



Bodleian Libraries

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

This book is part of the collection held by the Bodleian Libraries and scanned by Google, Inc. for the Google Books Library Project.

For more information see:

<http://www.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/dbooks>



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 2.0 UK: England & Wales (CC BY-NC-SA 2.0) licence.

STRICTURES
ON
AN ARTICLE
OF
THE MONTHLY REVIEW

UPON
DR. GRAY'S PUBLICATION,

ENTITLED
*The Connexion between sacred and profane
Literature :*

WITH
Illustrations of that Work,
PARTICULARLY ON THE SUBJECT OF THE ZEND-AVESTA.

BY A GRADUATE M.A. OF OXFORD.

“ Absentem——amicum
“ Qui non defendit, alio culpante——
“ ——hic niger est; hunc tu Romane saveto.”—HOR. SER. 1—4.

London :
PRINTED FOR JOHN HATCHARD,
BOOKSELLER TO THE QUEEN,
NO. 190, OPPOSITE ALBANY, PICCADILLY.
1818.

Price Two Shillings.



S. Gosnell, Printer, Little Queen Street, London.

STRICTURES

AND

ILLUSTRATIONS.

To censure seems to be an employment congenial to a reviewer, but the inclination may be indulged without malignity. An author who has carried on an extensive work, "amidst many avocations, and "at a distance from the press" (Con.* p. 4), must be sensible of an obligation to any one who points out to him those blemishes in it,

*" quas aut incuria fudit,
" Aut humana parum cavit natura."*

But when imaginary blemishes are likewise held up to public notice, and the rules of fair criticism are made to yield to a captious spirit, prone to illiberal insinuation and ungenerous sarcasm, the public has a right to disclaim on his behalf any obligation, and to consider him as aggrieved and contumeliously treated. These observations have been suggested by an article lately published in the Monthly Review. Of the justness of them, as they

* The abbreviations "Con." and "M. R." refer to the "Con-nexion" and "Monthly Review for November 1817."

apply in the present case, sufficient proof shall be given.

At the close of a preamble descriptive of some considerable difficulties which obviously lie in the way of an author who takes in hand a work like that about to be examined, the reviewer begins his critique by a charge of a general nature, which, with the change of words only, is repeated in the same page, that in "the treatise now under consideration" there is a "want of a judicious estimate of the force of the proofs of preceding authors." (M. R. p. 245.) With respect to this charge, it might be shortly replied, that it was incumbent upon the reviewer to substantiate it more convincingly than in the instance quoted, which is wholly inapposite*. But, nevertheless, let the

* The reviewer endeavours to found his charge upon these words of Dr. Gray: "Forming our opinion of Orpheus from what is quoted by ancient writers, and not attempting to discriminate what is genuine from what is spurious, we may consider him as having discovered and published some intimations of revealed truth, amidst the delusions of Polytheism." (Con. p. 367—M. R. p. 245.) An impartial reader would be led to reflect from these words, that in the instance of Orpheus and of the fragments which go under his name, "an estimate of the force of the proofs of preceding authors" would be morally impossible. This is actually the case. There is no inquiry into Grecian antiquities more confused and obscure than that which relates to the person of Orpheus and the fragments which ought to be ascribed to him. Dr. G. does not "attempt" to disperse a darkness that may be felt; or *nicely* "to discriminate what is genuine from what is spurious," without sufficient knowledge for such discrimi-

charge be fairly met and answered. It is not reasonable, in a work so complicated and of such extent as that of Dr. G. to expect uniformly "an estimate of the force of the proofs of preceding authors." These proofs are frequently

mination. He is satisfied with bringing forward respecting Orpheus and his supposed fragments, "what is quoted by ancient writers," without sitting in exact judgment upon their reports. He could not refrain from bringing forward such reports under the head of Orpheus; but he attaches little value to them, he builds no argument upon them, he draws no conclusions from them. He has not, however, omitted (Con. p. 370) to mention the rule by which Cudworth has endeavoured to throw some light upon the subject of the supposed fragments of Orpheus, viz. to insist "only upon those passages which are attested by heathen writers:" and the prominent truths which Dr. Gray brings forward, as taught by Orpheus, the unity, self-existence, omnipotence, spirituality, and omnipresence of God, are attested, agreeably to this rule, by Justin and Proclus, both of them heathen writers. (Con. pp. 369. 370.) But, continues the reviewer, "of what value, we would ask, can the Orphic verses be to Dr. Gray's argument, when it is not ascertained whether they were the work of a poet older than Homer, or a Pythagorean philosopher, or a Christian, assuming the name of Orpheus to give the greater force to his testimony against Paganism?" (M. R. p. 245.) Dr. G. though he considers the Orphic verses as being of little value to his argument, nevertheless states, upon the best authority, that of Herodotus, that they were the work of a poet later than Homer (Con. p. 366); and, accordingly, in his volume, the chapter on Orpheus follows that on Homer. On the other hand, the prominent truths in the Orphic verses (quoted by Dr. G.), being attested by *heathen* writers, the conclusion hereby suggested to his readers is obvious, that at least the most important fragments of the verses, in which these truths occur, were not the work of a *Christian*.

of a nature too evanescent; or they can scarcely be traced at all through the thick obscurity which envelops an inquiry: sometimes they rest upon the authority of a fragment of a single author, whose entire works are lost, and whose veracity must be taken upon credit; often they are not of sufficient moment to reward a laboured estimate of their value. In any one of these cases, it may be expected of a writer that he should bring forward the bare proofs, in their native state, without consuming his labour, and wearying his readers, with elaborate discussions upon their force, for which he has not satisfactory data, or which would not be of adequate importance. This Dr. Gray has done. But, although he has avoided the encumbering with such discussions a work planned, not, as the reviewer seems to imagine, for the profound scholar, solely or chiefly, but to be a popular compendium for the youth of the universities, to supply them with materials, for their profitable study, and for further inquiry (Con. pp. 4. 6); yet, in drawing any conclusions, he constantly keeps in view the grounds upon which these proofs rest. Commonly he draws no conclusion at all from *them*; and never any conclusion of importance to his argument. Wheresoever any proofs cannot be fully substantiated; documents of history cannot be well authenticated; coincidences between the sacred text and passages from a heathen author cannot be sufficiently established;—he considers himself obliged, by the plan of his work, if they have any bearing upon it, to bring

them forward in their original shape; and generally he waves a useless discussion about them; but he does not attribute any weight to them, in his mass of "evidence, in confirmation of the truth of revealed religion." They are simply mentioned, and passed by, as being (however curious) destitute of a proper foundation. It is a misrepresentation to affirm, with the reviewer, that Dr. G. acts in this way to, "excuse himself from the labour of investigating the authenticity of doubtful documents, or the reality of supposed coincidences." (M. R. p. 245.) From a "labour" of this kind, which would either have proved fruitless, or of inadequate result, or which would have led him far beyond the limits of a popular work, he has discreetly "excused himself;" but from any important or reasonable "labour" of the kind he has not shrunk*. It is equally a misrepresentation of the reviewer, to assert that Dr. Gray brings forward "the groundless fancies of former writers" as "matters of fact." (M. R. p. 245.) If he has at any time brought forward any such fancies, or has himself indulged in any, he has commonly attributed them to their respective authors, or he has set a mark upon them (one of the instances noted by the reviewer excepted, M. R. p. 249—Con. p. 73), by using expressions implying doubt or conjecture: and, further, they are in every instance only slightly noticed, *in trans*

* The elaborate investigations to be met with in pp. 296—299. 310—321. 390—396. of the *Connexion*, occur to the writer at this moment. They are quite apposite, and well deserving of attention.

itu, and no value whatsoever is assigned to them in his argument*. These general remarks in reply to a charge which implicates the conduct of the work under review, will receive much confirmation in the course of these pages.—The reviewer, however, does not yet quit the subject. In his judgment “the arrangement, according to which the coincidences between Jewish and Heathen writers and Scripture are produced in the first half of the volume, and an account of these writers is given in the second, should have been inverted.” (M. R. p. 245.) It should seem sufficiently obvious, that “the first half of the volume,” containing “coincidences between Jewish and Heathen writers and Scripture,” classed un-

* Let the reader judge whether the following instances, which the reviewer stigmatizes as “fancied coincidences,” and which, with the single exception above mentioned, are all of the kind that he has selected from the work of Dr. Gray, be not marked by expressions of doubt, which would be inconsistent with “matters of fact:”

“The Romans, it appears, sent ambassadors to Athens to receive advice in the formation of their judicial code; and by these means they *might have* obtained Hebrew precepts.” (M. R. p. 251—Con. p. 105, where Dr. G. alludes to the circumstance that the Greeks “borrowed some of their laws from those of sacred authority.”)

“Horace *seems* to allude to the laws of the Decalogue when he describes men in the earlier periods of civilization as building cities, and enacting laws against thefts, robberies, and adulteries.” (Ibid.)

“Semiramis is related to have protected pigeons, with *some* reference to Noah’s dove.” (M. R. p. 251—Con. p. 149.)—This last instance is not *sufficiently* marked.

der general heads, would have been encumbered by "an account of" particular "writers;" which, therefore, "is given," with propriety, "in the second half, in which coincidences peculiar to each writer are mentioned.

To pass from the observations of the reviewer on the conduct of the work, to those which he makes on its parts, it will be necessary to follow the course of his argument from the page so often quoted (M. R. p. 245), and to note the several passages wherein he has hazarded a petty or unfounded criticism, or he has given way to gross mis-statement, illiberal insinuation, or ungenerous sarcasm. An instance of petty criticism occurs at the foot of p. 245 (M. R.). But to proceed to more important matters.

On Chapter III. "devoted to Zoroaster and the religion of the ancient Persians," the reviewer observes, "Dr. Gray *decides* him to have been the contemporary of Hystaspes, the father of Darius, and to have borrowed his most remarkable doctrines from the Jews of the captivity." (M. R. p. 247.) Dr. G. has admitted into his text (Con. p. 46) this popular tradition respecting Zoroaster, current both in the East and in Greece, upon the authority of Hyde (De Rel. vet. Pers. pp. 277, 292, 312, 318), Prideaux (Con. Part I. b. 4), and Richardson (Diss. p. 74*).

* The concurrence of the Eastern writers with those of Greece in assigning the same period to Zoroaster, is remarkable. Ri-

Notwithstanding such high authority, so cautious is he of speaking positively upon a doubtful point, that he does not *decide* the fact to be as they report, if we may judge from his own words: “*More correct accounts* represent him (Zoroaster) to have “*flourished towards the conclusion* of the empire of “the Medes; *some* imagining that he enjoyed the “favour of *Cyrus*, and established his religion in “the reign of *Darius Hystaspes*.” — “*Possibly*,” adds Dr. G. “he might have lived with one of those “who partook of the captivity.” And again: “*All that appears indisputable* is, that he was intimately “acquainted with the history and religion of the “Jews.” (Con. pp. 44, 45.) This is not the language of *decision*, but (in despite of the reviewer’s remarks, p. 4 of this tract) of judicious investigation.

“The author’s account of the Zend-Avesta, the “supposed code of Zoroaster’s laws and doctrines, “is very imperfect and unsatisfactory.” (M. R. p. 247.) This charge involving a discussion of no ordinary interest, it will be excusable to reply to it somewhat at length. There are but two sources from which “the author” could derive an “account

Richardson, in the Proofs and Illustrations to his Persian Dictionary, p. 74, says of him—“The greater number of Eastern writers “make him cotemporary” (contemporary) “with Kishtasb, King “of Persia, and consequently suppose him to have lived about five “hundred years before the Christian era.” At that time the revolt of the Ionians from Darius Hystaspes is recorded in Grecian history.

“ of the Zend-Avesta.” 1st, Certain fragments of the doctrines said to have been contained in the original Zend-Avesta, which are brought forward in the works of Hyde, Pococke, and Prideaux*. 2d, A supposed copy of the whole work brought from India by Anquetil du Perron, oriental interpreter to Louis XV. King of France. The “ account of the “ Zend-Avesta” given by Dr. Gray is drawn from the first of these sources only. In order to refute the charge of the reviewer, that this “ account is very “ imperfect and unsatisfactory,” it is necessary to prove that the second of these sources is a source *too corrupt to be relied upon*; and that Dr. G. has drawn from the first source *so far as sound judgment would allow*. To prove that the second of these sources, viz. a supposed copy of the whole Zend-Avesta, brought from India by Anquetil du Perron, is *too corrupt to be relied upon*, Dr. G. has recourse to the authority of Richardson, who, in the dissertation to his Persian Dictionary, declares, that “ the publications of Anquetil du Perron carry “ palpable marks of the total or partial fabrication “ of modern times;” and that, “ upon the whole, M. “ Anquetil has made no discovery which can stamp “ his publications with the least authority.” (Diss. pp. 5, 6.) The reviewer endeavours to shake the force of this testimony of Richardson, by urging that, “ whatever may be the oriental learning of this

* Hyde De Rel. vet. Pers.—Pococke, Specimen Hist. Arab.—Prideaux, Connexion.

“ author, his judgment on a point of historical cri-
 “ ticism will not be very highly valued by those who
 “ recollect, that, on the authority of the broken and
 “ fabulous annals of Persia, he would deny the rea-
 “ lity of the most strongly attested facts of Grecian
 “ history.” (M. R. p. 248.) This assertion con-
 tains a *petitio principii*. It assumes that the authen-
 ticity of M. Anquetil’s Zend-Avesta is “ *a point of*
 “ *historical criticism.*” It is strictly a point of phi-
 lology, and of plain common sense. The authenti-
 city of that work must be established by showing it
 to be, either *a copy of the code of Zoroaster*; or (ad-
 mitting the interpretation of the reviewer, M. R. p.
 249), “ *an acknowledged system of the doctrine at-*
 “ *tributed to him.*” That it is not *a copy of the code*
of Zoroaster, is evident from certain peculiarities of
 the language in which it is written, which are ob-
 viously matters of philology, and respecting which
 the “ oriental learning” of Richardson will render
 his “ judgment” to be “ very highly valued.” The
 Zend-Avesta, or code of Zoroaster, was written in
 the ancient Persian dialect called the Zend, confess-
 edly a dialect long since extinct: but in the Zend-
 Avesta of M. Anquetil may be detected,—1st, The
 intrusion of a number of Arabic words; whereas
 no Arabic was introduced into the Persian idiom
 earlier than the seventh century of the Christian era:
 2d, The introduction of a sound like the English *th*,
 with a strong aspiration, in numerous words, to
 which sound the Persians entertain the greatest
 aversion, and which is not expressed by any charac-

ter, either in the old dialects of Persia—called the Parsi or Farsi, and the Pehlavi, which M. Anquetil allows to have been formed from the Zend—nor in the more modern Persian: 3d, A complete radical dissimilitude between the Zend, in which it is supposed to be written, and the modern dialect of Persia—a circumstance which all observation declares to be impossible, had it ever existed as an ancient Persian idiom. (Richardson, Diss. pp. 5, 6.) It is not reasonable to conclude, that a work bearing such palpable marks of modern, and, comparatively speaking, of recent innovation, should be *a copy of the ancient code of Zoroaster*. That it is not “*an acknowledged system of the doctrine attributed to him,*” appears from the character of the work as to its matter, which is strictly a point of plain common sense. Richardson remarks, that the religion of Zoroaster, as it appears in that work, is of “*uncommon stupidity;*” that it abounds with the “*most jejune puerilities, without one ray of genius*” to rescue it from contempt, without a sentiment “*that could elevate the soul, or give one dignified idea of Omnipotence.*” Its claim is to “*disgrace the human understanding;*” and a specimen of it from one of the books of the work (the Vendidad Sade), given in his Proofs and Illustrations, from the translation of *M. Anquetil* (by no means, says Richardson, selected as the worst), is sufficient to check all desire of reading more concerning it. (Diss. pp. 6. 75.) To this report of the character of the Zend-Avesta of M. Anquetil as to its matter, that of M. Anquetil himself may be added, which must be

decisive, and which is highly creditable to his veracity and candour. Speaking of the books of Zoroaster, he says, "Le peu de vérités qu'ils renferment, est comme absorbé dans une multitude de ce qu'on appelle petites d'esprit; ils sont fades, ridicules, aussi mal raisonnés que l'Alcoran, aussi ennuyeux et aussi dégoûtans que le Sad-der*." M. de Voltaire, who, before he had read the translation of them by M. Anquetil, had spoken of the books of Zoroaster in unmeasured terms of approbation, "Ces livres sont les plus anciens livres du monde, et les écrits incontestablement authentiques du législateur des Perses," describes them, after having read that translation somewhat more correctly, as "suppositious works, composed subsequently to the time of Zoroaster, and very unworthy of the name which they bear;" in a word, "Un fatras abominable, dont on ne peut lire deux pages sans avoir pitié de la nature humaine." (Lettres de quelques Juifs à M. de Voltaire, tom. ii. p. 220.) Is it possible to consider such a work as this to be "*an acknowledged system of the doctrine attributed to Zoroaster,*" who was highly celebrated for his wisdom by the most sagacious nations of antiquity, and whose doctrine was eagerly and rapidly embraced by the highest in rank and the wisest men of the Persian empire †? Who

* A Compendium of the Precepts and Rules of the modern Magians.

† Zoroastris, (Viri, omnium consensu, doctissimi.) Hyde, p. 26.

can think of gravely making the authenticity of such a work "*a point of historical criticism*" (M. R. p. 248), without a sense of the ridiculous in his mind? What matters it whether "Kleuker," or any other learned personage, "has shown that this volume has been received from time immemorial, both by the Ghebers of Persia and the Parsis of Guzzerat, as the canonical code of their doctrines, ritual, and forms of prayer?" (M. R. p. 248.) Such a defence of the work only adds the sanction of antiquity to absurdity; and what remains but to grieve over the imbecility of human nature? Upon the whole, then, it appears, that the authenticity of M. Anquetil's Zend-Avesta is not "*a point of historical criticism,*" but strictly *a point of philology, and of plain common sense*; that it cannot be established, by showing the work to be either *a copy of the code of Zoroaster*, or "*an acknowledged system of the doctrine attributed to him;*" and that the testimony of Richardson may be adopted, that "the publications of Anquetil du Perron carry palpable marks" (both as to the language in which they are written and as to their matter) "of the total or partial fabrication of modern times;" in a word, that "M. Anquetil has made no discovery which can stamp his publications with the least authority." (Diss. pp. 5, 6.) Dr. Gray has adopted this testimony, and upon the strength of it has concluded that the supposed copy of the ancient Zend-Avesta brought from India by Anquetil du Perron is a source *too corrupt to be relied upon*. It remains to be proved, in order to refute the charge of the reviewer, that

Dr. G. has drawn his "account of the Zend-Avesta" from another source, (viz. certain fragments of the doctrines said to have been contained in the original Zend-Avesta, which are brought forward in the works of Hyde, Pococke, and Prideaux,) *so far as sound judgment would allow*. The rule which he has observed is this: wheresoever Hyde, who refers to MSS. in his possession *, states any doctrine to have been derived from Zoroaster, or any two of these authors † coincide in a similar statement, Dr. G. has inserted the doctrine in question in his text, as far as the limits of a single chapter would admit. (Con. p. 49—54.) Hyde, indeed, brings forward, besides fragments of doctrine, extracts from the Sad-der, or compendium of the precepts and rules of the modern Magians. Dr. G. very slightly mentions this work, with the addition of Richardson's character of it, who describes it as consisting of "the wretched rhymes of a modern Parsi priest who lived about three centuries ago." (Diss. p. 4.) It would have been easy to swell out an "account of the Zend-Avesta" from such a spurious production: Dr. G. has shown his judgment by his forbearance. From all that has been said, the clear and just inference may be drawn, that inasmuch as, of two

* Hyde—Epist Dedicat, Præfatio. p. 5, et p. 344.

† Hyde, Pococke, and Prideaux, refer not only to Greek and Latin authors, but to original Eastern writers: Shahrastani, "De Religionibus Orientis Arabicè conscript."—Abulfeda—Gjannabius—and others. M. Anquetil admits that his Zend-Avesta does not include all the works of Zoroaster; and that the Eastern writers quoted by Hyde may have seen some works of that lawgiver in Persia which are not known in India.

sources from which Dr. G. could derive an "account of the Zend-Avesta," the one is a source *too corrupt to be relied upon*, and the other has been applied to *so far as sound judgment would allow*, "the account" which he has actually given "of the Zend-Avesta, the supposed code of Zoroaster's laws and doctrines, is" neither "*imperfect*" nor "*unsatisfactory*:" and that the reviewer has shown a want of candour, and perhaps of judgment, in hazarding an opposite assertion. (M. R. p. 247.)—There is considerable unfairness, and positive inconsistency, in the language of the reviewer upon other points connected with this subject. "The single circumstance," says he, "that the real Zend-Avesta" (i. e. of M. Anquetil) "is written in a language which, like the Sanscrit and the Bali, has long been extinct, and is preserved only by the sacred writings, which are composed in it, is sufficient to prove that it can be no modern forgery." (M. R. p. 248.) This is to throw dust in the eyes of his readers. He keeps out of sight the strong circumstance, that this *antiquated* language is marked by such *modern* peculiarities, as to compel Richardson to affirm that it resembles "a *Lingua Franca*, a language culled from the dialects of every surrounding country, grouped together with little pretensions to grammatical propriety." (Diss. p. 6.) Is it not also inconsistent, and even absurd, to advance that "the Zend-Avesta loses *nothing* of its interest as a document for the history of language, though it be not the work of Zoroaster, but only an acknow-

“ledged system of the doctrine attributed to him?” (M. R. pp. 248, 249.) It must be obvious, that it would be a far more important “document for the “history of language,” if it could be proved to be the one rather than the other. It has been proved to be neither. Having assumed (as was above mentioned) that the Zend-Avesta of M. Anquetil is the *real* Zend-Avesta, he taxes Dr. G. with “repeating the groundless tales of Zoroaster having mentioned Joseph, Moses, and Solomon, and transcribing” (transcribed) “the Psalms of David, things of which not a vestige occurs in the *real* Zend-Avesta,” instead of comparing “the slavish principles of government, the absurd estimate of the morality of actions, and the vain repetitions of the Median prophet, with the institutions of Moses, and the ethical and devotional books of the Old Testament.” (M. R. p. 249.) The accounts repeated by Dr. G. rest upon the authority of Hyde, Prideaux, and the Abbé Foucher*, they are not therefore “groundless tales;” they are only hinted at in the most cursory manner; and if the *real* Zend-Avesta of M. Anquetil were made the test of their truth, doubt would stand corrected by falsehood. Of course Dr. Gray will be excused for having neglected to compare any “slavish principles,” “absurd morality,” or “vain repetitions,” of *that* work with the “institutions” or “books of the Old Testament.” He would have undertaken an endless and useless

* Hyde Præfat. p. 5.—Prideaux (Con. Part I. b. 4.)—Mém. de l'Acad. des Belles Lettres, tome xxvii.

task, and one not very agreeable to "a man of industry and piety," however it may be so to one, like "Priestley," of "a philosophical mind." (M. R. pp. 245. 249.) It is remarkable, that the reviewer admits enough with respect to the work, to convince any reasonable person, that the *real* Zend-Avesta is utterly unworthy of being considered either as a copy of the code of Zoroaster, or as an acknowledged system of the doctrine attributed to that law-giver, whose wisdom was famed not only in the East, but amongst the Grecian nations. His explanation of the meaning of the name Zend-Avesta, as "the living word, *i. e.* of Zoroaster, or of Ormuzd, speaking by him" (M. R. p. 247), instead of that of the "Fire-kindler," repeated by Dr. Gray from Hyde, is probably correct, and is curious as being synonymous with the designation, "Word of God," applied to the sacred Scriptures.—This article may be concluded by the observation, that although the Zend-Avesta brought from India by Anquetil du Perron cannot be considered in any other point of view than as a forgery, yet there is still a prospect that fragments at least of the original work may be brought to light. Hyde professed to have MSS. in his possession which he considered as fragments of the work of Zoroaster; and which must not be confounded with his extracts from the *Sad-der* before mentioned. It may be observed, that the words which Hyde uses with respect to them, would lead his readers to think that they were, as to the *language* as well as to their matter,

copied from the genuine Zend-Avesta of Zoroaster.
 “ In vetustissimis exemplaribus, non sunt admixtæ
 “ voces exoticæ, sed omnia purâ putâ linguâ veteri
 “ exarata sunt.” (Hyde, p. 342, et Præfat. p. 5.)

To take up again the thread of the review at p. 249 (M. R.)—Reviewers are in the habit of giving “specimens of an author’s *manner* ;” but in this page a favourable specimen occurs of the reviewer’s *manner*, of the slight which he and his philosophical school often put upon the sacred authority of Scripture. Speaking of the sapphire image of truth which was worn about the neck by the president of the Egyptian tribunal, and the urim and thummim of the Jewish high-priest—“ If any connexion,” says he, “ subsists between them, it is much more likely (as Marsham and Spencer maintain) that the urim and thummim was borrowed from “ Egypt.” A sufficient refutation of this hypothesis of Marsham and Spencer, served up as a “crambe recocta” by the reviewer, may be found in Exod. chap. xxviii. ver. 30* ; nor can it for a moment be supposed, by any one but a sceptic in the authority of Scripture, that the Most High would condescend to imitate the religious customs of a foreign nation ; and much less that he would borrow a most mys-

* “ And thou shalt put in the breastplate of judgment the
 “ urim and the thummim ; and they shall be upon Aaron’s heart
 “ when he goeth in before the Lord : and Aaron shall bear the
 “ judgment of the children of Israel upon his heart before the
 “ Lord continually.”

terious institution, and one likely to lead directly to idolatry, but for its divine origin, from a nation so grossly idolatrous as the Egyptian.

The reviewer continues: " In the next paragraph we are told, without reference to any authority, that it was related in the books of the priests, that an Egyptian was killed by the words of Moses." (Con. p. 74.—M. R. p. 249.) The authority required is in Clemens Alexandrinus, Strom. lib. i. cap. 23: " Φασὶ δὲ οἱ μύσαι*." The same relation is given from Artapanus by Eusebius (Præp. Evang. lib. ix. cap. 27):—" A few pages farther on," he adds, " we are informed that Manetho was an Egyptian writer, conversant with the Greek language, who professed to have compiled his chronicle faithfully from the Scriptures" (Con. p. 78); " an extraordinary profession on the part of a priest of Heliopolis." (M. R. pp. 249, 250.) The language which Dr. Gray uses respecting Manetho may be incorrect; but it is coarse and unfounded abuse to insinuate, as the reviewer does, p. 250, that it is incorrect because Dr. G. has consulted the Latin. The Latin, " E sacris interpretatus libris," is a fair translation of the Greek text; but Dr. G. has precipitately confined the meaning of the *Greek* of Josephus †: " He has written the history

* " Μύσαι." Qui admittuntur ad sacrorum arcana.—*Steph. Thes.*

† Γεγραφε γαρ Ελλαδι φωνῇ την πατριον ιστοριαν, εκ τε των ιερῶν, ὡς φησιν αὐτος, μετὰ φρασας.—*Joseph. Cont. Apion. lib. i. 14.*

“ of his own country in the Greek language, having “ literally translated it *from sacred* (books),” to the sacred books *of the Scriptures* alone. That the sacred books *of the Scriptures* are *included* in the Greek words “ ἐκ τε των ἱερῶν,” *from sacred* (books), is unquestionable; since Josephus, in the same chapter in which these words occur (Cont. Apion. lib. i. cap. 14), has this remarkable passage: “ Manetho, “ in his *Egyptiaca*” (History of his own Country), “ says, that this nation” (that of the Jews), “ who “ are called shepherds, are described as captives, “ ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς αὐτων βίβλοις, *in their own sacred “ books.*” “ An extraordinary profession on the part of a priest of Heliopolis!” (M. R. p. 250.) Let it be observed, too, that Manetho lived in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, by whose mandate the translation of the Septuagint was made; therefore he could borrow as freely from the sacred books *of the Scriptures*, as from those of his native country. Perhaps the reviewer, in sneering illiberally at another, did not recollect these circumstances, which at least qualify the incorrect language of Dr. G.

It would appear from the words of the reviewer in the same page (M. R. p. 250), that Dr. G. had admitted “ the narrative of the visit of Alexander to “ Jerusalem” without hesitation; whereas he observes (Con. p. 88), “ this account has been *disputed.*” But, to proceed at once to the examination of the most “ formidable objection against the narrative of

“Josephus,” which presents itself to the reviewer.—
 “All the historians of Alexander agree in representing him as going from Tyre to Gaza, without any mention of a visit to Jerusalem.” (M. R. p. 250.)
 May not this silence be accounted for by the well-known aversion of heathen historians to record any fact honourable to the Jewish nation? It is not reasonable to expect from them direct evidence in favour of such a fact. Indirect evidence may often be obtained; and this kind of evidence is the most unexceptionable. The statements of Arrian, Pliny, and Justin, referred to (Con. p. 89), supply this species of evidence, in the present instance. Arrian states (*De Exped. Alex.* l. ii. c. 25), that immediately after the storming of Tyre, Alexander planned an expedition into Egypt, “the other cities of that part of Syria called Palestine” (including therefore Jerusalem), “having already quietly surrendered to him.” This account proves little *per se*; but let it be coupled with that of Pliny (*Nat. Hist.* l. xii. c. 25), who, speaking of the balsam-tree, describes Alexander as “conducting his military affairs” in the district of Jericho, where the balsam-tree grew. Jericho was distant from Jerusalem only twenty-one miles. To these indirect testimonies add that of Justin (*lib. xi. c. 10*), who writes that Alexander went into Syria (of which Palestine is a part), “where many princes of the East met him, *cum infulis*, with their *mitres*,” as Dr. Gray translates the word “*infulis*,” and, as it will shortly appear, it should be translated. It follows,

then, that Alexander, after the storming of Tyre, was acknowledged at Jerusalem; that he was within twenty-one miles of that city; and that he received, about that time, a deputation of persons wearing a head-dress similar to that worn by the Jewish priests. Perhaps this indirect evidence, in confirmation of "the narrative of the visit of Alexander to Jerusalem," is as strong as could be expected from heathen historians. In the passage of Justin above quoted, the words "*cum infulis*" have been translated, agreeably to Dr. Gray's interpretation, "with their *mitres*." Upon this interpretation, however, the reviewer remarks, that Dr. G. "by translating *infulis* mitres, in a passage from Justin, destroys the support which this account gives to the narrative of Josephus. The *infula*, hung on a sceptre or an olive-branch, was the emblem of supplication" (II. A. 14—Æd. Tyran. 1. 3); "and Jaddua's" (the Jewish high-priest's) "appearance before Alexander in this character *may* be that to which Justin alludes." (M. R. p. 251.) A piece of groundless criticism this. It was unnecessary to quote Greek authors for the meaning of a Latin word. In the best Latin authors, "*infula*" means more often a sacred ornament or head-dress encircling the head, decorated by fillets, with labels hanging from it on each side of the face, than an "*emblem of supplication*:"

"Quoi simul infula virgineos circumdata comptus

"Ex utraque pari malarum parte profusa est."

Lucret. l. i. v. 88.

—“ stans hostia ad aram,
 “ Lanea dum nivea circumdatur infula vitta.”

Georg. iii. 486-7.

“ Nec procul Hæmonides, Phœbi, Triviæque sacerdos,
 “ Infula cui sacra redimibat tempora vitta.”

Æn. l. x. v. 537.

“ ‘ *Infula*,’ fascia in modum diadematum, a qua de-
 “ pendent vittæ ab utraque parte (*Stephens, Thes.*)”
 Hence it *may* be translated, “ *mitre* :” and that it
should be so translated, is evident from this circum-
 stance, that the word פָּנֵי, which is the original
 Hebrew of the head-dress or “ *infula*” of the high
 priest of the Jews, is rendered in the best English
 translations, by the word “ *mitre* ;” and by Taylor,
 in his Concordance, is translated, “ Turban or
 “ *mitre*.” See also Hale’s Analysis, vol. iii. p. 227.
 Dr. Gray, therefore, “ by translating *infulis, mitres*,
 “ in the passage from Justin,” is correct in his in-
 terpretation; and so far from destroying “ the sup-
 “ port which this account gives to the narrative of
 “ Josephus,” he fully avails himself of it. But it
 seems that the reviewer had resolved that (Jaddua),
 the high priest of the Jews, should appear before
 Alexander in the “ character” of a *suppliant*; and
 therefore it “ *may* be that to which Justin alludes.”

In this page (M. R. p. 251), certain errors of the
 press are noted; and Dr. Gray cannot object to the
 exposure of the negligence of his printer, which
 must have considerably exercised his patience. In

the Connexion (pp. 148, 149), for "Persepolis" read "Panopolis;" for "the Thessalonians" read "the Thessalians." To bring under one head, all the observations of the reviewer in this matter of errata, in pp. 414. 416. 418 of the Connexion, for "Hippolitus" read "Hippolytus;" and for "Bachus" read "Bacchæ." In the note of Con. p. 497, for "Nicad. Theschlin," read "Nicolaus Frischlinus." The illiberal insinuation thrown out in remarking one of these errata, is undeserving of notice.—To return to p. 251 of the review. "Aristotle is said to speak of the effects of the deluge in Epirus; whereas the fact is, that he explains the story of a deluge from the overflowings of the Achelöus; and the *Thessalians*, not the *Thessalonians*, were the people who believed it to have prevailed in their country: the passage of Servius, cited by Dr. Gray, says nothing either of the one or the other." (M. R. p. 251.) There is a gross misrepresentation in the first portion of this sentence. Aristotle speaks of the effects of the deluge of Deucalion, which he says "spread widely in Greece, and especially in that part of it called ancient Hellas, which district is that round Dodona and the Achelöus."—"The deluge of Deucalion" has been considered by the best authors as a local tradition only of the *general* deluge; and the "district round Dodona," stretching towards the Achelöus, was a part of Epirus. (Cluv. lib. ii. c. 13.) "Aristotle may therefore be said to speak

“ of the effects of the deluge in Epirus*.” He then “ explains the story” of Deucalion’s deluge, or rather hints that it may be explained, “ from the “ overflowings of the Achelöus.” (Aristot. Meteorol. lib. i. c. 14.) The latter portion of the sentence contains an assertion which is untrue. “ The passage “ of Servius cited by Dr. Gray” in the *Connexion* (p. 149) mentions the Thessalian belief or tradition of the deluge. In the common Delphin edition of Virgil it begins thus, “ Pyrrha Deucalionis uxor fuit, “ quo apud Thessalos regnante, contigit diluvium.” (Ecl. vi. l. 41.) This piece of information must originally have come from the Thessalians; in a word, it is the belief or tradition of the Thessalians respecting the prevalence of a deluge in their country†. The reviewer continues, in the next line, “ The treatise *De Deâ Syriâ*, is not the work of “ Lucian.” (M. R. p. 251.) Possibly not. It has however always been classed amongst the works of Lucian. A careful investigation of such a matter was not in the scope of Dr. Gray’s work. “ The “ succeeding passage,” adds the reviewer, “ may “ vie with any in Bryant or Faber, &c.” The pas-

* The natives of Epirus suppose him (Deucalion) to have been of their country, and to have founded the ancient temple of Dodona.—(See Bryant’s *Mythol.* vol. ii. p. 237.)

† Bryant, speaking of “ the people of Thessaly,” who “ maintained, that Deucalion was exposed to a flood in their “ district,” quotes the same passage of Servius upon *Eclogue* vi. l. 41. He considered it therefore to be quite to the purpose. (*Mythol.* vol. ii. p. 237.)

sage occurs in the *Connexion* (p. 151), where it is only casually mentioned as a curious circumstance; and it is actually borrowed, with a trifling addition, from Bryant (*Mythol.* vol. ii. pp. 294. 296), whose remarks are grouped together, and his name mentioned, in the lines immediately preceding and connected with the passage.

In the next paragraph the reviewer has had the decency to bestow a meed of praise upon an eloquent passage extracted from the "Introduction to the account of the Classics." (*M. R.* p. 252. *Con.* pp. 326-7.) The passage presents a solitary instance of his impartiality, notwithstanding the usual plausible declaration, "we do not wish to exhibit only the unfavourable side of Dr. Gray's work." (*M. R.* p. 252.) The passage also conveys a very imperfect notion of the judgment with which, upon the whole, Dr. G. has collected the scattered rays of truth, which are blended with the mass of heathen literature, to illustrate both the necessity and the superiority of revealed religion, as the sun in the moral world, from whence all the heathen systems of morality and religion "draw light." To a fair and honest critic, the introduction of such a passage would have afforded occasion to refer the reader to the able parallel drawn between the Sacred Writings and the moral and religious opinions of the profound Philo*; to the account of the great Roman orator†; of the Roman

* *Con.* p. 255.

† *P.* 602.

republic in the chapter on Livy*; of the Epicurean system in that on Lucretius†; and of the system of the Stoics in that on Seneca‡. Probably, yet more favourable specimens of the author's manner might be pointed out: in particular the sketch of Heathen morality, compared with that of Revelation§; the summary of Heathen opinions respecting an atonement, prayer, and sacrifice||; and the original discussion, (on the probability that Josephus accompanied St. Paul in his Mediterranean voyage and shipwreck), which occurs in one of the chapters on Josephus¶. Some of these excellencies of Dr. Gray's work, could not have escaped the notice of one who did "not wish to exhibit only its unfavourable side;" nor would they have been deprived by a fair critic of their just tribute of applause**.

But even the small portion of praise doled out by the reviewer, is rendered unpalatable and disgusting by the ample measure of illiberal remark and gross misrepresentation with which it is coupled. Dr. G. observes, "It is not unreasonable to suppose, that translations of *a part* at least of the inspired books *might have been* made before the time of

* Con. p. 657.

† P. 593.

‡ P. 679.

§ P. 181.

|| P. 203.

¶ P. 310.—See also the chapter on Josephus, pp. 207—310.

** The merit of "Gray's Connexion" will not be fully understood, until the work shall be provided with a well-digested "Index rerum," in which the matter should be arranged under general heads, without regard to minutiae.

“Homer.” (Con. p. 363.) Upon this observation the reviewer sarcastically remarks: “The supposition is very prudently limited to a part of the Old Testament, since half of it was not extant in the time of Homer; though we doubt whether Dr. Gray has not escaped by accident rather than by design, from the absurdity of imagining a book to be translated before it was composed.” (M. R. p. 252.) Such an insinuation would have been illiberal, had it been directed against any other writer of name and note, but being directed against the writer of the “Key to the Old Testament,” it assumes the character of envious malignity, and is calculated to injure only its author. With respect to the observation which gave rise to it, it is avowedly conjectural, but neither absurdly nor unreasonably so. Clemens Alexandrinus expressly writes, that “the doings of the Hebrews in their departure from Egypt; the striking appearance (ἐπιφάνεια) of all things that befel them; their conquest of the land” (of Canaan); “and the detail (ἐπεξήγησις) of their whole legislation; have been translated by some other person before Demetrius” (Phalereus, who conducted the translation of the Septuagint). (Strom. lib. i. c. 22.) In the countries over which Solomon reigned, “from the river Euphrates to the border of Egypt,” various written languages must have been in use*, and “it is not unreasonable to

* “The use of letters in the East, I am persuaded, is of much greater antiquity than is generally supposed.—It is certain, not only that the Israelites had letters before the law, but that books

“suppose that translations of *a part* at least of the “inspired books” (ex. gr. of portions of the Pentateuch) “*might have been made*” into one of *these* languages during his reign, which fell out more than a century before the birth of Homer.—The instance of misrepresentation, of gross distortion of the meaning of words, which closely succeeds the passage last quoted, is of the most glaring and culpable kind. To use the words of the reviewer, “The writers of Scripture, he” (Dr. G.) “says, cannot have borrowed from Homer where they use “similar imagery, because they are older; and, to “exemplify this, in his note he compares passages “from the Iliad with quotations from Isaiah, Hosea, “Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, the eldest of whom prophesied a hundred years after Homer.” (M. R. p. 253.) Surely the most virulent accuser would have hesitated to bring a charge of such unmixed absurdity against an author of acknowledged ability and reputation; and would have concluded, which is the case, that the absurdity lay with himself, in mistaking the sense of a passage which is thus printed, even to the punctuation, in the Connexion (p. 363, where the note is attached to it): “There are “many other passages in Homer containing moral “reflections, images, and expressions, which have “a general resemblance to Scripture, but which “cannot be regarded as imitations of the heathen

and writing were in use in the days of Job, in that part of the country where Job and Balaam lived.”

HORSLEY on the Prophecies of the Messiah, pp. 95. 98.

“ poet, since they claim a superior antiquity, they
 “ may be considered therefore as general and casual
 “ coincidences.” The “*passages in Homer*” are evi-
 dently the subject of this sentence throughout; and
 of *them* it is predicated, that they “cannot be re-
 “ garded as imitations of the heathen poet, since
 “ *they*,” not *the writers of Scripture*, “claim a su-
 “ perior antiquity”—i. e. to passages resembling
 them in Scripture. It is therefore with the utmost
 propriety that Dr. G. “to exemplify this,” viz. the
 superior antiquity of the Homeric passages, “in his
 “ note compares passages from the Iliad with quo-
 “ tations from Isaiah, Hosea, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel,
 “ the eldest of whom prophesied a hundred years
 “ after Homer.” After the perusal of such a spec-
 imen of impotent criticism, who would not believe
 that a kind of poetical justice sometimes falls upon
 a reviewer, by which he is made to pass sentence
 upon himself, and to fix that mark of censure upon
 his own judgment, with which he endeavours to
 stigmatize the judgment of another?

A misrepresentation of less magnitude than the
 preceding one, appears in the next lines. “The
 “ part of the Old Testament, which it is reasonable to
 “ suppose was translated into Greek, nine centuries
 “ before the Christian æra” (éra), “must in course
 “ have been rendered into hexameter verse; because
 “ it is known, that the Greeks had no prose writing
 “ for 300 years at least after Homer’s death.”
 (M. R. p. 253.) “*In*” (of) “*course*;” but what is

to be inferred from this remark? That Dr. G. anywhere asserts it to be "reasonable to suppose," that a "part of the Old Testament was translated "into *Greek*" 900 years before Christ? He makes no such assertion. He speaks of translations in general. "It is not unreasonable to suppose that "translations of a part at least of the inspired books, "might have been made before the time of Homer." (Con. p. 363.) He does not specify any particular *language* into which they might have been made; but the reviewer has met with a passage in Eusebius (Præp. Ev. l. xiii. c. 1, 2), which mentions that a "part of the Old Testament was translated into "*Greek*," before the translation of the Septuagint; and he has transferred this passage to the account of Dr. G. with the addition of the date 900 B. C. He may equally suppose translations to have been made into the *Latin* language at that early period; but let him charge the folly of such suppositions to the right author.—In his next observations, he is not more successful, although the criticism contained in them is of a petty nature. "In the section on Euripides, the author (Dr. G.) says,—He "is represented by Aristophanes to have been particularly severe in his treatment of women. Sophocles observed that he himself painted women as "they should be, but Euripides as they are. We are "at a loss to conceive why Dr. Gray should quote "Aristophanes as evidence of what is so abundantly "visible in the works of Euripides; or confine the "well-known saying of Sophocles, (αὐτὸς μὲν ΟΙΟΥΣ

“*δει ποιεειν*, Arist. Poet. 46), to female characters.” (M. R. p. 253.) Dr. G. does not “quote Aristophanes” as evidence of a fact “so abundantly visible in the” existing “works of Euripides,” viz. his severe treatment of women; but “as evidence” of the opinion of an *impure heathen* touching that fact. In the opinion even of Aristophanes, of the author of *Lysistrata*, the *Thesmophoriazusæ*, those gross satires on women, Euripides was “*particularly* severe in “his treatment of women.” Aristophanes likewise, being acquainted with the far greater number of the pieces of Euripides which are now lost, was competent to judge of the *uniformity* of his severe treatment of women; and we learn from him a circumstance which might have been quoted with effect, that Euripides never made Penelope the subject of a play, “because he thought her a modest woman.” (*Thesmoph.* l. 554.) The observation of Sophocles, quoted by Dr. Gray, “that he himself painted women as they should be, but Euripides as they “are,” is not the same as “the well-known saying” of Sophocles, in Aristotle’s *Poetics*, (46). Harwood, in his *Biog. Class.* vol. i. *confines* the observation of Sophocles, “to female characters,” how much-soever the reviewer may be “at a loss to conceive” the fact.

The sarcastic tone assumed in the following remark, considering the matter of it, is somewhat ridiculous. “Speaking of the *Cassandra* of *Lycophron*, Dr. G. observes,—Some writers who

“ have noticed the feeble light which is indistinctly
 “ discerned in the poem, have compared it to the
 “ faint and nebulous *stars* in the Pleiades. Dr.
 “ Gray has met with some author, who, alluding
 “ to Lycophron being one of the poetical Pleiades
 “ of the court of Philadelphus, and to the ob-
 “ scurity of his poem, has compared him to Merope,
 “ the Pleiad who has lost her light; and the reader
 “ sees what this elegant allusion has become under
 “ the hands of a skilful copyist.” (M. R. p. 253.)
 An ordinary reader must be sensible, that the point
 of Dr. Gray’s observation may be drawn out by
 the simple alteration of the plural “ *stars*,” which
 must be an error of the press, into “ *star*,” an
 alteration required to make sense of it. “ Some
 “ writers, who have noticed the feeble light which
 “ is indistinctly discerned in the poem, have com-
 “ pared it,” i. e. the poem, “ to the faint and nebu-
 “ lous *star* in the Pleiades,” i. e. to Merope, who
 has lost her light. The original comparison (given
 in the notes), relating to the poet with reference to
 his poem, has been applied by a common figure to
 the poem alone*.

By this time the reader will have formed some
 idea of the critique, or, as it may more justly be

* “ Haud absurde, Arnoldus Arlenius Peraxylus (præfat. ad
 “ Lycoph.), poëtam hunc *propter tenebras hujus dramatis*, Cim-
 “ meriâ caligine obscuriores, ait respondere stellæ in Pleiade ob-
 “ scuræ ac nebulosæ.” (Fabricius, Bib. Græc. tit. Lycophron.)

denominated; the attack made by the Monthly Reviewer upon the work of Dr. Gray. The concluding passages of it which immediately follow, are marked, except in one instance, by a disposition to carp at and dwell upon trifles; and by a supercilious expression of censure, indecent towards the distinguished author who is made the subject of it, and uncalled for by the occasion. Dr. Gray observes, that “the Phenomena of Aratus was translated metaphrastically into Latin by Cicero and Germanicus Cæsar.” (Con. p. 500.) It is evident that he uses the word *metaphrastically* to mean *literally*, in the same manner as Warton (Hist. Poet. vol. ii. p. 169) uses *metaphrastic* to mean *literal*. The reviewer, however, objects: “Apparently Dr. Gray does not know that *metaphrasis*, the word by which he found the work of Germanicus described in Fabricius, means neither more nor less than a translation.” (M. R. p. 254.) The word *metaphrasis* (*μεταφρασις*) is unknown to the best Latin authors; and therefore the best Latin scholars might be at a loss for its precise meaning in Fabricius: being, however, opposed to the word *παραφρασις*, a *free* translation, it *may* mean a *literal* translation—Dr. Gray has assigned *this* meaning to it.—The error pointed out by an observation of the reviewer in the next line (M. R. p. 254), should thus be corrected: in page 500 of the Connexion (line 3), there is an inversion of the order of the words, and the omission of a date. The passage beginning with that line should run thus: “The Phenomena of Aratus was

“ published by Stephens in 1566, by Grotius at Ley-
 “ den in 1600, and since that time also at Oxford”
 (i. e. in 1672).—Con. p. 500, l. 3—7.)

“ We are also informed,” continues the reviewer,
 “ that Diodorus Siculus lived in the time of Julius
 “ Cæsar and Augustus, *and beyond* the period in
 “ which the calendar was reformed, which took
 “ place forty-six years before Christ. Why Dr. G.
 “ has substituted forty-six years before Christ for
 “ annum U. C. 746, we cannot tell.” (M. R. p. 254.)
 It will not be difficult to answer the reviewer. The
 words of Fabricius are these: “ Vixit” (Diod. Sicul.)
 “ sub Julio Cæsare, et sub Augusto, ut Suidas auc-
 “ tor est, certe *supervixisse* videtur annum U. C. 746,
 “ quo,” &c. (Bib. Græc. tit. Diod. Sicul.) There
 is no ground, therefore, for a taunting insinuation
 thrown out, of incorrect translation. This date
 only, U. C. 746, which is that of the *second* re-
 form of the calendar, under Augustus, has been al-
 tered for B. C. 46, which is that of the *first* reform
 of the calendar, under Julius Cæsar. Probably, in
 transcribing, the latter was substituted for the former.
 The particulars of the second reform of the Roman
 calendar, by Augustus Cæsar, are not generally
 known. Julius Cæsar, by intercalating or inserting
 about ninety lost days in the running year, having ad-
 justed the civil year to the solar year, regulated that
 in future the civil year should consist of 365 days, 6
 hours; and that in the course of every fourth year,
 the odd six hours in each year during three years, or

eighteen hours, together with the six hours of the running year, making twenty-four hours, or one day, should be intercalated, or inserted. The priests who were appointed to enforce this regulation, instead of intercalating twenty-four hours, or one day, in the course of every fourth year, made this intercalation in the course of every third year, when eighteen hours only should have been reckoned. Thus they advanced the civil year before the solar year every three years by six hours. This error continued during thirty-six years from the death of Julius Cæsar; and whereas upon every three years there was an advance of six hours, upon the whole thirty-six years there was an advance of twelve times six hours, or seventy-two hours, or three days. Augustus Cæsar having detected this error, reformed the calendar a second time, by directing that the odd six hours in each solar year should be neglected during twelve years; thus gradually cutting off from the civil year twelve times six hours, or seventy-two hours, or the three days gained. He then reinforced the "regulation for the insertion of an intercalary day, by reckoning the 24th of February twice over, every fourth year." The dates of the *first* reform of the calendar are, before Christ 46 years, from the foundation of Rome 708. Those of the *second* reform, after the first 38 years, after the death of Julius Cæsar 36, before Christ 8, from the building of Rome 746*.

* Compare Solinus, Polyhist. cap. 3, with other accounts.— It is well known that the reforms of Julius Cæsar and of Au-

The passage which the reviewer quotes in the ensuing lines (M. R. p. 254), is chargeable with the omission of a single word, which if inserted will render the sense clear. "Lascaris," says Dr. G. (Con. p. 509), "professed to have seen a complete copy of "his history" (that of Diodorus Siculus) "in the imperial library at Constantinople. Of the importance, "however, or even the existence of this library, great "doubts may reasonably be entertained; and Professor Carlyle, who made it the object of his particular "inquiry, could not obtain any information concerning it." The word "*existence*" here used is obviously equivocal; it may mean either *past* or *present* "existence." Let the word *present* be inserted before "*existence*," and the sense becomes unequivocal. It is pitiful in a reviewer to devote nearly half a page to the notice of such a trivial omission; and it is in the highest degree ungenerous to couple with the detection of it, the heavy and groundless charge, that Dr. Gray is "an author" who does not write "according to the common rules of English construction." (M. R. p. 254.)

gustus, by which the solar year was made to consist of 365 days, 6 hours, giving an excess of 11 minutes and 3 seconds above the true solar year, have been succeeded by those of the Council of Nice, in 325 A. D.; and of Pope Gregory XIII. in 1582. This latter reform was adopted in England in 1752, under the appellation of the New Style. Nevertheless, the calendar still labours under an inaccuracy with respect to the right period of the feast of Easter, upon which all the moveable fasts and feasts of the Christian church depend. (See an able tract on this subject, lately published, By a member of the University of Oxford: printed for S. Leigh, 18, Strand.)

The remark immediately following, with which the reviewer takes leave of his readers, contains an insinuation which is contrary to the common rules of liberal construction. Dr. G. observes, "The account of the Julian star, which was said to have appeared soon after the death of Julius Cæsar, was probably fabricated in imitation of the prophetic accounts, or of the sacred relation with respect to the star which appeared to the wise men of the East." (Con. p. 242.) Upon this passage the reviewer remarks—"It should seem that Dr. G. is ignorant that the Julian star, of which the reality of the appearance is attested by a memorial of Augustus, preserved by Pliny, was the great comet, of which the period of 575 years coincides with 44 B. C." (M. R. p. 254); i. e. soon after the death of Julius Cæsar. It should seem that the reviewer is more confident of the identity of these two phenomena, than the great Halley, who first noticed it; but who speaks with caution and becoming diffidence about a comet, whose supposed periodical revolution of 575 years, would have been *geometrically* ascertained only from the short period (four months) employed in describing a very small part of its orbit*. The inten-

* "Si quid argumenti ex æqualitate periodorum, et ex phænomenis simularibus peti possit—*haudquaquam absurdum erit* si cometam à Cæsare visum, absolutis tribus revolutionibus, anno 1680, nobis denuò affulsisse credamus; præsertim cum ad æqualia temporis intervalla, annis scilicet Christi 531 et 1106, similes quoque cometæ apparuerint." (*Halleii. De Motu Cometarum Synopsis.*)

tion, however, of the reviewer, is to insinuate that Dr. G. was ignorant of the *fact* of the appearance of the Julian star; an insinuation which cannot by any fair construction be cast upon an author who, in the passage succeeding that now quoted (Con. p. 243), records the appearance of a comet (during the period of the shows and theatrical entertainments exhibited by Augustus, soon after the death of his adopted father), from the memorial of Augustus referred to by the reviewer, in which the identity of that comet with the Julian star is marked by this well-known circumstance, that a representation of the comet or star was affixed to the head of the statue of Julius Cæsar in the forum. (Pliny, lib. ii. c. 26.) To such a hypercritic it might be replied further, that Dr. Gray is not speaking of the *fact* of the appearance of the Julian star, but of "the *account*," the popular *tradition* relating to it, as having been "*probably* fabricated" in imitation of the prophetic accounts, or of the sacred relation with respect to the star in the East." But it would be unnecessary to have recourse to a minute defence, if an equitable and liberal feeling were exercised towards the author; and that decent respect and deference were shown for his knowledge and abilities, to which a work distinguished for its varied and sound learning, and which may be considered as classical in the department of theology, fully entitles him*.

* Gray's Key to the Old Testament and Apocrypha.

The Strictures now submitted to the public would have been drawn up at an earlier period, if the Review, in which the article that gave rise to them occurs, had been at that time in the writer's possession. From a close examination of this article it appears, that an original work of considerable magnitude, and of extensive research, which was submitted to the ordeal of a reviewer, during nearly one year and a half comprises some particles of dross mixed up with its pure metal; or, to drop the metaphor, contains some faults which may be purged away without difficulty in a future edition, and which are not of that importance to conceal its actual merit. In detecting these faults in a volume of 770 pages, embracing the whole circle of Heathen literature, the reviewer has committed greater in the course of an article consisting of not as many lines. In some instances he has been proved chargeable with gross misrepresentation; in many instances he has indulged a disposition to cavilling, petulant remark; and he has often had reason to blush for his illiberality and virulence. He has not made known any of the *excellencies* of the work; but has chiefly employed himself in minutely picking out errors which, to use the words of the poet,

“ Like straws upon the surface flow,”

which do not affect the main stream and current of the argument, and which a critic of much less ability than he possesses would equally have discern

ed. If he imagines that he has obtained a triumph, let him enjoy it, without rivals and unenvied.

“ Sunt censores, quibus placere nec datur, nec
 “ à nobis studetur. Si offendunt aliquam incautam
 “ phrasin, quæ à currente calamo fortè exciderit,
 “ aut alium aliquem, vel typographi, vel auctoris
 “ defectum, inter *Paroramata* numerandum, de eo
 “ statim triumphos agunt, tanquam de repertis ali-
 “ quibus thesauris absconditis, aut reportatis spoliis.
 “ Pro tali delicto (illis iudicibus) nulla est compen-
 “ satio: si mille utilia et mille thesauros eis aperue-
 “ ris, non satisfacit, sed talis dictus defectus his
 “ omnibus præponderat. Isti, gloriolam sibi aucu-
 “ pantur, aliena opera sugillando; quosvis libros
 “ rimantes non ut aliquid boni inde capiant, sed ut
 “ mendas carpant—De eis non erimus multùm soli-
 “ citi. Nam solis bonis et probis placuisse sufficit.
 “ Vale—” (HYDE *Præfatio.*)

THE END.

BOOKS

Published by JOHN HATCHARD, 190, Piccadilly.

1. **HEBER'S BAMPTON LECTURES.** Second Edition. 8vo. Price 13s.—The Personality and Office of the Christian Comforter asserted and explained in a Course of Sermons, on John, xvi. 17. Preached before the University of Oxford, in the Year 1815, at the Lecture founded by the late Rev. John Bampton, M. A. Canon of Salisbury. By REGINALD HEBER, M. A. Canon of St. Asaph, Rector of Hodnet, Salop, and late Fellow of All Souls College.

2. **PEARSON'S PRAYERS for FAMILIES.** 8vo. Third Edition. Price 3s. 6d. Boards.—Prayers for Families, consisting of a Form, short but comprehensive, for the Morning and Evening of every Day in the Week: selected by the late EDWARD PEARSON, D. D. Master of Sidney College, Cambridge, and Christian Advocate in that University.

3. **PYE'S JUSTICE of the PEACE.** 12mo. Third Edition. Price 6s. 6d.—Summary of the Duties of a Justice of Peace, out of Sessions, with some preliminary Observations. By HENRY JAMES PYE, Esq. With considerable Additions. By a BARRISTER AT LAW, of the Inner Temple.

4. **AN ACCOUNT of the CAPTIVITY of CAPTAIN ROBERT KNOX, and other ENGLISHMEN, in the ISLAND of CEYLON;** and of the Captain's miraculous Escape, and Return to England, in September 1680, after a Detention on the Island of Nineteen Years and a Half. Written by Himself, and first printed in 1681. To which is prefixed, a Sketch of the Geography, Civil and Natural History, Commerce, &c. of Ceylon, brought down to the Year 1815. Price 3s. 6d. Boards.

5. **The ESSAY on the SIGNS of CONVERSION and UNCONVERSION in MINISTERS of the CHURCH,** to which the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge and Church Union in the Diocese of St. David's adjudged their Premium for the Year 1811. Second Edition. By SAMUEL CHARLES WILKS, A. M. of St. Edmund Hall, Oxon. 1 Vol. 12mo. Price 3s. Boards.

6. **A SKETCH of MY FRIEND'S FAMILY;** intended to suggest some practical Hints on Religion and domestic Manners. By Mrs. MARSHALL, Author of "Henwick Tales." "In every work regard the writer's end." 1 Vol. 12mo. Price 4s. 6d. Boards.

7. **PRACTICAL VIEW of CHRISTIAN EDUCATION, in its EARLY STAGES.** 1 vol. 12mo. Fourth Edition. Price 5s. Boards.

8. **SERMONS.** By the Rev. JOHN MARRIOTT, M. A. of Church Lawford, Warwick. Price 10s. 6d. Boards.

9. **OBSOLETE IDEAS, in Six Letters, addressed to Maria.** Dedicated to Viscountess Cremorne. By Mrs. ELIZA BROWNE. Fourth Edition. Price 4s. Bds.

10. **The HISTORY of NEW SOUTH WALES.** Second Edition. 1 Vol. 8vo. Price 14s. Boards.

11. **A SECOND EDITION of a TREATISE on the RECORDS of the CREATION, and on the MORAL ATTRIBUTES of the CREATOR,** with particular Reference to the Jewish History, and to the Consistency of the Principle of Population with the Wisdom and Goodness of the Deity. By JOHN BIRD SUMNER, M. A. &c. In 2 Vols. 8vo. 11. 1s.

12. **VOYAGE to LOCUTA, a Fragment:** with Etchings and Notes of Illustration. Dedicated to Theresa Tidy, Author of the Eighteen Maxims of Neatness and Order. By LEMUEL GULLIVER, Jun. 1 Vol. 12mo. Price 4s. Boards.

In the Press,

13. **The BIBLE, and NOTHING but the BIBLE, the RELIGION of the CHURCH of ENGLAND:** being an Answer to the Letter of an Unitarian Lay Seceder: with Notes and Illustrations, containing Schleusner's Interpretation of Passages of the New Testament relative to the established Doctrines of Christianity. To which are added, a Postscript on the Anti-Socinianism of Newton and Locke, and a Letter dedicatory to the Bishop of Gloucester on the Divinity and Atonement of Christ. By the BISHOP of ST. DAVID'S. Second Edition. To which are added, Three Addresses to Persons calling themselves Unitarians.

BOOKS

Edited by JOHN HATCHARD, 190, Piccadilly.

BAMPTON LECTURES. Second Edition. 8vo. Price 13s.—
The Office of the Christian Comforter asserted and explained in a
Sermon, on John, xvi. 17. Preached before the University of Oxford,
at the Lecture founded by the late Rev. John Bampton, M. A.
in 1787. By REGINALD HEBER, M. A. Canon of St. Asaph, Rector
and late Fellow of All Souls College.

PRAYERS for FAMILIES. 8vo. Third Edition. Price 3s. 6d.
Prayers for Families, consisting of a Form, short but comprehensive, for
the evening of every Day in the Week: selected by the late EDWARD
WILKINSON, Master of Sidney College, Cambridge, and Christian Advocate in

THE DUTY of the PEACE. 12mo. Third Edition. Price 6s. 6d.—
The Duties of a Justice of Peace, out of Sessions, with some prelimi-
naries. By HENRY JAMES PYE, Esq. With considerable Additions,
and a Treatise on the Law, of the Inner Temple.

**THE HISTORY of the CAPTIVITY of CAPTAIN ROBERT KNOX, and
of the RETURN of CAPTAIN ROBERT KNOX, in the ISLAND of CEYLON; and of the Captain's mi-
nisterial Return to England, in September 1680, after a Detention
of Nineteen Years and a Half. Written by Himself, and first
published in 1700. To which is prefixed, a Sketch of the Geography, Civil and Na-
tural History, &c. of Ceylon, brought down to the Year 1815. Price**

**ON the SIGNS of CONVERSION and UNCONVERSION in
the CHURCH, to which the Society for promoting Christian
Church Union in the Diocese of St. David's adjudged their Pre-
dication, 1811. Second Edition. By SAMUEL CHARLES WILKS, A. M.
of Exeter, 1 Vol. 12mo. Price 3s. Boards.
OF MY FRIEND'S FAMILY; intended to suggest some prac-
tical and domestic Manners. By Mrs. MARSHALL, Author of
"In every work regard the writer's end." 1 Vol. 12mo.**

**A VIEW of CHRISTIAN EDUCATION, in its EARLY
Stages. Fourth Edition. Price 5s. Boards.
By the Rev. JOHN MARRIOTT, M. A. of Church Lawford,
Esq. 6d. Boards.**

**IDEAS, in Six Letters, addressed to Maria. Dedicated to
her. By Mrs. ELIZA BROWNE. Fourth Edition. Price 4s. Bds.
HISTORY of NEW SOUTH WALES. Second Edition. 1 Vol.
8vo. 11s.**

**EDITION of a TREATISE on the RECORDS of the CREA-
TOR, with particular
MORAL ATTRIBUTES of the CREATOR, with particu-
lar reference to Jewish History, and to the Consistency of the Principle of Po-
sitive Wisdom and Goodness of the Deity. By JOHN BIRD SUMNER,
Esq. 8vo. 11s.**

**LOCUTA, a Fragment: with Etchings and Notes of Illustra-
tions. Theresa Tidy, Author of the Eighteen Maxims of Neatness and
GULLIVER, Jun. 1 Vol. 12mo. Price 4s. Boards.**

In the Press,

**and NOTHING but the BIBLE, the RELIGION of the
UNITARIAN LAND: being an Answer to the Letter of an Unitarian Lay
Minister, and Illustrations, containing Schleusner's Interpretation of
the New Testament relative to the established Doctrines of Christia-
nity, and a Postscript on the Anti-Socinianism of Newton and
Hobbes, dedicated to the Bishop of Gloucester on the Divinity and
Authority of the Bible. By the BISHOP of ST. DAVID'S. Second Edition. To
be published by J. Hatchard, 190, Piccadilly. Price 4s. 6d.**