infer that the younger Cyrus had gathered around him friends, who, inspired by that enthusiasm of which he was certainly a wonderful master, had made the history of the elder hero a special study, and were able to answer the questions of our Attic inquirer, without drawing upon the prolific imagination of the Orient.

We may now enter upon the question whether, in respect to public as well as private affairs, we are to consider the leading statements of the Cyropaedia as the inventions of a Greek romancer, or as the results of careful inquiry by a Greek competent to sift and to tell the truth, and whose authorities were Persians, whose position gave them the best opportunities of knowing the facts, and whose tastes had led them to search those facts. In this inquiry we must compare the history itself with such other information as is accessible to us.

Coming from such sources we shall of course expect to find the story pervaded by a decided Persian feeling and a strong partiality for Cyrus. We should have reason to suspect its authenticity if we found it otherwise. We must expect it to differ in many things from the story of Herodotus, which in many points is evidently a Median one, and especially from that of Ctesias, whose chief inspiration seems to be a bitter animosity against the very name of Cyrus.

¹ Persae, 771-773.

We may avoid many apparent difficulties by remembering that geographically and nationally our starting-point and continual centre is Persia. Every fact and every thing is seen with Persian eyes and from a Persian stand-point.

The first view presented is that of Persia at the birth of Cyrus. The Persians are represented by Herodotus as a population in the Median realm, consisting of several tribes, but without a king, and apparently without even a satrap of their own. Cyrus forges a commission¹ from the Median king, and leads them into rebellion, and we hear of no Median authority present to interfere with him. Xenophon gives them a regularly established and independent constitutional monarchy, limited by a peerage,² and perhaps a popular assembly,³ and by laws,⁴ to which the king is subject as well as the poorest citizen, sustained by an elaborate system of education, by which the ruling class were trained in military exercise, and to do justice, to reverence the aged and the law, and to speak the truth. This kingdom, though not a ruling state,⁵ is independent,⁶ and is just forming that alliance with Media, out of which grew the empire which appears in history as that, first, of the Medes and Persians, then of the Persians and Medes, and finally of Persia.

Which of these two views is correct? The existence of the monarchy fixed in a royal family, for generations before Cyrus, is fully established by the declaration of Darius in the Behistun Inscription:⁷ "From antiquity our family have been kings. Eight of my race have been kings before me; I am the ninth." Even Herodotus implies as much by the genealogy which he records as claimed by Xerxes.⁸ The peerage is also recognized by Herodotus,⁹ who names, as leading tribes, the Pasargadae, the Maraphii, and the Maspii, of whom the Pasargadae are the noblest, while the royal house of the Achaemenidae are at the head of the Pasarga-

¹ Herodotus, i. 1. 25.

² Cyropaedia, ii. 2. 21.

³ Ibid. i. 5. 4.

⁴ Ibid. i. 3. 18.

⁵ Ibid. viii. 7. 7.

⁶ Ibid. i. 5. 3.

⁷ Rawlinson's Herodotus, Appendix, Book iii. note C. Inscr. col. 1.

⁸ Herodotus, vii. 11.

⁹ Ibid. i. 125.

dae and of the nation. The same is implied by the council of seven Persian nobles, who appear in the revolution against the Magus and in the reconstruction of the government.

The laws of the Persians are famous everywhere. We find them recognized by Herodotus as well as by Xenophon, and by scripture, so that the impression given of the people is that of a nation in whom the instinct of law was more controlling than in any other nation that has lived upon earth, except perhaps the Romans. It is in principle the same idea of order which distinguishes a son of Japheth. It has developed itself differently in various positions and circumstances. But it will come out wherever a son of Japheth acts; and wherever we find a community of them existing for any long period under fixed circumstances it will-crystalize in some characteristic form. In Attica was a tribe in a still eddy, by and around which swept the turmoils of wars and revolutions, of commerce and governments and civilizations. It shaped the chaotic fancies and thoughts of men into statues and temples, and harmonies and poems and philosophies, and into forms of civil, social, and individual life which were themselves artistic. In Sparta it formed a camp; in Rome, a legion; in Macedon, a phalanx; all applications of law to war. In Persia, a self-contented people, defended by mountains and deserts from the thoughts as well as the arms of other races, developed certain ideas of civil law, which grew among them into a power even greater than the monarchy. If, in all that race of mankind, the presumption is in favor of the view which recognizes the power that everywhere displaces kings, and sets up in their stead laws of Lycurgus or Solon, or twelve tables, or Magna Charta, or Declaration of Independence, we may be sure that in Persia, above all, the native authority was that of law. Almost the same may be said as to the personal constitution of the government. The Indo-Germanic mind has no idea of government which is not vested in co-ordinate authorities. Agamemnon and Romulus have their senates as well as the kings of Sparta and England, the Archons of Athens, and the President of the United States.

Jove, too, has his Olympian council, and Ormuzd has his six archangels, among whom he is chief, like Darius and Ahasuerus among the seven noblemen of Persia. The race will work out constitution and law, with supreme allegiance to law and right in peace, and in war soldierly obedience. Thus it is not strange that the same people, whose law was mightier than the king in their quietness, should become in an empire the most devoted subjects of their chief.

The idea has been thrown out that Cyrus is to be regarded as an Oriental barbaric chief, like Timour or Genghis Khan. An observation so striking in its tone, and from so acute a man as Niebuhr, naturally finds many echoes. We think, however, that it forgets the essential difference between the Tartar race, which is essentially lawless, and that race whose genius is law, and of which probably no finer specimen has yet appeared than Cyrus, unless he be Julius Caesar or Napoleon, both great generals and greater statesmen. The Greeks at Troy or Marathon or Arbela are not more distinguished by their discipline from the Asiatics than were the body of Persian warriors among the mob which composed the mass of the host of Xerxes or of either Darius. Cyrus is the consummate fruit of this people at the moment of their prime, and we cannot think of him as a Bedouin or a bandit chief.

Whether, therefore, we consider the evidence or the probabilities of the case, we must think Xenophon's account of the Persian constitution before Cyrus substantially correct. Whether his informants were right in representing Persia as then co-ordinate with Media, rather than as a dependent monarchy, is not a point of so much importance, because it is one on which a mistake would be very easy, and not material. Even on this point, however, the way in which the scripture writers speak of the Medes and Persians would imply a league, rather than a subjection of one to the other.

If the Medes had been so insatiate of dominion as to march over four hundred miles of mountain or desert to seek out those Swiss of the East, in their corner of mountains between

the desert and the sea, they could not have conquered them, and if they had they would have gotten no spoil. The Persians were made for war, and went a thousand miles to find service (Ezek. xxvii. 10; xxxviii. 5),— even as far as Tyre,— when Cyrus was a boy, growing up to be their emperor. Indeed, we should infer even from the clearness with which the two nations, similar as they were in blood, are distinguished in Herodotus, that the one could not have been so incorporated in the other as he seems to have conceived. Cyrus must be called “the Mule,” on account of kindred with nations more separated than the English and the Scotch.

The confirmation of authority and of probability is equally complete as regards the Persian system of education. As Xenophon's account is in its main features confirmed by Herodotus, and by every other authority, we have absolutely nothing to meet here, except the objections raised by a certain class of reasoners, based upon features of supposed resemblance to Spartan education. As these analogies support the argument already drawn from the genius of the people, it would be far from our purpose to deny them, even if the points of likeness were as manifold as they are meagre. The Persians were, in their day, the leading representatives of a race of mankind whose nations are successively coming to greatness in history; and always their greatness is instinctively sought and found by education. The Persians trained the boys to draw the bow, and speak the truth, and keep the law; the Greeks taught them poetry; and the Romans, war; the English, Magna Charta and “Rule Britannia”; and America, letters and the rights of man. Persian victory grew out of Persian education, as Prussian victory now grows out of Prussian education. No doubt Cyrus and his peers, admirers as they were of Sparta, were fond of dwelling on the points of likeness in the two disciplines, and did not extenuate them; but it is also clear that they had substantial foundation for their pictures.

As regards the Medes, there is no conflict of authorities. They had an absolute military despotism, and an irregular

empire, which may have extended from the Caspian to the Halys, and have existed as long as Herodotus, or even Ctesias, represents. But that was the empire of the Medes. The Persians were never, so far as we know, associated with the Medes, or the Medes with the Persians, by either Greek, Hebrew, Babylonian, Assyrian, Armenian, or native authorities, until the time of Cyrus. According to Xenophon,¹ the coalition out of which the Medo-Persian power grew was formed at the time of the marriage of Cambyses and Mandane, and it grew into empire under the generalship of Cyrus. But the Persians acted, in that war, as allies of the Medes, so that the Median king became sovereign of the conquered nations. To them, therefore, Cyaxares was king; while to the Persians he was only the head of the confederation. Astyages and Cyaxares were kings of Media, and as such at the head of the Medo-Persian force while engaged in the wars of Media.

Cyrus was first commander, under Cyaxares, of the combined armies, and afterward king of Persia, as heir of Cambyses, and king of Media, as heir of Astyages and of Cyaxares. Thus the two were peacefully united under one crown — the old empire of the Medes, succeeded by the Medo-Persian alliance under Astyages and Cyaxares, and the Medo-Persian empire under Cyrus and Cambyses, which afterwards gave place to the Persian empire of Darius and his successors.

This scheme is so natural, and so accordant, as we shall see, with the inscriptions, and with Aeschylus, and with scripture, that it would be received as established history, were it not contradicted by Herodotus and Ctesias — positively as to the peaceful transition, and negatively as to the existence of Cyaxares.

Herodotus and Ctesias both give particular, though conflicting, accounts of a war in which Astyages was deposed by Cyrus; and Herodotus certainly, and Ctesias as reflected by his copyists, leave no room for Cyaxares.

The correctness of Xenophon has been so strongly con-

¹ *Cyropaedia*, i. 5. 3.

firmed by previous tests that probably his authority would have been accepted against both of them, but for an impression that Xenophon has testified against himself with regard to the peaceful succession to the Median throne. We will state this argument in the words of Colonel Mure :

“The discrepancies between these several accounts being so great, and the ingredient of pure mythology, from which that of Xenophon is free, being so copious in those of Herodotus and Ctesias, it were the less fair to Xenophon to assume from the concurrence of the two rival authorities on any one or two points that their version is necessarily right, and that of the *Cyropaedia* wrong. He has, however, forfeited his claim to credibility by having, in his own properly historical work, the *Anabasis*, concurred with Herodotus and Ctesias in representing the Median empire as conquered by Cyrus.”¹

If this is so, we must at least admit that Xenophon recognizes the existence of a history different from his own, which represents Cyrus as peacefully succeeding Cyaxares in the kingdom of Media. But let us turn to the authority. We are referred to *Anab.* III. iv. 8, 11, 12. The passage is one of the most impressive in history. The ten thousand Greeks are wandering, without knowing it, over the forgotten site of Nineveh. “They came to the Tigris. There was a great, desolate city, the name of it Larissa [supposed to be the *Resen* of scripture, Nimrud of Layard]. The Medes dwelt there of old. When the Persians were taking the empire from the Medes, the king of the Persians laid siege to it, but could not take it in any way ; but a cloud covered the sun, and hid it until the people fled, and so it was taken. Thence they proceeded six parasangs to a great deserted fortress near a city. The name of the city was Mespila [perhaps the Mound Kouyunjik, near Mosul], and the Medes once lived in it. There the Median wife of the king was said to have taken refuge when the Medes lost their empire by the Persians. This town the Persians could not take by

¹ *History of Greek Literature*, Vol. v. p. 392.

siege or assault. But Zeus struck the inhabitants with thunder, and so it was taken."

In all this there is nothing said of Cyrus. Probably the poor barbarians who told the Greeks these stories knew no more of him than they did of the great Nineveh, which was buried there scarcely two hundred years before. They only knew of a fierce struggle between the Medes and Persians, which had raged over that ground, and they naturally connected all the legends which haunted those huge, charred heaps with that crisis. Xenophon, with that precision which he had learned in the school of Socrates, tells us no more than the simple people told him,—that "the Persians wrested the empire from the Medes." It will be just to attribute to him only what he does say. Thus the question remains: Who was the "king of the Persians" who, in the view of these poor barbarians, took the sceptre from "the Medes"?

To this question we think that there is an answer, which, while it vindicates the consistency and establishes the accuracy of Xenophon in both his statements, will also show how his rivals fell into their error with regard to the same revolution. The history appears to have been as follows:

Cyrus succeeded peaceably to the kingdom of Media and the empire of Asia as the lawful heir, in his own right as son of Mandane, and that of his wife as daughter of Cyaxares. Cyrus and Cambyses were kings of Media, as James I. and Charles I. were kings of England. Of this change the dwellers by the Zab and the Tigris knew nothing. But when the line of Astyages expired with Cambyses, and the sceptre was seized by a mere Persian noble,—Darius, son of Hystaspes,—the spirit of the Medes rose; and then was the conflict, raging across their own villages, between armies bearing Median and Persian banners, which so obliterated all their memories of former wars.

Of this struggle, as between those parties, Herodotus was ignorant. It is strange, but it is true, that a leaf has during our own generation been restored to the history of the East, so that we know of convulsions which shook all central Asia,

not forty years before Herodotus was born, of which he hardly gives a hint. He tells of the accession of Darius in 521 B.C. and of the insurrection of Babylon which followed it, and the next we see of the Persians is the army of the great king on its march to Scythia in 513. But Darius had himself caused the history to be engraved upon the face of the rock of Behistun, overhanging the great road from Mesopotamia to Media in arrow-head characters, three hundred feet aloft, which, after being a dumb wonder for two thousand years, have at last been read to us.

The inscription, after a record of the Babylonian rebellion, proceeds thus: "Says Darius the King, whilst I was at Babylon, these are the countries which revolted against me: Persia, Susiana, Media, Assyria, Armenia, Parthia, Margiana, Sattagydia, Sacia."¹

Of these insurrections, the most formidable seems to have been that in which Media, Assyria, Armenia, and Parthia were united under Phraortes, a Mede, who claimed to be "Xathrites, of the race of Cyaxares." Against this pretender, Darius sends four generals, besides himself, and he records nine battles, occurring in Armenia, Assyria, and Media, in which, as he claims, his forces were victorious. To all this, as belonging to the history of Darius, we find no allusion in Herodotus, except in a remark at the close of his account of the deposition of Astyages, that "the Medes afterward revolted from Darius, but were defeated in battle, and again reduced to subjection."² We think that Herodotus and Ctesias, and all the Greeks, failed to recognize either the fact or the importance of this conflict. During those years Greece heard nothing from the East, because all the East was so engulfed in its own turmoils; and, hearing nothing, they inferred that nothing was going on there; and when, two generations later, they found the East full of the remembrance of a great convulsion in which the empire passed to the Persians, they very naturally referred it either to the time of

¹ Rawlinson's Herodotus, Appendix, Book iii. note C. Inscr. col. 2, par. 2.

² Herodotus, i. 130.

Cyrus, whom they knew as the first Persian emperor, or to that of the false Smerdis.¹

¹ Darius was a man of remarkable craft and wonderful abilities for organizing and administering an empire; but he had absolutely none of those heroic qualities around which popular tales gather. He was simply "the κλέηλος," a huckster, and not an emperor. Consequently his name is great in history, but unknown in legend. The great events of his life were ascribed in story to the hero who stood next behind them in the line of vision of the narrator. Accordingly, the great struggle with Fravartish and the old Median realm, was referred by the Greeks, and perhaps by ill-informed Persians, to the elder Cyrus. Curiously enough, we seem to have in the Book of Judith the same contest as presented in the Jewish traditions of Palestine and Egypt; and here the place which Darius was too pale to fill is occupied by Nebuchadnezzar, — a great name, which for them threw every other in the shade, but which seems never to have been heard beyond the Taurus, so that it cannot be found in the Dictionary of Classical Biography. As this case is so analogous to that in the text, and throws light upon the same events, it will be proper to state the grounds for our opinion. The book refers its events to "the reign of Nabuchodonosor, who was King of Assyrians in the great city of Nineveh," a description which, in itself, betrays a very defective knowledge respecting the central power of the empire. On the other hand, it is evidently at home in Palestine, and we may take its Jewish dates as comparatively reliable. These are fixed by the statement that the temple had been recently rebuilt and consecrated (chap. iv. 3), which occurred in the sixth year of Darius (Ezra vi. 15), and that the high-priest at the time was Joachim (chap. iv. 8), who appears in Nehemiah (xii. 10, 12) as the son of Joshua, the chief-priest in the earlier part of the reign of Darius, and in Josephus (Antiq. xi. 5), as high-priest about the time of the death of Darius and the accession of Xerxes. The time being thus fixed, we have only to inquire into the correspondence of the events. In the Book of Judith, there gathered to the standard of "Arphaxad, king of the Medes at Ecbatana, all the inhabitants of the mountain region and the dwellers upon the Euphrates and the Tigris and the Hydaspes, as well as Erioch, king of Elymacians in the plain, and exceeding many tribes of the sons of Chelod came to his army." Against whom Nabuchodonosor summons the Persians, and also Palestine and Egypt, — but they despise his orders. He, however, defeats his enemy in the field, captures Ecbatana, and finally takes Arphaxad himself in the mountains of Rhagau, and puts him to death. In the Behistun inscription, the revolt of Phraortes, or Xathrites, is supported by Media, Armenia and Assyria, Parthia and Hyrcania, while Susiana or Elymais, and Babylon, the seat of the Chaldeans, appears in arms against Darius at the same time. The reliance of Darius is "the army of Persians and Medes that was with me." The struggle is sufficiently protracted to allow abundant time to send even to Egypt for aid; and the strength of the combination against Darius is enough to encourage the western nations to disregard his summons. But after many battles the pretender is subdued, and finally captured at Rhages, and crucified. In this record we cannot but recognize the original of the war of the Book of

If this view is correct, we should expect that many of the facts of the struggle of Darius would be referred by the narrators to the times of Cyrus. Our want of information will of course in general prevent our distinguishing such points. One, however, comes out very remarkably by comparison of Herodotus with Ctesias, and with Justin.¹ In the latter, we find Cyrus continually attended by a kind of Mephistopheles, named Oebares, or Soebares, who first appears as a slave carrying a basket of horse-manure. In Herodotus, Oebares is the hostler of Darius, by whose low craft his master is made monarch. For the correctness of his own account Herodotus is able to appeal to an equestrian monument, bearing the inscription: ² "Darius, son of Hystaspes, by the good help of his horse [telling the name], and of his groom Oebares, gained the kingdom of the Persians." If he is right in his translation, this is conclusive in his favor, so far as concerns the fact that Darius, and not Cyrus, was the man who vaulted to the empire by the aid of Oebares; though for the filling out of the story we may prefer Ctesias's account of a long course of unscrupulous cunning and audacity, to the single trick of the common version.

Though this is but a single point, it is one of such a character as to carry with it the whole story told by Ctesias, or by Justin, of the war of Cyrus and Astyages. Oebares cannot be spared from their drama, any more than Mephistopheles from the Faust, or Iago from the Othello.

But if the wars related by Ctesias are to be referred for such basis of fact as they may have to the times of Darius, it may still be true that Astyages was dethroned by Cyrus, and that Herodotus has given us a history of the revolution. Let us examine the evidence on this question.

We find in Herodotus, besides the passage already quoted,

Judith, and the history of Darius, as told in Palestine of Nebuchadnezzar, and in Greece of Cyrus, is a most curious instance of the refraction of historic facts as seen through different media of tradition. This, then, was "when the Persians wrested the empire from the Medes."

¹ Book i. 17.

² Herodotus, iii. 8.

three references to the usurpation of the Magus, as an attempt of the Medes to secure the command of the empire.¹ If he is in error in this, his mistake must be taken as proving that there had come to him a report of a struggle between Darius and the Medes, which he did not understand, and which, now that the inscriptions have shown us its magnitude, we see may well have been the original of his war between Astyages and Cyrus.

But if we have sufficiently shown how Xenophon is consistent with himself, and how Herodotus may have fallen into error as to the transition of the empire, the question will still remain, whether we have any evidence, beside that of Xenophon, that the "father of history" actually is in error on that point.

We would call attention, first, to the prevailing view of the Greeks until after the time of Darius Hystaspis.

Herodotus regards the fall of Astyages as the end of the Median, and the beginning of the Persian, empire.² He also tells us that the war of Croesus against Cyrus was taken up in behalf of Astyages.³ Now, it was this war which first brought the Oriental empires prominently within the notice of the Greeks. They had no habits of thought or of speech with regard to them which had become fixed and inveterate. If, then, the invading power which came upon the coast of the Aegean was already Persian, and had overthrown the Median empire by a violent revolution, and was resisted distinctly because it was Persian, instead of Median, it could hardly be that the Greeks should have regarded it as Median. And yet we find that the Greeks did call their enemy "the Mede," not only during the wars of Cyrus, but that the same habit of thought became so fixed in their minds that they still continued to call him the Mede through all the generation which warred against Darius and even Xerxes. This, we repeat, could not have been, unless Cyrus, though known as himself a Persian, had been distinctly and clearly understood as representing the Median power. He was Cyrus the

¹ Herodotus, iii. 65, 73, 126.

² Ibid. i. 129.

³ Ibid. i. 73.

Persian, but his empire was Median, as that of James Stuart or William of Orange was English.

We may add that Aeschylus, who lived very near the time of Cyrus, and who is supposed to have conversed with Medes and Persians captured at Marathon, seems to have had no more thought of a violent revolution at the accession of Cyrus, than Homer had of the quarrels of Atreus and Thyestes. We are to remember that in the view of Xenophon the Medo-Persian power was inaugurated when the forces of the two nations were united in the armies of Astyages, with Cyrus for his general. That power was further developed in the reign of Cyaxares, who, weak as he was, had at least the good sense to leave the work in hands which were able to do it, until it came fully into the hands of the man of destiny.¹

With this view compare Aeschylus :

Μῆδος γὰρ ἦν ὁ πρῶτος ἡγεμὼν στρατοῦ.
 ἄλλος δ' ἐκείνου παῖς τὸδ' ἔργον ἤνευεν,
 φρένες γὰρ αὐτοῦ θυμὸν οἰακοστρόφουν.
 τρίτος δ' ἀπ' αὐτοῦ Κῦρος, εὐδαίμων ἀνὴρ,
 ἄρξας ἔθηκε πᾶσιν εἰρήνην φίλοις.²

“A Mede was the first *commander of the host*; and another, his son, forwarded the work, for reason guided his heart; and third after him Cyrus, prosperous man, took the rule, and established peace for all that loved him.”

Here, in addition to the idea of the empire as, at first, a military hegemony, we have a list of emperors, in which we need the much-challenged name of Cyaxares, son of Astyages. If we wish to be satisfied of this, we have only to look at the expedients of those who reject it, and endeavor to reconcile Aeschylus with Herodotus, whose list of emperors was Dejoces, Phraortes, Cyaxares, Astyages, Cyrus. Rawlinson,³ for example, rejects Dejoces as a myth, because the record is inconsistent with Assyrian inscriptions; and also Phraortes, because his name corresponds with one found in the Behistun inscription as a Median rebel against Darius. We would

¹ Isa. xlv. 1.

² Persae, 761-765.

³ Rawlinson's Herodotus, Book i. Appendix, Essay iii. p. 7.

suggest that the same expedient be applied to the first Cyaxares, also, for whose existence we have no authority but that of Herodotus, who is unsupported by either Xenophon or Ctesias, and who may very probably have been known to Herodotus only through some Median account of the reign of the uncle of Cyrus which failed to mention that all the achievements which it recorded were really due to Cyrus the Persian. However, we need not disturb either the elder Cyaxares or any of the former emperors from the thrones which they hold in Herodotus or in Ctesias. Aeschylus and Xenophon both give Persian accounts, and they prove that the Persians did not know the Median empire until the time of Astyages.

Now weigh the evidence as to the existence of Cyaxares, son of Astyages.

Darius, in the inscription, says that two pretenders rose against him, each claiming to be "of the race of Cyaxares." One was a Sagartian, and was followed by his countrymen. The other assumed the name of "Fravartish," or Phraortes, and his rebellion extended to Media, Armenia, Assyria, and Parthia. Who was the Cyaxares whose name was such a power in all the old Median realm? It may be possible for us to answer the question from Herodotus, by deposing the wise Dejoces and the mighty Phraortes, because they will not come into our system, and exalting Cyaxares to the position of founder of the monarchy and empire, because he will accommodate it. But how much easier to take the statement of Xenophon, that Cyaxares was the last purely Median king, and the emperor under whom all that region was united, through the agency of Cyrus, under a rule which was loved, as well as feared.

We do not altogether sympathize with that veneration with which modern scholars are wont to take the statements of Herodotus — unless they clash with their own schemes. But we do feel an inclination to defend him from such liberties. If we try to amend his testimony, how much more modest it will be to simply transpose the reigns of Astyages and

Cyaxares. Then we may leave Phraortes and Dejoces, as monarchs who did consolidate the Median power, and preside over the civilization which was already so advanced in the days of Astyages. Their names are too great in tradition to be lightly blotted out. And see what Herodotus will gain by the change.

He comes into natural accordance (1) with the Behistun inscription; (2) with Xenophon, whom we must by this time regard as an authority; (3) with Babylonian authorities, as given in Abydenus and Polyhistor, which represent "Asdahages" as king of Media at the time of the fall of Nineveh¹; (4) Perhaps we should add, with Ctesias; as the name Astyages or Asdahages certainly seems much more convertible than Cyaxares into Arbaces, which is the name of the Median king given by Diodorus, from Ctesias, as the Median conqueror of Sardanapalus.

On the other hand, a similar change in Xenophon's order might be made without seriously impairing our confidence in such general historical accuracy as it would be fair to expect in such a case. For the two names we have the combined authority of the two historians, and the question of their order is one upon which either might easily have been mistaken. The considerations given above would seem to favor Xenophon; to which we should add that the younger Cyrus and his friends were better able and more likely to have consulted the records of the empire and the royal family respecting the elder Cyrus, than the informants of Herodotus.

A history drawn from such sources will necessarily be more particular and definite as to both names and facts, in proportion as they are near to the central figure; and we may test the faithfulness of the picture by its fidelity to this perspective. Let us look at some of the more remote objects.

As we are watching the training of Cyrus at court, — and Astyages and Cyaxares are familiar acquaintances, — word comes of an inroad made by the son of the Assyrian king. Who was that prince? Ctesias would have given us a name,

¹ Müller's Frag. Hist. ii. p. 505, and iv. p. 282.

and undoubtedly Xenophon asked ; but none was given him, and he gives us none. But the story itself must have come from Media or Persia, and from the times to which it is referred. If it had grown a generation later, or been invented by a Greek, it would have called the invader a Babylonian. But the Medes had evidently been accustomed to call the region lying to the west and south of the passes of Mount Zagros by the name Assyria ; as the Romans and the Greeks, respectively, called the continent beyond the sea Africa or Lybia, from the quarter nearest to themselves. The national designation is, of course, a mistake ; but it is a mistake of such a character as to vindicate the historian from any charge of tampering with his testimony. It could not have been made by a Greek, but only by a Mede, or, even more naturally, by Persians of the generation of Cyrus. For the Persians probably knew nothing of Mesopotamia, except through the Medes. Even in the days of their glory, the great king could not go through the passes leading westward from Persia but by leave of the tribes who held them ; and between Persia and Babylonia lay the great country of Susiana. They must follow up the eastern slopes of Zagros to Media, and thence to Assyria. When Cyrus came to Media, the generation was dead who had combined with the governor of Babylon against the king of Nineveh ; and men only thought of the kingdom beyond the mountains as Assyria, as to the Greeks and Romans the Ptolemies were Egyptian, and the Seleucidae were Syrian, and not Grecian, kings. Thus the distinction between Assyrians and Babylonians had been forgotten by the Medes, and never known to the Persians. We shall observe that this story understands the Babylonian rule as extending generally over the territory to which the name of Assyrian properly belongs — an opinion which will not seem unlikely, when we remember that the great reign of Nebuchadnezzar has just closed.

We find a similar fact in the narrative of events in Armenia. We have here anecdotes told with much definiteness. But the Armenian actors are merely mentioned as the

Armenian king and queen, etc., except the two princes, Tigranes and Sabaris. These are names which we find in no other Greek historian. Did Xenophon invent them? It is remarkable that, as we have found him sustained on Persian matters by Persian inscriptions, so here we find native Armenian¹ authorities representing their hero Dikran, son of King Erwand, as closely associated with Cyrus in personal friendship and in military enterprises. Their accounts are sufficiently distorted in favor of the Armenians to show their native origin; but they show abundantly that the fame of Tigranes and of his friendship to Cyrus were conspicuous enough to explain the fact that they came down together in stories told in Persian camps for a hundred and fifty years. The name of Sabaris came down with his brother's; but not so that of his father or of his mother. They were only official characters.

In further illustration of the correctness of Xenophon's information respecting the Armenians, we may notice that he represents² the king of Armenia as having been subjugated by Astyages some time in the earlier part of his reign. According to Abydenus,³ Astyages was king at the capture of Nineveh, B.C. 606 — a view which agrees well with Xenophon's. It would appear, from inscriptions found both in Assyria and in Armenia, that Armenia had its native line of kings, who were powerful during the eighth and seventh centuries B.C.; and, though crippled by Sargon so that their own inscriptions cease, still, as appears from incursions into their territory recorded by Sennacherib and Esar-Haddon, maintained some kind of independence, which probably grew during the decrepitude of Assyria. But naturally Armenia was unable to cope with the conquerors of Nineveh, and as naturally fell by its geographical position under the sway of Media; while Assyria itself fell to Babylon. By a like geographical necessity, in the close union which followed its re-conquest by Cyrus, it remained still attached to Media,

¹ Moses of Chorene, Book i. Chamich, Part i. ch. 6. ² Cyropaedia, iii. 1-10

³ Müller's Frag. Hist., Graec. Vol. iv. p. 282.

rather than to Persia, and was almost the chief field of the struggle of Darius against the pretender Phraortes.

The position and character of the northern Chaldeans is given by Xenophon, with the distinctness and correctness which we should naturally expect from the fact that they are so intimately connected with the personal story of Cyrus and Tigranes, as well as that the historian himself had passed over the ground in the *Anabasis*.

But with regard to the nations lying north and east of Media, there are some geographical questions, out of which have arisen strong objections to the historical character of the whole work. Mure,¹ for example, affirms that, while "the Oriental geography of the *Anabasis* has been shown by modern research to be reasonably correct, . . . that of the *Cyropaedia*, whether from ignorance or carelessness, is continually at fault." It will be interesting to see what geographical errors an English scholar has been able to find in an Athenian's report of the tent-talk of Persian soldiers.

The greater portion of the criticisms respect the Hyrcanians and Cadusians. Here there can be no excuse for ignorance. The companions of the younger Cyrus ought to be well-informed respecting the situation and power of the Hyrcanians, for Ctesias informs us that the father of Cyrus was satrap of Hyrcania before he was king; and likewise respecting the Cadusians, for Xenophon himself tells us, in his *Greek History*,² that Cyrus was called to their frontiers to visit his father, who had been taken sick on an expedition to suppress an insurrection of the Cadusians. Xenophon, moreover, affirms³ that the Hyrcanians were received by Cyrus as equal allies with the Medes and Persians, and continued to his own time to share the high trusts of the empire with them. This statement is remarkably confirmed by Herodotus,⁴ who, in the catalogue of the host of Xerxes, describes them as "armed like the Persians, having for their chief Megapanus, who was afterwards satrap of Babylon."

¹ *History of Greek Literature*, Vol. v. p. 384.

² *Gr. Hist.*, ii. 1. 13.

³ *Cyropaedia*, i. 1. 4; iv. 2. 6; v. 3. 2.

⁴ Herodotus, vii. 62.

Ctesias, also, as cited by Diodorus,¹ confirms the statement that the Cadusians were brought into the Medo-Persian connection by Cyrus. We must conclude that if the authorities upon which Xenophon relied — which have been proved so cautious and correct on other matters, and even, on other than geographical points, respecting these same tribes — have fallen into gross geographical errors concerning the Cadusians and Hyrcanians, their “ignorance or carelessness” is inexcusable. We must examine this bill of errors.²

1. “The Hyrcanians, on the southeastern shore of the Caspian Sea, hence also called the Hyrcanian Sea, are, on Xenophon’s map, neighbors and subjects of the Assyrians; from whom they were separated, in the real geography of Asia, by the whole breadth of the Median empire.”

2. “They are also described as a small people; being, in truth, one of the most extended of Central Asia.”

3. “Their neighbors, the Cadusians, are, with equal disregard of topographical propriety, characterized by the Hyrcanians themselves as vassals of Assyria.”

4. “As a very numerous race; being but a petty tribe as compared with the Hyrcanians.”

On these charges it is to be observed :

1. It is true that the army of Alexander found the Hyrcanians at the southeast angle of the Caspian Sea, and that the sea was, after that time, often called the Hyrcanian. Whether they were there two hundred years earlier is a question upon which we may perhaps learn as much from Xenophon as from any other author. He regards the Hyrcanians, Caduscians, and Sacians as neighbors,³ and the Hyrcanians as subject to the Assyrian, while the other two are at war⁴ with him. The access to their country is through some pass which is commanded by a single fortress, built for the special purpose of threatening the Hyrcanians and Sacae.⁵ Between this fortress and the principality of Gadatas is a distance of six or seven⁶ long days’ marches over an open and level⁷ country,

¹ ii. 33.

² History of Greek Literature, Vol. v. p. 385.

³ v. 2. 25.

⁴ v. 2. 24; v. 3. 25.

⁵ v. 3. 11.

⁶ v. 3. 28.

⁷ v. 3. 36.

while Babylon is still beyond.¹ These distances would bring us from Babylon to the northern border of the Assyrian lowlands, and the fort is naturally understood as commanding the passes through the Kurdish mountains to the valleys which open upon the Caspian, where the three nations are found together in later history. The circumstance that the subjugation of the Hyrcanians to the Assyrian is mentioned in connection with his designs against Bactria,² may indicate that they are to be regarded as occupying the country between the Caspian and the Elburz mountains, as that was the road from Assyria to Bactria. The association of the Cadusians as a third race with the Medes and Armenians in the principality assigned to the younger son of Cyrus,³ implies that their country added to the other two constituted a domain naturally complete in itself. All these considerations will lead us to place the three nations — viz. the Hyrcani, Cadusii, and Sacae — on the south and west shores of the Caspian, and in the country known in the time of the Greek empire as Media Atropatene, and now as Azerbaijan. This district is separated from Media proper by the mountain range now called Elwand, and from Armenia by the Carduchian or Kurdish mountains. At the angle of the four regions lay the wild region of mountain and forest where we find the common hunting-ground of Assyrian, Armenian, and Mede. By crossing this barrier toward the northwest, the Mede had reached and subdued Armenia; while toward the northeast the Assyrian is carrying his armies into the region of the Caspian. The “breadth of the Median empire” in this quarter, then, is only this comparatively narrow barrier of desolate mountain, which knew no master until the Assyrian built his fort in the pass anciently known as the Gates of Zagros,⁴ and now called Keli Shin, from the two blue pillars, bearing cuneiform inscriptions, which still stand to mark the ancient thoroughfare.⁵

¹ v. 3. 45. ² i. 5. 2. ³ viii. 7. 11. ⁴ Ptolemy's Geography, vi. 2.

⁵ H. C. Rawlinson, in *Journal of Royal Asiatic Society*, Vol. x. c. 4. p. 187—quoted by Bonomi.

2. Hyrcania is described by Strabo as an extensive district with great natural advantages, which are not improved on account of the oppression of the government to which the people have been subject. The people are mentioned by Herodotus as in the army of Xerxes; but their country is not named among the satrapies of the empire. According to Curtius, when Darius gathered the hosts of Asia for his struggle with Alexander, the Persians numbered a hundred thousand; the Medes, sixty thousand; the Armenians, forty-seven thousand; and the Derbices, forty-two thousand; while the Hyrcanians were six thousand footmen. The number of their cavalry is not stated, perhaps because massed with the Medes. We may take the two thousand assigned them by Xenophon¹ as giving the estimate of their horse in his time, which will correspond very well with the six thousand infantry. They were kindred to the Medes, who probably gave their name to territory which contained other nations much larger than they,—among them the Derbices, who supplied forty-two thousand of the same host. All the notices we have of them sustain the statement of Rawlinson,² that they “at no time attained any distinction, military or other, and disappear from history shortly after the time of Alexander,” that is, after the fall of their patrons, the Medes and Persians.

3. The “carelessness” of stating that the Cadusians were vassals of the Assyrian,—though it would involve no geographical difficulty, yet does not belong to Xenophon, who consistently and repeatedly represents the Cadusians as enemies of the Assyrians.³ As to their numbers and power and relation to the belligerents, Diodorus,⁴ copying Ctesias, tells us that in the reign of Artaxerxes, one hundred years before Cyrus, the Cadusians revolted from the Medes, at the instigation of Parsondas, a Persian, and maintained the struggle until the time of Cyrus. They do not appear at all in the satrapies or the armies of Darius Hystaspis, or of Xerxes,

¹ *Cyropaedia*, v. 3. 24.

² Herodotus, Appendix, Book vii. Essay i. 3.

³ *Cyropaedia*, v. 2. 25; 3. 24. ⁴ *Diod. Hist.* 2. 33.

probably because they did not own the sway of either. In Xenophon's *Hellenica*, we find that Darius Nothus was going in person to bring them back to his authority when he was seized with the illness of which he died. And Plutarch¹ relates that his successor, Artaxerxes Mnemon, invaded them with three hundred thousand foot and ten thousand horse, and returned as the son of Hystaspes returned from Scythia, and Napoleon from Russia. The defeat embittered the remainder of his life. Justin² affirms that his successor, Ochus, made the same attempt; and Diodorus agrees with Justin, in illustrating the impression made by these wars upon the Persians, by stating that, after the line of Artaxerxes was extirpated, the throne was given to Darius Codomannus, because he had, years before, slain a Cadusian champion in single combat.³ Poor Codomannus himself, when his hour came, was fain to invoke the same power to avert his fall. Curtius makes Alexander, in his address before the battle of Arbela, guard his soldiers particularly against the terror of the name of the Scythæ and the Cadusii.⁴ And Arrian⁵ says that in the next year a false report met Alexander, on his way from Persia to Ecbatana, that Darius was prepared to renew the struggle, relying on an alliance with the Scyths and Cadusians. These estimates of the importance of the Cadusians are abundantly sustained by Strabo, who affirms that the Cadusians occupied the coast of the Caspian for nearly five thousand stadia,⁶ and that their numbers were little inferior to that of the great race of the Ariani.⁷ These notices may enable us to judge whether the Cadusians were "a petty tribe as compared with the Hyrcanians."

5. The next "error" is that "the Bactrians, whose frontier was about eight hundred miles distant from Assyria, and could only be reached through Persia or Media, are represented as having been subjected to a hostile inroad by the Assyrian king, just before Assyria itself was invaded by

¹ Life of Artaxerxes.² Justin, x. 3.³ Justin, l. c.; Diod. xvii. 6.⁴ Curtius, iv. 14.⁵ Arrian, iii. 19.⁶ Strabo, xi. 7.⁷ xi. 13.

the Perso-Median army." Of this it is only necessary to say that by securing the gates of Zagros and the country of the Hyrcani, the Assyrian commanded the road to Bactria, not only for himself, but against the Medes. The historical probability of such an enterprise we shall consider presently; there was no geographical barrier.

6. "The Chaldeans, on the frontiers of Armenia, are described as in habitual intercourse with India, and serving as mercenaries in the army of the Indian monarch, from the nearest point of whose territory their own was really distant about fifteen hundred miles." Certainly, one of the Chaldeans tells Cyrus that his organization of peace might be a very fine thing for the rest; "but that there were some of the Chaldeans who did not know how to work, and could not work, but lived by war—were always plundering or serving for hire, often with the king of the Indians; for now, they said *πολύχρυσος ὁ ἀνὴρ*, he is a man of much gold."¹ And why not? They had only to come down from their mountains to come upon the great caravan route by which luxurious Nineveh, and even Babylon, carried on their commerce with the jewelled East. The king of India had gold, and wanted men; the Chaldeans were brave, and wanted gold, and were not afraid of an overland journey so much shorter and easier than that by which the Yankees made their way to California. We may notice, however, that Cyrus and the Persians used the Chaldeans as guides on their way to India, which may seem strange, if our only ideas of the geographical relations of countries are formed by measuring straight lines on maps, but not when we consider that the Chaldeans were on the line of communication between the Euxine and the Indus, and very near to that between India and Mesopotamia; while the Persians, behind the desert and the mountains, were very far from either.

7. "The no less anomalous notices of the Indian envoys" will naturally come into our historical review. Geographically, there is nothing difficult in them.

¹ Cyropaedia, iii. 2. 25.

8. Mure's only remaining criticism is thus expressed: "In one instance he [Xenophon] seems to write, or rather fancy himself writing, in the person of some Asiatic chronicler, rather than of a Greek man of science. After defining (somewhat vaguely) the empire of Cyrus when finally constituted, as bounded by the Erythraean sea to the east, the Euxine to the north, Egypt and Cyprus to the west, and Ethiopia to the south, he adds: 'The regions beyond those limits [inclusive, therefore, of Greece and all Europe, with the richer parts of Africa] are either seas, arid deserts, or otherwise little adapted, owing to excess of heat or of cold, for human habitation.' This description would be appropriate in an extract from some popular Median work of geography, but reads strangely in the page of an accomplished Greek scholar and traveller." Exactly so; and this is the key to all the geography and all the history of the *Cyropaedia*. The statements are not to be regarded as those of Xenophon, but of the companions of Cyrus, and are therefore made from the Persian stand-point. Unsuccessful as our critic has been in his search, it would be strange if there were no geographical mistakes among them. On the other hand, there are true statements here which Xenophon never would have made, and which he would even have struck out, if he had assumed to modify them by his own views of Asiatic geography. For example, his own idea seems to have been that Media, as well as Babylon, lay to the south of Nineveh, while Ecbatana and Susa were toward the east,¹ perhaps fixing the location of Media by his "wall of Media."² But there is no trace of such an error in the *Cyropaedia*.

In order to test the accuracy of the view of Oriental history implied in the *Cyropaedia*, we must endeavor to fix some of its leading points in time.

If we accept the common opinion, that Cyrus died in 529 B.C., at the age of seventy, his birth will fall in 599 B.C. If his uncle Cyaxares be the same with Darius the Mede, who was sixty-two years of age at the taking of Babylon in 538

¹ *Anabasis*, iii. 5. 15.

² *Ibid.* i. 7. 15; ii. 4. 12.

B.C., that prince was born in 600 B.C., and was only one year older than Cyrus. Perhaps the mere fact that they were related as uncle and nephew may be sufficient to account for the circumstance that the views of private life preserved in the *Cyropaedia* suppose a greater difference of age; while, on the other hand, the correction of that misconception will help us to receive the story, found also in Ctesias, which Xenophon felt bound to reject, that the bride of Cyrus was daughter of Astyages, and not of Cyaxares.¹ Taking, from Herodotus, thirty-five years as the length of the reign of the Median king, and, from both Herodotus and Ctesias, forty years for his predecessor, and, from scripture, the year 585 B.C. as about the limit of the last reign, we shall put the accession of Astyages about 610 B.C., and that of Cyaxares about 570 B.C. Thus we shall agree with Babylonian authorities² in regarding Astyages as the Median king at the fall of Nineveh, in 606 B.C.; while his father, the elder Cyaxares, may have been the monarch who first joined the Babylonian prince against Nineveh, in 625 B.C., or earlier. Astyages will also be the king who fought with Alyattes the Lydian the battle made memorable by the eclipse of Thales, taking 585 B.C. as the date of that eclipse; and the sister of Croesus (who was born in 595, or at the earliest in 605 B.C.) will become the wife of Cyaxares, rather than of Astyages, thus relieving the story in Herodotus of the strangeness of making Croesus a counsellor at the court of the great-grandson of his brother-in-law. The thirty years commonly assigned to the reign of Cyrus will commence in 559 B.C., which may be the date of his accession to the command of the armies, and so to the virtual direction of the empire.

The public history of the *Cyropaedia* opens soon after the accession of Cyaxares. Assuming the year 570 B.C. as the date of that event, let us examine the political map of Asia at that time, as it is presented by Xenophon with a fulness which invites scrutiny.

¹ *Cyropaedia*, viii. 6. 28.

² Berosi, *Frag.* xii. *Frag. Hist. Greece*, Vol. ii. p. 505, and Vol. iv. p. 282. Vol. XXXIII. No. 130.

The Assyrian king, having previously subdued Syria and Arabia, has just overcome the Hyrcanians, and is now attacking Bactria,¹ and is at war with the Cadusians and the Sacae.² On the other hand, the Medes have reduced the Armenian king to dependence, and formed an alliance with the Persians. The Indians on the east are independent, as well as Asia Minor, in which are the yet independent states of Lydia, Cappadocia, the two Phrygias, Paphlagonia, Caria, and Cilicia. That map will bear examination. As regards the states of Asia Minor, it is fully sustained by Herodotus, who represents them all, except perhaps Cappadocia, as independent at the time when Croesus came to the throne³—a date variously fixed from 571 to 560 B.C. Herodotus also represents the empire of the Medes as having been carried to the river Halys in the preceding reign.⁴ Ctesias supports it in respect to the independence of the Cadusians;⁵ and it accords remarkably with our accounts of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, the great contemporary king of Babylon.

For the first twenty-five years of his reign Nebuchadnezzar appears continually in Western Asia, in wars with Jerusalem, Phoenicia, and Egypt. In 585 B.C. he took Tyre; and it is very easy to believe that he may, in conjunction with the Cilician king, have mediated peace between his Median ally and the Lydian king in that year of the eclipse. It is singular to find the monarch whose figure filled all the East, as seen from Palestine by the writer of the Book of Judith, himself, in his one appearance in the Greek horizon, lost behind such a minor figure as Nabonadius, and recorded only as "Laby-netus the Babylonian."⁶ From about the year 580 B.C. the great conqueror disappears from the West. During the eighteen or twenty years which remain, where were the armies which had been upon the Mediterranean and the Red Seas, and on the Nile? Xenophon gives us an answer. And the proof of his reliability lies in the fitting of his mountain district of the dissected map with the map of the

¹ *Cyropaedia*, i. 5. 2.² *Ibid.* v. 3. 24.³ Herodotus, i. 28.⁴ *Ibid.* i. 103.⁵ Diodorus, ii. 35.⁶ Herodotus, i. 74, 77.

plain, which we have from Babylonian and Hebrew sources of which he was entirely ignorant.

His view is in entire accordance with the evidence of all other authorities, that there was peace between the Medes and Babylonians for a considerable period after they had destroyed Nineveh. This time was improved by Astyages in the conquest of Armenia, and the forming of close relations with Persia, and by Nebuchadnezzar in extending his dominion to the Mediterranean and the Red Seas. When at last the West and the South were pacified, and the Assyrian king returns home, he finds himself absolute master of countless millions of men and money; but the mountains all along his eastern and northern frontier are held by his old ally; and the question which shall be lord of Asia can be no longer deferred, at least in the proud heart of Nebuchadnezzar. So Xenophon presents us an "Assyrian king," of great resources and magnificent schemes, whose former conquests have fed his ambition, no less than his power. On the other hand, Astyages was old, and Cyaxares was weak, and the way seemed open for making Babylon as great a head of human pride and empire as the first builders of Babel ever dreamed of.

But Nebuchadnezzar was a scientific warrior. He dealt more in sieges than in battles. And he proceeds to lay siege to the Median empire, by extending his power about it, before meeting the direct and final issue of war. He throws his forces across the narrow, though rough, barrier of Zagros (not a great achievement for the armies which had forced their way across Lebanon and the desert to Egypt), and is behind the northern mountain wall of Media. Not stopping to pacify the Cadusians and Sacians on his left, he subjugates the Hyrcanians, thus securing the essential road between the Caspian and the Taurus, and passes on to the invasion of Bactria. Such distant operations will not seem incredible if we remember that Nebuchadnezzar was a monarch like Alexander, or Caesar, or Napoleon. It was not farther to reach Ecbatana by the way of Bactria and the Caspian gates, than to reach Richmond by the way of Chattanooga and Savannah.

Had Nebuchadnezzar lived, and had the struggle been between him and Cyaxares, the plan would undoubtedly have been justified by the event. Still further to organize victory, like a Chaldean used to deep and long calculations as he was, having secured the north by his conquest of Hyrcania, he sends his ambassadors to India on the east, and to the states of Asia Minor on the west, to enlist them on his side in the coming struggle. His argument is the general danger which threatened all Asia from the accession of Persia to the Median force. In this we have a very natural explanation of the fact that Herodotus has in some way received the impression that Croesus was led into the war by jealousy of the Persians. As we have seen, it could not be that his war was distinctly for the object of avenging the Medes upon the Persians; because it is clear, even from Herodotus, that the Western world in that generation called the enemy of Croesus "the Mede." But very probably Herodotus, in his investigations at Sardis, may have found evidence that at the court of the Lydian king the feeling of hostility was directed chiefly against the Persians. The courts of Sardis and of Pasargadae were both closely connected by marriage with that of Ecbatana, and the jealousies which would naturally arise may have afforded the crafty Chaldean an opportunity for bringing Croesus into his combination against the Medo-Persian power. Considering the nearly equal age of Cyaxares and Cyrus, and the relations of jealousy which are prominent even in Xenophon's history, we may easily imagine that Croesus may have considered himself as really acting in the interests of his brother-in-law in joining the coalition which was to deliver him from the dictation of the Persian general.

But we are anticipating. Our scene opens in the earlier portion of the first decade of Cyaxares, and the last of Nebuchadnezzar — 570–560 B.C. Ambassadors have gone from Babylon; but the coalition is not yet organized. Perhaps Croesus, now newly seated on his throne,¹ did not join

¹ Croesus became king, according to Volney, in 571; according to Rawlinson, in 568. Rawlinson's Herodotus, Book i. Appendix, Essay 1.

it until he had made several of the neighboring princes dependent on himself, and till the successes of Cyrus in Armenia had excited his apprehensions or jealousy. At this juncture Cyrus, now, as we are told, an adult man, — and therefore somewhat more than twenty-seven years of age, — comes in command of Persian auxiliaries.

A rapid glance at the situation convinces him that if the Medo-Persian power is to stand before the masses which threaten it, it must be by means of some system which would make one man equal to many. The method was suggested by the old Persian training, which made the nobles peers of the king and masters of the commons. He begins to organize victory over Asia by the same law, arming and training the light Persian force as heavy infantry, and afterward the nobles as heavy cavalry — thus instituting that military embodiment of law by which the Persian force became ultimately the centre of empire in Asia, and by which, in the forms of the Greek phalanx, the Roman legion, and the modern army, the organizing power and the staunchness of the Indo-European race have been and are moving to the command of the world. The permanence of the empire and the permanence of the Persian heavy infantry and cavalry as the centre of the power may be regarded as a sufficient vindication of this view of the style of the power of Cyrus, as opposed to the view which regards him as a wild chief of barbarians.

The brilliant enterprise next recorded, by which Armenia is converted from a revolted dependency of Media to a most devoted member of the new empire, is supported by native Armenian accounts¹ with a distinctness which is made only more valuable as a testimony by the distortion of facts in the interest of Armenian pride which indicates its authenticity. The leading facts — the previous disturbance of the former relations between Media and Armenia, the government of Armenia by its own line of kings, the name of Tigranes or Dikran as the Armenian hero, and his subsequent close

¹ Moses Choren. i. 24–30.

association with Cyrus, king of Persia, in forming the empire of Asia — are in both stories. The point of difference — whether the empire they constituted was Armenian or Persian — may be left to the verdict of the world's history. The cordial feeling in which Armenia felt the final triumph as her own victory, rather than her degradation, illustrates the view which Xenophon takes of Cyrus as master of a magnetic power to conciliate, as well as to conquer, of which Alexander, Caesar, and Napoleon had the rudiments; but none of them developed it into such victory and moral dominion as did Cyrus.

We come next to the great battle which decided the fate of Asia, both because it was, like Marathon, a test of the qualities of the rival powers, and because, as at Mantinea, the man whose genius was all the life of the one party fell, according to Xenophon's account, in the battle. How shall we test the accuracy of this account? Direct evidence for or against the occurrence of such a battle fails us; but the history of Herodotus seems to presuppose that, at the time when he takes up the story, the old Babylonian power has already been driven from the field in Central Asia, and thus, perhaps, gives us all the confirmation which we could expect from a historian who does not know even the name of Nebuchadnezzar. Some such field seems the necessary transition from the victorious position of the golden head of empire to the anxious fear and foreboding which pervade Babylon in the age of Nitocris. Here, then, Xenophon supplies a link so necessary to the continuity of history that it cannot be removed from its place; and yet he supplies it with so little apparent consciousness of the rest of the chain that we see that his informants were cognizant of that fact from the Persian, rather than the Babylonian, point of view. They were, perhaps, as ignorant as Herodotus himself of the name of the great king of Babylon, who returned about the year 580 B.C., laden with the spoils of Egypt and the West, and, after his temporary lycanthropy, was restored to the excellent majesty of his kingdom, and able to apply his genius to the

conquest of the East. They only knew of the "Assyrian king" who about the time of the accession of Cyaxares began to organize a coalition for the subjugation of Media and Persia. The preliminary movements may very naturally bring us to the last year of Nebuchadnezzar (about 561 B.C.), before the decisive collision of the forces. Respecting the fact that Nebuchadnezzar disappeared from the stage just as Cyrus came upon it, there is no dispute. The circumstance that Berosus represents him as dying by disease, rather than in battle, may be explained by the reluctance of the Chaldeans to chronicle his disastrous end; or the Persians may have been led into error in uniting the two nearly contemporaneous events of his defeat and death. We may even refer the battle to a later year, and suppose the "Assyrian" who appears in it to be Neriglissar, without changing the moral conditions of the crisis. The death of Nebuchadnezzar was the death of the old Mesopotamian empire, and the rise of Cyrus was the rise of the Medo-Persian; and the history of the twenty-three years from the fall of the king to the fall of the city is the history of the disintegration of the body from which the imperial soul had gone out, and the re-formation of its elements about the new genius which had been born.

After the battle, the allies of Babylon dispersed each to his own. Prominent among them was Croesus the Lydian, who was now the only man of ability left of the host, and who applies himself to the formation of a new coalition against the Medo-Persian power. Here, very probably, is our point of junction with the history of Herodotus; we have only to consider that the Croesus of Herodotus was alarmed by the victory of Cyrus over the Babylonian, rather than over the Median king, to bring him into substantial harmony with Xenophon, and with the general current of Greek as well as Oriental historical conception.

The revolt of the Hyrcanians from the Assyrian to the Cyrean army, and the accession of their neighbors, the Sacae and Cadusii, to the alliance, were natural consequences of

their previous relations to the Assyrians, and of their geographical position as known to the Persian informants of Xenophon and to us, though not such as Xenophon, with the idea of the locality of Media which appears in the *Anabasis*, would have been likely to invent.

Of the other great defections by which the empire of Nebuchadnezzar fell into that of Cyrus, three are related with a particularity which challenges, and has received criticism. The first of them, Gobryas, is called by Xenophon an "Assyrian," while the name he bears is prominent in history as the name of a noble Persian. Of this it is to be observed, that the companions of the younger Cyrus certainly should have been informed with reference to the ancestry of Darius Hystaspis, and the frequent and somewhat familiar references with the strong characterization, not to say caricaturing, both of Gobryas and of his son-in-law Hystaspes, show that they were not inventions of the Attic scholar who pens them, but rough camp stories which he heard and does not attempt to render into Greek refinement. As to their correctness, we may compare their disparagement of the parentage of Darius, with the style of story which Ctesias gives us as current at the same time at the court of Artaxerxes, respecting the extraction of Cyrus the Great. The principality of Gobryas is evidently located on the eastern border of the Babylonish empire; and he was probably a Persian vassal of the king of Babylon, and so was naturally called by the Cyreans an "Assyrian," while the courtiers of Artaxerxes would probably have represented him as a Persian prince.

The next accession is Gadatas, — evidently a Babylonian, — a former companion of the new king of Babylon, whose lawless and heartless cruelty, both to him and to Gobryas and his son, correspond with the character given by Babylonian authorities to Evil-Merodach, son of Nebuchadnezzar, whose barbarities and excesses caused his deposition and death in two years from his accession. No doubt the indictment was true as against the young Nero, whatever personal ambition may have moved his brother-in-law Neriglissar and

his sister, whom we may probably name Nitocris, in urging the issue.

The way to the principality of Gadatas from that of Gobryas, lay past Babylon, which would locate it in the west of Mesopotamia. Thence, the general moves a distance, as represented in the Cyropaedia, of not less than seven days march, to the mountain-fort commanding the country of the Sacae and Hyrcani. The relations there established correspond with the honorable union of the Hyrcani with the Medes, and the independence of the Cadusii and Sacae, which continued throughout the history of the empire. A return to the domain of Gadatas, now become part of the new empire, and thence past Babylon again, brings the force back to the eastern border, where it is ready to receive the accession of the king of Susa, whose kingdom was close by them; and its position was evidently better understood by the Persian officers of Cyrus than by Xenophon, who in the *Anabasis*¹ locates Susa somewhere northeast of old Nineveh and near to Ecbatana.

Xenophon, and probably his authorities, would seem to have regarded these events as occurring within two or three campaigns after the death of the great Assyrian king. We can, of course, place no stress upon the accuracy of their chronology. The events and their moral relations are what live in heroic history. The same conditions of a government, impotent to restrain either its passions or its subjects, continued in Babylon until its fall. We shall, therefore, have no difficulty in placing the revolt of Susa late enough to allow the presence of Daniel² the prophet, "at Shushan, which is in the province of Elam," on business for the king of Babylon, "in the third year of the reign of the king Belshazzar."

Meanwhile the coalition, which had fallen with its chief on the Tigris, has found a new head by the Pactolus. Croesus, the Lydian, having by this time, as we gather from Herodotus, brought the greater part of Asia Minor, both Greek and Barbarian, under his sway, and gained the alliance of

¹ *Anabasis*, iii. 5. 15; ii. 4. 25.

² Daniel viii. 1, 2, 27.

Egypt and the islands, as well as European support, is ready to take the field again, probably soon after the accession of Nabonahit in Babylon, about 555 or 554 B.C.¹

Of this campaign we have the Lydian account in Herodotus, and the Persian in Xenophon. If we consider the Persian the better authority for events in Central Asia, which produced or accompanied it, we may be willing to accept Lydian accounts of matters upon the Lydian side, though our faith is somewhat shaken, as we find their stories of the most public events, in Sardis itself, utterly fabulous.

The fall of Croesus left not a man to head the immense powers which were still ready to oppose the transference of empire to the Japhetic race. There was, however, still one woman in whom the vigor which had ruled the East was still alive and resolute. For her name and her works we are indebted to Herodotus. And just here is the use of such a historian as Herodotus. He had an ear for the talk and the song of men, and a soul for their sympathies; and therefore he will often give the soul, where he does not give the body, of history. The name of Nitocris does not appear in the mathematical canon of Ptolemy, or in the court calendar of Daniel. On the other hand, Herodotus never heard, or at least never tried to utter with his Ionic mouth or pen, such a name as "Nabu-kuduriuzur"; he did try "Nabu-nahit," and brought out "Labynetus." But the living figure in the history, as it came to him, was Nitocris, wife and mother of the last two kings of Babylon; each of whom, as he understood, was named Labynetus. We have views, then, of the last age of Babylon from four sides — from Greece and Lydia through Herodotus, from the Persian camp through Xenophon, from the official centre of administration through Chaldean authorities and monuments, and from the precincts of the ancestral royalty in the Book of Daniel. In Herodotus, accordingly, we find the last struggles of the once great ally of Croesus to defend itself by means of those dykes, marshes, and walls which Greek travellers found in

¹ Rawlinson's Herodotus (Am. ed.), Vol. i. p. 278.

their way to Babylon, and described on their return, without extenuation, to such attentive ears as those of our author; and they did not fail to refer them to the queen by whose influence not only those works were made, but even the king whose name they bear on their bricks to this day held such royalty as he possessed. The Persian camp, again, was full of rumors and proofs of the disgusts and rebellions which rose around the feeble, licentious, and lawless court which had succeeded to the state of the grand monarch. Berosus and the inscriptions give the names of the men who administered the rule, and scripture gives the names of the princes who held hereditary right. From all these we may derive some such plan as this.

Nebuchadnezzar died in 561 B.C., leaving a son Evil-Merodach, and a daughter Nitocris, whose Egyptian name may indicate that her birth was about the time of those splendid victories in the West, which the conqueror may have desired to commemorate, and whose husband was "Nergal-Sharezer, the Rab-mag," or chief magus, with whom we are already acquainted, as with his master, thirty years before, at the siege of Jerusalem. Berosus¹ tells us that Evil-Merodach succeeded; but, after two years of lawless and licentious rule, was slain by Neriglissar, his brother-in-law, who succeeded him. We may believe that he deserved his fate, without acquitting his sister and her husband of selfish motives in their conduct. In four years more Neriglissar dies, and is succeeded by his son Laborosoarchod, who, after nine months of depravity, was beaten (*ἀπετυμπανίσθη*) to death "by his friends." Thus the tender mercies of that court of which Nitocris is the leading spirit prepared the way for the reign which appears in Berosus and the inscriptions as that of Nabunidus, or Nabunahit, "a certain Babylonian," "not related to his predecessor"; while in the book of Daniel the king is called Belshazzar, and Nebuchadnezzar is called his father.

This name of Belshazzar has been one of the great stumbling-blocks in the comparison of sacred and profane history.

¹ Josephus contra Apion, i. 20.

It has stood for centuries as the name of the last king of Babylon, on the sole authority of the book of Daniel. It was contradicted by Herodotus, who names the last king Laby-netus; and by all Chaldean authorities, who name him Nabonahit, or, in Greek form, Nabonidus or Nabonadius. When, in modern days, the old inscriptions came to be deciphered, the same name of Nabonahit appeared repeatedly and continuously; and yet there was the book of Daniel, a professedly contemporary authority, and at the very court itself, giving the name of Belshazzar, with the air of perfect assurance. Moreover, the scriptures¹ elsewhere, as well as Xenophon, represent the king of Babylon as present in the city at its fall; while the Chaldean authorities affirm that on his defeat in the field Nabonadius was cut off from the city, and fled to Borsippa. The accounts of Daniel and Xenophon are, moreover, confirmed, so far as respects the sudden surprise of the city in the riot of a festival, by both Herodotus² and Isaiah.³ Such an array of evidence might suggest a caution in rejecting the witnesses. Yet so strong seemed the evidence of inscriptions, that we find Sir H. C. Rawlinson writing thus to Dr. Lobdell, in 1854: "The Assyrian and Babylonian records confirm in the most satisfactory manner all the genuine portions of scripture history; while, at the same time, they afford positive evidence that the book of Daniel is not genuine,—that, in fact, it should have been left by the Christian church in the Hagiographa, where, as you know, it has ever been held by the Jews."⁴

Thus the question was brought to the point at which human wisdom was at fault; and it was time for the revelation of the key which had lain hidden almost from the time when Daniel the prophet wrote his record. This was a cylinder, deposited by Nabonadius himself in the corner of a temple which he built for the Moon-goddess, at a site now called Mugheir, which is supposed to be "Ur of the Chaldees," from which the "father of the faithful" went forth, but which

¹ Jer. li. 31.

² Herodotus, i. 191.

³ Isa. xxi. 5.

⁴ *Journal of American Oriental Society*, Vol. v. No. 1. p. 269.

was for many centuries used only as a resting-place for the dead from the later Babylon. This cylinder was found by Mr. J. Taylor, British vice-consul at Busrah, and came into the hand of Sir H. C. Rawlinson; and on it was found, in 1854, the long hidden name of Belshazzar. The inscription is a prayer to the goddess to whom the temple is dedicated. It closes as follows, as rendered by H. Fox Talbot: ¹

“And to Bel-sar-ussur, my eldest son, my rising hope,—
fix firmly in his heart the awe of thy great divinity. And
like the duration of the moon itself may the splendor of this
temple endure.”

Dr. Hincks ² translates: “As to Binhlusar-yushur, the son, the beginning of the issue of my heart, to the worship of thy great godhead his heart make to incline.”

Dr. Hincks supposes that Belshazzar was the son of Nabonadius and Nitocris, whom he also considers a daughter of Nebuchadnezzar. With this understanding, let us see how our key will unlock the riddles of the last years of Babylon.

The death of Nebuchadnezzar leaves the power in the hands of the Chaldeans, whose influence he had represented, and of his family, consisting of Evil-Merodach and the strong-minded Nitocris. Evil-Merodach becomes king; but Nitocris is wife of the chief of the Chaldeans, and in two years the new king is assassinated, and his sceptre passes into the hand of his brother-in-law, Neriglissar. In four years more Neriglissar dies, and his young son, Laborosarchod is called king; while Nitocris finds another consort in Nabonadius. After a short time,—nine months, the chronicles say,—the young monarch is murdered “by his friends,” and Nabonadius assumes the command; holding the throne, probably, as the representative of his infant son Belshazzar, now the lineal heir of the royalty of Nebuchadnezzar, for the seventeen years which yet remain before the fall of the city. On the monuments erected during these years Nabonadius, with a natural vanity, caused his own

¹ Proceedings of the Royal Asiatic Society, Vol. xix. p. 195.

² Journal of Sacred Literature, January, 1862. See also Rawlinson's *Ancient Monarchies*, Vol. iii. p. 515.

name to be inscribed ; while, as we have before supposed, Daniel, the old minister of Nebuchadnezzar, counted them as years of Belshazzar, as he would probably have assigned those of Neriglissar to the infant prince of the seed royal, Laborosoarchod. Daniel was himself of the seed royal of Judah, and he cherished those traditions of royalty which look forward to the Messiah, the Prince. When Nabonadius was excluded from the city, the administration and the conduct of the defence naturally devolved on the queen mother and the ministry. The boy king, however, appears at the feast of the thousand lords on the fatal festival night. But he is still the boy. He does not know his own minister. In his terror he has no resource but to scream, and his mother comes to quiet him. The name of Belshazzar faded from history almost sooner than the hand-writing of doom disappeared from the wall of the palace. But some story of Belshazzar's feast seems to have lingered in the memory of men. It is in Xenophon and in Herodotus, as well as in Daniel. We can very well understand that refugees from Babylon may have told it in Lydia, and so Herodotus would know that the king of Babylon was there, and that he was the son of Nitocris. But Herodotus has also heard, from other sources, that Nitocris was the wife of the Labynetus (Nabonidus) in whose reign the defensive works were made, and also that Labynetus was the last king of Babylon ; it was, therefore, very natural that he should conclude that there were two monarchs of the same name — the husband and the son of the queen, who was really the ruling spirit, for evil and for good, of the last years of Babylon.

It is to be remarked that the discovery of the name of Belshazzar goes far to establish not only the veracity of the history of the Book of Daniel, but its authority as a contemporary document. For it introduces, with the familiarity of present knowledge, a name which did not pass into history at all, and is known to us now only by the sacred record and the contemporary inscription which has providentially been brought to light as an interpreter of God's word.

We have thus far endeavored to establish the character of the Cyropaedia, as being in its historical outlines a faithful representation of the history of the time of Cyrus the Great, as gathered by an intelligent Greek from diligent inquiry of Persian noblemen whose relations and tastes were such as to incline them to make those facts a special study. We should expect it to be liable to such deficiencies and errors as would naturally arise from its point of view, which is the Persian camp, and from the lapse of a century and a half since the events. As such, we may now compare some of its features with those presented by the view which scripture gives us of the same events from the stand-point of Palestine or of the Babylonian court itself, and from times preceding or accompanying the facts.

We shall naturally consider, first :

Its view of the general character, position, and history of the Babylonian kingdom.

Scripture calls it Babylonian. Xenophon calls it Assyrian, as he should ; for its Median and its Greek aspect were Assyrian. Xenophon does not give us the name of Nebuchadnezzar, — no Greek had attempted that as yet, — nor of the different princes who sat on the throne at Babylon during the twenty-two years from the death of Nebuchadnezzar to the fall of his kingdom. No Greek — probably hardly any Persian — had disentangled that skein of domestic conspiracy and crime. We have only the outline, as it would be seen from the Persian camp, and preserved in Persian story : First, a great monarch, who has carried his conquests, on the west, to the Taurus and to Egypt, — as the scripture has told us, from the other side of the view, — and who now, just at the point where his armies disappear from the Hebrew vision, turns them toward the east. To this grand monarch succeeds a reign of imbecility and of lawless passion, which Chaldean authorities separate into several reigns, as our telescopes resolve double stars ; but which in Herodotus is united under the name of the queen whose energy directed whatever of system there was in them ; while at the Persian camp it

mattered little whether the lawlessness which sat on the throne of Nebuchadnezzar was named Evil-Merodach, or Laborosoarchod, or Belshazzar, just as to the suffering world in the generation after Augustus Caesar it mattered little whether the central monster was Tiberius or Caligula or Nero. They only knew that the caprices of "the new king" were continually alienating the strongest supporters of the old monarch. We may compare their view, from their distance in place and in after time, with that of Jeremiah,¹ from Jerusalem, half a century before the facts. "A rumor shall both come one year, and after that in another year a rumor, and violence in the land, ruler against ruler." Each is the like comprehensive glance; one at the interior, and the other at the exterior, aspect of the self-destroying court of Babylon.

By a similar process, the contest for the empire of Asia, which seems to have appeared to Xenophon, and perhaps to his informants, as a short, sharp struggle of not more than two or three campaigns, is seen, from the various points of view open to us, to extend over a quarter of a century.

The story of Panthea and Abradatas is not less full of historical than of sentimental interest. With the latter we have nothing to do here, except to remark that it is clearly Oriental, rather than Greek. Let us study the view which it presents of the history and attitude of Susiana during the struggle of its mighty neighbors.

The country dependent upon Susa — known in scripture generally as Elam — is represented by Xenophon as governed by a king of its own, who at the commencement of the war was subject to the king of Babylon, but is offended by the young Babylonian king, and, charmed by the continence and magnanimity of Cyrus, goes over to the Medo-Persian side, and, with his forces, fights in their armies in the field and at the siege. Now let us turn to the Hebrew books.

1. Had Elam kings of her own, and did they become subject to Nebuchadnezzar?

Jeremiah,² "in the first year of Nebuchadnezzar," recog-

¹ Jer. li. 46.

² Jer. xxv. 25.

nizes their independent royalty at that time, and their coming subjugation, by enumerating "the kings of Elam" among those who were to drink the cup of the Lord's fury. Again,¹ in the eighth year of the same reign, he renews the prediction of their utter defeat, with a promise of their restoration "in the latter days." The fulfilment of this prediction of their subjugation is recorded by Ezekiel² as having taken place before the twentieth year of the king. If we understand Isaiah³ as predicting the presence of Elam in the Babylonian army at the final siege of Jerusalem, which occupied from the seventeenth to the nineteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar,⁴ we come still more closely to the date of the subjugation of Elam. It had therefore been a dependency of Babylon about thirty years before the death of Nebuchadnezzar, and probably continued to be so for several years after. For Abradatas is the last among the important accessions to the army of Cyrus recorded by Xenophon; and we find the prophet Daniel⁵ "at Shushan the palace, which is in the province of Elam," upon "the king's business, . . . in the third year of king Belshazzar." This would imply that Elam was still a "province" of Babylon, and in such relations that a Babylonian minister is there quietly for "certain days" on the king's business, ten years after the commencement of the war. The phrase "Shushan, the palace," is noticeable, as calling to mind that wonderful monument of the ancient royalty and greatness of Susa which is continually presented in the books of Nehemiah and Esther, and whose ruins mark the site to-day, and which, though not mentioned in the Persian story which Xenophon repeats, was almost the only thing, anterior to the Persian occupation, which had made the city known to Greece. As Shushan was known to the Hebrews as the palace or royal castle, so was it to the Greeks as the "Memnonium," and by its association with the son of Dawn, who fought and fell at Troy.⁶

¹ Jer. xlix. 34-39.² Ezek. xxxii. 24.³ Isa. xxii. 6.⁴ 2 Kings xxv. 1, 8.⁵ Dan. viii. 1, 2, 27.⁶ Herod. v. 53, 54; vii 151; Strabo, xv. 3; Diod. ii. 22; Paus. iv. 31. 5; x. 31. 2.

“Susā the Memnonian” seems to be the Greek for “Shushan the palace.”

The remaining fact—the presence of Elam in the army of the Medes against Babylon—we find predicted by Isaiah,¹ three hundred years before Xenophon recorded it.

In confirmation of the existence of a native line of kings in Susā, we have, beside the fame of the palace, the testimony of Assyrian inscriptions of the century before Cyrus, and the repeated rebellions, in the name of the ancient royalty, recorded in the Behistun inscription.²

The scenes of the last night of Babylon, described by Isaiah³ and Jeremiah⁴ as seen in vision long before, and by Daniel and Xenophon as seen by eye-witnesses and actors “in that night,” make a picture so vivid, so consistent, and so significant, and one which recent discoveries have so brought out into the light of certainty as to establish the absolute authority, for that scene at least, of each of the narrators. But they are so familiar that we need not dwell upon them here.

We pass to the next record.

Daniel tells us: “And in that night was Belshazzar the king of the Chaldeans slain. And Darius the Median took the kingdom, being about threescore and two years old.”⁵ And again: “Darius, the son of Ahasuerus, of the seed of the Medes, which was made king over the realm of the Chaldeans.”⁶

Who was Darius the Mede?

Herodotus, Berosus, and the inscriptions alike have no answer. They know only Cyrus, as they knew only Nabonadius. Xenophon alone gives us an answer, whose very simplicity and aptness seems to have offended modern interpreters. He gives us a Mede, who should have been at this time about threescore and two, and who “was made king over the realm” by the victory of Cyrus. The differences between his account and that of Daniel are hardly more than

¹ Isa. xxi. 2.

² Col. 1. par. 16; col. 2. par. 4.

³ Isa. xxi. 5.

⁴ Jer. li. 31.

⁵ Dan. v. 30, 31.

⁶ Dan. ix. 1.

enough to establish the independent character of the witnesses. Xenophon gives the name of Cyaxares, and Daniel that of Darius. But we know too little of Median names or titles to criticise such a difference; especially as we know how commonly the same prince is known by two names; and we might allow that Xenophon or his authorities may have misplaced or mistaken a name, without impeaching the general truth of their statements. Certainly we can attach no such authority to Herodotus as to be disturbed by his omission of such facts. Xenophon also represents Cyrus as assuming the government at Babylon, assigning, however, to Cyaxares a palace for his abode whenever he should choose to go there; while Daniel represents Darius as actually assuming authority in Babylon. On such a point we must, of course, believe the eye-witness. Xenophon does not deny that Cyaxares went to Babylon, and, even without the authority of Daniel, we should be sure, from the character which Xenophon has drawn, that he would go; and the account given by Daniel of his proceedings there is so in keeping with the man with whom we have become acquainted in the *Cyropaedia*, that we cannot fail to recognize him, by whatsoever name he may be introduced. On the other hand, Daniel does not deny that Cyrus arranged the state of Babylon. Indeed, with all the reverence for legitimacy which is in him, we cannot fail to see as much in the phrase, "which was made king." From the two we understand that, upon the conquest, Cyrus arranged the order of things, and then — as policy, as well as duty, required — invited the Mede to assume his royalty. How long he may have continued there we cannot judge, unless the thirty days named in his decree may furnish us a suggestion. When his jealousy was appeased, his desire of ease would naturally take him home again, and leave the administration of the empire to hands able and willing to do the work. Still Daniel, as during the Chaldean rule, recognizes the titular king; while the astronomers and brick-makers, now as before, give the name of the actual ruler, until, after a year

or two, the death of the Mede leaves the title in the hands which already held the reins.

It is interesting to observe, in scripture, exactly the same conception of the character of the Medo-Persian power which we find in Xenophon. The earlier prophets speak only of the Medes. The Persians then were still in their seclusion, preparing their greatness. But in Daniel the kingdom is given to the "Medes and Persians." Perhaps we should consider Darius as "made king" by agreement among the confederates. His administration is under the "law of the Medes and Persians." In every instance, in speaking of the existing state of things, the power is represented as dual, the precedency being with the Medes.¹ As the prophet looks into the future, he sees the ram with two horns, which were the kings of Media and Persia;² and the higher horn comes up last. And when we come to the vision of the more distant future, the name of Persia³ appears alone. In the Book of Esther, which dates after the revolution effected by Darius Hystaspis, the empire is still dual, but the order is Persia and Media,⁴ except in a single instance.⁵ In Ezra we hear only of "the king of Persia"; and in Nehemiah, as in Greece of the same age, only of "the king."

In the Book of Ezra⁶ a decree of Cyrus is found at "Acmetha, in the province of the Medes," indicating that Ecbatana was the seat of his empire; while the date, "in the first year of Cyrus the king," proves that the official records of the empire did not regard Cyrus as the king until a time subsequent to the capture of Babylon.

Here we must pause to mark the decisiveness and the importance of this concurrence of testimony. The Hebrew books of Daniel, Ezra (which even quotes an official document of Cyrus himself to the point), and Chronicles agree in the statement that the first year of the reign of Cyrus in Media and over the empire was the year of the edict for the rebuilding of the temple at Jerusalem, or two years after the

¹ Dan. v. 28; vi. 8, 12, 15.

² Dan. viii. 3, 20.

³ Dan. x. 13; xi. 2.

⁴ Esth. i. 3, 14, 18, 19.

⁵ Esth. x. 2.

⁶ Ezra vi. 2.

fall of the city of the Chaldees; thus agreeing exactly with the Athenian reporter of the statements of Persian princes. Can a fact so established by witnesses so independent be set aside by the silence of other witnesses who have overlooked the minor actors in history? But if we accept it, it carries with it the substantial truth of the whole of Xenophon's plan of the career of Cyrus, and thus answers, at the great culmination of his life, to the test fact as to his parentage, with which the history opened.

Xenophon represents Cyrus, after arranging affairs at Babylon, as returning first to Media, where he finds Cyaxares still on the throne, and then to Persia, where his father Cambyses is still king among the Persian peers. This would defer the accession of Cyrus to the Persian, as well as to the Median throne—a conclusion which agrees remarkably with scripture,¹ and is readily brought into accord with other authorities, by understanding that the thirty years which they assign to Cyrus are to be understood as measuring the term for which he was virtually the *Ἡγεμὸν στρατοῦ*, imperator, or generalissimo of the armies of the empire. Cyrus was about sixty years of age when he took Babylon, and about sixty-two when he received the two royalties of Media and of Persia. In the mean time his right to the Median throne had been made complete by his marriage with the daughter of Cyaxares, who had no legitimate son. Cyrus was but two years younger than his brother-in-law, who now became also his father-in-law. But, even in Rome, Pompey weds the daughter of his younger colleague, Julius Caesar; and the polygamy and marriage of kindred involved in the story only mark it as of Oriental, rather than of Greek, origin. The double claim to the Median throne, in right of his mother and of his wife, appears also in the story of Ctesias, that Cyrus adopted Amytis, the daughter of Astyages, first as mother, and then as wife. Moreover, the statement that Cyaxares “had no legitimate son” leaves room not only for the grandchildren of Astyages by his daughter named by Ctesias,²

¹ 2 Chron. xxxvi. 22; Ezra i. 1.

² Photius, 72.

but for the pretenders, who, according to the Behistun inscription,¹ rose against Darius Hystaspis, claiming to be "of the race of Cyaxares."

In the rapid glance at the subsequent achievements of Cyrus, given in the Cyropaedia, occurs a statement which has been grasped as almost a complete proof of the fabulous character of the work. We find the statement: "After this is said to have occurred the Egyptian campaign and the conquest of Egypt."² Here we mark the same form of expression as in the opening statement concerning the father of Cyrus "is said to have been." Xenophon only tells what was told him, implying that there were also other and conflicting accounts. Respecting Cambyses, the father of Cyrus, his informants seem to have been correct; as to the Egyptian invasion, probably not. But the truth of Xenophon's statement, that such a story was current, is rendered at least probable by the tradition, twice mentioned by Herodotus,³ and quoted by Athenaeus⁴ both from Dino and Lyceas of Naucratis, that at the demand of Cyrus Amasis sent Nitetis, an Egyptian princess, to his harem. If Amasis held Egypt as a vassal of Nebuchadnezzar, he very probably did accept the suzerainty of the new empire at the first approach of Cyrus or his armies; so that the subjugation of Egypt is highly probable, and the story, at least, of an actual invasion could hardly have failed to arise. We may observe that Xenophon does not say that Cyrus accompanied that invasion.

There remains only the closing scene of the life of Cyrus.

Herodotus⁵ closes the drama with tragic effect, with a defeat and death preceded by an overweening pride of the veteran conqueror, and followed by insult to his remains on the part of an incensed and barbarous enemy. Xenophon⁶ says that, in the fulness of his age and prosperity, he died peacefully in his bed, giving his kingdom to his elder son, Cambyses, and assigning to the younger, Tanaxares, the

¹ Col. 2, par. 5, 14.

² Herodotus, iii. 2. 3.

³ Herodotus, i. 214.

⁴ Cyropaedia, viii. 7. 20.

⁵ Athen., xiii. p. 560 a.

⁶ Cyropaedia, viii. 7, 11.

satrapy of the Medes, Armenians, and Cadusians. Ctesias¹ gives a similar death-scene, calling the younger son Tanyoxarces, and giving him the rule of the Ohoramnians, Parthians, and Carmanians; but that scene is preceded by a mortal wound, three days before, in battle with the Derbices. Of these three stories, that of Herodotus is discredited by the existence of the tomb of Cyrus at the old Pasargadae; the other two seem to have been the versions current, respectively, at the court of Artaxerxes Mnemon and in the camp of the younger Cyrus.

We have thus endeavored to study the geographical and historical statements of the Cyropaedia. We think that the result of that study has been to show that, throughout the work, such statements are not fabrications of the Greek writer, but careful reproductions of information given to him by high Persian authority. In the majority of cases they are confirmed as true; and even their errors, as well as their facts, are such as to prove their Persian origin.

They deal with the matters of which they treat with the same confidence, unapprehensive of mistake, which marks the scripture accounts with which we have compared them. It is the tone of men who know the things of which they affirm. The agreement of two such independent, distinct witnesses, on such test-points as the relations of Susa in the last struggle of Babylon, the presence of the king in Babylon at its fall and the story of his last night, the Median predecessor of Cyrus, and the date of the accession of Cyrus to the royalty, must be accepted as proving the reliability of each of them. Such a demonstration, in the case of Xenophon, we must welcome, not only because it unites the honor of truth with the charm of his grace, but because it gives us a most valuable addition to our reliable history of the world.

As regards scripture the result of our examination is to transfer the Book of Ezra, and especially that of Daniel, from a defensive position to one of authority, as showing the famil-

¹ Photius, 72.

ilarity of a contemporary with such facts as the existence and position of Belshazzar and of Darius the Mede, with the kingdom of Susa, and with the formal as well as the actual relations of Cyrus the Great to his kingdoms and to his empire.

The general result is the same which we reach in every comparison of scripture with other forms of truth, namely, that, while one record may explain another, none of them, rightly read, are contradictory; and that we may go on without fear accepting and holding fast all proved truth, knowing that, when we come to understand it all, we shall find each part consistent with every other, and contributing to the illustration and support of the highest truth.

ARTICLE II.

HORAE SAMARITANAE; OR, A COLLECTION OF VARIOUS READINGS OF THE SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH COMPARED WITH THE HEBREW AND OTHER ANCIENT VERSIONS.

BY REV. B. PICK, ROCHESTER, N. Y.

OF the Samaritan literature which has come down to our times, first in importance and order is the Pentateuch. As to its merits and demerits, there has always been a difference of opinion. The Jews regarded it with contempt, and charged the Samaritans with a downright forgery. "You have falsified your law," וְיִשְׂרָאֵל תִּירָחֶם. This we read very often in the Talmud. Early Christian writers, however, speak of it with respect, in some cases even preferring it to that of the Masoretic text. *Origen* (†254) quotes it under name of τὸ τῶν Σαμαρειτῶν Ἑβραϊκόν, giving its various readings on the margin of his Hexapla (cf. Montfaucon, *Hexapla*, praelim. p. 18 sq.). *Eusebius of Caesarea* (†340), notices the agreement in the chronology of the Septuagint and Samaritan text as against the Hebrew (*Chron. i.*, xvi.