

gods, but it would seem from the notes on page 111 that there were several cases in which oaths were also taken by the king's son. It is certain that in these cases the son was associated with his father <sup>as king</sup> at the time of the taking of the oath?

For Darius' room is made, but it is only by piling assumption on assumption. (140 "Assuming, however, that Gobryas' daughter was Darius Hystaspis' mother, it would afford a ground for assumption that" Gobryas may have been Darius etc.) It had already been admitted that there were difficulties in the way of the first assumption, but they are brushed aside by impugning the testimony of the Greek historians, which <sup>testimony</sup> he is to employ freely later on in his discussion of the Kasdim. Again on 143 <sup>practically</sup> it is assumed that like Ushtanni <sup>Darius,</sup> he was satrap of Syria, and on 197 it is said that it is more than possible that Darius may have reigned over Syria among other countries. If the case of Ushtanni is the only ground for this statement it would seem that it is very little more than possible, if at all.

The chapter on Nebuchadnezzar's madness is interesting, but, I fear, fails to quell my doubts. The effort to make the seven times mean something less than years seems to be vitiated by the text which says he remained in that condition until his hair was grown like eagles', and his nails like birds'. How long it would take the hair to grow to that extent the present writer does not know, but he has known it to take a year for an injured nail to grow out anew. The *idea* quoted from Dr. Burrell with approval to the effect that the king really subsisted on "the food of man" but ate grass in imitation of animals only, is surely a pure assumption, without justification of any sort in the text.