ing a little ; the position is stiff and unnatural. In sitting figures the legs are parallel, the feet squeezed together, and the arms fixed to the sides ; but in the figures of wo­men the left arm is folded across the breast ; the bones and muscles are faintly discernible ; the eyes are flat and look­ing obliquely, and the eyebrows sunk,—features which de­stroy entirely the beauty of the head ; the cheek-bones are high, the chin small and piked ; the ears are generally placed higher than in nature, and the feet are too large and flat. In short, if we are to look for any model in the statues of Egypt, it is not for the model of beauty, but of deformity. The statues of men are naked, only they have a short apron, and a few folds of drapery surrounding their waist. The vestments of women are only distinguishable by the bor­der, which rises a little above the surface of the statue. In this age it is evident the Egyptians knew little of drapery.

Of the second style of sculpture practised amongst the Egyptians, Winckelman thinks he has found specimens in the two figures of basaltes in the Capitol, and in another figure at the Villa Albani, the head of which has been re­newed. The first two of these, he remarks, bear visible traces of the former style, which appear especially in the form of the mouth and the shortness of the chin. The hands possess more elegance ; and the feet are placed at a greater distance from each other than was customary in more ancient times. In the first and third figures the arms hang down close to the sides; in the second they hang more freely. Winckelman suspects that these three statues were made after the conquest of Egypt by the Greeks. They are clothed with a tunic, a robe, and a mantle. The tunic, which is puckered into many folds, descends from the neck to the ground. The robe in the first and third statues seems close to the body, and is only perceptible by some little folds. It is tied under the breast, and covered by the mantle, the two buttons of which are placed under the epaulette.

The Egyptian statues were not only formed by the chisel ; they were also polished with great care. Even those on the summit of an obelisk, which could only be viewed at a distance, were finished with as much labour and care as if they had admitted a close inspection. As they are gene­rally executed in granite or basalt, stones of a very hard tex­ture, it is impossible not to admire the indefatigable patience of the artists. The eye was often of different materials from the rest of the statue ; sometimes it was composed of a pre­cious stone or metal. We are assured that the valuable dia­mond of an empress of Russia, the largest and most beau­tiful hitherto known, formed one of the eyes of the famous statue of Scheringham in the temple of Brahma.

Herodotus mentions two Egyptian statues, one placed before the temple of Vulcan at Memphis, the other in the city of Sais by king Amasis, each of which was seventy-five feet long. The colossal sphinx near the great pyramid rises twenty-five feet. The sitting statues of Memnon, the mo­ther and son of Osmandue, at Thebes, are each fifty-eight feet high. To these we might add a number of similar works known by remaining fragments, or described by authors. Most of the great works of the Egyptians were executed in the reign of Sesostris, who lived in the time of Reho- boam king of Israel, a thousand years before the Christian era, which shows that the arts of Egypt and of Greece were in a progressive state of improvement at the same time.

The enormous works of Egypt have struck foreign visi­ters with wonder and awe, from Herodotus down to the members of the French Institute. Herodotus says “ one of their buildings is equal to many of the most considerable Greek buildings taken together and M. Ripaud observes, “ these works are so prodigious, they make every thing we do look little.” The Egyptians had notions of durability in their works which no other nation has succeeded in imi­tating: they seemed to work as if they laughed at time,

war, barbarism. Quantity was every thing with them, or almost so ; quality but little. They washed to please them­selves and astonish posterity, and they succeeded.

The ancient authors who give the most satisfactory ac­counts of Egyptian antiquities are, Herodotus, Diodorus Siculus, Josephus, Strabo, Clemens of Alexandria, Jambli- cus, and Orus Apollo. Among the modern writers, we may mention Pocock, Savary, Norden, and Denon, as wor­thy of perusal on this subject.

The Phcenicians possessed both a character and a situa­tion highly favourable to the cultivation of statuary. They had beautiful models in their own persons, and their indus­trious character qualified them to attain perfection in every art for which they had a taste. Their situation raised a spirit of commerce, and commerce induced them to culti­vate the arts. Their temples shone with statues and co­lumns of gold, and a profusion of emeralds was everywhere scattered about. All the great works of the Phcenicians have been unfortunately destroyed ; but many of the Car­thaginian medals are still preserved, ten of which are de­posited in the cabinet of Florence. But though the Car­thaginians were a colony of Phcenicians, we cannot from their works judge of the merit of their ancestors.

The Persians made no distinguished figure in the arts of design. They were indeed sensible to the charms of beauty, but they did not study to imitate them. Their dress, which consisted of long flowing robes concealing the whole person, prevented them from attending to thu beau­ties of form. Their religion, too, which taught them to worship the divinity in the emblem of fire, and that it was impious to represent him under a human form, seemed al­most to prohibit the exercise of this art, by taking away those motives which alone could give it dignity and value ; and as it was not customary among them to raise statues to great men, it was impossible that statuary could flourish in Persia.

The Etrurians, or ancient Tuscans, in the opinion of Winc- kelman, carried this art to some degree of perfection at an earlier period than the Greeks. It is said to have been in­troduced before the siege of Troy by Dædalus, who, in or­der to escape the resentment of Minos king of Crete, took refuge in Sicily, whence he passed into Italy, where be left many monuments of his art. Pausanias and Diodorus Si­culus inform us, that some works ascribed to him were to be seen when they wrote ; and that these possessed that character of majesty which afterwards distinguished the la­bours of Etruria.

A character strongly marked forms tl∣e chief distinction in those productions of Etruria which have descended to our times. Their style was indeed hard and overcharged ; for it is not to be supposed that a people of such rude man­ners as the Etrurians could communicate to their works that vividness and beauty which the elegance of Grecian manners inspired. On the other hand, there are many of the Tuscan statues which bear so close a resemblance to those of Greece, that antiquaries have thought it probable that they were conveyed from that country, or Magna Græcia, into Etruria, about the time of the Roman con­quest, when Italy was adorned with the spoils of Greece.

Among the monuments of Etrurian art two different styles have been observed. In the first the lines are straight, the attitude stiff, and no idea of beauty appears in the for­mation of the head. The contour is not well rounded, and the figure is too slender. The head is oval, the chin piked, the eyes flat, and looking asquint. These are the defects of an art in the state of infancy, which an accomplished mas­ter could never fall into, and are equally conspicuous in Gothic statues as in the productions of the ancient natives of Florence. They resemble so much the style of the Egyptians, that one is almost induced to suppose that there had once been a communication between these two