

'undivided' Aryan community has long since been shattered by anthropology.

For the purposes of history philology can be only accidentally of service, only in so far as it throws light on the meaning of a literary record or assists in the decipherment of an ancient inscription. It is the linguistic sense of the record, and not the history it embodies or the historical facts to be drawn from it, with which alone philology is properly concerned. We must not go to it for dates or for the history of the development of civilization and culture.

Still less can we look for help to what has been called 'literary tact.' 'Literary tact' is but another name for a purely subjective impression, and the subjective impressions of a modern European in regard to ancient Oriental history are not likely to be of value. It is quite certain that an ancient Oriental author would not have written as we should write, or as we should have expected him to write; and consequently the very fact that an ancient Oriental document does not conform to our modern canons of criticism is an argument in favour of its genuineness. A document written in accordance with the critical require-