vinity was represented on the leaves of the tamara or lotus. Pan was worshipped as a god in that country, as well as over the eaſt. Their ſphinxes, and all their combined figures of animal creation, took their origin from the mother of the Scythians, who brought forth an offspring that was half a woman and half a ſerpent. Their pyramids and obeliſks aroſe from the idea of flame; the firſt emblem of the ſupreme principle, in­troduced by the Scythians, and which even the influ­ence of Zoroaſter and the Magi could not remove.

We are told that the Bacchus of the Greeks is de­rived from the Brouma of the Indians; that both are repreſented as ſeated on a ſwan ſwimming over the waves, to indicate that each was the god of humid na­ture, not the god of wine, but the god of waters. The mitre of Bacchus was ſhaped like half an egg; an em­blem taken from this circumſtance, that at the creation the egg from which all things ſprung was divided in the middle. Pan alſo was revered among the Scythians; and from that people were derived all the emblems by which the Greeks repreſented this divinity.

It would be tedious to follow our author through the whole of this ſubject; and were we to ſubmit to the labour of collecting and arranging his ſcattered ma­terials, we ſhould still view his ſyſtem with ſome degree of ſuſpicion. It is drawn, as he informs us, from the work of M. D’Ancarville, intitled, *Recherches ſur l'Ori­gine, l'Esprit, et les Progres, des Arts de la Grece.*

To form concluſions concerning the origin of nations, the riſe and progreſs of the arts and ſciences, without the aid of hiſtorical evidence, by analogies which are ſometimes accidental, and often fanciful, is a mode of reaſoning which cannot readily be admitted. There may indeed, we acknowledge, be reſemblances in the re­ligion, language, manners, and customs, of different na­tions, ſo ſtriking and ſo numerous, that to doubt of their being deſcended from the ſame ſtock would ſavour of ſcepticiſm. But hiſtorical theories muff not be adopted raſhly. We muſt be certain that the evidence is credible and ſatisfactory before we proceed to deduce any concluſions. We muſt firſt know whether the Scythian hiſtory itſelf be authentic, before we make any compariſon with the hiſtory of other nations. But what is called the Scythian hiſtory, every man of learn­ing knows to be a collection of fables. Herodotus and Juſtin are the two ancient writers from whom we have the fulleſt account of that warlike nation; but theſe two hiſtorians contradict each other, and both write what cannot be believed of the ſame people at the ſame pe­riod of their progreſs. Juſtin tells us, that there was a long and violent conteſt between the Scythians and Egyptians about the antiquity of their reſpective nations; and after ſtating the arguments on each ſide of the queſtion, which, as he gives them@@\*, are nothing to the purpoſe, he decides in favour of the claim of the Scy­thians. Herodotus was too partial to the Egyptians, not to give them the palm of antiquity: and he was probably in the right; for Juſtin deſcribes his moſt ancient of nations, even in the time of Darius Hyſtaſpes, as ignorant of all the arts of civil life. “They occupied their land in common (ſays he), and cultiva­ted none of it. They had no houſes nor fettled habi­tations, but wandered with their cattle from deſert to deſert. In theſe rambles they carried their wives and children in tumbrels covered with the ſkins of beaſts, which ſerved as houſes to protect them from the ſtorms of winter. They were without laws, governed by the dictates of natural equity. They coveted not gold or ſilver like the reft of mankind, and lived upon milk and honey. Though they were expoſed to extreme cold, and had abundance of flocks, they knew not how to make garments of wool, but clothed themſelves in the ſkins of wild beaſts @@‡.” This is the moſt favourable account which any ancient writer gives of the Scythi­ans. By Strabo @@§ and Herodotus @@‖ they are repreſented as the moſt ſavage of mortals, delighting in war and bloodſhed, cutting the throats of all ſtrangers who came among them, eating their fleſh, and making cups and pots of their ſkulls. Is it conceivable that such ſavages could be ſculptors; or that, even ſuppoſing their manners to have been ſuch as Juſtin repreſents them, a people ſo simple and ignorant could have impoſed their mythology upon the Chaldeans, Phenicians, and Egyp­tians, whom we know by the moſt incontrovertible evi­dence to have been great and poliſhed nations ſo early as in the days of Abraham? No! We could as ſoon admit other novelties of more importance, with which the French of the preſent age pretend to enlighten the world, as this origin aſſigned by Mr Bromley to the art of ſculpture, unleſs ſupported by better authority than that of D’Ancarville.

The inference of our author from the name of the ſacred ox in Arabia, and from the dancing and gaiety which were common in the religious feſtivals of the Arabians, appears to us to be very haſtily drawn. At the early period of the departure of the Iſraelites from Egypt, the language of the Hebrews, Egyptians, and Arabians, differed not more from each other than do the different dialects of the Greek tongue which are found in the poems of Homer (ſee Philology, Sect. III.); and it is certain, that for many years after the formation of the golden-calf, the Hebrews were ſtran­gers to every ſpecies of idolatry but that which they had brought with them from their houſe of bondage. See Remphan.

Taking for granted therefore that the Scythians did not impoſe their mythology upon the eaſtern nations, and that the art of ſculpture, as well as hieroglyphic writing and idolatrous worſhip, prevailed firſt among the Chaldeans, we ſhall endeavour to trace the progreſs of this art through ſome other nations of antiquity, till we bring it to Greece, where it was carried to the higheſt perfection to which it has yet attained.

The firſt intimation that we have of the art of ſculp­ture is in the book of Geneſis, where we are informed, that when Jacob, by the divine command, was return­ing to Canaan, his wife Rachel carried along with her the teraphim or idols of her father. Theſe we are aſſured were ſmall, since Rachel found it ſo easy to con­ceal them from her father, notwithſtanding his anxious ſearch. We are ignorant, however, how theſe images were made, or of wſhat materials they were compoſed. The firſt perſon mentioned as an artiſt of eminence is Bezaleel, who formed the cherubims which covered the mercy-feat.

The Egyptians alſo cultivated the art of ſculpture; but there were two circumſtances that obſtructed its progreſs, 1. The perſons of the Egyptians were not poſſeſſed of the graces of form, of elegance, or of ſymmetry; and of conſequence they had no perfect ſtandard
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