



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

8^{oo}. B. S. R. 154

A
DISSERTATION
UPON THE
EPISTLES OF PHALARIS:
WITH
An Answer
TO THE
Objections of the Hon. C. Boyle.

BY RICHARD BENTLEY, D. D.
CHAPLAIN IN ORDINARY AND LIBRARY-KEEPER TO HIS MAJESTY.

TO WHICH ARE ADDED,
DR. BENTLEY'S DISSERTATION
ON
THE EPISTLES
OF
Themistocles, Socrates, Euripides,
AND OTHERS;
AND
THE FABLES OF ÆSOP,
AS ORIGINALLY PRINTED;
WITH OCCASIONAL REMARKS ON THE WHOLE.

A NEW EDITION.

London:
Printed by G. Auld, Greville Street,
FOR J. CUTHELL, MIDDLE ROW, HOLBORN; LAW AND WHITTAKER,
AVE MARIA LANE; R. PRIESTLEY, HIGH HOLBORN; AND
OGLES, DUNCAN, AND COCHRAN, PATERNOSTER ROW, & 295, HOLBORN.

1817,

**Mordear OPPROBRIIS FALSIS, mutemque colores?
FALSUS HONOR juvat, et MENDAX INFAMIA terret
Quem, nisi MENDACEM et MENDOSUM? —**

Horat. Epist. I. 16.



Advertisement

TO THE FORMER EDITION.

DR. Bentley's Dissertation on Phalaris having become scarce, and its merit being at length universally acknowledged, there can be no impropriety in transmitting it again to the Public. The Edition of 1699, which hath been faithfully followed as far as it goes, is now completed, by adding the Dissertation on the Epistles of Themistocles, Socrates, and Euripides, and on the Fables of Æsop; which the great Critic omitted in his republication, with a view probably to enlarge them.

The remarks which have occurred to the Editor, in the course of many years occasional attention to these subjects, will be found in the margin, ascribed to the respective writers, from whose books or personal communication they have been selected. Amongst these, the Reader will not be displeased at meeting with the names of Bishops Warburton and Lowth, Mr. Upton, Mr. W. Clarke, Mr. Markland, Dr. Salter, Dr. Owen, and Mr. Toup.

THE
AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

IN the former Edition of this DISSERTATION, A. D. [iii]
MDCXCVII, I thought myself obliged to take notice of a certain
passage in a Preface to "Phalaris's Epistles," published at
Oxford two years before; which I did in these words:—

"The late Editors of Phalaris have told the world, in their
"Preface, that, among other specimens of their diligence,
"they collated the King's Manuscript as far as the XLth
"Epistle; and would have done so throughout, but that the
"Library-keeper, *out of his singular humanity*, denied them
"the further use of it*. This was meant as a lash for me,
"who had the honour then and since to serve his Majesty in
"that office. I must own, it was very well resolved of them
"to make the Preface and the Book all of a piece; for they
"have acted in this calumny both the injustice of the Tyrant
"and the forgery of the Sophist. For my own part, I should [iv]
"never have honoured it with a refutation in print; but
"have given it that neglect that is due to weak detraction,
"had I not been engaged to my friend to write a censure
"upon Phalaris; where to omit to take notice of that slander,
"would be tacitly to own it. The true story is thus:—A
"Bookseller came to me, in the name of the Editors, to beg
"the use of the Manuscript. It was not then in my custody;
"but, as soon as I had the power of it, I went voluntarily
"and offered it him, bidding him tell the Collator not to lose
"any time, for I was shortly to go out of town for two
"months. It was delivered, used, and returned. Not a
"word said by the bearer, nor the least suspicion in me, that
"they had not finished the collation; for, I speak from ex-
"periment, they had more days to compare it in than they
"needed to have hours. It is a very little book, and the
"writing as legible as print. Well; the collation, it seems,
"was sent defective to Oxon; and the blame, I suppose, laid

* Collatas etiam curavi usque ad Ep. XL. cum MS^{to} in Bibliotheca
Regia, cujus mihi copiam ulteriorem Bibliothecarius pro singulari sua
humanitate negavit.

[v] “ upon me. I returned again to the Library some months
 “ before the edition was finished: no application was made
 “ for further use of the Manuscript. Thence I went for a
 “ whole fortnight to Oxon, where the book was then printing;
 “ conversed in the very college where the Editors resided:
 “ not the least whisper there of the Manuscript. After a few
 “ days, out comes the new edition, with this sting in the
 “ mouth of it. It was a surprize, indeed, to read there that
 “ our Manuscript was not perused. Could not they have
 “ asked for it again then after my return? It was neither
 “ singular nor *common humanity* not to enquire into the truth
 “ of the thing before they ventured to print; which is a sword
 “ in the hand of a child. But there is a reason for every
 “ thing; and the mystery was soon revealed: for it seems I
 “ had the hard hap, in some private conversation, to say the
 “ *Epistles* were a spurious piece, and unworthy of a new
 “ edition. *Hinc illæ lacrymæ*. This was a thing deeply re-
 “ sented; and to have spoken to me about the Manuscript,
 “ had been to lose a plausible occasion of taking revenge.”

This I then thought was sufficient to vindicate myself from that little aspersion. But I am now constrained, by the worse usage that I have since met with from the same quarter, to give an account of some particulars which then I omitted, partly out of an unwillingness to trouble the Public with complaints about private and personal injuries, but chiefly out of a tenderness for the honour of the Editor.

The first time I saw his new *Phalaris* was in the hands of a person of honour, to whom it had been presented; and the rest of the impression was not yet published. This encouraged me to write the very same evening to Mr. Boyle at Oxford, and to give him a true information of the whole matter; expecting that, upon the receipt of my letter, he would put a stop to the publication of his book till he had altered that passage, and printed the page anew; which he might have done in one day, and at the charge of five shillings. I did not expressly desire him to take out that passage, and reprint the whole leaf; that I thought was too low a submission: but I said enough to make any person of common justice and ingenuity have owned me thanks for preventing him from doing a very ill action.

I am sorry I have not the letter itself to produce on this occasion; but I neither took any copy of it, nor was I careful to keep the gentleman's letter which I received in answer. I had no apprehension at that time that the business could have

have been blown to this height ; but the gentleman, it seems, had something at that time in his view, and was more careful to keep my letter, a part of which he has thus published :—
 “ Mr. Bennet desired me to lend him the Manuscript *Pha-*
laris, to be collated ; because a young gentleman, Mr. Boyle
 “ of Christ Church, was going to publish it. I told him,
 “ That a gentleman of that name and family, to which I had
 “ so many obligations, and should always have an honour for,
 “ might command any service that lay in my power.” These
 he acknowledges to be *civil expressions* ; and I dare trust my
 memory so far, as to aver that all the rest were of the same
 strain. Nay, as the Examiner has given us this fragment of
 my letter, because he thought he saw a fault in it, which I
 shall answer anon, so if there had been any thing else in that
 letter, either in the words or the matter, that he could but
 have caviled at, without doubt he would have favoured us with
 more of it ; for we may easily see his good-will to me, both
 from his *Preface* and his *Examination*.

P. 19.

[vii]

Ibid. &
P. 4.

But what return did he make me for my *expressions of great civility* ? After a delay of two posts, on purpose, as one may justly suspect, that the Book might be vended (as it was) and spread abroad in the meantime, I received an answer to this effect :—“ That what I had said in my own behalf might be
 “ true ; but that Mr. Bennet had represented the thing quite
 “ otherwise. If he had had my account before, he should
 “ have considered of it ; and now that the Book was made
 “ public, he would not interpose : but that I might do myself
 “ right in what method I pleased.” This was the import of
 his answer, as I very well remember : there was not the least
 hint that he had or would stop the publication of his book till
 the matter was farther examined.

P. 4.

[viii]

The gentleman himself, in his late treatise, has been pleased to give some account of the same letter ; and he represents his expression thus : That, if the matter appeared as I had told it, “ he meant to give me satisfaction as publicly as he had injured
 “ me.” But I am sorry that his civility comes three years too late. Less than this would have passed with me for good satisfaction. But it was not “ that He would give me satisfac-
 “ tion,” but “ that I had his free leave to take it :” which was in answer to a paragraph of my letter, “ that perhaps I might
 “ think myself obliged to make a public vindication.” And this, as I take it, was so far from being a just *satisfaction*, that it was plainly a defiance, and an addition to the affront.

P. 4.

The gentleman and I here differ a little about the expression

[ix] in his answer; but I suppose the very circumstances will plainly discover whose account is the truer: for what probability is there that he should promise such fair satisfaction, and yet let the book be published when it was in his power to stop it? If he had writ me word the very next post, that he had stopped the books in the printing-house, and would suffer no more to go abroad till the matter was fairly examined, this had been just and civil; and then, if he had found himself misinformed by his Bookseller, he might have cut out the leaf and printed a new one; which in all respects had been the fairest, and cheapest, and quickest satisfaction.

Several persons have been so far misinformed by false reports of this story, that they think the Editor himself desired the MS. either by letter to me, or by a personal visit. I heartily wish it had been so, for then all this dispute had been prevented; but the gentleman was not pleased to honour me with his commands. If he had favoured me with one line, or had sent his desire by any scholar, I would not only have lent the book, but have collated it myself for him: but it was both our misfortunes that he committed the whole affair to the care, or rather negligence, of his Bookseller; and the first application himself made to me was by that compliment in his printed Preface.

[x] I am surprized to see an *honourable* person think he has fully justified himself for abusing me, by reasons that he has found out since the time of the abuse; for even take his own account, and when he printed that Preface, he had heard nothing but on one side. And was that like a man of his character, to put a public affront upon me upon the bare complaint of a Bookseller, who was the party suspected of the fault? What! never to enquire at all, whether he had not misinformed him, when there was such reason to suppose that he might lay the blame upon me to excuse his own negligence; when he had such opportunities of asking me, either directly or by some common friends? Turn it over on every side, and the whole conduct of it is so very extraordinary, that one cannot but suspect there were some secret reasons for this usage that are not yet brought above-board. Be it as it will, it is in vain to hope to justify that calumny in his Preface, by such testimonies as he knew nothing of when he ventured to print it. He is fallen under his own reproof, "That he wrote his Preface first, and finds reasons
P. 2. "for it afterwards."

When his Phalaris came first abroad, it was the opinion of my

my friends, who were soon satisfied that the thing was a calumny, that it was the duty of my place, as Keeper of the Royal Library, to defend the honour of it against such an insult: but yet, out of a natural aversion to all quarrels and broils, and out of regard to the Editor himself, I resolved to take no notice of it, but to let the matter drop.

[xi]

Thus it rested for two years; and should have done so for ever, had not some accidents fallen out, which made it necessary for me to give a public account of it. I had formerly made a promise to my worthy friend Mr. Wotton, to give him a paper of some reasons why I thought Phalaris's Epistles supposititious, and the present Æsopian Fables not to be Æsop's own. And upon such an occasion, I was plainly obliged to speak of that calumny; for my silence would have been interpreted as good as a confession, especially considering with what industrious malice the false story had been spread all over England; for, as it is generally practised, they thought one act of injustice was to be supported and justified by doing many more.

The gentleman is pleased to insinuate, that all this is "pure fiction;" and that I wrote that Dissertation out of revenge, and purely for an occasion of telling the story: the very contrary of which is true; for I was unwilling to meddle in that Dissertation, because I should be necessitated to give an account of that story, as it will plainly appear from Mr. Wotton's own testimony, which I have by me under his hand:—

P. 4.
24, &c.

"I do declare, that, in the year 1694, when my *Discourse about Ancient and Modern Learning* was first put to the press, Dr. Bentley at my desire undertook to write a Dissertation about Phalaris and Æsop, to be added to my Book; but being called away into the country, he could not at that time be as good as his word. Afterwards, when the Second Edition of my Book was in the press, I renewed my request to him, and challenged his promise: he desired me to excuse him, because now the case was altered, and he could not write that Dissertation without giving a censure of the late Edition at Oxford; but I did not think that a sufficient reason why I should lose that treatise to the world, by receding from the right and power that he had given me to demand it.

[xii]

"W. WOTTON."

The Reader will please to observe, that Mr. Wotton's *Discourse* was first printed in 1694, and Phalaris the year after: a plain

[xiii] plain argument that the Examiner is quite out in his reckoning, when he pretends that I first engaged in that Dissertation purely to fall foul on his Book. I was so far from harbouring such "vengeance in my heart," that if the Editor, or any body from him, had but given me leave to say in his name "That he had been misinformed," all this story, and all the errors of his edition, had slept quiet in their obscurity.

About nine months after my Dissertation was printed, the Editor of Phalaris obliged the world with a second piece, called "Dr. Bentley's Dissertations Examined." He has begun that elaborate work with stating an account of this story, in opposition to what I had said of it; and that he does upon the credit and testimonies of the *Bookseller* and the *Collator*, and of a third *Infermant*, who overheard some discourse of mine. I will give a clear and full answer to every part of their depositions; and I question not but to make it plain, that the Examiner has been imposed on, not only by the Author of Phalaris's Letters, but by others that are every way of lower qualifications than he.

P. 6. The Bookseller avers "That he was employed by the "Honourable Mr. Boyle, and by Him only, to borrow the "MS. of Phalaris from Dr. Bentley: and, after about NINE "months solicitation," says he, "it was delivered into my "custody, without any time limited for the return of it." I now perceive I had more reason than I was then aware of, when I said in my Dissertation, that a falsehood about time

[xiv] was the truest and surest method of detecting impostures; and Mr. B. I hope, will allow that a chronological argument will be a good proof against his Bookseller, though he will not admit it against his Book. The Bookseller, we see, is positive that I did not lend him the MS. "till after about "NINE months solicitation." And Mr. B. himself repeats it,

P. 19. "That there was about NINE months solicitation used to
P. 5. "procure it." And in another place, he affirms "That the "Bookseller gave him liberty to assure the world, that he "was ready to justify it with his OATH when it should be "duly required of him." Now if, instead of these "NINE "months," I make it appear beyond contradiction that, from my very first admission to the office of Library-keeper, to the time that the Bookseller not only had but returned the MS. there was but ONE single month, I humbly conceive the world will be satisfied, that not the word only, but the very OATH of this Witness is little to be regarded.

The Royal Patent, which constitutes me "Keeper of his
"MAJESTY'S

"MAJESTY'S Libraries" (which may be seen not only in my own hands, but in the Patent-office) bears date the twelfth day of April, MDCXCIV. The words are "In cujus rei testimonium has Literas nostras fieri fecimus Patentes. Testibus Nobis ipsis apud Westminsterium, duodecimo die Aprilis, Anno Regni nostri Sexto." Now I may appeal to any body that has ever been concerned in a Patent, if, by reason of the delays that necessarily attend a thing of that nature, it may not fairly be supposed that the remaining part of that month expired before all could be finished. I find in a book of my private accompts, that I took the Patent out of the Patent-office the eighteenth day of that month; and the several offices to be attended after that, before I could have admission to the Library, may be allowed to take up the rest of the month. But I shall prove the thing directly by two Witnesses beyond all exception, the worthy Masters of St. Paul's and St. James's Schools, who gave me this account under their own hands:—

"Some time after the death of Mr. Justell, late Library-keeper to his Majesty, we were desired by his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, then Lord Bishop of Lincoln*, in pursuance of a command from the late Queen (of blessed memory) to take a Catalogue of the Royal Library at St. James's. We began it in October 1693, finished, and had it transcribed and presented to her Majesty by the Easter following: during all which time we had the key of the said Library constantly in our keeping, as also some weeks longer; and then, as we were directed, we delivered it up to Sir John Lowther, now the Right Honourable the Lord Lonsdale, who was at that time Vice-Chamberlain to his Majesty.

"JO. POSTLETHWAYT.
"RICH. WRIGHT."

It is plain then, from the date of a public record, joined with Mr. Postlethwayt's and Mr. Wright's testimonies, that I had not actual custody of the Royal Library before May; for in that year Easter fell upon April the eighth: and it is deposited here, that the key of the Library was not delivered to the Vice-Chamberlain, from whose hands I was to receive it, till "some weeks after Easter;" and in the same May I delivered the MS. to the Bookseller; for, as I had said before,

* Dr. Thomas Tenison, translated from Lincoln to Canterbury in 1694.

[xvii] "as soon as I had it in my power, I went voluntarily to the "Bookseller and offered it him." The Bookseller has not yet thought fit to deny that the Book was delivered to him in May; and to save him from the temptation of denying it hereafter, I will prove, by another record, that the Book was used and restored to me again, and lodged in his Majesty's Library before the end of that month: for the reason why I insisted to have the MS. speedily returned was, because I was obliged to make a journey to Worcester to keep my residence there as Prebendary of that church. And that I was at Worcester by the first of June following, the following certificate will prove, the original of which I have by me:—

"It appears by the Chantor's Rolls, kept to note the "presence of the Dean and Prebendaries of the Cathedral "Church of Worcester, that Dr. Richard Bentley, Preben- "dary of the said Cathedral Church, was present at prayers "in the Choir there on the first day of June, in the year "1694, and continued his attendance there till September "the 26th following, not absenting more than two days at any "one time all the while. Witness my hand, this 25th day of "May, 1698,

"ANDREW TREBECK, Chantor.

"We have seen and examined the Chantor's Rolls above "mentioned, and do find them as he hath above certified; and "we did see him sign this certificate.

"JO. PRICE, Chancellor.

"CH. MOORE, Pub. Not. Reg.

"THO. OLIVER, Pub. Notary."

[xviii] I must crave leave to observe to the Reader, that the Residence Roll for the month of May, though diligently sought for, could not be found: but if it ever happen to come to sight, I make no doubt but it will appear by it that I was present at Worcester some part of that May; for it is great odds that the first day of my being there would not fall upon the first of June. The last note of time, before I took my journey, that I can now find among all my papers, is the fifteenth day of May; and I find a Letter to me out of Surrey, dated May the tenth, that then wishes me a good journey: all which makes me believe that I left London upon Monday, May the twenty-first, and that the MS. was returned to me the Saturday night before.

But, not to insist upon that, I suppose it is sufficiently manifest,

nifest; from his Majesty's Patent, Mr. Postlethwayt's and Mr. Wright's testimonies, and the Residence Rolls of the Church of Worcester, that the MS. was delivered, used, and returned, within the space of ONE month after I had the custody of the Library; so that the deposition of the Bookseller, "That he could not obtain the MS. till after about NINE months solicitation," is demonstrated to be a notorious falsehood; and since he has farther declared that it was in his intention a perjury, he has pilloried himself for it in print, as long as that book shall last. [xix]

I have been informed by several good hands, that when the starters of this calumny heard how I could disprove, from the very date of the Patent, this story of "NINE months solicitation," they betook themselves to this refuge, That though the Patent was not finished till about May, yet I had the power and trust of the Library for NINE months before; but, besides the folly of this evasion, which is visible at first view (for how could I demand the key of the Library before I had a right to it?) Mr. Postlethwayt and Mr. Wright give a direct evidence, that "they had the key constantly in their keeping all the time from October to May;" so that I had not the MS. in my power till the very time that I lent it; nay, the very warrant where his Majesty first nominated me to that employment, was but taken out of the Secretary's office, December 23, 1693. There were but FIVE months, therefore, in all, from the first rumour of my being Library-keeper, to the time that they had the MS.; and the Bookseller, even by this account, was plainly guilty of an intended perjury, when he was ready to swear "that he used about NINE months solicitation." But, suppose it were true that NINE months had elapsed from the date of the warrant to my admission to the Library, yet what an honest and ingenuous narrative is here of "nine months SOLICITATION!" That word carries this accusation in it, that I could have lent them the book if I pleased; which appears now to be a mere calumny and slander, since it lays that to my charge which was not in my power. [xx]

By his talking of SOLICITATION, one would be apt to imagine that he had worn the very streets with frequent journeys to solicit for the MS. I had said, in my former account, "that a Bookseller CAME to me in the name of the Editors;" which is a word of more concession than the pains he was at deserved; for, to the best of my memory, he never asked me for the MS. but at his own shop, or as I casually

casually met him; neither can I call to mind that either he or his apprentice came once to my lodgings, or to the Library for it, till the time that he sent for it by my appointment, and received it.

P. 6.
[xxi]

I had said "That I ordered him to tell the Collator not "to lose any time, for I was shortly to go out of town for "two months." Now this was to be denied by the Bookseller, or else his whole deposition had signified nothing; for the blame would still lie at his own door. He resolutely affirms, therefore, "That no time was limited for the return "of it." What can be done in this case? Here are two contrary affirmations; and the matter being done in private, neither of us have any witness. I might plead, as *Æmilius Scaurus* did against one *Varius*, of *Sucro*: — "*Varius Sucro-
"mensis ait, Æmilius Scaurus negat: utri creditis, Quirites!*"* I hope, upon any account, my credit will go further than this Bookseller's, especially after his manifest falsehood in his story of the "nine months."

But let us enquire into the nature of the thing. Is it likely, or probable, that I should put the MS. into his hands, to be kept as long as he pleased, without any intimating that, after a competent time for using it, he should restore it again? They must certainly have an odd opinion of their readers, that expect to make such stuff as this pass upon them for truth. Besides, it appears upon record, that I took a journey soon after the lending of it, which was not a sudden and unexpected one; for the time of my residence had been fixed six months before. I must needs know then of my intended journey when I lent the MS. to the Bookseller; and it is very unlikely that I should omit to give him notice of it, unless it be supposed that I had then a private design to disappoint them of the use of the MS.

[xxii]

But that I had no such design, but, on the contrary, a true intention and desire to give them full opportunity of using it, I conceive the very circumstances of the affair, besides my own declaration which I here solemnly make, will put it out of all question; for, I pray, what interest, what passion, could I serve by hindering them? I could have no pique against the Editor, whom I had never seen or heard of before; and who, as soon as I heard of him, both deserved and had my respect, upon account of his relation to a person of glorious memory; neither could I envy him the honour of publishing the MS. or

* Val. Max. iii. 7.

repine that such an opportunity of getting fame was taken out of my own hands; for, I suppose, my "Dissertation" alone is a convincing argument, that I myself had never any design of setting out Phalaris.

But I have a better proof still behind, of my sincerity in lending the MS. though I cannot produce it without accusing myself; for it is the duty of my place to let no Book go out of the King's Library without particular order. This the learned Dr. Mill and several others know, who having occasion for some Books in the time of my predecessor, were obliged to procure his Majesty's warrant for them. If it were my design then to keep the Book out of the Editor's hands, what fairer pretence, what readier excuse, could be wished than this? — "That I was ready to serve the gentleman to the [xxiii] utmost of my power; but it was a rule with my predecessors, to let no Book go abroad without a Royal warrant; and I durst not venture to transgress the rule at my very first entrance upon my office. If the gentleman would obtain an order in the usual method, I would wait upon him the first moment, and deliver the Book." I could have refused the MS. in this manner with all the appearance of civility; but, out of a particular desire of obliging the Editor, I ventured beyond my power, and lent the Book privately, without any order. I confess I have justly suffered for it since; and the very men I aimed to oblige were my enemies (as they give it out) only on that account. Had I kept myself firm to the rules of my office, without straining a point of courtesy beyond the bounds of my duty, all their calumnies had been avoided; but I hope I shall have caution enough for the future to know persons a little better before I put myself in their power.

I had said that "I had no suspicion that the Collation was not finished." In opposition to this, the Bookseller deposes, "that I called upon him for the Book upon Saturday at noon, and staid while he sent to the Collator; and [xxiv] word was brought by the messenger, That it was not collated." That I called then at the Bookseller's shop, I believe may be true; for, having business to dispatch in St. Paul's Church Yard, and some friends there to take leave of before I began my journey, I took that occasion to call upon this Bookseller, and to mind him of his engagement to restore the Book on Saturday evening; but that I staid there till his messenger returned from the Collator, I do not remember. But suppose that I did stay, what then? The message, he says, was brought "at noon," that the Book was not
not

not then collated; but the Bookseller well knows that I did not require the Book till the evening; nor was it returned before. The Collator indeed might be behind-hand at noon, and, as I might suppose, want about two or three pages; but must I needs think him still behind-hand at nine o'clock at night? That is a sort of consequence that I am not used to make; for if he had not done one page of the Book at noon, yet he had time more than enough to have finished it by the evening; for, as I said before, "it is as legible as print," being written in a modern hand, and without abbreviations; and wants one-and-twenty epistles that are extant in the printed copies, which is the seventh part of the whole Book; so that the work of collating is so much the shorter. I had a mind, for the experiment sake, to collate the first forty epistles, which are all that the Collator has done; and I had finished them in an hour and eighteen minutes, though I made no very great haste; and yet I remarked and set down above *fifty* various lections, though the editor has taken notice of *one* only. Now, if FORTY epistles can be collated in an hour and eighteen minutes, the whole MS. which contains but ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-SEVEN Epistles, may be collated in four hours. The Collator then, had he been diligent, might have finished the whole Collation twice over, between noon and the close of the evening, when the Book was returned.

As for the Collator, I am utterly a stranger to both his person and character; and have nothing to say to him, but that his testimony is as useless and imperfect as his collations. Indeed, it is hard to conjecture to what purpose it is produced. The sum of it is, "That the MS. was sent for before he had finished;" which is confessed on all hands. It had been more to the purpose, if he had told us what he was doing all that time the MS. was in his hands. I say "five or six days;" the Bookseller says, "a few days;" Mr. Boyle, "not nine." By the shortest account it now appears, as I said before, "that he had more days to compare it in than he needed to have hours." And how did he spend the last afternoon, which was more than sufficient to do the whole work in? Whether he undertook it for a reward, or out of kindness, the Editor was not very much obliged to him.

The Bookseller adds further, "That I utterly refused to leave the MS. with him beyond Saturday, though he begged but to have it till Sunday morning, and engaged to oblige the Collator to sit up at it all Saturday night." How false and silly

silly this is, the sagacious reader must needs see and acknowledge. This was spoken "on Saturday at noon," by the Bookseller's own confession; and he had then free leave to keep it, and did keep it till the evening: and the whole Collation was but the work of four hours, as I have proved by experiment; and yet he has the face to tell the world, that he would engage the Collator to sit up all night to finish it; when the whole might be done, from the beginning to the end, twice over before candle-light. Why I would not have spared it till Sunday morning, suppose I had been asked, there might be several good reasons. I was to take coach for Worcester by five o'clock on Monday morning; and I could have no leisure on Sunday to put the Book into the Library; for at that time I lived with the Right Reverend the Bishop of Worcester*, at a good distance from the Library. The key too of the outward door was then in custody of another; who perhaps might not be met with upon Sunday. Besides that, there was time and enough to spare before Saturday evening; and what obligation had I to neglect my own business to humour others in their laziness?

[xxvii]

"But," he says, "I gave him not the least hopes that, if he applied to me upon my return out of the country, he should have leave to get the Collation perfected." That I gave him not any hopes of it by an express promise, I verily believe; for how could I do that, when I was fully persuaded they would finish the Collation before I went into the country? But what he saw in me that forbade him to hope it, if there should be occasion, I cannot imagine. He knew the reason why I then demanded the Book, was my journey into the country. I was to make so long a stay there, that it was not fit to expose the Book all that while to the hazard of being lost. I told the Bookseller then, "that I was to be absent for two months; but it appears now upon record, that I was four months at Worcester; and how many accidents might have happened in that time! Should I, who was under a trust, and accountable to God and man, run such a risk without any warrant? The Editor and his Witnesses may calumniate as they please; but I wish I could as well justify my lending the MS. out, as my calling it in."

[xxviii]

The Bookseller concludes, "That I made some reflections from time to time, when he spoke to me from Mr. Boyle; but, considering his employment, it may not be proper to

P. 6.

* Dr. Edward Stillingfleet.

" add

P. 3. "add an account of them." So that he puts off that piece of work to one "Dr. King of the Commons," as the Examiner styles him. Now what he means by *reflections*, or what harm there is in *making reflections*, I do not understand. A great person, *one of the Examiner's family*, made a whole Book of "Reflexions;" and I never heard it was counted a crime in him. I am much to seek too for his meaning, "That his employment makes it not proper for him to add an account of those reflections." His employment, as a Bookseller, I think a very reputable one, if he himself be not a disgrace to it. And if that make it *not proper* for him to bear false witness against his neighbour, by a pretended *account of those reflections*, methinks the profession of the Doctor to whom he refers himself, is more *improper* for that work. The Doctor, indeed, by his profession may be enabled to do it with more cunning; but he would do it with the greater crime:—but let us hear the Doctor's testimony; — the air and spirit of it is so very extraordinary; — the virulency and *insolence* so far above the common pitch, that it puts one in mind of *Rupilius King*, a great ancestor of the Doctor's, commended to posterity by Horace*, under this honourable character:

"Proscripti Regis Rupili pus atque venenum,"
The filth and venom of Rupilius King.

And if the Doctor do not inherit the estate of Rupilius, yet the whole world must allow that he is heir of his virtues; as his own writings will vouch for him, — his deposition here against me, — his buffoonry upon the learned Dr. Lister, — and some other monuments of his learning and his morals.

P. 9. "I have endeavoured," says the Doctor, "as far as I can, to recollect what passed between Mr. Bennet and Dr. Bentley, concerning a MS. of the Epistles of Phalaris. I cannot be certain as to ANY OTHER particulars, than that, among other things, the Doctor said, *That if the MS. were collated, it would be worth nothing for the future.*" Now the reader may please to take notice, that the Doctor here publicly owns "That he cannot be certain as to any other particulars;" and yet "he endeavoured to recollect, as far as he could;" and "the scorn," he says, "and contempt, which he has naturally for pride and insolence, made him remember that, which otherwise he might have forgotten." Now, if the Doctor, even whetted with his "scorn and contempt," could call to mind but ONE particular, and if that particular have nothing at all in it about Mr.

* Sat. I. vii. 1.

Boyle,

Boyle, nor any thing that borders upon "pride and insolence," what pretence has he for traducing me here as a proud and insolent man, and an abuser of Mr. Boyle? If the Doctor, as he owns, has but *ONE* particular from his *memory*, the rest he must have from his *invention*. I am obliged indeed to the Doctor, for he has effectually disproved himself in his own deposition; for he first declares he knows but *ONE* particular; and yet presently runs into a charge, whereof nothing can be made out from that particular:—and would such an evidence as this pass in *Doctors' Commons*? I am much mistaken, if the worthy persons that preside there would dismiss such a witness as this without marks of their dissatisfaction.

To account then for that "one particular," that the Doctor "is certain of," the reader must give me leave to tell him a short story. After I was nominated to the Library-keeper's Office (before the Patent was finished) I was informed that one copy of every Book printed in England, which were due to the Royal Library by Act of Parliament*, had not of late been brought into the Library, according to the said Act. Upon this I made application to the Master of the Stationers' Company, to whom the Act directed me, and demanded the copies. The effect whereof was, that I procured near a thousand volumes, of one sort or other, which are now lodged in the Library. While this was transacting, I chanced to call upon Mr. Bennet (whom I had several times obliged) and acquainted him with it; not questioning but he would be very ready to comply, as far as his share went, which was then but little; but, to my surprize, he answered me very pertly, "That he knew not what right the Parliament had

[xxx]

* By the Stat. 13 & 14 Car. II. commonly called "The Licensing Act," Chap. 32. Sect. 17, it was enacted, That every Printer should reserve *three* printed Copies, of the best and largest paper, of every Book new printed, or reprinted by him with additions, and, before the public vending of the same, deliver them to the Master of the Stationers' Company; who was thereby directed to deliver One Copy to the Keeper of his Majesty's Library, and the other Two to the Vice-Chancellors of the Two Universities, for the use of their Libraries. This Act was made for Two years; and from thence continued to the year 1679, when it expired. It was afterwards revived by 1 Jac. II. c. 17, and continued to 1692; and then to 1694, when it finally expired: some months after Dr. Bentley's appointment to his office. It is printed in the Appendix to Ruffhead's Edition.—By the Stat. 8 Anne, still in force, it was enacted, that *nine* Copies of every Book should, in like manner, be delivered to Stationers' Hall, for the Royal Library, Sion College, the Six Universities in Great Britain, and the Advocate's Library at Edinburgh.

" to

"to give away any man's property; that he hoped the Company of Stationers would refuse, and try it out at Law; that they were a Body, and had a common purse;" and more to this purpose. Some little time after, calling there again, upon a fresh discourse about the MS. Phalaris, which I had formerly promised to lend him as soon as I had power, I asked him, "Upon what account he could refuse to give the Royal Library its due, settled on it by Act of Parliament? and at the same time expect a favour out of it, that would make his own Book more vendible, and the MS. less valuable? For, after the *Various Lectons* were once taken and printed, the MS. would be like a squeezed orange, and little worth for the future. Since, therefore, he was resolved to try

[xxxii] "the Law against the Library, he ought in justice to present to it some Book of competent value, to make amends for the damage it would sustain by his using the MS."

This discourse I very well remember; and, I believe, I can bring witness that heard me relate it long before the Doctor's deposition came abroad; and I take it for certain, that this was the very same conversation which Dr. King overheard. It is true, there is some small difference in the account: I said that the MS. would be *worth little* for the future; and the Doctor says *worth nothing*. But that is no material change, and may be excused in the Doctor, who is not over nice in his expressions. But do I remember that the Doctor was present then? No; nor any time else; for I know him not if I meet him; and perhaps my "pride and insolence" might lie in that, that I did not know a person "of such known credit in the world."

P. 5. Allowing then that this was the free conference (as the Examiner calls it) which the Doctor overheard, I have a few things to observe in the narrative that he has made of it.

It appears, first, that his pert reflection, which he thought carried such a sting in it, is very silly and insipid. "Which

[xxxiii] "I took the more notice of," says he, "because I thought a MS. good for nothing unless it were collated." Wonderful remark, and worthy of such eves-droppers, that are prowling after that which does not concern them, and catch at little scraps of other mens discourses. It is true, Sir, a MS. not collated, is, upon that account, worth nothing to the rest of the world; but to the owner it is the better for it, if a price were to be set on it. And I think, with submission, that a fresh MS. newly brought out of Greece, and never yet printed, would sell for more, *cæteris paribus*, than another already printed.

printed. Do you think the Alexandrian MS. of as great a value now, since the edition of the English Polyglott, as when Cyrus the Greek Patriarch first presented it to King Charles the First? But what do I talk to him of MS. who has so little a relish and sense of such things, as to declare deliberately "That he does not believe the various readings of ANY BOOK are so much worth, as that Mr. Boyle should be used so *scurvily* to obtain them." And this he says when he is giving *evidence*; where all declaimings and rhetorical aggravations above the naked and strict truth are unlawful, and border near upon perjury. But we must not expect from the Doctor that he should know the *worth of Books*; for he is better skilled in his catalogues of his ales, his *humtie-dumtie*, *hug-matee*, *three-threads*, and the rest of that glorious list*, than [xxxiv]

P. 8.

But pray what was that *scurvy usage* that I gave to Mr. Boyle? The Doctor remembers but ONE particular; and that has no relation to Mr. Boyle. I am almost persuaded that Mr. Boyle's name was not once mentioned in that conversation; for this talk was not had the last time when I called for the MS. but long before, when my patent was not yet passed, and before I had the custody of the Library. But suppose Mr. B. was named then, I am sure it must be with respect; for how could I use him *scurvily*, in denying him a MS. which was not then in my power to give? Before the time of that discourse, I had promised that the MS. when I could come at it, should be at Mr. Boyle's service; and in such words as Mr. Boyle himself owns to be "expressions of great civility, — That a gentleman of that name and family, to which I had so many obligations, and should always have an honour for, might command any service that lay in my power." That I really used these expressions, even the Bookseller himself is my witness; for, if it had not been true, he would never have let it be printed without contradicting it. Now, how is it credible that I should use a man so *civilly* and yet so *scurvily* too? A man must be dosed with *humtie-dumtie* that could talk so inconsistently. And how could I abuse a young gentleman, whom I had never heard of before, without any provocation, in a public place, and before his own friends? I dare appeal to

P. 4. 19.

[xxxv]

* See his "Journey to London," a travestie on Dr. Lister's "Journey to Paris," in the lately-reprinted Collection of his Original Works, vol. I. p. 223. In p. 142 of the same volume, is a letter of Dr. King's, occasioned by these reflections of Dr. Bentley.

any that ever was acquainted with me, if he thinks me capable of doing so.

All the discourse then that the Doctor overheard had relation only to the Bookseller. Mr. Boyle was sure of the MS. which I promised before; but I had a mind to make the Bookseller sensible of his ill-manners, in denying justice to the King's Library at the same time that he asked favours. And I do further declare that I was but in jest when I told him That he should give a Book to the Royal Library, to recompense for the use of the MS.; and I had no design in it, but to mortify him a little for his pertness about going to law: for when the time came that I could lend him the MS. he had it freely, without giving to the Library the value of a printed sermon; though I remember, when I once told this story to a very great man, his answer was, "That, if I was not in earnest, I ought to have been so."

[xxxvi] The Bookseller says "His employment makes it not proper for him to give an account of the reflections I made as we talked about Phalaris:" but I will help him out for once, and give an account of one that I very well remember. The Bookseller once asked me privately, "that I would do him the favour to tell my opinion, if the new edition of Phalaris, then in the press, would be a vendible Book? for he had a concern in the impression, and hoped it would sell well; such a great character being given of it in *Essays*, as made it mightily enquired after." I told him "He would be safe enough, since he was concerned for nothing but the sale of the Book; for the great names of those that recommended it would get many buyers: but, however, under the rose, the Book was a spurious piece, and deserved not to be spread in the world by another impression." His employment, it seems, could suffer him to betray this discourse to some concerned in the edition, as I was informed from a very good hand; and this I meant, when I said in my former account "that it was my hard hap in some private conversation to say the Epistles were spurious, and unworthy of a new edition." What influence this might have towards the civility in the "Preface to Phalaris," I leave others to judge; but I dare say this was all the reflection that I had ever made at that time to Mr. Boyle's disadvantage, "Si hoc peccare est, fateor." If there be no way of gaining his good opinion but to believe Phalaris a good Writer, I must needs submit to my fate, that has excluded me from his friendship.

Mr.

Mr. B. is pleased to observe "That Mr. Bennet is so little interested in this dispute, that he may entirely be depended on." So very little, that the best part of his interest and his trade lay at stake; for is not this the plain state of the case? Mr. Boyle commits the affair of collating the King's MS. to his Bookseller: the Bookseller, by his own neglect, having failed in his trust, for fear of losing the gentleman's favour and custom, lays the fault upon me. This occasioned a private grudge against me, which terminated in an affront in print. I verily believe that the Bookseller did not think at first that Mr. Boyle would have carried his resentment so high; otherwise, perhaps, he would have invented some other excuse of his negligence: but the business was afterwards past recalling; and he must go on of necessity, being once engaged in the cause. The whole of his trade and business seemed to depend upon Mr. B. and his friends. The temptation indeed was strong; and I pray God forgive him.

Having now, as I humbly conceive, given a full and satisfactory answer to all the matters of fact that the Examiner's Witnesses lay to my charge, I am very little concerned at the inferences he draws from them, or the satire and grimace he plentifully sprinkles. All these must drop of themselves, and fall down upon the Author of them, when the foundation that they stood on is taken away. But, however, I shall take some short notice of every thing he has said, that is not entirely included in the testimonies of his witnesses. [xxxviii]

"The Doctor," says he, "seemed to be satisfied and willing to let the dispute drop, by his not writing to me any further about it, or discoursing Mr. Bennett concerning it, to whom my Letter plainly referred him." The Doctor, it is true, was willing to "let the dispute drop;" but whether either or both of these reasons ought to have made Mr. B. suppose I was *satisfied*, I leave it to the judgment of those that know good breeding. I had written him, as himself owns, a *very civil* Letter, complaining of the fraud of his Bookseller, and representing the matter quite otherwise than he had told it. After a delay of two posts, when the Books were spread abroad in the meantime, I had an answer, giving me leave to take my own satisfaction, and, as he here says, referring me to discourse with his Bookseller. Now what person of any courage or spirit, such as innocence always gives one, would either write again to Mr. B. after this repeated affront, or go with his finger in his eye to tell his story to the Bookseller, who was the principal in the injury? Mr. B. must sure have [xxxix]

- P. 106. an "odd cast of his head," to think that I or any man else would submit to such indignities. I had done all that became me in writing him a timely account of the whole truth, with
- P. 4. "expressions of great civility to him;" but when I saw the civility of his Answer, which bade me right myself as I pleased, and referred me to his Bookseller, "I neither thought my *station* so little, nor the *Editor's* so very great, nor the *calumny* so terrible, that I should make a second application "after such a repulse." I designed, indeed, "to drop the dispute," but not because I either owned or feared, but because I despised the detraction, being conscious that it was false; and well knowing that, if ever I pleased, I could make the Authors ashamed of it.

- Mr. B. has such an affection for chicanery and banter, that he cannot abstain from it when he ought to be most serious. He pretends to draw up a heavy charge against me, because
- P. 18, 19. I say "the Editors of Phalaris;" and, in another place,
- P. 17. "They have collated." — "How came I, says he, "to be multiplied at this rate?" Well, I will submit to the chastisement of this great Aristarchus; though I might have the common liberty of changing numbers, which is familiar in all the languages that I know of, either old or new. Who knows not that *οἱ περὶ Πλάτωνα, οἱ περὶ Ἀριστοτέλην* are often put for Plato and Aristotle alone? "As certain of your own *POETS* have said," says the Apostle; and yet he meant only Aratus. And how often do we say *We*, and yet speak of ourselves only, without thinking we are *multiplied*, or doubled, like Sosia in Plautus's *Amphitryo*! I do not question but some example of this may be found in his own Book, if the matter were worth the search. I am sure that, in another piece of grimace, he is guilty of the very expression that he would turn to ridicule. I had said "It was a surprize indeed
- P. 21. "to find there that our MS. was not perused." — "Our MS." says the Examiner, "that is, His Majesty's and mine. He fancies himself to have some interest in it. It is like the *Ego et Rex meus* of Cardinal Wolsey." Very smart and witty! so that, by the same rule, when Mr. B. himself says "It will be hard upon our Sicilian Prince," we must interpret it "*Ego et Phalaris meus*," *I and my Prince Phalaris*. And when he so often says "our Critic," meaning his humble servant, the world is to take it that he has some dominion over me, which is an honour I am not worthy of. And when I myself often say "our Editor," and "our Edition," Mr. B. by this rule, may infer that I claim
- a share

a share and a concern in his Edition of Phalaris; which I should take for a compliment more severe than any thing he has yet said on me.

There is a certain temper of mind, that Cicero * calls PHALARISM, "a spirit like Phalaris's;" and one would be apt to imagine that a portion of it had descended upon some of his Translators. The Gentleman has given a broad hint more than once in his Book, that, if I proceed further against Phalaris, I may draw perhaps a duel or a stab upon myself; which is a generous threat, especially to a Divine, who neither carries arms nor principles fit for that sort of controversy. It is the same kind of generosity, though in a lower degree, when he forbids me "to meddle with banter and ridicule, "which, even when luckily hit on, are not very suitable to "my character." And yet the sharpest, nay almost the only arguments that he himself uses, are banter and ridicule; so that "we two," as he says, "must end this dispute;" but he takes care to allow me none of the offensive arms that himself fights with. These are the extraordinary instances both of his candour and his courage. However, I have endeavoured to take his advice, and avoid all ridicule where it was possible to avoid it; and if ever "that odd work of his" has irresistibly moved me to a little jest and laughter, I am content that what is the greatest virtue of *his* Book should be counted the greatest fault of *mine*.

P. 285.

Preface.

[xlii]
P. 68.

The facetious Examiner seems resolved to vie with Phalaris himself in the science of PHALARISM; for his revenge is not satisfied with one single death of his adversary, but he will kill me over and over again. He has slain me twice by two several deaths; one in the first page of his Book, and another in the last. In the Title-page I die the death of Milo the Crotonian:—

"—— Remember Milo's end:

"Wedg'd in that timber which he strove to rend."

The application of which must be this: That as Milo, after his victories at six several Olympiads, was at last conquered and destroyed in wrestling with a tree, so I, after I had attained to some small reputation in Letters, am to be quite baffled and run down by wooden antagonists:—but, in the end of his Book, he has got me into Phalaris's Bull; and he

* Attic. vii. 12. "Istum quidem, cujus Φαλαγισμόν times, omnia "tetricè facturum puto."

P. 290. has the pleasure of fancying that he hears me "begin to
[xliii] "bellow." Well, since it is certain then that I am in the Bull, I have performed the part of a sufferer; for as the cries of the tormented in old Phalaris's Bull, being conveyed through pipes lodged in the machine, were turned into music for the entertainment of the Tyrant, so the complaints which my torments express for me, being conveyed to Mr. B. by this Answer, are all dedicated to his pleasure and diversion; but yet, methinks, when he was setting up to be Phalaris Junior, the very omen of it might have deterred him; for, as the old Tyrant himself at last *bellowed* in his own Bull, so his imitators ought to consider, that at long run their own actions may chance to overtake them.

[xliv] But it is not enough for him that I die a bodily death, unless my reputation too die with me. He accuses me of one of the meanest and basest of actions: "That when Sir Edward Sherburn put a MS. into my hands to get it published by Mr. Grævius, desiring me to let him know from whom he had it, that he might make an honourable mention of him, I concealed the kindness of Sir Edward, and took the honour of it to myself; so that the Book was dedicated to *mè*, and not one word said of *him*." This is both a very black and a very false accusation; and yet I own I am neither sorry nor surprized to see it in print. Not sorry, because I can so fully confute it, that with all ingenuous readers it will turn to my applause;—not surprized, because I expected such usage from the spirit of PHALARISM. I am morally sure that the very persons that printed this story knew how to give a good answer to it; for I heard of it by some common friends some time before it was printed, who, I question not, gave them an account how I justified myself; but, however, it seems they would not lay aside this calumny; for, as in war sometimes it is an useful stratagem to spread a false report, though it certainly must be disproved in two or three days; so here it was thought a serviceable falsehood, if it could be credited for a few months. Besides that, it is the old rule to accuse strenuously, and something will stick; and it is almost the same thing with men's reputations as with their lives: he that is prodigal of his own, is master of another man's.

I had prepared a new Edition of *Mamilius*; which design being known abroad occasioned my acquaintance with Sir Edward Sherburn, who had formerly translated the First Book of that Poet into English verse, and explained it with a large Commentary. He had got together some old and scarce Editions, which

which he courteously lent me ; and besides those, he had purchased at Antwerp, by the means of a Bookseller, a whole box full of papers of the famous Gasper Gevartius's, who undertook an edition of the same Poet, but was prevented by death. All this mass of papers he desired me to look over, if perhaps I might find any thing that was useful to the public. Among the remains of Gevartius, I found nothing of any moment; but there was one Treatise about Theodorus Mallius, written in another hand, but without any name to it, which I thought to be considerable; and, by good fortune, among a parcel of Letters, I met with one written in the same hand with that Treatise, and subscribed "A. R."; and I easily guessed, by the contents of the Letter, that they meant ALBERTUS RUBENIUS. This gave me a certain discovery of the true Author of that Treatise; and I immediately waited on Sir Edward, and gave him an account of it; desiring him either to send it to Oxford to be printed among some Miscellanies, or to Utrecht, to the learned Mr. Grævius; who, having printed some Posthumous Works of the same Albertus Rubenius, was the properest hand to convey this to the world. The latter proposal being embraced, I wrote to Holland, to Mr. Grævius, giving a narrative of the whole, and promising, in the name of Sir Edward, that, if Mr. Grævius would undertake the Edition, I would presently send him the Book. Within no long time, I received an answer from Mr. Grævius; where, among other things, says he, "Pray present my humble service to that learned and noble Gentleman, Sir Edward Sherburn; and if he pleases to commit Rubenius to my care, I will immediately put it to the press, and let the Learned World know to whose kindness they are obliged. I had never heard of his Commentary upon the First Book of Manilius; but, since you give such a character of it, I am sure it must needs be good, and therefore I will purchase it." I shewed this Letter to Sir Edward; and so the Book was sent to Holland by a safe hand.

[xlv]

[xlvi]

The very next Letter that I received from Mr. Grævius was accompanied with half a dozen printed copies of Rubenius. I was much surprized to see the Book printed so soon; but more, when I saw a Dedication to myself; which was an honour that I should not have expected, if I had been not only the discoverer, but the possessor too of the MS.; but it troubled me exceedingly, when I found not the least mention of Sir Edward Sherburn there; and I expressed my concern about it to several friends; particularly the Right Reverend the

- [xlvii] Bishop of Norwich*, whom I do myself the honour to name here, will bear me witness how extremely I was concerned at it, when I presented him one of the copies. And some time after, when his Lordship sent to Mr. Grævius, by my means, a Collation of the Philosophical Works of Cicero, from a very ancient and excellent MS. (for, as his Lordship has one of the best Libraries of England, so he is as free in communicating it) I appeal to Mr. Grævius himself, who has yet perhaps that letter by him, if I did not wish him to take care, not to ascribe that favour to me; and not to forget to name his Lordship, as he had formerly forgotten Sir Edward Sherburn. Another of the copies of Rubenius I presented to Sir Edward himself; and both lamented to him and excused Mr. Grævius's oversight, that he had dedicated that to me, which was rather due to Sir Edward. As for myself, I had no manner of need to make apology to Sir Edward, since he had read Mr. Grævius's own Letter, where he voluntarily promised to make honourable mention of him; and would certainly have done it, if the multiplicity of his studies and other affairs had not quite struck it out of his mind. I might appeal to Sir Edward's own memory for the truth of all this; but that his exceeding old age†, and the infirmities that attend it, make him an incompetent witness; and upon that account I heartily excuse and forgive him all that his weakness has furnished to the malice of some others.
- [xlviii]

The Examiner has represented, as if the good word that Mr. Grævius has been pleased publicly to give me, was solely bottomed upon that which I falsely assumed to myself, the publication of Rubenius. It is necessary therefore to give the Reader here as much of that Dedication as concerns me and that affair; that he may see whether such a stress is laid upon that favour, as, if that belong to another man, my little reputation must all drop with it.

“ Viro Cl. Richardo Bentleio, S. P. D.

“ Joannes Georgius Grævius.

“ Redit ad te, quam mihi dono miseris, Alberti Rubenii
 “ commentatio de Theodoro Mallio sane quam docta et polita.
 “ Pro qua, cum illam mecum communicare voluisti, non
 “ possum non tibi et meo et rei literariæ nomine gratias
 “ agere publice. Plurimum igitur tibi debebunt manes Ru-

* Dr. John Moore, translated to Ely in 1707.

† He was born Sept. 18, 1618, and died Nov. 4, 1702.

“ benii,

“benii, si quis manium sensus est, qui tam egregiam ejus diatriben ex tenebris, in quibus absque te fuisset, perpetuo quasi sepulta jacuisset, in dias luminis auras protraxisti.— Nec manes tantum Rubenii, sed omnes humanitatis cultores tibi pro hoc in se merito devinxisti. Hi nunc tuas curas in Manilium, Hesychium, aliosque Scriptores desiderant et expectant cupidè. Nam eruditissima illa Epistola, quam subtexuisti Malalæ Chronicis, tam multa recondita nos docuit, ut incredibilem expectationem tui ingenii commoverit. Nihil nobis longius est, nihil desideratius, quam ut illa videamus, quorum spem fecisti, cum publice omnibus, tum mihi de tuis in Callimacho animadversionibus, quarum pulcherrimum specimen mihi misisti. Hanc ut propediem expleas, Vir Eximie, Deum precor, ut salvus, incolumis, felix ætatem agas, meque tui studiosissimum amare pergas.”

[xlix]

Now the whole that Mr. Grævius says here, or could say of me, in relation to the publishing of Rubenius, is this: —“That himself in particular, and all the lovers of polite learning, and the very Author Rubenius (if the Dead have any knowledge of what is done here) give me thanks for retrieving the MS.” But for the rest of the Dedication, I humbly conceive, the character he has there given of me has another foundation. I implore here the Reader’s candour, that he would not believe me so vain as to assume the commendations that Mr. Grævius and some other eminent persons have given me (to encourage, as I suppose, my beginnings) as if they really were deserved by me. But I mention them here on this occasion, to shew that some of the learnedest men of the age have either more candour, or another kind of judgment, than Mr. B. and his party. Mr. B. is pleased somewhere to send me to Hermogenes’s Chapter*, Περὶ τῆ ἀνεπαχθῆς ἐαυτὸν ἐπαυεῖν, “How a man may commend himself, without envy or fulsomeness.” And I find there, that one may safely do it “when detraction and calumny make it necessary.”

[1]

Nay, I may freely say that I deserve almost as well of the memory of Rubenius, as if all the honour which they pretend I robbed Sir Edward of, had been truly my own; neither is there one single word that Mr. Grævius says of me, with respect to Rubenius, that is not literally true; for it was I that “communicated the MS. to him;” it was I that “brought it out of that darkness, where, without me, it might have

* Hermog. p. 429.

“been

[ii] "been buried for ever;" for Sir Edward had been possessor of Gevartius's papers for several years; but he knew no more of that Treatise, and especially who was the Author of it, than if it had never been written; nay, if I had been such a plagiarist as Mr. B. would traduce me for, I had it wholly in my power not only to rob Sir Edward, but Rubenius himself of the honour of that Treatise; for Sir Edward entrusted me with the whole box of papers, whereof he knew little or nothing, without either numbering or weighing them; so that I could easily have kept back that little Treatise without giving him any notice of it, and have published it afterwards as my own work; and this alone is a sufficient disproof of this malicious calumny; for how is it credible, since I was so ingenuous as to make discovery of a paper which I could have concealed as my own, that at the same time I could be so senselessly dishonest as to seek to rob him of that little honour of being master of another man's work many years, without knowing what it was?

[iii] When I first met with this accusation in print, it seemed the easiest way of confuting it, to produce Mr. Grævius's Letter; where, in answer to mine, he thanked Sir Edward for the hopes he had given him of the MS. and promised to do him right in the publication; so that presently I looked among my papers; but, to my grief, I could not find it by the most diligent search. The next thing was, to produce my own letter to Mr. Grævius, where I myself had made *honourable mention* of Sir Edward and his intended kindness; but I had not that Letter in my power; for I wrote that, as I do others, but once over, without keeping any copy of it. The only reserve then that I had left, was to write to Mr. Grævius, and to desire a copy of his former Letter, if perhaps he had a transcript of it; or that he would send me either a copy or the original of my Letter, if such a trifle, by good providence, should still be in being, or at least that he would now do me right by a new Letter, since he could not but remember, when put in mind of it, that I had sent him Rubenius as Sir Edward Sherburn's Book, and not as my own. And in answer I received a Letter, part of which I here published without varying a word; and I must own myself obliged to Mr. B. that he was pleased to start this calumny so early, while all the parties are still alive to disprove it.

‘ Joannes Georgius Grævius, S. P. D.

‘ Richardo Bentleio.

‘ Literis

* Literis tuis, quas Febuario superiore dedisti ad me quamvis nihil iis acceptius et optatius mihi poterit afferri, serius respondeo; non quod immemor fuerim officii, sed quod * Epistolam illam, qua nonnulla fragmentis Callimachi adjici volebas, quæ ego præmio inserui, cum jam omnia cætera * typis essent descripta, diu frustra quæsivi. Nec enim exputare possum, unde illa, quæ tua negas esse, excerpserim. * Itaque non putabam me ante tibi posse satisfacere, quam [liv] * illam inspexissem Epistolam, et num me mei oculi, aut memoria fefellerit, inde cognovissem. Quamvis vero mihi * non perierit, qui omnia tua custodio diligentius nigris uvis, nescio tamen in quem se angulum Bibliothecæ abdidit, ex * quo nondum potuit erui. Nunc visa tua novissima Epistola, quam pridie, cum ex itinere menstruo fere domum revertissem, inveni domi meæ; diutius cessandum non duxi. Ad * priores, pro quibus tibi *ῥίαν* debeo, brevi respondebo. * Jam ad has, quas xxix Aprilis exarasti, hæc habe.

* In literis, quas Londini in ædibus Episcopi Wigorniensis scripseras iv Julii, 1692, hæc tu ad me: "Est apud nos * Edvardus Sherburnus, Eques Auratus, qui librum primum * Manilii Anglicè vertit, et commentario doctissimo auxit. * Is abhinc annis aliquot apparatus Gas. Gevartii ad Manilium ab ejus hærede emit Antwerpiae, mihiq; non ita * pridem, quem novam ejus Scriptoris editionem parare inaudiverat, schedas Gevartianas perlegendi copiam fecit. Comperi autem Virum Clarissimum omnem operam in eo * posuisse, non qui Manilii textum corrigeret, vel illustraret, sed * qui infelicem suam (mea quidem sententia) conjecturam de * Theodoro Mallio Cos. quem Astronomici auctorem esse [liv] * voluit, adversus Barthios, et Salmasios, et Tristanos, et Possinos defenderet. Nihil tamen in medium profert, quod * momenti habeat quicquam ad opinionem suam stabiliendam, * præterquam quæ dudum in lucem ediderat in Papinianis et * Variis Lectionibus. Itaque cum toties repetita crambe mihi * fastidium moveret, mirifice tamen recreatus sum aureolis duabus Epistolis, quæ in isto chartarum fasce latitabant, * quæque celeberrimum Grævii nomen ferebant inscriptum. * Illud vero me perculisse fateor, quod ad Gevartii sententiam * de ætate Manilii videris accedere." Et quæ sequuntur de hac opinione Gevartii, quam damnas. Post hæc addis: * Erat autem præterea quod me Adversaria ista versantem non * mediocri voluptate affecit, Dissertatio scilicet bene longa et * perquam erudita de vita Fl. Mallii Theodori Cos. auctore, * ut casu comperi, Alberto Rubenio, cujus Opuscula Post-
"huma,

"huma, te obstetricante, in lucem prodierunt. Hanc meo
 "judicio minime dignam, quæ cum blattis et tineis diutius con-
 "flictetur, curabo tibi mittendam, si ejus Editionem te procu-
 "raturum fore polliceris; et quidem vel una cum aliis quibus-
 "dam vel etiam sola non incommode edi poterit."

[Iv]

'Hæc αὐτολεξίᾱ in Epistola tua, ex quibus luce meridiana
 'clarius patet, non tuam, sed meam culpam esse, quod, cum
 'Commentationem Rubenianam ederem, non meminerim
 'hujus Epistolæ, et propterea non debitas gratias persolverim
 'Viro Nobilissimo Edvardo Sherburno pro communicato cum
 'utroque nostrum hoc Rubenii libello. Ipse aut negligen-
 'tiam aut oblivionem meam detestor, et culpam deprecor.
 'Meæ responsionis nullum servavi exemplum, æque ac nec
 'aliarum. Illud memini me Sherburni Mamilium, quem ex
 'tua Epistola cognovi plane mihi ante ignotum, sæpe desi-
 'derasse.

'Vale, — et tibi persuade, te doctos omnes viros maxime
 'facere, *rumpantur ut ilia Codris*; sed neminem esse qui te
 'majoris faciat, et magis æstimet quam ego te facio.'

After this letter of Mr. Grævius's, I suppose, there needs
 nothing more to silence this sorry calumny. He has exscribed
 the words of my own Letter, which in the plainest expres-
 sions declare, "That the MS. was Sir Edward Sherburn's;
 "that he had lent me it to read over; and if Mr. Grævius
 "would promise to publish it, it should be put into his hands."
 And though he has no transcript of that letter which he sent me
 in answer to mine, where he returned Sir Edward thanks, and
 promised to do it publicly, yet he very well remembers it, and,
 upon the whole, avers, "That it was his fault, and not mine,"
 that Sir Edward was not mentioned; and he "asks pardon for
 the omission, whether it "happened through negligence or
 "through forgetfulness."

[Ivi]

The first part of Mr. Grævius's Letter relates to another
 affair, that Mr. B. is not concerned in; and yet it is not so
 wide from the present case as not to deserve a place here.
 Mr. Grævius, in his Preface to the late Edition of Callima-
 chus, has these words: "In epigrammate xxix *Bentleianæ*
 "συναγωγῆς, versum secundum sic legendum esse postea nobis
 "scripsit celeberrimus *Bentleius*, Τῶρρα μένων αἰγᾶν ἔκαθιμάσ'
 "ὁ Κύκλωψ, et sic vertendum,

"*Illic manens capras non dimisit Cyclops:*

"Hoc est, gregem non dimisit ex pascuis suo tempore: Τῶρρα
 "Hesych. Τῶ ρα, δὲ δῆ. Idem, Τό ρα ὅτε δι."

When

When I read this passage first, it was a very great surprise to find a correction ascribed to me, as communicated by my own Letter, which I could not remember one syllable of, and which, in every part of it, is quite against my own judgment. As the first word *Τάρρα* is falsely translated *Illic*, and the translation is falsely justified out of Hesychius; for Hesychius interprets it διὸ δὴ, i. e. *quamobrem*, and ὅπερ δὴ, i. e. *quod quidem*: and what do those two words relate to *Illic*? Then the third word *Αἰγᾶν* seems to be set there as a Doricism for *Αἰγῶν*: but the Dorians never turn *ων* into *ᾶν* in that declension; for they say *τᾶν φρενῶν*, not *τᾶν φρενᾶν*. And the fifth word *καθιμάσ* has no fewer than three faults in it. First, it should be accented *καθίμασε*, and not *καθιμάσσε*; then the syllable *θι* here is made short in the measure; but it is always long, as appears in Aristophanes and others; then it is translated here *DIMISIT*, *dismissed*; but it truly signifies *DEMISIT*, *he let down by a rope*. Besides all these verbal faults, the whole sentence is flat, and unworthy of Callimachus. I declare therefore that I never wrote this; and I utterly disown the whole. And in the copies that I presented soon after the publication to some Right Honourable persons, whom I will not name upon so slight an occasion, they will find my name in that place blotted out, and the correction left to its unknown Author.

[lvii]

This mistake of Mr. Grævius's was one of the subjects of that Letter of mine, which he answers here in the first paragraph of his. He says "He sought a long time for that Letter, where (as he thought) I gave direction to insert this emendation; but it could nowhere be found." No wonder, indeed, that it was sought *in vain*, for there was no such Letter written by me; but Mr. Grævius, as it seems, by a very natural and very pardonable failing, had forgot who it was that had sent him that correction. He might have a schedule of it inclosed in a letter; and if the letter and the schedule were parted, it was a very easy mistake to ascribe it to a wrong Author. And I heartily excuse this little oversight in that excellent person, as I doubt not but he will excuse this freedom, that I publicly disclaim that correction; for, as his incomparable learning will not allow the least suspicion that the correction could be his own, so his singular ingenuity and candour will allow me the liberty to renounce what is not mine. But I would crave leave to make two inferences from this, with relation to the Examiner: first, I humbly conceive, here is a case exactly parallel with that of Sir Edward Sherburn's; and if such a mistake happened without my

[lviii]

my knowledge in the Edition of Callimachus, the same thing might happen in the Edition of Rubenius. And, secondly, we have a singular instance here of Mr. B.'s great capacity to be a censurer of my writings, who, though he read (as appears from his Book) my Notes on Callimachus, and my Dissertation on Jo. Antiochensis, on purpose to find faults in them, was not able to discover the mistakes of this passage, that lay so thick and so open.

[lix] I cannot omit this opportunity of correcting and explaining one of the Epigrams of that Poet: *

Τὴν ἀλίην Εὐδήμου, ἐφ' ἧς ἄλα λίθον ἐπελθὼν,
 Χειμῶνας μεγάλης ἐξέφυγεν δανέων,
 Θῆκε θεοῖς Σαμόθραξι· λέγων ὅτι τήνδε κατ' εὐχὴν,
 Ὡ λαοὶ, σωθεῖς ἐξ ἁλὸς ὡδ' ἔθειο.

where the MS. reading *ἐπελθὼν* betrayed not only myself, but the most ingenious and learned Madam Dacier into a mistake. We took *ἄλα* here to mean the sea, and consequently *ἀλίην* a ship; and the Samothracian Gods seemed to require that interpretation, for they were supposed to deliver from storms at sea. But I have since discovered that the Epigram has quite another meaning: *Ἀλίη* signifies a salt-seller, and *ἄλα* salt. And the first verse is to be corrected thus:

Τὴν ἀλίην Εὐδήμου, ἐφ' ἧς ἄλα λίθον ἐπέσθων.

And the whole to be thus translated:

“ Salinum Eudemus, in quo salem tenuem comedens
 “ Procellas magnas effugit usurarum,
 “ Donavit Diis Samothracibus; dicens, quod hoc ex voto,
 “ O populi, servatus à sale hic posuit.”

[ix] Eudemus here in the Epigram, owing a great many debts, paid them off by living sparingly upon bread and salt, the diet of poor people; and, in the memory of it, he dedicated his salt-seller to the Samothracian Gods. The Epigram is very ingenious, and the humour of it lies in the double meaning of *ἀλίην*, and *ἄλα*; and *ἁλὸς*; and the likeness of *ἐπέσθων* to *ἐπελθὼν*, and of *δανέων* to *ἀνέμων*: and the whole is a *Parodia*. Suidas quotes a part of it; and from him I had the hint of this true and certain explication. *Ἐπέσθων*, says he, *ἐπεσθίων, εὐαχήμενος*. Τὴν ἀλίην Εὐδήμος, ἐφ' ἧς ἄλα λίθον ἐπέσθων χειμῶνας μεγάλης ἐξέφυγε θῆκε θεοῖς Σαμόθραξι. The word *δανέων* is omitted in Suidas; but there is no question now but it is the

* Callimachus, Epig. li.

true reading. If Mr. B. when he searched my writings to pick holes in them, had but corrected this one Epigram, which none of us that were concerned in Callimachus then understood, he had done himself more true honour by this single improvement, as slight as it is, than he has done by his whole Book.

But to return to the affair of Sir Edward Sherburn. The Examiner now proceeds to fortify his accusation, and secure it against all exceptions. "But Grævius," says he, "it may be, was in fault, and forgot to do Sir Edward justice." Is it so then? "May it be" that Mr. Grævius was in fault? Had I not reason to say above that I was well assured the authors of this calumny were conscious that the blame was Mr. Grævius's? And is not this fencing and supposing of theirs a plain indication of it? "But it is hardly to be imagined," says he, "that Grævius could forget it, had the Doctor told him plainly that the MS. was put into his hands under that express condition." True indeed! if Mr. Grævius had no more business on his hands than the Examiner and his assistant have. But a man that considers both the great variety and great importance of Mr. Grævius's own affairs, would not wonder if he had forgot not only to mention Sir Edward Sherburn (whom he had never heard of but once in my letter) but to publish the very MS. itself. But, with the Examiner's good leave, there was no need at all either of "intimating it slightly," or "telling it plainly," to Mr. Grævius. He does not want any spur to make him own his obligations. I had no occasion to make either slight or broad *intimations*, what Sir Edward expected; for Mr. Grævius had promised of his own accord, before this Book was sent him, that he would do Sir Edward justice. It is true I cannot produce Mr. Grævius's Letter, because I have unfortunately lost it, and he has no transcript of it; but the Right Reverend the Bishop of Norwich, who gives me leave to say this in his name, remembers very well that I shewed him the Letter, and that Mr. Grævius there returned his thanks to Sir Edward, and promised to inform the world who it was that obliged it.

"But suppose," says he, "the omission lay wholly at Grævius's door, why did not the Doctor send immediately to Sir Edward to excuse it?" See here the true spirit of PHALARISM. It is no matter whether a thing be true or false, so it make for their purpose. I did more than *send*, for I *went* immediately to Sir Edward to excuse it; which, by his carriage then

then and some time after, I thought I had done effectually; and I presented him then with one of the copies Mr. Grævius had sent me. Nay, I am morally sure it was in that Book which I had given him, that he "entered the memorandum" which the Examiner produces.

- P. 15. "And why," says he, "did not the Doctor take care to have this neglect repaired in the next Holland Journal?" A most wonderful expedient! It was a thing indeed of great consequence to the world, to know whose box it was that had preserved the MS.: and yet, as mean as the thing was, and as little as the honour of it was, I had resolved and engaged to Sir Edward to do him that right in a fitter place than a Holland Journal. I had then prepared a Manilius for the press, which had been published already, had not the dearth of paper and the want of good types, and some other occasions hindered. And I assured Sir Edward that in that Book I would make him amends for Mr. Grævius's omission; for I had occasion there to have thanked him upon another account, which I will now mention, that I may be quite out of his debt. Among those papers I found a Discourse of the learned Godefridus Wendelinus's, about the age of the Poet Manilius. There were two copies of it, one by Wendelinus's own hand, and the other by Gevartius's; and Sir Edward was pleased to give me one of them, because I purposed either to print the whole, or give an extract of it, in my Edition of Manilius. I return him here my acknowledgements for it; but let Manilius come out when it will, the world I believe will excuse me, if I think I have now paid him as much as I owe him.

- P. 14. The Examiner goes on in the honourable work of false accusation. "A Foreigner," says he, "of great note complained how ill the Doctor had used him, in a case near resembling mine; which, not yet having his leave for it, I do not think myself at liberty to publish." The short of which is, "That somebody complained of something which Mr. B. will not tell." I must own, when I read such stuff as this, set out in the name of Mr. B. I am forced to suspect, do what I can, that there are more forgeries than Phalaris's Letters. Mr. B. must forgive me if I think this paragraph more becomes the *humtie-dumtie* Author, than a gentleman of sense and honour. If such loose and general accusations must pass for evidence, who can be innocent? When the Examiner is "at liberty to publish" this story, I make no question but I shall prove it as false as his calumny about Sir Edward.

In

In the meantime, he has shewn his proficiency in the noble science of detraction, when, under pretence of saying nothing, he says more than all; for he insinuates a blind story about *something* and *somebody*, which the Reader is to guess at, and make as black as he pleases. I remember a certain Foreigner, whose name I have now forgotten, made the modest and reasonable demand that I would give him the Alexandrian MS. to his lodgings, to be collated quite through; which would require half a year's constant labour. It was pretty hard to keep one's countenance at so senseless a proposal; however, I gave him a civil answer why I thought the favour could not be allowed him. If this be "the man that complained to Mr. B. how ill I had used him," as the circumstances make it probable, I do not envy Mr. B. the honour of his acquaintance of "great note."

"But another," it seems, "applied to Dr. Bentley for a sight of the Alexandrian MS. and met with no other answer, but that the Library was not fit to be seen." Here is another general accusation without naming the person, and upon that account not easy to be disproved; but, however, it has the common fate of all his stories and arguments, that they are false, and so may be turned upon himself; for, ever since I came to St. James's, I have constantly kept that MS. in my own lodgings, for this very reason, "that persons might see it without seeing the Library." I believe there are a hundred now in England that have seen the MS. since I had the custody of it; and I appeal to all their memories if they did not see it in my lodgings, and not in the Library.

But let us see the Examiner's comment upon it: "A pretty excuse," says he ("that the Library was not fit to be seen) for a Library-keeper to make, who had been four years in that service!" That I could not make this excuse for not shewing the Alexandrian MS. I suppose it is already sufficiently clear; but I will own, that I have often said and lamented "that the Library was not fit to be seen." If he thinks this such a reproach to the Library-keeper, he has free liberty to make the best of it. But upon whom would this reflection fall, were it really a matter of reproach? Our keen Examiner should look before him a little, and not blindly throw about his abuses without minding whom they will hit. If the room be too mean and too little for Books,—if it be much out of repair,—if the situation be inconvenient,—if the access to it be dishonourable, is the Library-keeper to

D

answer

[lxv]
P. 14.

P. 15.

[lxvi]

answer for it? Would he have me "in the four years of that service," to have erected a new Library at my own charge? But there is nothing really to be blamed here but the Examiner's pertness; for the expences and toils of a long war are but too just an excuse that the thoughts of a new Library were not part of the public cares: but there is no question but a few years of peace under his Majesty's most happy government will set us above this reproach.

These, I think, are all the personal accusations in the Examiner's Preamble: let us now take a short view of his complaints against my Book. The first is, That I insinuate there that the translation of Phalaris was not his own; for I said it was "ascribed to him," and "his name was set to the Edition;" and "the faults in it were no disparagement to him, but to his teachers;" and I call them, in the plural number, "Editors, Annotators, and Great Geniuses."

[lxvii]

These are all the passages in my Book that are or can be brought to make out this indictment. Now the two first of these expressions are very far from affirming that he was not the true Author; for this present Book is *ascribed* to me, and my name is *set* to the Edition, and yet I assure him it is my own. It must be the third then of those phrases, "that the faults were a disparagement to his teachers," which must imply they were not his. But, with humble submission, whether this inference be his or his teachers, it is a weak one; for he himself owns that he was then very *young*, and not only had a *Tutor**, but a Director of his Studies; and, in that case, the *faults* might be really his own, but the *disparagement* theirs that suffered them to pass. In his Dedication there, he tells the Tutor that he was "assisted by him in the work†;" and in his Preface here, he says "The Director was consulted by him upon ANY difficulty." After such a public declaration, the world will still be of my opinion, that both the Tutor and the Director were accountable for the faults in Phalaris, though they were really the pupil's. Mr. B. indeed, in his Preface here, seems to excuse the Tutor, for he declares "That, excepting the Director, no one had a hand in it; nay, scarce a line," says he, "was ever seen by any body else as I know of, till it was finished." But, if this be so, how came he to thank the Tutor "for assisting the work?" Let the Reader please to try "if he can bring these

Pref. p. 5.

[lxviii]

* Dr. Aldrich, Dean of Christ Church.

† "Opus tua ope adjutum."

two passages to meet; for my own part, I have seen so many contradictions between the Latin Phalaris and the English Examination, that I dare not attempt to reconcile them. But Mr. B. himself offers to do it, when he tells us that the Tutor "might otherwise assist him in the Edition than by collating MSS. translating the Text, and writing Comments." P. 199.
True, he might so: he might be at some charge of the printing, and make the Book his worthy New-year's Gift to the Scholars of his house. But Mr. B. here answers to a question that never was asked him; for the query is not Whether the Tutor was to *translate* or *comment*? but Whether he was not to *revise* and *correct*?

Since it is hard therefore to believe both passages together, I had rather believe the English one, that the Tutor "had no hand" in the version of Phalaris; for the world will own that he has more wit, more learning, and more judgment, than to let such a translation go through his hands. Much less can I think him concerned in the English Examination, which is the faultiest Book in its kind (which is *critical*) that has appeared upon the theatre of Learning these two hundred years. If my answer here do not shew it to be so, let not this character be regarded; but I know already by experiment that the best judges are satisfied that I have proved it so; and the rest of the world will by degrees follow their sentiment. I must own, therefore, that the deserved reputation of the Tutor acquits him of all suspicion that he had a hand in the Examination. There is only one thing that his friends want and desire in him, that he would not suffer some under his discipline, by entering into a kind of faction in behalf of a very sorry Book, to give occasion to a rumour that nearly concerns his and the whole Society's honour. [lxi]

As for the "Director of studies," I entirely agree with Mr. B. that he might "consult him upon ANY difficulty;" and yet all the errors of the Version might pass him, or be made by him. He is of the same size for learning with the late Editor of the *Æsopian Fables*. If they can but make a tolerable copy of verses, with two or three small faults in it, they must presently set up to be Authors, to bring the nation into contempt abroad, and themselves into it at home. This Director is he who has lately set out *Ovid's Metamorphoses**, with a Paraphrase and Notes; which I did but once dip in, and presently found these two instances of his great sense and learning. The passages are in the speech of Ulysses: [lxx]

* Oxon. Theat. 1696.

"Cujus equos pretium pro nocte poposcerat hostis,
 "Arma negare mihi, fuéritque benignior Ajax."*

That is, "Dolon was to have Achilles's horses for being scout
 "one single night: I, that took and defeated Dolon, de-
 "mand but Achilles's armour, which is of far less value
 "than his horses. If you deny me that, *fuérit benignior Ajax*,
 "even Ajax himself, as much as he is my enemy, would re-
 "ward my services more generously." But the Director thus
 paraphrases it: "FUERITQUE BENIGNIOR AJAX. Sitque
 "melius de vobis meritis Ajax quam ego." But how comes
benignior to signify *melius meritis*? He has put such stuff
 here upon the Poet, as makes him talk neither Latin nor sense.
 But let us see another instance:

"Reppulit Actorides sub imagine tutus Achillis
 "Troas ab arsuris cum defensore carinis."†

[lxxi]

"Patroclus," says the Poet, "being disguised in Achilles's
 "armour, repulsed the Trojans from our ships; which other-
 "wise would have been burnt with those that defended them."
Defensore here, by a change of number familiar among Poets,
 means *defensoribus*, the Grecians, who fought on shipboard;
 and, by consequence, had the ships been burnt, they also had
 been burnt with them. But our Paraphrast tacks the words
 thus together: "TROAS CUM DEFENSORE, Trojanos cum
 "Hectore eorum propugnatore," which is silly and absurd
 upon all accounts; for why should Hector be called the *de-*
fender here, when it was he that made the *attack*? And why
 should the words, if the meaning of them was as the Director
 has given it, be so disjointed from one another? Besides that,
 the whole thought, as he has made it, is poor and flat, and
 more becoming his own Poems than Ovid's. And is not this
 man now a fit "Director of studies!" Is he not a rare in-
 structor to a young gentleman of a noble family and excellent
 parts; who, if he had never fallen into such hands, would have
 been thought to have deserved to have fallen into better!

[lxxvii]
P. xl.

But to return to Mr. B.'s complaints: If neither "ascrib-
 "ing," nor "setting the name," nor "disparagement to his
 "teachers," imply that I thought his Book was not writ by
 himself, the only words that can be accused of implying it are
 "Editors, Annotators, and great Geniuses," all in the plural
 number. But I have given my own answer already to this
 point, and now I will give Mr. B.'s. He is pleased to confess

* Lib. xiii. ver. 253.

† Ver. 273.

that

that the "Director was consulted upon ANY difficulty:" so that we have Two at least concerned in the Edition of Phalaris, unless Mr. B. will wholly exclude himself. Had I really therefore understood those words in the plural acceptation, I had implied nothing but what Mr. B. admits to be true. But why must my words be stretched so far, when they may fairly be supposed to mean but one person? For even Mr. B. in his Preface to Phalaris, says "QUANTUM SCIMUS, as much P. 198. "as we know," and "NOSTRO LABORE, by OUR labour;" and yet he avers he speaks of none but himself. And why then might not I mean him only by "Editors and Annotators?" As if it were unusual for the plural number to be put for the singular! P. 199.

I am clear, therefore, of this accusation of robbing Mr. B. of the right he has to his Phalaris; and if the world has generally believed that somebody assisted him in it, my Book is not to answer for it. On the contrary, it was the rumour that had already obtained in the world, that made my words be so interpreted; for I had left the thing loose and indefinite, neither denying nor affirming that Mr. B. was the Author; and his true friends took hold of that handle, which was given out of kindness; and they believed it was more for his honour to renounce the Edition, than to assume it with all its faults. Mr. B. has been pleased to take it the other way, and to vindicate it for his own; and the success that he has had may now be seen by the event. He has heard more than once from the press what the world believes in that matter, and I am afraid he has more contributed to that belief by his second performance than he did by his first; for a man that entitles himself to such a motley heterogeneous piece, that is not only inconsistent with his first work, but with itself,—that has such variety of styles in it, as like one another as fustian is to silk,—that is sometimes above and sometimes below itself in the several degrees of ignorance and banter,—a man, I say, that "merrily represents" himself to be such a linsey-wolsey Writer, seems to be of Planudes's humour; "for nobody can P. 273. "ever be silly enough to imagine it; nor can Planudes himself "dream of being thus far credited."

Mr. B. goes on to accuse me, that I have given him very ill language; for I call the story in his Preface "a calumny, P. 11. "weak detraction, injustice, forgery, slander, and vile aspersion." These are the flowers, he says, "that I have [lxxiv] "strewed throughout every page almost in the Epistle." Now this "every page almost," seems very nearly related to his

Bookseller's "nine months;" for of CLII pages, which that Epistle consists of, there are not above a dozen that in the least concern Mr. B. or his edition. But to the rest of the indictment I must plead guilty; for I own I then gave those titles of honour to his story, and have repeated some of them now; and whether I have miscalled it, the world will judge. But it is not that I have any love or fondness to those expressions; I am more sorry that I had occasion to say them than Mr. B. can be to hear them: but, if Mr. B. will do an *ill thing*, he must excuse me if I give it its *true*, and consequently an *ill name*. If he give himself the liberty to say what he pleases, he must expect a return of what will not please himself. The Comic Poet's rule is the common law in those cases: —

"Si mihi pergit quæ vult dicere, ea quæ non vult audiet."*

P. 11. But he says "I charge him with the basest tricks;" which, if it were true, I confess I should be ashamed of; for, were it ever so much deserved, that language is too coarse to be given by me. But if the Reader pleases to consult the place, [lxxv] he will presently see a *trick* in this accusation; for my words are nothing but a translation of Mr. B.'s Latin "*moribus ne-quissimis*;" and they are not applied to Mr. B. but to one Alcibious in the Epistles, who is represented there as a very great knave.

P. 11. And "by the help," he says, "of a Greek proverb, I call him downright ass." After I had censured a passage of Mr. B.'s translation that has no affinity with the original, "This puts me in mind," said I, "of the old Greek proverb, that Leucon carries one thing and his Ass quite another," where the Ass is manifestly spoken of the Sophist, whom I had before represented as "an Ass under a Lion's skin." And if Mr. B. has such a dearness for his Phalaris that he will change places with him there, how can I help it? I can only protest that I put him into Leucon's place; and, if he will needs compliment himself out of it, "I must leave the two friends to the pleasure of their mutual civilities."

P. 11. But is this Mr. B.'s way of interpreting similitudes? Are the things from whence they are taken to be directly applied to the persons they are spoken of? If I liken an ill Critic to a "bungling Tinker, that makes two holes while he mends one," must I be charged with calling him Tinker? At this

* Terent. Andria, ver. 927.

rate, Homer will call his heroes Wolves, Boars, Dogs, and Bulls. And when Horace has this comparison about himself, [lxxvi]

"Demitto auriculas, ut iniquæ mentis Asellus,"*

Mr. B. may tell him "he calls himself downright Ass." But he must be put in mind of the English proverb, that "similitudes," even when they are taken from Asses, "do not walk upon all four."

I will here claim the Reader's leave to make one general apology for any thing, either in my Dissertation or my Defence of it, that may seem too severe. I desire but this favour, or justice rather, that he would suppose my case to be his own; and then, if he will say sincerely that he should have answered so many calumnies with fewer marks of resentment, I am content to lie under his censure. But it is a very difficult thing for a person unconcerned, and out of the reach of harm, to be a fair arbitrator there. He will be apt to think the injured party too angry, because he cannot have as great a passion in seeing the ill usage as the other has in feeling it. Even Job himself, with all his patience, was accused of losing his temper by his companions, that had no share in his sufferings. Besides, there is a common fault in human nature, which I crave leave to express in Greek, ἐπιχαιρεκακία. There is a secret pleasure, they say, in seeing another man under the risk of a shipwreck, while one's self is safe on the shore; and so we find the world is delighted to see one worried and run down, while themselves are made spectators, and entertained with the diversion. It was an excellent saying of Solon's, and worthy of the wisest of the famous Seven, who, when he was asked, Πῶς ἤμισα ἀδικοῦν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, "What would rid the world of injuries?" — "If the by-standers," says he, "would have the same resentment with those that suffer the wrong." Εἰ ὁμοίως ἄχθοντο τοῖς ἀδικημένοις οἱ μὴ ἀδικέμενοι †. If the Reader will but follow that great man's advice, and have an equal sense of my ill usage as if it had fallen upon himself, I dare then challenge him to think, if he can, that I have used too much severity. [lxxvii]

I do not love the unmanly work of making long complaints of injuries; which I think is the next fault to deserving them: much less will I imitate Mr. B. who has raked together those few words of my Dissertation that had the least air of resent-

* Horat. Sat. I. ix. 20.

† Laërt. in Solone.

ment, and repeated them six times over; for if I was to enter into the particulars of his abuses, I must transcribe his whole book; which, from the beginning to the end, is nothing else but a rhapsody of errors and calumnies.

[lxxviii] But there is one rudeness that I ought not to omit, because it falls upon others as well as myself. "I am satisfied," says P. 223. he, "how unnatural a step it is for an Amanuensis to start up "Professor of Divinity." I am persuaded, every ingenuous Reader must be offended at his insolence, who could suffer such stuff as this to come out of his mouth; which is a double affront, both to the whole order of Bishops, and to a whole University; as if a person, who in his youth had been an Amanuensis to a Bishop, was upon that account made unfit to be Doctor of Divinity; as if a whole University, which was pleased to confer that degree upon him, were neither fit judges of his merit, nor knew their own duty!

I should never account it any disgrace to have served the Right Reverend the Bishop of Worcester in any capacity of a Scholar. But I was never Amanuensis to his Lordship nor to any body else; neither did his Lordship ever make use of any Amanuensis:—so little regard has this Examiner either to decency or truth. I was first Tutor to his Lordship's son, and afterwards Chaplain to himself; and I shall always esteem it both my honour and my happiness to have spent fourteen years of my life in his family and acquaintance, whom even Envy itself [lxxix] will allow to be the glory of our church and nation; who, by his vast and comprehensive genius, is as great in all parts of learning as the greatest next himself are in any. And I have the satisfaction to believe that this excellent person has not the worse opinion either of my probity or my learning, for all the calumnies that the Examiner has cast upon me.

As for the general character that Mr. B. endeavours to fix upon me, that I have no learning, no judgment, no reasoning, no knowledge in Books, except Indexes and Vocabularies, with many other expressions of the utmost contempt, that make up the greatest part of his Book, I do not think myself concerned to answer them. These things shall never make a dispute between us; he shall be as great as he thinks himself, and I as little as he thinks me: but then it will lie upon him to dispute with some other persons, who have been pleased to declare publicly such an esteem for me and my writings as does not altogether agree with Mr. B.'s.

He must commence a critical war against his Excellency Mr. Ezekiel Spanhemius, who has this passage concerning me: "Sed

"Sed de hoc Philostrati loco meliora forte nos docebit, qui
 "nova versione et luculento commentario eundem auctorem
 "explanandum et illustrandum suscepit, novum idemque jam [lxxx]
 "lucidum litteratæ Britanniae sidus Richardus Bentleius."*
 And in another place, "Talia autem in Hesychium ὅσα νέως
 "irrepsisse, et quibus fœde inquinatæ sint etiamnum ejus
 "glossæ, et pridem ad eum vidimus ac passim animadvertimus;
 "et novissime etiam in eruditissima ad Jo. Millium Epistola
 "post Jo. Malalam edita, luculenter adductis pluribus eam
 "in rem exemplis adferuit, oriens novum litteratæ Britanniae
 "sidus, Richardus Bentleius.†." And again in another place,
 "An vero nihil uspiam de illa fabella, quanquam ab aliis pas-
 "sim memoretur, à Sophocle sit prolatum, quod statuit in
 "Epistola Malalæ addita vir eruditissimus, et à quo magnum
 "præclaris doctrinarum studiis incrementum licet augurari."‡
 These perhaps are no vulgar commendations which this great
 man has bestowed on me; and I will assure Mr. B. that I did
 not procure them by any private services, for I have not yet
 done myself the honour once to write to Mr. Spanhemius;
 so that all that he has said of me came voluntarily and freely
 from him; and we shall see by the event, if the present disputes
 about Phalaris will make him repent of it.

He must turn his formidable pen against Mr. Grævius, who,
 besides the Dedication already cited, has another passage.
 "Videbis hic, Lector studiose, Musicarum cupediarum, et [lxxxii]
 "aliud quod tuo palato, simul ac gustaris, sat scio arridebit
 "mirifice. Richardus Bentleius potentissimo Regi Gulielmo
 "à bibliotheca, novum, sed splendidissimum Britanniae lumen,
 "certior à me factus de hac Callimachi Editione, preferri ad
 "nos jussit eruditissimas animadversiones in quædam Hymno-
 "rum loca et in Epigrammata, quibus adjecit nova non pauca
 "quæ lucem antea nunquam adspexerant; alia, quæ quidem
 "ante legebantur, sed à nemine fuerant intellecta, clara luce
 "perfudit§." Mr. B. perhaps, will object that the friendship
 which I have with this most learned Professor makes him so
 kind in his character of me; but the candid part of mankind
 will rather believe the reverse of it, that my character was the
 reason that he honoured me with his friendship.

Mr. Boyle, I suppose, has no great deference to the judg-
 ments of Mr. Spanheim and Mr. Grævius; for a man that has
 such a false opinion of himself, can hardly be supposed to have

* Spanheim in Julian. p. 19,

† Ibid. 605.

‡ Idem in Callimach. p. 455.

§ Grævii Præf. ad Callim.

a true one of others. But I must take the freedom to tell him, that I had rather have these short expressions of the esteem of those great men, than the most studied panegyrics of him and all his party. Neither would I consent that these passages should be blotted out, to have all his abuses of me blotted out [lxxxii] with them, both those he has made already, and those he shall make hereafter; — for as a commendation from the greatest men is the greatest of commendations, so a disparagement from men of no knowledge in the things they pretend to judge of, is the least of disparagements.

After the testimonies of these two great men, I will not produce any more, lest I should seem to trust to the number rather than the quality of those that speak well of me. I am entirely of his opinion who was “*contentus paucis, sed magnis laudatoribus.*” And I will once more borrow the form of argument that Æmilius Scaurus used against Varius Suetonius*: “Mr. Spanheim and Mr. Grævius give a high character of Dr. Bentley’s learning; Mr. Boyle gives the meanest that malice can furnish him with: *Utri creditis, Quirites?* Whether of the characters will the present age or posterity believe?”

The Examiner has given two descriptions: one of a Pedant, and another of a Good Critic; designing to draw the first as my picture, and the latter as his own. But perhaps, if we compare the pictures with the originals, he may be forced by his readers to change one of the places here with me, as he voluntarily did with the Sophist in the case of Leucon and his Ass.†

- [lxxxiii] 1. His “first and surest mark of a Pedant is, to write with-
P. 93. “out observing the rules of civility or common decency; and
“without distinguishing the characters of those he writes
P. 94. “against.” Upon this article, he accuses two expressions of mine; and yet both of them are both civilly worded and truly said. Then he mentions some “coarse compliments” upon himself, which I have already accounted for; only here he says, I compare him with “Lucian’s Ass;” which, were it true, would be no “coarse compliment,” but a very *obliging* one; for “Lucian’s Ass” was a very intelligent and ingenious Ass, and had more sense than any of his Riders: he was no other than Lucian himself in the shape of an Ass;

* See here p. xxxi. [In all the places where Dr. Bentley refers to his own book, the original numbering of the pages is preserved; which are for that purpose noted, between erotichets, in the margin of this edition.]

† See here p. lxxv.

and

and had a better talent at kicking and bantering than ever the Examiner will have, though it seems to be his chief one. Let the Reader too observe by the way, that Mr. B. in this place has it "Lucian's Ass;" — but in another he cites it truly, "Leucon's Ass;" and yet we are told the very same hand wrote both the passages.

But to bring the Examiner near to the picture, if perhaps it may have some little resemblance to himself. Has he observed the rules of "civility," in writing the most scurrilous and virulent Book that the age has yet seen? — has he kept to the measures of "decency," in raking up so many tales and hearsays that a man of honour would scorn to repeat? — has he distinguished the "character of him he wrote against," in abusing and vilifying upon the falsest surmises a man in Holy Orders, a Doctor in Divinity, a domestic servant to one of the greatest of Kings, and the first that was employed to preach the Lecture established by the great Mr. Boyle, a relation of the Examiner's? If these be against all rules of "civility," and "decency," and "distinction of characters," then, I suppose, his first and surest mark of a Pedant will be thought to hit himself. [lxxxiv]

2. "A second mark is, to use a Greek or Latin word, P. 93.
"when there is an English one that signifies the very same thing." Now, if this be one of his marks, himself is a Pedant by his own confession; for, in this very sentence of his, *signify* is a Latin word; and there is an English one that *means* the very same thing. We shall do the Examiner therefore no injury in calling him Pedant, upon this article; but, if such a general censure as this forward Author here passes, had been always fastened upon those that enrich our language from the Latin and Greek stores, what a fine condition had our language been in! It is well known it has scarce any words besides monosyllables of its native growth; and were all the rest imported and introduced by Pedants? At this rate, the ignominy of Pedantry will fall upon all the best Writers of our nation; and upon none more heavily than the Examiner's great relation, the incomparable Robert Boyle, whose whole style is full of such Latin words; but, when the Examiner is possessed with a fit of rage against me, he lays about him without consideration or distinction, never minding whom he hits, whether his own relation, or even himself. The words in my book which he excepts against, are "com-mentitious, repudiate, concede, aliene, vernacular, timid, "negoce, putid," and "idiom;" every one of which were in print [lxxxv]

print before I used them; and most of them before I was born; and are they not all regularly formed, and kept to the true and genuine sense that they have in the original? Why may we not say "negoce" from *negotium*, as well as "commerce" from *commercium*, and "palace" from *palatium*? Has not the French nation been before-hand with us in espousing it? and have not we "negotiate" and "negotiation," words that grow upon the same root, in the commonest use? and why may not I say "aliene," as well as the learned Sir Henry Spelman; who used it eighty years since, and yet was never thought a Pedant? But he says, "My words will be hissed

[lxxxvi]

P. 287. "off the stage, as soon as they come on." If so, they would have been hissed-off long before I had come on; but the Examiner might have remembered, before he had talked thus at large, who it was that distinguished his style with "ignore" and "recognosce," and other words of that sort, which nobody has yet thought fit to follow him in; for his argument, if it proved any thing, would prove perhaps too much, and bring the Glory of his own Family into the tribe of Pedants; though I must freely declare I would rather use, not my words only, but even these too (if I did it sparingly, and but once or twice at most in CLII pages) than that single

P. 166,

167.

word of the Examiner's "cotemporary," which is a downright Barbarism; for the Latins never use *co* for *con*, except before a vowel; as "co-equal, co-eternal;" but, before a consonant, they either retain the *n*, as "contemporary, constitution;" or melt

[See here-

after,

p. 447.]

it into another Letter, as "collection, comprehension;" so that the Examiner's "COTEMPORARY" is a word of his own *coposition*, for which the Learned World will *cogratulate* him.

P. 94.

3. "Another token of a Pedant is, the use of Greek and "Latin Proverbs;" but, however, I will run the risk of it once more; and make bold to use one Proverbial Saying:

[lxxxvii]

"Homine imperito nunquam quicquam injustius:

"Qui nisi quod ipse fecit, nihil rectum putat."

Why, forsooth, is it more pedantry in me to use Latin Proverbs in English discourse, than in Cicero to use Greek ones in Latin? Nay, do not even Greek Proverbs make as good a figure now in English, as then they did in Latin? If Mr. B. can spare any time from his Phalaris' Epistles to look into Cicero's, he will find him in every page among the herd of Pedants. If I had used Proverbs in my "Sermons against "Atheism," or upon any solemn argument or occasion, the Examiner's censure had been more just; but to blame the use of

of them in an Epistle or a Dissertation, which have been always allowed to be their proper places, is itself a very ill mixture of ignorance and pedantry; for if they cannot be used there without pedantry, they must be banished out of all sorts of writings; so that Aristotle, Theophrastus, Chrysippus, Aristarchus, and some others of the best Wits of old; and among the Moderns, the great Erasmus and the great Scaliger made collections of Proverbs merely to serve Pedants. Erasmus's own Writings are full of them; and he will be thought [lxxxviii] to have had as much wit, and as little of pedantry, as Mr. B. and his Directors; and the great treasures from whence he collected them, are the Writings of Plato, Plutarch, and Lucian, who "among some little men may go for Pedants; but among the wise and sensible part of mankind, will pass for men of Wit." P. 99.

4. "To over-rate the price of knowledge is another sign P. 94.
"of Pedantry;" and let the world judge between the Examiner and Me, whether of us is most concerned in this character of a Pedant. I have never published any thing yet, but at the desire of others. My Sermons in Mr. Boyle's Lecture were required for the press by the Honourable the Trustees; my Epistle about Jo. Antiochensis was desired by the Right Reverend the Bishop of Lichfield*; my Notes on Callimachus by Mr. Grævius; and my Dissertation upon Phalaris by Mr. Wotton. The only book that I have written upon my own account is this present Answer to Mr. B.'s objections; and I assure him I set no great price upon it; the errors that it refutes are so many, so gross and palpable, that I shall never be very proud of the victory.

But then a man that "over-rates the price of" his performances, acts the very reverse of this. He engages in matters where he has no concern; he obtrudes his notions [lxxxix] upon the world, though neither his friends desire him, nor the business oblige him to meddle. And is not this the picture of the Examiner? He has written a large Book in behalf of Phalaris's Epistles, which has hitherto been the public diversion, and will be so too hereafter, but in a different way; and yet he professes that "he was not IN THE LEAST concerned to vindicate them." P. 202.

5. "But an assuming and positive way of delivering one's P. 94.
"self, upon points especially that are not capable of being
"perfectly cleared, is pedantry." Now, to take no notice of

* Dr. William Lloyd, translated to Worcester in 1699.

the rest of his Book, which is nothing but heaps of errors delivered in the most arrogant and insulting language, I am content to be tried by this very paragraph of his, which of us two seem to have sat for this picture. He has cited here xv passages out of my whole Dissertation, which he pretends are delivered in an "assuming and positive" way, and yet he says, are "certainly false;" — whereas every one of them is true, and may be "perfectly cleared," except one small mistake about *προεδωμένα*; and that too is delivered without any "assuming" expression. But let us see Mr. B.'s behaviour,—“where the contrary,” says he, “is most

P. 95.
[xc]

“CERTAINLY true; as it is, and shall be proved to be in ALL “those instances here referred to.” Now, if this be not an “assuming and positive way,” what is? And yet, in xiv of his xv instances, he is miserably mistaken.

P. 95.

6. “To depart from the common ways of writing, on “purpose to shew exactness, is a piece of affectation that “savours of pedantry.” Upon which article he accuses my spelling *Taurominium*; for, he says, “it is GENERALLY “written *Tauromenium*, both by Ancients and Moderns.” Now, if the contrary of this be “certainly true,” who will then be the Pedant? The learned Cluverius, who made it his business to search all the Books and MSS. that relate to Sicily, says, “It is sometimes spelt *Tauromenium*, and some- “times *Tauromenia*, but GENERALLY *Taurominium**. And Mr. B. must write at another rate than yet he has done, before the world will prefer his testimony before that of Cluverius.

P. 96.

Mr. B. here “goes a little out of his way to do right to “.... against Mr. Wotton,” who had taken notice of an absurd usage of *Delphos* for *Delphi*; — and because it lies “a “little in my way,” I will do right to Mr. Wotton; for indeed the case is my own, because I too have called it *Delphi*, and rejected the common error. Mr. B. defends his

[xci]

Delphos upon this only pretence, that it has been the “com- mon custom” of our English writers, five of whom he names there, to call it so. An admirable reason, and worthy to be his own! As if the most palpable error that shall hap- pen to obtain and meet with reception, must therefore never be mended! One would think he had borrowed it from the Popish Priest, who for xxx years together had read *Mumpsimus* in his Breviary, instead of *Sumpsimus*; and, when a Learned Man told him of his blunder, “I will not change,”

* Cluver. Sicil. p. 90. “Plerumque *Taurominium*.”

says he, "my old *Mumpsimus* for your new *Sumpsimus*." It is a known story, but I'll give it him in the words of Sir Richard Pace, who was "a man of business and an ambassador too;" and upon these accounts will have more authority with the Examiner*. If Mr. B. then will not change his old *Delphos* for our new *Delphi*, he shall have leave to keep his *Mumpsimus* as long as he pleases: but when he would put it upon us for *good English*,—for that we must beg his pardon. The word is not yet so naturalized in England, but it may, and certainly will be sent back again to Barbary, its native country. We have instances of other words, that had both longer continuance and more general reception than he can plead for his *Delphos*, and yet they were "hissed off the stage" at last. In the old Editions of the English Bibles in Henry the Eighth's time, it was printed *Asson* and *Miletum*†; afterwards, under Queen Elizabeth, it was changed into *Asson* and *Miletum*; but in the last review, under King James the First, it was rectified *Assos* and *Miletus*. Here is a case that is exactly parallel with this of our Examiner; *Miletum* and *Asson* were at first supposed to be nominative cases,—just as *Delphos* was mistaken to be like *Argos*, *Samos*, and *Delos*; but we see, upon better information, the words were discarded. Neither the stamp of Royal authority, nor the universal use in every parish, nay almost every family of England, for two or three generations, could protect them from being exploded. A most certain argument, that the whole kingdom then believed that analogy and reason ought to have a greater force than vulgar error, though established by the longest and commonest custom. In the old Translation of Virgil, set out by Phaer and Dr. Thyne, they are called "the XII books of *Virgil's Æneidos*;" and the running-title of every page is the I, or II, or III "Book of *Virgil's Æneidos*." Without question, that was the language in those days all over the nation; so that if the Examiner's *Mumpsimus* should pass for an argument, the *Æneidos* should be the current language at this day; and those that call it *Æneis* must be run down for Pedants. I dare venture to foretell the Examiner, that his *Delphos* in a few years will be thought as barbarous as *Æneidos*; and, if his Book shall happen to be preserved anywhere as a useful commonplace-book for ridicule, banter, and all the topics of calumny,

[xcii]

[xciii]

* *Paceus* "De fructu, qui ex Doctrina percipitur. Basil. 1517," p. 80. "Quidam indoctus Sacrificus Anglus per annos triginta *Mumpsimus* legere solitus est loco *Sumpsimus*; et quum moneretur à docto, ut errorem emendaret, respondit, Se nolle mutare suum antiquum *Mumprimus* ipsius novo *Sumpsimus*." † Act. Apost. xx. 14, 15.

this

this very page about *Delphos* may perhaps, before he grows an old man, be made an unwelcome evidence against himself. I see here that the excellent Bishop of Lichfield (who, as appears by his most admirable Dictionary to the great Bishop Wilkins's "Real Character," has the largest and nicest knowledge of the English language of any man living) calls it *Delphi* in his printed, though unpublished, Chronology, which I had the honour to see; and so did the learned Gentleman Mr. Stauley long ago, in his "Lives of the Philosophers." I do not here disparage those excellent pens that have unawares fallen into the common error; but to defend it against manifest reason, and to vilify those that would reform it, is a plain instance of a positive and pedantic genius.

[xciv] I must take hold of this occasion to do another "piece of right" to Mr. Wotton; for the Examiner says, It is hoped Mr. W. will publicly declare that he neither assisted nor approved my Dissertation; but I myself can save him half that labour; and therefore here I do aver, that neither Mr. Wotton nor any one else assisted me, either in that work or in this; so that I alone am accountable for the errors in them both.

Though, after such an instance of Mr. B.'s judgment in language and style, I might safely despise his pert censures upon mine, yet I will crave the Reader's patience while I answer those exceptions of his that at present I can remember. In two or three places of his book, he would ridicule my expression **FIRST INVENTOR**, as if it were mere nonsense. If it be so it is a very new sort of it, and perhaps may come off better than somebody's sense; for it has both good reason and great authorities in its behalf. The word **FIRST** there, is no idle and superfluous epithet, nor borders upon tautology; for there may truly be a first and a second, and more inventors of the very same thing. The Chinese invented the use of Guns and Printing*; and so did the Europeans, without knowing

* Dr. Bentley has adopted the opinion of those who have confounded the European mode of **PRINTING** with the **ENGRAVED TABLETS** used in China, and invented about the year 930. See "Origin of Printing," 1774, 8vo, p. 23. The first Printing in Europe was from **WOODEN BLOCKS**, at Harleim, in 1430, by Laurentius, who soon proceeded to **SEPARATE WOODEN TYPES**, p. 64: in 1464, Geinsfleisch, by the aid of Fust, contrived, at Mentz, **CUT METAL TYPES**, p. 85: the art was finally completed, by the invention of **MATRICES**, by Schoeffer, 1452, p. 91. — The earliest account of the use of gunpowder in Europe is in 1333, at the siege of Puy Guillaume. Du Cange, in voce **BOMBARDA**. Its force was known by our countryman Roger Bacon, as appears in his *Opus Majus*, to Pope Clement IV. 1267, p. 474, et. Præf. p. xi. Cannon were used by the Venetians against the Genoese, 1378. Pancirolus, *De Inventoribus*.

at

at that time that they were used in the East; and may we not ask the question "Whether INVENTED them FIRST," without danger of nonsense? Terence*, therefore, is not only in danger, but manifestly caught in it, when he says

"Hoc novum est aucupium; ego adeo hanc PRIMUS INVENTIAM :"

and so is Lucretius†, when he speaks of his master:

"Qui PRINCEPS vitæ rationem INVENIT eam quæ

"Nunc appellatur Sapientia—"

After these two, we have no need to name more of the Latins. Let us see if some of the best Wits of Greece are not guilty of the same nonsense. And among these, I find Pindar as deep in it as any body: Τὸν ῥα Τέρπανδρός ποθ' ὁ Λέσβιος ΕΥΡΕ ΠΡΩΤΟΣ ἐν δειπνοῖσι Λύδιον ψαλμόν‡; and Herodotus and Plato in the very same condition; where the former says ΠΡΩΤΟΣ Αἰγυπλίης ἀπάντων ἀνθρώπων ΕΞΕΥΡΕΕΙΝ τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν§; and the latter Τῶτον δὲ τὸν Θεὺς ΠΡΩΤΟΝ ἀριθμὸν τε καὶ λογισμὸν ΕΥΡΕΙΝ||. Or, if printed books will not satisfy the Examiner, I will give him it in an Inscription: — Τάγης ὁ Φρυγῆ αὐτὸς ΠΡΩΤΟΣ ΗΥΡΕΝ¶. And is not Mr. B. now a judicious Censurer, to come with his little cavils against an expression, which the best Writers in the world have so frequently used? For, besides the passages produced, I dare undertake to bring fifty more; and, among the best of our own nation, it is one of the commonest phrases; particularly it is adopted by our English Cicero, the Right Reverend the Bishop of Rochester**, in his "History of the Royal Society," where Philosophy and Eloquence have renewed as strict an acquaintance as they had in Cicero's "Philosophica" seventeen hundred years ago.

Another "happy phrase" which, he says, "I have newly minted," is "the MIEN of a FACE;" which, as he takes it, is much the same thing with "the behaviour of a look," or "the carriage of a smile." His expression indeed is a little obscure; and his readers, I find, are not agreed about his meaning. But the thing he aims at seems to be this, that *mien* signifies the behaviour and the carriage of the whole person, and cannot be applied to a single part, the face: an observation that shews him to be as great a critic in the modern languages

* Eun. II. ii. ver. 247.

† Lib. v. ver. 9.

‡ Athen. 635.

§ Herod. ii. p. 91.

|| Plato in Phædro.

¶ Marm. Arund. I. l. 19.

** Dr. Thomas Sprat.

- as he is in the ancient; for *mien* does not signify *behaviour*, even when it is spoken of the whole person, but the air and look that results from it. The word *mien* is of French original; and both the English and the Italians borrowed it of that nation; so that the sense of it must be determined from the usage of the French: — and if those be consulted, they will tell us, that though *mine* be often extended to denote the air of the whole man, yet it chiefly and originally means the “air of the face.” So Monsieur Pomey in his Dictionary, “*MINE DU VISAGE*” (which is exactly “*mien of the face*”) “*oris species, oris habitus, nativa vultus compositio.*” And so the late Dictionary by the Academy, “*MINE, l’air, qui resulte de la conformation exterieure de la personne et principalement du visage.*” One would have guessed by the Examiner’s talking out of Balzac and Bruyere, that he had been too well acquainted with the writings of the French; and yet we see, by this instance, he was as raw in that language as he is in the Greek: but perhaps, since his late Journey to Paris, he may have brought back with him “*une mine de visage,*” though he did not carry over with him “*a mien of a face.*”
- P. 98, 99. [xcvii]
- P. 97. 7. Another mark, he says, of a Pedant is “an itch of contradicting great men upon very slight grounds.” I must own that I am sometimes forced in my writings to “contradict great men,” by correcting such oversights as they made through inadvertency or want of information; but then I do it without any diminution to their character: and if that modesty be observed, the contradicting them in this way deserves the highest commendation, and is such a sort of pedantry as the Examiner and his Director will never be accused of. But the instance he charges me with, is “my brisk censure of Grotius and Scaliger, for not knowing the measure of an Anapæstic verse;” and whether I did that upon “very slight grounds, this very Answer* will shew. But let us see the Examiner’s words here, if perhaps this last character of a Pedant may not prove to be his own picture: “When it is
- P. 91. “PLAIN,” says he, “as I shall SHEW BEFORE I LAY DOWN MY PEN, that the Doctor would never have censured them if he had known it himself.” What a formidable threat! and what a miserable performance! The stuff that he has brought there is so shameful and scandalous, so inexcusable in a very School-boy, betrays such ignorance of the commonest rules of *Prosodia* and *Syntax*, that, if he has but learning enough to
- P. 98.

* See here, p. 132, &c.

know when he is confuted (which is not every body's case) he may have the wisdom to take his leave of the press as long as he lives for that part of learning.

But if an itch of "contradicting" great men upon "very slight" grounds has a relish of pedantry, to abuse and revile great men, and that without any ground at all, must be the very spirit and quintessence of it. And we know a late Writer that, in the very entrance of his Work, calls Dion Chrysostom "as errant a sophist and declaimer as ever was," and his Discourse "tedious and insipid;" that says "Manilius has no wit" in him; and is as unlike to Ovid as Thersites was to Nireus; that says "Laertius is a writer of Dr. B.'s own form," which, as he has been pleased to use me, is the vilest of characters; that calls "Athenæus rude and insolent," and "a confident clown," when the sole occasion of it is his own ignorance. I shall give here a short account of his affront upon Athenæus, to shew what a strange compound must go to the making up a Defender of Phalaris.

The Examiner accuses Athenæus* for calling Plato *dog* and *liar*. Now the words of Athenæus are, "that Antisthenes says the same thing of Socrates that Plato says; but yet the matter is not true:" *χαρίζεται γὰρ καὶ ὁ κύων ἄτος; πολλὰ τῷ Σωκράτει*; "for this Cynic too compliments Socrates in many particulars." Antisthenes was Diogenes's master, and the founder of the sect of the Cynics: so that *κύων* here means a *Cynic*, and not a *dog*; and is so far from being a reproachful word, that it was adopted by the whole sect as a name of honour. But the learned and sagacious Mr. B. takes *κύων* for a very *dog*, and draws in Plato to have a share in the name as well as Antisthenes; which Athenæus never dreamt of. And is not this now a just occasion of calling so excellent a writer an "insolent and confident clown?" But we have instances of late, that such qualifications as those are not the properties of "clowns" alone.

But Mr. B. is not contented with abusing the Antients, unless he bestow his civilities upon some of the greatest of the Moderns. "Salmasius," he says, "and Scaliger were all GALL, and PRIDE, and PEDANTRY; which made the vast Learning they were masters of sit so ill upon them, that the World hated and despised them, at the same time that it was profiting by them." If he pleases he may add, that they are "hated and despised" by some who will never be able to

[xcix]

P. 26.

P. 28.

P. 238.

P. 238, 9.

P. 225.

* Athen. p. 216.

Prof. p.3. "profit by them." But are these the "expressions that become a young Writer?" though in truth they could come from nobody but a "young" and unfledged "Writer," that neither knows the Works of those Great Men, nor the History of that Age. Did the "World hate and despise them," who were admired and courted by the greatest Princes? who were invited out of their own country with the solemnity almost of an Embassy, that they would honour a potent Republic with their presence, and accept of a noble pension without any incumbrance of an office; who, as appears by the Letters written to them from the best Wits of all the nations of Europe, were universally esteemed as the glory of their age? It is true, they met with some very unworthy usage, which proceeded not from "contempt," but a quite contrary passion. He must be a "young Writer," and a young Reader too, that believes Milton and Petavius had themselves as mean thoughts of Salmasius as they endeavour to make others have. He that studies to represent one of known and eminent merit to be a mere fool and an idiot, he gives himself the lie, and betrays he is either actuated with envy, or corrupted by a faction. But the greatest persecution these great men lay under was upon the account of Religion. They were the ornament of the Reformation; and, by their influence and example, gave such a spirit of learning to it, as made it triumph over its enemies, who would then have engrossed the reputation of letters, and confined it to their own party. They were vilified therefore and traduced by those who, if they had been of their own communion, would have almost adored them; so that Protestants should be tender and cautious from what hands they receive the characters of those great men. And if a magisterial air and too much heat and passion appear in their Writings, a candid Reader will forgive it, and say

" Sume superbiam
" Quæsitam meritis;"*

[cii] he will impute some of it to their temper; but the most to the ill usage they met with from envy and detraction. To "hate and despise" a man "at the same time they are profiting by him," is an ill mixture of the worst of human passions. A little haughtiness and warmth, when accompanied with merit, will be forgiven by some; but such black ingratitude will be "hated and despised" by all.

Mr. B. is pleased to bestow his next favour upon "Ludovico

* Horat. Od. III. xxx. 14.

"Castel-

"Castelvetro," whom he calls "an Italian PEDANT, famous for his snarling faculty, and contradicting great men upon very slight grounds;" and he thinks "Balzac says very well of him, that he was a public Enemy:" but whether somebody else will not be "infamous for His snarling faculty," we may predict from this very instance. This PEDANT, as our modest Author calls him, was one of the most ingenious, and judicious, and learned Writers of his age; and his books have at this present time such a mighty reputation, that they are sold for their weight in silver in most countries of Europe. I will mention but three testimonies of him: the famous Lilius Giralduſ* ſays "He had ſeen ſome of his pieces; which fully ſatisfied him that he was *judicio ſane quam acerrimo, et eruditione non vulgari.*" Henricus Stephanus dedicated a Book† to him; and, ſays he, "I refer for the cenſure of a piece of Poetry, *Sagaciæ et emunctæ tuæ uari, Ludovice πριτωτάτε et ποιητικώτατε.*" And he has this character given him by Menagius‡: "Ludovicus Caſtelvetrius in Commentariis illis ſuis eruditiffimis et acutiſſimis;" and again, "Omnium optime acutiſſimus Caſtelvetrius." I am perſuaded our Examiner has never read one line of this Author, whom he abuſes thus out of Balzac, a Writer, without undervaluing him, many degrees inferior to Caſtelvetro. I had the fortune ſome years ago to meet with moſt of the pieces of Caſtelvetro and his antagoniſts; and I find that the ſole occaſion of all his troubles in Italy was a copy of verſes made by Annibal Caro in praiſe of the Houſe of France; ſo that the very ſubject of it was enough to bias the judgments of Balzac and ſome others of that nation. Theſe verſes were diſperſed over Italy and France, and received with mighty applauſe; and being ſent to Caſtelvetro by a private Friend at Rome, who deſired his judgment of them, he returned him ſome ſhort cenſures, deſiring they ſhould neither be publiſhed nor ſhewn to any one as his: but by chance they got abroad and were printed; and brought ſuch a violent faction againſt him, as made the poor man weary of Italy. The very firſt lines of Caro's Verſes are,

[ciii]

"Venite à l'ombra de' gran Gigli d'oro,
 "Care Muſe, devote a' miei Giacinti:"

[civ]

where the Muſes are invited to come under the ſhadow of Flower-de-luces: upon which Caſtelvetro remarked, That the Muſes muſt be leſs than pigmies, if they could be ſhadowed

* Giralduſ. ii. Dialog. p. 421.

† Parrhaſii Epist.

‡ Menag. ad Laert.

by Flower-de-luces, which were scarce shelter enough for little insects. Who can have the folly to deny that this censure was just? "*Quis tam Lucili fautor ineptus, ut neget hoc?*" and yet this fault, and others as plain as this, were stoutly maintained by Caro and his party: for the advantages of Caro was, that he was Member of an *Academy*; and a whole College was engaged for him; and when neither reason nor truth was of their side, they confided in their numbers,

"Defendit numerus, junctæque umbone phalanges."

[cv] Their way of refuting Castelvetro* was by Pasquils, Lam-poons, Burlesque Dialogues, Public Speeches in the Academy, Declamations of School-boys, and, in the close of all, "A short Account of Messer Ludovico Castelvetro, by way of Index," full of the most virulent abuses†. These were the fair and honourable methods of managing their controversy; and though their Adversary, while he lived, suffered much from their malice, yet posterity has been just to him, and has set an extraordinary value upon his performances, while *Theirs* upon this argument (for in other things they were men of some worth) have nothing that now makes them enquired after, but the great reputation of the man they abuse. And such a man will never be called "an Italian PEDANT," but by those that copy after his Adversaries in their infamous way of writing.

It is now time to draw towards a conclusion of this Preface; which I shall do by informing the Reader, that when these papers were put to the Press, I designed to have brought into this Volume "The Dissertation about *Æsop* and the rest;" but this of *Phalaris* alone taking up more paper than I expected, I am obliged to put off the others to another opportunity. There are a few things therefore referred to in this part which do not appear here; but they shall be all made out in the next. I have it already by me; and when I can have leisure to transcribe it for the press, the Examiner shall have it.

Pref. p. 1. He has been pleased to say more than once, that I spent two or three years of my life in writing my First Dissertation; and
P. 24. yet he owns he never once saw my face, much less can he have any knowledge of the course of my studies: but he has a singular way of talking, as he says, "at a venture. I drew up that Dissertation in the spare hours of a few weeks; and

* *Apologia de gli Academici di Banchi di Roma.*

† *Tavola dela contenenza. Ibid.*

while

while the Printer was employed about one leaf, the other was making. It is now I think about XL weeks since his Examination came abroad, VIII of which I spent in the country, where I had no thoughts of Him and his Controversy: and if in the rest of that time I have published This Book, and have the Second ready for publication, I conceive the world will be satisfied that I could not spend three years in the other Book of nine sheets only; and yet I will assure him, but for the delay of the press, which I could not remedy, he had had this Answer some months ago. In a small part of the last of those three years, which he says were all laid out upon Phalaris, I wrote my Notes on Callimachus; and Mr. Grævius perhaps will thank Mr. B. if in six years' time he will send him the like upon any other Author. But suppose his accusation true, I had rather have spent all that time in discovering truth, than have spent three days in maintaining an error. [civ]

But he says the whole thing is "a very inconsiderable point, which a wise man would grudge the throwing away a few weeks thought upon." And I doubt not but many others, whose designs and studies are remote from this kind of learning, will follow this censure. To such men as these I must answer, that if the dispute be quite out of their way, they have liberty to let it alone; it was not designed for them, but for others that know how to value it; who, if the principal point about Phalaris were quite dropt, will think the other heads that are here occasionally handled, not unworthy of a Scholar. But that the single point, Whether Phalaris be genuine or no? is of no small importance to Learning, the very learned Mr. Dodwell is a sufficient Evidence; who, espousing Phalaris for a true Author, has endeavoured by that means to make a great innovation in the ancient Chronology. To undervalue this dispute about Phalaris, because it does not suit to one's own studies, is to quarrel with a circle because it is not a square. If the question be not of vulgar use, it was written therefore for a few; for even the greatest performances upon the most important subjects are no entertainment at all to the many of the world. P. 24.

I will venture here beforehand to give this character of Mr. B.'s performance upon Æsop: — That, though it is not wholly unworthy of its Author, yet it seems a little below him. The style of it is something worse than that of the Defence of Phalaris; and the learning of it, which he ought to take for a compliment, a great deal worse. If there be one thing which he has said right in his Phalaris, about *προδίδωμι* and *διάνω*, I will [cvii]

will pass my word there will not be one good thing in his *Æsop* when I call it to account. His observations there about *Babrius's Verses* will be found worse than those here about the *Anapæsts* of *Æschylus* and *Seneca*; his accusing me there as a *Plagiary* from *Nevelettus* and *Camerarius*, will appear much more unjust than what he says here about my pillaging *Vizzanius* and his own "poor notes;" his grimace there about *Socrates* will be shewn more impertinent, if possible, than his long banter here, "That *Dr. B.* cannot be the

P. 184, &c. "Author of the *Dissertation*:" which insipid banter seems rather to have been written in a tavern than in a study, and is not fit to be answered by me. But if another should answer him in his own way, and pretend to prove "that *Mr. B.* is "not the Author of the *Examination*," from the variety of styles in it, from its contradictions to his edition of *Phalaris*, from its contradictions to itself, from its contradictions to *Mr. B.'s* character and to his title of Honourable, and from several other topics, it would be taken perhaps for no raillery, but too serious a repartee; or at least might pass for a true jest, though intended only for a merry one.

Pref. p. 6.

P. 289.

[cix]

Mr. B. has been pleased to threaten me with the resentments of "a whole Society," and "a great Body of Learned Men." I must own I do not well know what apprehensions to have of this threat; for as I have done no injury to any Society, so I think I have no reason to be afraid of their resentments. It does not appear to me that *Mr. B.* has any commission to threaten thus in their name; and if he has not, his making use of their authority is a sort of libel upon them, which would represent "a great Body of Learned Men" as the partakers and patrons of the faults of his Book. I have a true honour and great esteem for that noble and flourishing Society which is supposed to be meant here; and I should think I did them a great injury to suspect they will interpose in *Phalaris's* behalf; for when a cause cannot be defended, the numbers of those that engage in it make it only the more scandalous.

But since *Mr. B.* has been so free as to threaten a reply, even before he sees what I say in my Defence, though I will not prescribe to so great a genius any method of his answer; yet I think I may make bold to tell him what I shall look upon to be No Answer.

1. If he pretends that he did not maintain that his *Phalaris* is genuine, but only that my arguments do not prove him to be otherwise, I shall look upon this as a shuffle, and

no answer at all; for, if he suspects whether he is genuine, and yet allows none of my arguments,—the world desires to have his reasons, why he has that suspicion of him. I observe indeed, that there is one argument against him proposed by Mr. B. which I had not taken notice of: “That the names of those whom the Epistles are directed to, seem sometimes to be feigned on purpose, according to the subject of those Epistles*.” Till Mr. B. shall think fit to give us other grounds of his suspicion, the world will take the liberty to think that this is all he has; so that we are to take this measure of his great judgment by this scale, that all my reasons go for nothing with him; and his own single and substantial one goes for all.

[cx]

But perhaps he will now be more loyal than ever to his “*Sicilian Prince*,” and have no scruples at all about his true title to the Letters; for “he assures the reader, that his doubts about the authority of the Epistles, since he read my Dissertation, are much lessened; and if I write once more upon that subject, perhaps the point will be clear to him.” Agreed and contented on both sides! I have written once more against them; and Mr. B. for that reason will more firmly believe them. I desire no greater punishment to him for all his ill usage of me, than that he would maintain them to be genuine as long as he lives.

P. 33.

2. Or, if he comes with more Testimonies of his Bookseller, or his *humtje-dumtje* Acquaintance, I shall take those for no Answer; for a man that is once convicted of an intended perjury is no longer a lawful witness; and a man that has declared publicly, that “his memory could but serve him for one particular,” can have no benefit in Law allowed him of strengthening it afterwards either with “three threads” or “four threads.”

3. Or, if he brings any new stories and hearsays about me that are foreign to the business, I shall look upon those as no part of an answer; for, after I have so fully disproved his capital accusation about the King’s MS. and that of Sir Edward Sherburn, I shall not think myself concerned at any calumnies that he shall start hereafter.

4. Or, if he thinks fit, or any Friend for him, to reply to me in Latin (for he threatens^d me with a Latin Book, in the imperious style of Festus: “Hast thou appealed to Foreign Universities? to Foreign Universities thou shalt go.”) I may look perhaps upon that as an answer; but such a one as will need no Answer from Me; for, if I may guess at what

P. 230.
[cxi]

* Præf. ad Phal.

is to come by the present performance, a Latin book from any hand that has been yet concerned in the Defence of Phalaris will carry its own answer in itself.

5. But, if he chuses to reply in English, and meddle once more with the matter of Learning; if he do not mend his hand a little, and bring a piece with fewer faults in it than the last, I shall not take that for an Answer; for my whole life might be spent at that rate in refuting the merest trash; and he has clearly the advantage of me in this point; for he may commit more mistakes in five weeks time, and in five sheets of paper, than can be thoroughly confuted in fifty sheets, and in a whole year.

Besides this, I may justly expect, that if he proceeds further upon the subject of Phalaris, he should freely acknowledge those faults that I have refuted in his last Work. I have done the like myself; and I here sincerely declare, that I am not conscious of one error that he observed in my Dissertation, which I do not own in my Answer. I design nothing but a search after truth; and will never be guilty of that mean disingenuity, to maintain a fault that I am convinced of. I require therefore the same candour from him; and if he does not perform it, I shall not reckon it as an Answer; for if he has not either judgment enough to know when he is confuted, or sincerity enough to confess it, it is to no purpose at all to continue the controversy.

[cxii]
P. ult. 3d
Edition.

6. But, if he thinks to drop the main subject, or but slightly to touch upon it; and to give, as he says, "a view of the Doctor's picture in miniature," by way of burlesque, and ridicule, and banter, which his genius is so strongly bent to, I shall look upon that to be least of all an Answer, because it is no part of the dispute; for I will never contest that point with him, but allow that he has no ill talent at farce and grimace; and if there be neither truth, nor learning, nor judgment, in his Book, it shall be cried up for those other accomplishments as much as he pleases.

Mr. B. thought fit, in his second edition, to rake up all his affronts upon me together, under the title of "A short Account of Dr. B. by way of Index;" and, in an imperfect imitation of so great an Example, I had drawn up "an Account," not of Mr. B. but "of his Performance, by way of Synopsis;" but when I saw such a multitude of errors concentrated together, the sight was so deformed and disagreeable, "*miseranda vel hosti*," that no resentment could prevail with me to return him his own compliment.

A DIS-

A Dissertation

UPON THE

EPISTLES OF PHALARIS.



AFTER the Honourable Mr. B. has dispatched his account of the matters of fact relating to Himself and his Bookseller, where, I am sorry to hear him say, "his honesty" was concerned, he proceeds to the main part of the dispute, which only touches "his learning." This, he says, will give him no "concern," though it may put him to some "trouble; for he shall enter upon it with the indifference of a gamester, who plays but for a trifle, which it is much the same to him whether he wins or loses."

[1]
P. 22.
P. 22, 3.
[2]

Mr. B. here seems to *enter upon* his work a little untowardly and ominously; for a gamester, they say, who plays with *indifference* and without any *concern*, never plays his game well. Besides that, by this odd comparison of himself to a gamester, he seems to give warning (and he is as good as his word) that he will put the dice upon his readers as often as he can; but, what is worst of all this, this comparison puts one in mind of a general rumour, which I make not my own, That there is another set of *gamesters* who *play him* in his dispute, while themselves are out of sight, and safe behind the curtain.

His very first sentence acquaints his Reader "That Dr. B. has taken the liberty of writing without any method;" which is a bold stroke to begin with, and shews we must expect nothing from him but what is masterly and great. I have first produced the *chronological* proofs, that Phalaris is spurious; then I consider the *language*, then the *matter* of the Epistles, and I conclude all with the argument taken from their *late appearance* in the world; and all these are ranked in their natural order, and distinguished from each other without any mixture or confusion; and if this be writing without method, my ignorance perhaps was occasioned, because I have not read the new "System of Logic" set out for the use of Mr. Charles Boyle,

P. 1.

P.33. Boyle, after the mode of *In usum Delphini*. When I have the happiness to read that great advancement of logic, and to receive from it new light about method, I may then perhaps be induced to change the order of my Dissertation; but, in the meantime, I have let every thing stand as it did before; and I have distinguished the former Dissertation by printing it in a *greater letter*; and in a *smaller* I have answered Mr. B.'s objections at the end of every article.

But I have good reason to suspect, that his cry here against my want of *method* is but a cast of his *gamester's* art, that he might have the shuffling of his own cards, and so begin his Examination upon such articles as he could raise the greatest bustle in; for he pleasantly distinguishes my arguments into two sorts; "those that affect the whole set of the Epistles, and "those that touch only those particular Epistles from whence "they are drawn." He begins, therefore, with the *general proofs*, which are only three, he says, from the *language*, and the *matter*, and the *late appearance* of the Epistles; and the others from *chronology* (which were then about a dozen, and now shall be near a score); supposing them true, he says, do but concern those single Epistles from whence they are taken; "so that the rest, TO HIS COMFORT, may be genuine still."

P. 155. I cannot dismiss this facetious distinction without making a brief remark upon it, though I shall consider it more largely in another place. First, the Examiner bears very hard here upon "the most accomplished writer of the age;" for the great Memmius had pronounced of the whole set, "That the Epistles of Phalaris have more race, more spirit, more force
[3] "of wit and genius, than any others he had ever seen, either "ancient or modern." Now, if he, with that *nicety of taste*, believed all the Epistles to be written by the same hand (as indeed every body else does, the style and turn of them all being so exactly alike) Mr. B. puts an affront upon that great man's *taste*, when he pretends a score of the Epistles, which chronology refutes, might be foisted in "by the wantonness or vanity of imitators in after-times," and yet the rest be authentic; for if those *vain imitators* could copy so well in *after-times* as to impose upon Sir* . . . "who had
P. 155. "written to Kings, and was qualified to judge how Kings "should write," what becomes of his fine argument, from the "race" and the "spirit," such freedom of thought, such boldness of expression, to prove that none but a Phalaris
P.91.

* Sir William Temple.

could write them? If Mr. B.'s distinction be admitted, Sir . . . " must have very little skill in painting, that could not " find out a whole score of them to be *copies* by vain and wanton imitators, but took the whole set for *originals*." Mr. B. himself puts the same compliment upon him, that he makes such a hideous outcry at in another, " That Sir . . . neither " knew the true time nor the value of his authors."

But the Examiner bears still harder upon another worthy author, the Honourable Mr. Boyle, in his Preface to Phalaris. That ingenious and learned gentleman is expressly against this new distinction " of proofs that affect the whole, and proofs " that touch only particular Epistles;" for he owns, " that Præf. Phal. p. 3. " if Diodorus Siculus say true, that Tauromenium was not " built and called so till after the razing of Naxos by Dionysius the Tyrant, *actum est de Phalaridis titulo, et ruit* " *omnis male sustentata conjecturis auctoritas*, Phalaris's title to " the Letters is quite cashiered; and all the authority of them, " supported by weak surmises, must drop to the ground." But this Tauromenium is mentioned thrice only in the whole set of Epistles*; so that if Phalaris's title to all the Epistles be rendered quite desperate by the disproof of three single ones, I have that Noble Author on my side against the whimsical distinction of the Examiner; who, though not three only but thirty of the letters, and those not coming all together, but scattered through the whole set, be refuted from chronology, would still comfort himself with the cold hopes " that the rest " may be genuine."

My former Dissertation began with a short Address to my learned friend Mr. Wotton, with whose book it was then published; but because in this second Edition it comes out alone, it was thought proper to leave out that little Proœmium†.

However,

* Ep. xv. 31, 33.

† The Reader will not be displeased at seeing it thus preserved in *this* Edition: —

" SIR, — I remember that, discoursing with you upon this passage " of Sir W. T. (which I have here set down) I happened to say, That, [See p. 13.] " with all deference to so great an authority, and under a just awe of " so sharp a censure, I believe it might be even demonstrated that the " Epistles of Phalaris are spurious, and that we have nothing now extant " of Æsop's own composing. This casual declaration of my opinion, by " the power of that long friendship that has been between us, you improved into a promise, That I would send you my reasons in Writing, " to be added to the New Edition of your Book, believing it, as I suppose, a considerable point in the controversy you are engaged in; for " if

However, I will not omit to give an answer to those *reflections* that the Examiner has made upon it.

First, he tells me "that Dion's authority," whom I had cited there, "in this or any other case, is not very considerable; he is tedious and insipid; he is as errant a Sophist and "Declaimer as ever was." We may learn the truth of this Gentleman's characters, from this one that he begins his Book with. Let us hear what others have said of Dion. His own age surnamed him Chrysostome* (the same title that was afterwards given to that great Father of the Church) upon account of his eloquence; nor had posterity a worse opinion of him, if Philostratus, Themistius, Synesius, all men of admirable eloquence, are competent witnesses of it. So far was he from being counted "as errant a Sophist as ever was," that both Christian Fathers and Philosophers, nay the very Sophists themselves, that would have been proud of his company, have declared him no Sophist, but a Philosopher. Themistius says† he was in the same quality with the Emperor Trajan as Arius was with Augustus, and Thra-

"if it once be made out that those Writings your Adversary so extols, are supposititious, and of no very long standing, you have then his "and his party's own confession, that some of the later pens have outdone the old ones in their kinds. And to others that have but a mean esteem of the wit and style of those books, it will be a double prejudice against him in your favour, that he could neither discover the true time nor the true value of his Authors. These I imagine were your thoughts when you engaged me to this that I am now doing; but I must take the freedom to profess, that I write without any view or regard to your controversy, which I do not make my own, nor presume to interpose in it. It is a subject so nice and delicate, and of such a mixed and diffused nature, that I am content to make the best use I can of both Antients and Moderns, without venturing with you upon the hazard of a wrong comparison, or the envy of a true one. *That some of the oldest Books are the best in their kinds*, the same person having the double glory of invention and perfection, is a thing observed even by some of the Antients‡; but then the Authors they gave this honour to are Homer and Archilochus; one the Father of Heroic Poem, and the other of Epode and Trochaic; but the choice of Phalaris and Æsop, as they are now extant, for the two great inimitable originals, is a piece of criticism of a peculiar complexion, and must proceed from a singularity of palate and judgment."

† Dion.
Chrysost.
Orat. 33.
p. 397.

* Photius, Biblioth. Eunapius, p. 5. Themist. Orat. 12. Synesius in Calvisii Encomio et in Dione, Δίῳ τῷ χρυσῷ τὴν γλῶττιαν. Τὴν γλῶττιαν, ἣν χρυσὸν εἶχεν, ὥσπερ καὶ λίγίαν.

‡ Themist. Orat. 12. Τὸν Ἀρείον ἱκαῖνον ὁ Σέβαστος, ὁ Τιβέριος τὸν Θράσυλον, Τραϊανὸς ὁ μίγας τὸν Δίωνα τὸν χρυσὸν τὴν γλῶττιαν, τὸν Ἐπίκτιτον τῷ δὲ Ἀντωνίνῳ.

syllus

syllus with Tiberius, and Epictetus with the two Antonines. He is ranked with Ammonius and Plutarch*, and Carneades and Favorinus, and such other great men, that are really philosophers, but, because of their polite learning, were called Sophists by the vulgar; but what need I say more, when his very Works, that are yet extant, are for the most part upon Political and Philosophical subjects? The Moderns too agree with the Antients in their character of Dion. It were easy to mention many; but, since our Examiner professes a peculiar deference to Casaubon's opinion, it is enough to say that he calls him "the most excellent Philosopher†." A man that traduces Dion for "a flat and insipid Sophist," seems to own that he neither read Dion, nor these others that have so commended him.

Then he taxes me "for singularity of judgment; for never any man, till I arose, pretended to despise Phalaris. My opinion is, contrary to the sense of all mankind, that have ever written before me." This is very peremptorily said; but Mr. B. by his own advice, should have had a care "of negatives, a very dangerous way of speech;" especially "when the contrary affirmative is most certainly true;" for chronologers are all agreed that the great Erasmus lived before our days, and these are his words: — "Those Epistles that somebody has left us, in the names of Brutus and of Phalaris, and of Seneca and St. Paul, what else can they be reckoned than little poor declamations‡?" This is as great a contempt of them as ever I expressed; it is the very word I myself used, "Was ever any Declamator's case so extravagantly put?"

P. 27.

P. 95.

But, to give his Reader another taste of somebody's singularity, Mr. B. tells a story of a "certain Critic of our Times, who maintained" (when and where it is no matter) "that Ovid and Manilius were the only two Poets that had wit among the Antients." To speak freely, I am ashamed to see a person, that writes himself Honourable, tell such little stories and hearsays, so below his name and character. I am not at all concerned to justify this criticism, for I know not

* Philostrat. de Soph. p. 485, 489, 496. Syncsius in Dione. Eunap. in Præfat. Τὴν φιλοσοφίας ἐν δόξῃ τῷ σοφιστῷσαι.

† "Gravitate captus orationum excellentissimi Philosophi." Casaub. Ep. ad H. Stephanum.

‡ "Porro Epistolæ, quas nobis reliquit nescio quis Bruti nomine, nomine Phalaridis, nomine Senecæ et Pauli, quid aliud censi possunt quam DECLAMATIUNCULÆ?" Erasm. Ep. lib. i. epist. 1. See also his Epistle before the Fourth Tome of St. Hieron.

that

P. 28.

that ever I said so; but, however, not to desert Manilius, for whom I have an esteem, I see no reason at all why he that said this should be ashamed of it; for, with submission, why must Ovid and Manilius be set as wide asunder as Nireus and Thersites? Better judges than Mr. B. have thought there was a likeness in the geniuses of those two poets. When our Examiner reads Manilius (for, by his censure, one would guess he yet had not) he will find in the best Editions what Scaliger says of him, “A most ingenious Poet, a most elegant Writer, that could manage an obscure and knotty subject with that clearness and smoothness of style; equal to Ovid in sweetness, and superior in majesty. Especially his introductions and digressions are secure above all de- traction. Nothing can be more divine, more copious, more grave, more pleasant*.” Thus, we see, one of the greatest Scholars of all the Moderns, and a very great Poet himself, has thought Manilius a very witty one; and, just as that *certain Critic* did, has joined him with Ovid. It is an honour therefore to Dr. Bentley, that, in a comparison of Writers, he is ranked here with Manilius. But what satisfaction will Mr. B. make to his admired Sir for listing him with Ovid; that Ovid whom he modestly calls, in another place, “the trifling Author of the Verses upon Ibis?” I cannot pretend to tell who is most obliged to him, the Roman Ovid or the English Memmius.

TO pass a censure upon all kinds of writings, to shew their several excellencies and defects, and especially to assign each of them to their proper Authors, was the chief province and the greatest commendation of the Ancient Critics; and it appears from those remains of antiquity that are left us, that they never wanted employment. For to forge and counterfeit Books, and father them upon great names, has been a practice almost as old as Letters; but it was then most of all in

* “Poeta ingeniosissimus, nitidissimus scriptor, qui obscuras res tam luculento sermone, materiam morosissimam tam jucundo charactere exornare potuerit, Ovidio suavitate par, majestate superior. Imprimis omnia ejus proœmia et *παρεχάσεις*, extra omnem aleam posita sunt. Nihil illis divinius, copiosius, gravius, et jucundius dici potest. Audiamus itaque olorem canentem.” Scalig. in Præf.

fashion,

fashion, when the * Kings of Pergamus and Alexandria, rivaling one another in the magnificence and copiousness of their Libraries, gave great rates for any Treatises that carried the names of celebrated Authors ; which was an invitation to the Scribes and Copiers of those times to enhance the price of their wares, by ascribing them to men of fame and reputation ; and to suppress the true names that would have yielded less money. And now and then even an Author that wrote for bread, and made a traffic of his labours, would purposely conceal himself, and personate some old Writer of eminent note ; giving the title and credit of his Works to the Dead, that himself might the better live by them. But what was then done chiefly for lucre, was afterwards done out of glory and affectation, as an exercise of style and an ostentation of wit. In this the tribe of the Sophists are principally concerned, in whose Schools it was the ordinary task to compose Ἠθοποιίας, to make speeches and write letters in the name and character of some Hero, or great Commander, or Philosopher ; Τίνας ἂν εἴποι λόγους, “ What would Achilles, Medea, or Alexander, say in such or such circumstances ? ” Thus Ovid, we see, who was bred up in that way, wrote Love Letters in the names of Penelope and the rest. It is true they came abroad under his own name, because they were written in Latin and in verse, and so had no colour or pretence to be the originals of the Grecian Ladies. But some of the Greek Sophists had the success and satisfaction to see their Essays in that kind pass with some Readers for the genuine Works of those they endeavoured to express. This, no doubt, was great content and joy to them ; being as full a testimony of their skill in imitation, as the Birds gave to the Painter when they pecked at his Grapes. One of them † indeed

[10]

[11]

* Galen. in Hippoc. de Natura hominis, com. ii. p. 17. ed Basil.

† Μιθιδάρης, Præf. Ep. Bruti.

has dealt ingenuously, and confessed that he feigned the Answers to Brutus, only as a trial of skill; but most of them took the other way, and concealing their own names, put off their Copies for Originals; preferring that silent pride and fraudulent pleasure, though it was to die with them, before an honest commendation from posterity for being good imitators. And, to speak freely, the greatest part of mankind are so easily imposed on in this way, that there is too great an invitation to put the trick upon them. What clumsy cheats, those Sibylline Oracles now extant, and Aristee's story of the Septuagint, passed without controul even among very learned men! And even some modern attempts of this kind have met with success not altogether discouraging; for, though Anniius of Viterbo, after a reputation of some years, and Inghiramus immediately, were shamed out of all credit, yet Sigonius's *Essay de Consolatione*, as coming from a skilful hand, may perhaps pass for Cicero's with some, as long as Cicero himself shall last, which I cannot presage of that bungling supplement to Petronius (I mean not that from Traw, but the pretended one from Belgrade) that scandal to all forgeries; though, I hear, it is at present admired as a genuine piece by some that think themselves no ordinary judges.

[12] I HAD said out of Galen, "That in the age of the Ptolemees the trade of coining false Authors was in the greatest practice and perfection;" wherein I am charged with several faults; as first, for citing passages "out of the way:" an accusation I should wish to be true, rather than false; for I take it to be a commendation to entertain the Reader with something that is "out of the common way;" and I will never desire to trouble the World with "common authorities," as this Gentleman would have me do.

P. 29. "But there are other old Writers that tell this Story:" I wish he had pleased to name them. I must freely own I remember but one, and he tells the story but by halves; and is more "out of the way" than Galen himself: it is Ammonius, in his Comment upon Aristotle's *Categories*. "It is reported,"

"reported," says he, "that Philadelphus, being desirous to make a Collection of all Aristotle's works (as indeed of all sorts of Books whatsoever) gave good encouragement to those that could bring him any Treatise of that Philosopher's; some therefore, with a design to get money of him, put Aristotle's name to other men's writings*." Ammonius, we see, only speaks of Books fathered upon Aristotle, which did not reach to my purpose; but Galen says it more fully, and yet as truly, of all Writers of reputation. [13]

"But who would expect to see a point of History settled out of a Physician?" Any one that has read the Works of that Physician, or even that single Tract of his "About his own Books†," such a one would know, that excellent Author was not only a great man in his own Faculty, but in all parts of Learning. But what if he had been a mere Physician, like Aëtius or Aretæus, is that a just exception, or the least diminution to his testimony? The Examiner has taken care very often in his Book to tell us of his *good breeding*, though it be one part of *good breeding* not to value one's self upon it. Without doubt then he has added much to that character of himself, by this cast of his civility upon a whole Profession at once. P. 29

But it seems I quote very *awkwardly*; "for I have fetched in a Witness that, after all, speaks against me." The passage in Galen that I refer to is this: "When the Attali and the Ptolemæes were in emulation about their Libraries, the knavery of forging Books and Titles began; for there were those that, to enhance the price of their Books, put the names of great Authors before them, and so sold them to those Princes‡." This, I conceive, is an ample testimony that the practice of counterfeiting was then most in fashion, which is the thing I produce him for. It is true, as Mr. B. observes, Galen hints a little more than I had occasion to cite [14]

* Ammon. p. 10. edit. Veret. 1546. Πτολεμαῖον τὸν Φιλάδελφον πάντῃ ἐπαυκίνειν φασὶ περὶ τὰ Ἀριστοτελικά συγγράμματα, ὡς καὶ περὶ τὰ λοιπὰ, καὶ χρήματα δίδοναι τοῖς προσφέρουσιν αὐτῷ βιβλίας τὰ φιλοσόφῳ ὅθεν τινὲς χρηματίζασθαι βυλόμενοι, ἐπιγράφοντες συγγράμματα τῷ τῷ φιλοσόφῳ ὀνόματι, προσήγον.

† Περί τῶν ἰδίων βιβλίων.

‡ Ἐν τῷ κατὰ τὰς Ἀτταλικῆς τε καὶ Πτολεμαϊκῆς βασιλείας χρόνῳ, πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀντιφιλοτιμυμένους περὶ κτήσεως βιβλίων, ἢ περὶ τὰς ἐπιγραφάς τε καὶ διὰσκίας αὐτὴν ἤρξατο γίνεσθαι ῥαδιουργία τοῖς ἑκκα τῷ λαβῆναι ἀργύριον ἀναφέρειν ὡς τὰς βασιλεῖς ἀνδρῶν ἐνδόξων συγγράμματα. Galen. com. ii. in Hip. de Nat. Hom.

from him; for he says this practice *began* at that time, which in another place he asserts more expressly, "That before the reigns of those Princes, there was no such thing as a counterfeit Book*." Which assertion, taken strictly and without a candid allowance, is notoriously false; for we have several instances of such forgeries, not only practised by persons that lived before those times, but told us also by Writers that lived before them. Ion Chius, the Tragic Poet, says, that Pythagoras made some Poems, and put Orpheus's name to them†. Herodotus denies that the Poem called CYPRIA is Homer's‡; and others say it is Stasinus's§, though Pindar ascribes it to Homer||. Aristoxenus mentions several spurious pieces that were fathered upon Epicharmus¶. Callimachus says, that OECHALIA CAPTA, a supposed Poem of Homer's, was really Creophylus's the Samian**. Heraclides of Pontus put forth his own tragedies under Thespis's name††. And Heraclides himself was deservedly punished by Dionysius Metathemenos; for Dionysius made a Tragedy called Parthenopæus, and intitled it to Sophocles, which Heraclides was cheated with, and quoted it for genuine‡‡. To these I will add that odd forgery of Anaximenes the Historian; though Pausanias be the oldest Author now extant that relates it§§. This Anaximenes, having a spite to his rival Historian Theopompus, wrote a bitter invective against the three most powerful governments of Greece, the Athenians, Lacedemonians, and Thebans; where he exactly imitated Theopompus's style: this Book he sends abroad in Theopompus's name, and so makes him odious all over Greece.

There are many more instances of such counterfeit Writers. In one short passage of Suidas there is an account of half a score|||. But because the Authors now extant that mention them were since the times of the Ptolemees, we have no certain demonstration but that the forgeries also were since: but Galen lived at a time when those other Books were in being,

* ἄδην ψευδὲς ἐπιγραφὴν οὐκ ἔραμμα. Comm. i. in Hip. de Nat. Hist.

† Vid. Laërt. in Pythag. & Clem. Alexand. Strom.

‡ Herod. lib. ii. c. 117.

§ Athen. p. 334, 682.

|| Ælian. Var. Hist. ix. 15.

¶ Athenæus, lib. xiv. p. 648.

** Callimachus in Epigram.

†† Aristoxenus apud Laërt. in Heraclide.

‡‡ Laërt. in Heraclide.

§§ Pausanias Eliac. xi. p. 195.

||| Suid. in 'Ορφείκ.

from

from which our Author^s now extant had the stories at second-hand. I can hardly, therefore, persuade myself that the great Galen, with all his vast and diffused learning, could be ignorant of such obvious things: I would rather suppose, that when he says forgeries *began* in the times of the Ptolemies, he means it only of those that were practised to get money by; for both he and Ammonius particularly speak of those*. If this will not excuse Galen, I have nothing more to justify him; nor am I concerned in his mistake; for let us consider the charge that the Examiner draws up against me. "What I [16]
 " cite out of Galen he acknowledges is there," and is true;
 " but there is something else in Galen, which I do not cite,
 " that is false." Is not this a subtle accusation, and worthy of the ingenious Mr. B.? If I quote that Author for one thing, must I therefore be concerned in all his other opinions? At this rate Mr. B. may charge me with maintaining the doctrine of the four humours of the body, or with denying the circulation of the blood.

Some Critics in St. Hierom's time†, of the same stamp with our Examiner, would needs censure St. Paul in the very same manner. The Apostle ‡ had cited a verse out of Epimenides:

Κρήτες ἀεὶ ψεύσται, κατὰ θηρία, γαστέρες ἀργαί.

" The Cretans are always liars, evil beasts, slow bellies."

This, said those censorious Critics, is to patronize idolatry, because the Poet in that passage calls them *liars* and *beasts* for refusing some idol worship; as if the Apostle, because he approves one single verse, must for that reason be supposed to espouse the whole context. If the Examiner consult Hierom, he will find there a very good answer both to those Critics and himself.

In the former Edition, I had said that the Supplement of Petronius was pretended to be found at Buda. I had never seen that sorry imposture but once in a shop; and I was not much concerned to remember the title of it. I will take there- [17]
 fore our Examiner's word, for I have not seen the book since, that it pretends to come from Belgrade. Nor do I envy him the honour of being better acquainted with that worthy Author

* Λαυδάσιον δ' ἀρχαίμινον μισθῶν (leg. μισθὸν) τῶν κομιζόντων αὐτοῖς συγγραμμάτια παλαιῶ τινος ἀνδρός. Galen. Ὅθεν τις χρηματίζεσθαι βελάμηναι. Ammon.

† Hieron. Comm. ad Titum.

‡ Titus i. 12.

than I am: but I wonder he would stop there, and not vindicate that Belgrade fragment for a genuine piece: for, upon the same foot that he has defended his Phalaris, he may maintain all the cheats that ever were made, as I will shew at large in its proper place. If the Examiner, therefore, have longer life, with leisure and good assistant, we may hope for new Editions of Berosus and Metasthenes, and the rest of that stamp; they will make a most noble set, and will deserve to stand together with Phalaris and Aristetas.

-
- T**HAT Sophist, whoever he was, that wrote a small Book of Letters in the name and character of Phalaris (give me leave to say this now, which I shall prove by and by) had not so bad a hand at humouring and personating, but that several believed it was the tyrant himself that talked so big, and could not discover the Ass under the skin of that Lion; for we find
- [A] Stobæus quoting the 38, and 67, and 72 of those Epistles, under the title of Phalaris; and Suidas, in the account he gives of him, says he has wrote “very admirable Letters,” ἐπιστολὰς θαυμασίας πάντων*, meaning those
- [18] that we are speaking of. And Johannes Tzetzes, a man of much rambling learning, has many and large Extracts out of them in his Chiliads; ascribing them all to the Tyrant whose livery they wear. These three,
- [B] I think, are the only men among the Antients that make any mention of them; but since they give not the least hint of any doubts concerning their Author, we may conclude, that most of the Scholars of those ages received them as true originals; so that they have the general warrant and certificate for this last thousand years before the restoration of Learning. As for the moderns, besides the approbation of those smaller Critics that have been concerned in the Editions of them, and cry them up of course, some very Learned
- [C] Men have espoused and maintained them; such as

* Stob. Tit. vii. & xlvii.

Thomas

Thomas Fazellus*, and Jacobus Cappellus†. Even Mr. Selden himself ‡ draws an argument in chronology from them, without discovering any suspicion or jealousy of a cheat; to whom I may add their latest and greatest Advocate, who has honoured them with that most high character, prefixed to this Treatise. §

Others, indeed, have shewn their distrust of Phalaris's title to them; but are content to declare their sentiment without assigning their reasons. Phalaris, or "somebody else," says Cælius Rhodus||. "The [19] Epistles that go under the name of Phalaris," says Menagius¶. Some name the very person at whose door they lay the forgery. "Lucian, whom they commonly mistake for Phalaris," says Ang. Politianus**. "The Epistles of Phalaris, if they are truly his, and

* *Historia Sicula*, p. 118.

† *Historia Sacra & Exotica*, p. 249.

‡ *Marm. Arundel.* p. 106. [p. 119. ed. 1732.]

§ The passage here alluded to, which was prefixed by Dr. Bentley to his first Dissertation, but omitted in the second edition of it, is taken from Sir William Temple's *Essays upon Ancient and Modern Learning*, p. 58; and is as follows:—

"It may perhaps be further affirmed in favour of the Antients, that the oldest Books we have are still in their kind the best. The two most Ancient that I know of in Prose, among those we call Profane Authors, are *Æsop's Fables* and *Phalaris's Epistles*, both living near the same time, which was that of *Cyrus* and *Pythagoras*. As the first has been agreed by all ages since for the greatest master in his kind, and all others of that sort have been but imitations of his original, so I think the *Epistles of Phalaris* to have more race, more spirit, more force of wit and genius, than any others I have ever seen, either Ancient or Modern. I know several Learned Men (or that usually pass for such, under the name of Critics) have not esteemed them genuine; and Politian, with some others, have attributed them to *Lucian*; but I think he must have little skill in painting that cannot find out this to be an Original. Such diversity of passions, upon such variety of actions and passages of life and government; such freedom of thought, such boldness of expression; such bounty to his friends, such scorn to his enemies; such honour of learned men, such esteem of good; such knowledge of life, such contempt of death; with such fierceness of nature and cruelty of revenge, could never be represented but by him that possessed them. And I esteem *Lucian* to have been no more capable of writing than of acting what *Phalaris* did. In all one writ you find the Scholar or the Sophist; and all the other, the Tyrant and the Commander."

|| *Lib. iii. c. 7.*

¶ *Ad Laert. p. 35.*

** *Epist. 1.*

"not

“ not rather Lucian’s,” says Lilius Greg. Gyraldus * ; who in another place informs us, that Politan’s opinion had generally obtained among the Learned of that age, “ The Epistles,” says he, of Phalaris, which “ most people attribute to Lucian †.” How judiciously they ascribe them to Lucian, we shall see better anon, after I have examined the case of Phalaris, who has the plea and right of possession ; and I shall not go to dispossess him, as those have done before me, by an arbitrary sentence in his own tyrannical way ; but proceed with him upon lawful evidence, and a fair and impartial trial ; and I am very much mistaken in the nature and force of my proofs, if ever any man hereafter, that reads them, persist in his old opinion of making Phalaris an author.

[D] The censures that are made from style and language alone, are commonly nice and uncertain, and depend upon slender notices. Some very sagacious and learned men have been deceived in those conjectures, even to ridicule. The great Scaliger published a few Iambics, as a choice fragment of an old Tragedian, given him by Muretus ; who soon after confessed the jest, that they were made by himself. Boxhornius wrote a commentary upon a small Poem *De Lite*, supposed by him to be some ancient Author’s ; but it was soon discovered to be Michael Hospitalius’s, a late Chancellor of France ; so that if I had no other argument but the style to detect the spuriousness of Phalaris’s Epistles, I myself, indeed, should be satisfied with that alone ; but I durst not hope to convince every body else. I shall begin therefore with another sort of proofs, that will affect the most slow judgments, and assure the most timid or incredulous.

[A] TO shew Stobæus’s approbation of Phalaris’s Epistles, I had observed “ that he quoted three of them, under the “ title of Phalaris.” The Gentleman adds one more ; and I

* Poet. Hist. p. 88.

† P. 332.

should

should thank him for his liberality, had not any one of those three I mentioned been sufficient for my purpose; but when he says "It is Tit. CCXVIII. and again in the Collection of Antonius and Maximus, and that I overlooked it," for that I must beg his pardon; for I could hardly overlook the 218th title of Stobæus, where there are but 121 in all. It is not *Title* 218, but *Page* 218th*; and not of Stobæus, but of Antonius that is printed at the end of him; but the Title of Stobæus, that the Examiner would cite, is LXXXIV. How far "the Assistant that consulted Books" for the Examiner may be chargeable with this mistake; or how far it goes towards a discovery that Mr. B. himself never looked into Stobæus, I will leave it for others to determine.

P. 31.

[21]
Præf.

[B] "These three," said I (Stobæus, Suidas, and Tzetzes) "I think are the only men among the Antients, that make any mention of them." I am sensible how hazardous it is to publish books in great haste, where it is impossible not to commit some oversight or mistake. I could then call to mind three only; but the Examiner and his Assistant have found as many more:—Photius in his Epistles, the Scholiast on Aristophanes, and Nonnus upon Greg. Nazianzen. For his first Author, Photius, I must own myself obliged to him, because that learned Patriarch plainly "intimates his suspicions" (as Mr. B. well observes) "that the Epistles are not genuine," when he says "they are attributed to Phalaris†." This is honest and just in the Gentleman (though he ridicules it in others) "to fetch in a witness that, after all, speaks against him." Out of gratitude therefore for this fair dealing, I will tell him something about his other two Authors that, perhaps, he is not yet aware of.

P. 30.

P. 32.

P. 28.

First, The passage that is quoted out of the Scholiast on Aristophanes‡ (with the Examiner's leave) is spurious; for there are other things not genuine besides Phalaris's Epistles. It is not extant in Aldus's original Edition § set out by Musurus, but was foisted in by the overseer of the press at Florence, and copied out afterwards at Basil and Geneva. And,

[22]

* Edit. Genv. 1609.

† Τὰς εἰς Φάλαριν ἐκείνον, οἶμαι τὸν Αλεξανδρινὸν τύραννον ἀναφερομένης ἐπιτελής. Rhot. Ep. 207.

‡ Aristoph. Plut. ver. 42. Καταλύω, τὸ ἀφανίζω καὶ διαλύω ὡς ἀνταῦθα, καὶ ὁ Φάλαρις· εἰ βέλυσθι ἱμὶ τὸν πρὸς ὑμᾶς καταλύσαι πόλεμον. See Phal. ep. 5.

§ Ven. 1498.

to

to shew that it was not taken out of the same ancient MS. (as perhaps the Examiner will be ready to say) the same person has interpolated four passages more, but all out of printed Books; Galen*, Athenæus†, and Eustathius‡. From the last of which Authors there hangs an observation. The Examiner, after he has cited this Scholiast on Aristophanes, thus flourishes and insults "That very Scholiast, whom, one would think, the Doctor by his citing him so often had thoroughly read." Now some perhaps may think still, and the rather upon this very account, that the Doctor had thoroughly read him, but that our Examiner had not, I have a small proof from his own words: "This Scholiast," says he, "is some centuries older than Suidas." Now, how could he say this, had he known that this Scholiast had cited Eustathius, who is some centuries younger than Suidas? For I suppose it appears manifestly, that the Gentleman had no apprehension that the passage was foisted in.

P. 31.

[23]

But some have thought Suidas younger than Eustathius himself. That point therefore must be settled; for we have to deal with a shifting Adversary, that, to avoid a thing which presses him, will strike in with any opinion. Eustathius is known to have lived A. D. 1180. As for Suidas§, he has brought down a point of Chronology to the death of the Emperor Zimisces, that is, to the year of Christ 975; so that he seems to have wrote his Lexicon between that time and the death of the succeeding Emperor, which was 1025. Wolfius indeed brings him much lower; for he says, he cites Metochita Logotheta||, that lived in the beginning of the 14th century, in the times of the Palæologi; to whom learned men have answered, that that passage, or any other of that sort, may be supposed to have been foisted in since Suidas's death; but the whole thing is a mistake of Wolfius's; for the places he hinted at are in the words Αἱρεῖ and Νοθεύει, where Logotheta indeed is quoted; but not the Logotheta that Wolfius understood; Theodorus Metochita Logotheta, that died 1332; but Symeon Metaphrastus Logotheta, that flourished in the beginning of the tenth century. The words are,

* Edit. Basil. p. 43.

† P. 52, 65.

‡ P. 52, 31.

§ Suid. v. Ἀδάμ. Ἀπὸ δὲ τῆ Πορφυρογεννήτου ἕως τῆς τελευταίας Ἰωάννη τῷ Τζιμισκῇ, ἔτη xi. lege ἔτη ii.

|| "Atque adeo, cum Metochitam Logothetam citet, qui sub Palæo-logis vixit, apparet eum vix annis abhinc 300 Lexicon hoc composuisse." Hieron. Wolf. in Præfat. ad Suid. A. D. 1544.

" Logotheta

“ Logotheta in the Martyrdom of St. Thecla*,” and “ The Exposition of Logotheta upon the Martyrdom of St. Lucian†;” where the very word “ exposition,” μεταφρασις, is a plain indication that he means Symeon, called Μεταφραστής; but, which is certain demonstration, those two discourses of Symeon’s are extant at this day. The Reader too may be pleased to observe, that our Author calls Symeon μακαρίτης, “ of blessed memory;” which I believe is never used in Greek but of persons not long dead, and within the memory of him that says it: but Symeon was in office under Leo, who died 58 years before Suidas’s chronology ends. If Suidas then was Symeon’s contemporary, he must have made his book soon after the death of Zimisces, 200 years before Eustathius. [24]

And then for the Examiner’s other Author, which he would give me the credit of, Nonnus, in his “ Commentary on Gregory’s Invective, I thank him for his kind offer; but I cannot accept of it. That poor Writer is not Nonnus the Poet, the Author of the Dionysiacs and the Paraphrase of St. John’s Gospel, as Learned Men‡, and, if I may presume to guess, Mr. B. himself have believed. It is true I am no admirer of that Poet; I have the same opinion of his judgment and style that Scaliger, and Cunæus, and Heinsius had: but he had great variety of learning, and may pass for an able Grammarian, though a very ordinary Poet. And I can never think so very mean of him as to make him Writer of that Commentary, so full of shameful mistakes. That Commentator interprets τὰς Φρυγῶν ἐκτομὰς§, “ The castration of the Phrygians,” to be the slashing and cutting their limbs. He says Anaxarchus was pounded in a mortar by Archelaus the tyrant||. Here is Archelaus of Macedonia, instead of Nicocreon of Cyprus: besides that, Archelaus was dead above sixty years before Anaxarchus’s time. When he explains Ἐπικτήτης σκέλος in Gregory¶, he says “ Epictetus’s leg was put in chains by a certain tyrant**.” He knew not, it seems, that common story, that Epictetus was lame of one leg; and not by chains and imprisonment, but merely by a rheumatism††. He says Plato in Theætetus; and everywhere

* Ο Λογοθέτης ἐν τῇ τῆς ἁγίας Θέκλῃς μαρτυρίῳ. Suid. v. Αἰαξί.

† Ἐν τῇ τῷ μακαρίτῃ Λογοθέτῃ μεταφράσει, τῇ εἰς τὸ μαρτύριον τῷ ἁγίῳ Λυκίανῳ. Suid. v. Νοβίῳ.

‡ Simlerus in Biblioth. Dr. Cave. See Catal. Biblioth. Oxon. &c.

§ Num. 5. edit. Eton.

|| N. 15.

¶ P. 37.

** Num. 14.

†† N. 22.

brings

[25] brings in Socrates saying ὅτι καλὸς ὁ Θεαίτητος, "Theætetus is handsome;" whereas Plato says directly the contrary, Νῦν δὲ ἔκ ἐστι καλὸς, "Theætetus is not handsome*," as having a flat nose and goggle eyes. But the merriest fancy of this writer is this very story of Phalaris, with which Mr. B. would enrich my Dissertation. "Phalaris," says he, "to ingratiate himself with Dionysius the Tyrant, invented the Brazen Bull, and presented it to him; but Dionysius, detesting the cruelty of the invention, made the first experiment upon Phalaris himself†." Mr. B. who is for drawing down Phalaris as low as he can, should have struck in methinks with this Writer, who has drawn him down with a vengeance, even to Dionysius's time, the xciv Olymp. the space of above sixscore years. Now I conceive it will be easily allowed, that Nonnus the Poet could not be guilty of these mistakes. But there are two errors of this Commentator, that we have the Poet's own assurance he could not have committed. Gregory says ἡ Κασαλία σείγεται, the Castalian Fountain is put to silence‡. This, the Commentator says, is Castalia at Antioch§; but the Poet would have known it to be Castalia of Parnassus, as these Verses of his will witness.

Καὶ ῥέα Παρήσσοιο τινάσσετο φοιβάδος ἡχῆς
Γείτονος εἰσαΐοντα, καὶ ὀμφήντι ῥέεθρῳ
Κασαλῆς πάφλαξε νοήμονος ἔνθεον ὕδωρ. ||

The Commentator calls Bacchus Ζαφραῖος, which is barbarous, instead of Ζαφρεύς¶; but the Poet writes it true in a hundred places of his Book:

Ἀρχηγόνῳ Ζαγρηῖ καὶ ὀψιγόνῳ Διονύσῳ.

[26] If the Commentary then carry the name of Nonnus, it must needs be some other Nounus, and not the Author of the Dionysiaca. Billius**, who first published it out of a Library at Rhemes, calls it "Patris Nonni collectio," &c. In Possevin's Catalogue of the MSS. of the Escorial††, it is "Nonnus Abbas de Narrationibus," &c. Bishop Mountague, that first printed it in Greek, had it out of the Library at Vienna; and he ascribes it to Nonnus, upon the credit, I suppose, of

* Plato on Theæt.

† Num. 48.

‡ P. 104.

§ Num. 14. Part 2.

|| Nonni Dionys. iv. p. 130.

¶ Num. 29.

** In oper. Nazian.

†† Possev. Appar. vol. ii.

Billius;

Billius; for the original that he followed had no name at all, as it appears from his own Edition*, and from Lambecius's Catalogue†. Tzetzes in his *Chiliads* cites this very Book; but he attributes it to one Maximus.

Περὶ τῶ λέγοντος χρησμῷ τὰς Θετταλάς τὰς ἵππους,
Μέμνηται μὲν καὶ Μάξιμος ἱστορῶν τοῖς λόγοις,
Ἄς ἱστορίας ἔγραψε Γρηγόριος ὁ μέγας·
Ἔπος δ' ἔδεν ἔδῃ βραχὺ τὴν τῷ χρησμῷ εἰρήκει.

"Maximus," says he, "in his Commentary upon the Histories in Gregory, mentions the oracle about the Thessalian mares; but produces not one single verse of it." If the Examiner look in Gregory, p. 69, and in the Comment. Numb. 74, he will learn what perhaps he knew not before, that John Tzetzes means no other Commentary than this very Nonnus, the Examiner's noble present to me.

[C] It is a keen reflection of Mr. B. "That I named Fazellus, Cappellus, and Selden, not as a modest man would expect; but only to shew how impossible it was for them to judge right, who had the misfortune to live before me." I wish the Gentleman had shewed his own modesty a little more in this particular; for what can *any man expect* from him that will talk thus against his own knowledge? In the very same page, I have cited Rhodoginus, Politian, Gyraldus, and the *most* of that age, as falling in with my own opinion, that Phalaris is spurious; and yet I am said to suggest that Fazellus and the rest could not *possibly* judge right, as having nobody to inform them till I wrote upon the subject; though the youngest of those that judged right, whom I have cited in the same place, is older than the eldest of these that judged wrong.

P. 32.

[27]

[D] The Examiner shall see that I will not persist in an error when I am plainly confuted. I was persuaded, when I wrote my Dissertation, "That nobody that read it would believe Phalaris an Author." Here I must confess, I was in a mistake; for the Examiner, who assures us "he has read it and weighed it," has writ a book of 200 pages to vindicate "his Sicilian Prince;" but then, whether, as I said, "I was mistaken in the nature and force of my proofs," or rather in the nature and force of my Adversary, I leave that to the judgment of others.

P. 33

P. 43.

* P. 127.

† Lib. iii. p. 207.

- T**HE time of Phalaris's tyranny cannot be precisely determined: so various and defective are the accounts of those who write of him. Eusebius sets the beginning of it Olymp. xxxi. 2. "Phalaris apud Agrirentinos tyrannidem exercet;" and the end of it [28] Olymp. xxxviii. 2. "Phalaridis tyrannis destructa."
- [A] By which reckoning he governed xxxviii years; but St. Hierom, out of some unknown chronologer (for that note is not extant in the Greek of Eusebius) gives a different time of his reign, above lxxx years later than the other; Olymp. liii. 4; or, as others' Copies read it, lii. 2. "Phalaris tyrannidem exercuit annos xvi;" which is agreeable to Suidas, who places him *κατὰ τὴν νβ. ὀλυμπιάδα*;"—"about the lii Olympiad." If the former account be admitted, the cheat is manifest at first sight; for those Letters of Phalaris to Stesichorus and Pythagoras must of necessity be false; because Stesichorus, by the earliest account, was but vi years old at the supposed time of Phalaris's death; and Pythagoras was not taken notice of in Greece till lxxx [B] years after it; but for the sake of Aristotle and Jamblichus, the first of whom makes Phalaris contemporary with Stesichorus, and the other with Pythagoras; and that I may prevent all possible cavils and exceptions, I am willing to allow the latter account the more favourable to the pretended Letters; his government commencing Olymp. liii. 4. and expiring after xvi years, Olymp. lvii. 3.

- [29] [A] MR. B. will not enter the controversy about Phalaris's age, but refers himself to another person to settle that point for him; but, however, he will nibble at some passages of this Section, to shew his own great wit, though he borrows another man's great reading.

P. 118. In the former Edition, for xxxviii. 2, it was printed xxxvii. 2. Now a man of sense and honour would have passed this over as a plain fault of the press, as it appeared from Eusebius, who is quoted for it, and from my allowing the sum

sum of **xxviii** years for Phalaris's reign, which in the other way is but **xxiv**; and yet the Examiner animadverts on it for ten lines together. But at last he is willing "to suppose "**xxxvii** a false print," which he does not out of justice and sincerity (let not the Reader mistake him) but to draw on another cavil against the following passage; a cavil that would not succeed if **xxxvii** were truly printed.

The case is thus: I had said, if Olymp. **xxxviii**. 2, was the time of Phalaris's death, that Letter to Pythagoras must be spurious, for he was not "taken notice of" in Greece till **lxxx** years after; but, for Jamblichus's sake, who made those two to be *contemporaries*, I would allow the later account, Olymp. **lvii**. 3, for Phalaris's death. Here the Gentleman has proved, by the dint of arithmetic, that I contradict myself; for by adding those **lxxx** years to Ol. **xxxviii**. 2, the product is Ol. **lviii**. 2, Phalaris then was three years dead before Pythagoras was taken notice of. They could not therefore be *acquainted*, as I said I would allow for Jamblichus's sake. But here the Gentleman makes use of a certain slight of hand that is not fashionable among Men of Honour;—he takes away the word *contemporary*, and in its room puts in *acquaintance*. Now that is a point I need not allow, neither for Jamblichus's sake nor Mr. B.'s, that Phalaris and Pythagoras had any *acquaintance* together. I granted they were *contemporaries*; and it is not improbable that the tradition about their acquaintance was grounded upon that truth, that they lived at the same time; and I imagine they might: nay, they must have been *contemporaries*, if the one died but three years before the other was famous.

[30]

The Examiner, not content with this, makes a step out of his way, "to shew another instance of my inconsistency about "Xerxes's expedition." He says, "I put it * in one place "at Olymp. **lxxiii**." Here again the controversy lies between him and my Printer, who for **lxxv**. 1 (by mistaking the two strokes of v) made it **lxxiii**. But his next attack is made upon myself. Pag. 85, I say, "the very next Olymp. "after Xerxes's expedition, Hiero was in the throne; and I "quote Diodorus for it;—but Diodorus says in that very "place †, that Hiero came to the throne Olymp. **lxxv**. 3. "Therefore, here I am of opinion that Xerxes's expedition "was Olymp. **lxxiv**.; and yet Diodorus and I myself "elsewhere place it Olymp. **lxxv**." See the penetration of

P. 119.

* P. 24, first Edit.

† Lib. xi. p. 39.

[31] our Examiner, if he once set about it. He makes *coming to* the throne, and *being in* the throne, to have the same signification; for the sum of his argument lies thus:—"Hiero *came* to the throne Olymp. LXXV.; therefore it cannot be said he *was* in the throne Olymp. LXXVI." Was there ever such a dangerous Disputant? Upon the same foot he may argue all the Princes in Christendom out of their thrones, if they are past the first year of their reigns; but it is well for them, that in his second Edition this terrible paragraph is left out. Neither should I have raised it up again out of its dust, but for the sake of those that may never see his second Edition; and to shew it possible, even by Mr. B.'s own confession, that his animadversions may have other faults besides satire and abuse.

To take a short leave then of the Examiner, the very learned Mr. Dodwell, to whose Book now in the press Mr. B. has made his appeal for settling the time of Phalaris, was pleased, at my request, to oblige me with a sight of those sheets of his Book where this question is handled; and there I find that learned man has not only brought Phalaris down to Olymp. LXXII, §. which is LX years lower than chronologers had placed him before; but he has asserted the Epistles too to be Phalaris's own. I have leave to say this part of his Book was printed before my Dissertation was made; so that only two of my arguments, and not those neither in the manner that I urge them, are considered by Mr. Dodwell; but we may expect that, in an Appendix to that noble Work, he will pass a judgment upon the whole controversy.

To inquire then as accurately as we can into the Age of Phalaris; first, we have the authority of Eusebius and Hierom, who have furnished us with two accounts from different Authors.

- [32] Ol. XXXI, 2. Phalaris's Tyranny began*.
 Ol. XXXVIII, 2. Phalaris's Tyranny ended†.
 Ol. LIII, 4. Phalaris held his Tyranny XVI Years‡.
 Which XVI years expire at Olymp. LVII, 3.

In all my Dissertation I have reckoned by this latter account, though some of the MS. copies of Eusebius date it VI years before§; but I was resolved to avoid cavils, as much as lay in

* "Phalaris apud Agrigentinos tyrannidem exercuit."

† "Phalaridis tyrannis destructa."

‡ "Phalaris tyrannidem exercuit ann. xvi."

§ See Pontacus's Edition of Eusebius.

my power, and to shew all reasonable favour to the pretended Epistles.

If we trace the footsteps of Phalaris's age in the remains of other Authors, I believe we shall find that there is no good warrant or authority to bring it down nearer to us than this last period of Eusebius.

Syncellus puts the whole time of Phalaris within the bounds of Phraortes and Cyaxares's reigns; that is, between Olymp. xxxi and xlvii.

Phalaris was Tyrant of Agrigentum*.

Phalaris was deposed from his Tyranny†.

Now, though we should extend Phalaris's life to the very last day of Cyaxares, yet it will end xli years earlier than by Eusebius's reckoning.

Suidas says "He was Tyrant over all Sicily about the lli "Olymp‡." Now allow that he *began* his Tyranny at that time, though the words do not import so much, the interval between this and Eusebius's period is xxlii years: a very competent length for the duration of his reign. [33]

Orosius fixes his age to the beginning of Cyrus's reign, after Astyages was deposed§. But Cyrus's reign commences Olymp. lv, 1, which falls xi years within Eusebius's period.

Pliny says "The first Tyrant in the world was Phalaris at "Agrigentum||." This account will carry his age as high or higher than the earlier period in Eusebius, Ol. xxxi, 2. For Cypselus made himself Tyrant of Corinth Olymp. xxxi, 3¶; or, as others say, xxx, 3**. But at least it will secure it from sinking below the later period, llii, 4; for there was good store of Tyrants in the world before and about that time. To mention a few of them: Periander succeeded his father Cypselus at Corinth††, Olymp. xxxviii; and he married the daughter of Procles‡‡, Tyrant of Epidaurus. He had a name-sake, a cousin-german§§, that was Tyrant of Ambracia; and an acquaintance with Thrasybulus|||, who was Tyrant of Miletus.

* Syncellus in Chron. Φάλαρις Ἀκρωγαντίνῳ ἐτυράνησε.

† Φάλαρις τυραννῶν κατελύθη.

‡ Suid. v. Φάλ. τυραννήσας Ζικελίας ὅλης κατὰ τὴν ιβ' ὀλυμπιάδα.

§ Oros. i. 20. "Ea tempestate, Phalaris Siculus Agrigentinos arrepta Tyrannide depopulabatur."

|| Plin. Hist. Nat. vii. 56. "Tyrannus primus fuit Phalaris Agrigenti."

¶ Herodot. Diog. Laërt.

** Arist. Polit.

†† Aristot. Laërt.

‡‡ Laërt. in Periand. Herodot.

§§ Laërt. ibid. Arist. Polit.

||| Herod. Plut. Conviv. vii Sap. Laërt.

Pittacus was Tyrant of Lesbos*, Olymp. XLVII, 9; and he slew Melanchrus†, Olymp. XLII, who was Tyrant there before him. This Melanchrus, I believe, is meant in that verse in Hephæstion‡:

Μέλαιχρος αἰδῶς ἄξιος ἐς πόλιν.

[34]

for it appears plainly to be a verse of Alcæus's, who with his brothers assisted Pittacus in killing Melanchrus§. Tynnondas was Tyrant of Eubœa|| before the year that Solon was Archon, which was Olymp. XLVI, 3. But there is one that it is almost impossible Pliny should forget, I mean Pisistratus, Tyrant of Athens, who began his government Olymp. LIV, 4¶. They will put an affront then upon that great Historian and Naturalist, who shall attempt to bring Phalaris lower than the later period in Eusebius.

But I believe the age of Phalaris may be best of all determined out of Pindar and his Scholiast. Pindar, in an Ode to Theron, Tyrant of Agrigentum, calls him and his Family Ἑμμενίδαι, Emmenidæ** ; which the Scholiast thus explains: "Emmenidæ, the Family of Theron. Telemachus, that deposed Phalaris, Tyrant of Agrigentum, was the father of Emmenides, he of Ænesidamus, he of Theron and Xenocrates. Theron's son was Thrasydæus, and Xenocrates's Thrasybulus.††"

The genealogy lies thus:—

1. Telemachus, who deposed Phalaris.
 2. Emmenides.
 3. Ænesidamus.
 4. Theron.
 5. Thrasydæus.
- } { 4. Xenocrates.
5. Thrasybulus.

[35]

These being descended in a direct line, the son from the father, if we can but certainly fix the age of any one of them, we may gather from thence the time of the first, and consequently of Phalaris that was deposed by him; for allowing thirty years for every generation‡‡, or rather an hundred years

* Laërt. in Pittaco.

† Laërt. ibid. Suid. v. Πύλακος.

‡ Hephæst. Enchir. p. 46.

§ Laërt.

|| Plutarch. in Solonc.

¶ Marm. Arundel. [I. 60.]

** Ἐμὲ δ' ὃν πα

Θυμὸς ὀτρύνει φάμεν Ἑμμενίδαίς

Θηρών τ' ἰδθῆν κῦδος. Pind. III Olymp.

†† Τηλεμάχῃ καταλύσαντος τὸν τῶν Ἀκραγαγτίνων τύραννον Φάλαρα παῖς γίγνεται Ἑμμενίδης, ὃ Αἰνησίδαλος, ὃ Θήρων καὶ Ξενοκράτης. Θήρωνος δὲ Θρασυδαῖος, Ξενοκράτης δὲ Θρασύβουλος. Schol. ad locum.

‡‡ Eustath. & Schol. vetus ad ἁ Iliad. Οἱ παλαιοὶ τὰς γενιάς ἡφίσταον ἕως ἑτῶν τριάκοντα.

to three generations*, which was the common rule and measure set by the ancient Historians, we shall come at last to the period we seek for.

The same genealogy is repeated again in the Scholia upon the Fifth Ode of Pyth. out of an ancient Historian, Hippostratus, "who wrote a Treatise of the Sicilian Families†;" only here, by an error of the copier, Ænesidamus is left out of the list. But that it is no more than a bare omission of the Scribe, is apparent from that other passage above, and from Pindar‡ himself, and Herodotus; both of whom being contemporaries with Theron, call him the son of Ænesidamus.

There is a third table of Theron's pedigree, in the Second Ode of Olymp. where Pindar, saying "that Theron's family was derived from Thersander," the Scholiast reckons the whole stem of them thus: "Cedipus, Polynices, Thersander, Tisamenus, Antesion§, Theras, Samus, who had two sons, Clytius, who dwelt in the island Thera, and Telemachus, who went with some forces to Sicily and settled himself there||." The descendants of

- " 1. Telemachus, are
- " 2. Chalciopæus.
- " 3. Ænesidamus.
- " 4. Theron."

It is observable, that he that was named Emmenides above, is here called Chalciopæus. But this difference is of no consequence in our present enquiry, since in both accounts there is the same number of persons: nay, we have the firmer ground to go upon for this little variation; for because these differing genealogies must have been taken from different authors, we have now a double authority for the number of the generations.

To proceed then in our search after some characters of time. Xenocrates, of the 14th generation, got the prize at the Pythian Games, in Pythiad the xxivth, which falls in with Olymp.

[36]

* Herod. xi. c. 142. Γεναι τρεῖς ἀνδρῶν ἑκατὸν ἑτά εἰσι. Clemens Alex. Strom. i. Εἰς μέντοι τὰ ἑκατὸν ἔτη τρεῖς καταλέγονται γεναί. So Dionys. Halicarnas. l. i. p. 120, from Numa, Ol. xvi, 3, to Pythagoras, Ol. i, 1, which make 134 years, are τέσσαρες ὅλαι γεναί, four generations.

† Ἰσπόστρατος ὁ τὰ περὶ Σικελίας γυνεαλογῶν.

‡ Pind. ii Olymp. πρὶναι τὸν Αἰνησιδάμην, speaking of Theron. Herod. vii. 165. Θῆρωνος τῷ Αἰνησιδῆμιν Ἀχαιαντίνων μνησέμεν.

§ In the Scholiast here it is Ἀντισίων; but the true reading is Αὐτισίων. [Addend. See Herodotus; p. 350; Apollodorus, p. 142; Pausanias in several places; p. 541.] and the Scholiast himself on Pyth. iv.

|| Συλλέξας δύταμιν, ἔρχεται εἰς Σικελίαν, καὶ κρατεῖ τῶν τέκνων.

LXXII, 3*. Supposing then that Xenocrates was but xxx years old at the time of that victory, and Telemachus xl when he deposed Phalaris, which is an allowance very favourable in behalf of the Epistles, there is yet an interval of fourscore and ten years; and Phalaris's death must be placed at Olymp. L, 1; which is above the period of Eusebius.

But we have more notes of time relating to his brother Theron. He was victor† at the Olympian Games (Olymp. LXXVII) and died the same year, in the xvith of his reign‡; so that he came to the crown Olymp. LXXIII, 1. He had a daughter, Demarete, that was married to Gelon, Tyrant of Syracuse, before LXXV, 1§. Let Theron then be XLII years old when he entered upon his government, which is an allowance scanty enough, since he had not the crown by succession, but obtained it by policy and interest||, and let his daughter Demarete be xx years of age at Olymp. LXXV, and Telemachus xl, as before, when Phalaris was deposed, the collected number of years is cx; which will carry Phalaris's death as high as Olymp. XLVII, 2.

Thus, we see Eusebius, Hierom, Syncellus, Orosius, Suidas, Pliny, Hippostratus, and the Scholiast on Pindar, are all pretty well agreed in placing the time of Phalaris's death above the LVIIIth Olympiad; and there will be occasion of adding several remarks in confirmation of their testimony, as we examine the opinion of the learned Mr. Dodwell.

The sum of his first argument¶ for bringing Phalaris down so much lower, turns upon these authorities.

"Phalaris was contemporary with Stesichorus**, and survived him††; but Stesichorus was alive Olymp. LXXIII, 3‡‡."

Where, without doubt, the Reader has already observed that the principal part of the argument, "Stesichorus's surviving of Phalaris, is plainly begging the question; for it has no voucher but the Epistles of Phalaris, the very book that is under debate. This particular then must be laid aside, and, without it, the whole argument has no force at all; for Stesichorus

* Pindar, Schol. ad II Isth. Οὗτος δὲ ὁ Ξενοκράτης ὁ μόνος Ἰσθμια νικήσας ἵπποις, ἀλλὰ καὶ Πύθια τὴν εἰκοστὴν τετάρτην πυθιάδα, ὡς Ἀριστοτέλης ἀναγράφει. See too ad VI Pyth.

† Schol. Pindari ad II Olymp.

† Diodor. Sic. p. 39.

§ Diodor. p. 21. Timæus apud Schol. Pindar. II Olymp.

|| Polyænus, lib. vi.

¶ De Cyclis Vet. Diss. v. sect. 10.

** Aristot. Jo. Tzetzes.

†† Phal. Ep.

‡‡ Marm. Arund. [I. 65.]

might be alive Olymp. LXXIII, 3, and yet be contemporary with Phalaris, even by Eusebius's account. Stesichorus lived to be LXXXV years old*; he might be XXI then at Olymp. LVII, 3, the time of Phalaris's death according to Eusebius.

Nay, the other branches of this argument are either for us, or at least not against us. Tzetzes, who says Phalaris lived in Stesichorus and Pythagoras's time†, is a witness of no credit in this particular; for, as Mr. D. himself acknowledges, he had it from the Epistles, which he often cites in his Chiliads. And Aristotle's story‡ of Stesichorus's Fable about the Horse and the Stag, when the Himæreans had made Phalaris their General, and were going to allow him a guard, is a little to be suspected, because Conon, a Writer in Julius Cæsar's time, gives us the very same narrative; but instead of Phalaris, he says it was Gelon that Stesichorus spoke of§. And the circumstances of Gelon's history seem to countenance Conon; for Gelon was in great favour and esteem with the Himæreans. When their city was besieged by Himlico, Olymp. LXXV, 1, he came and raised the siege with a total defeat of all the Carthaginian forces||; upon which almost all the cities of Sicily, even those that had opposed him before, came and made their submission to him, Stesichorus then might say his Fable upon that occasion, or perhaps long before, upon some other account that we know not of, before Gelon obtained the government of Syracuse. If we suppose then, with the Arundel Marble, that Stesichorus lived Olymp. LXXIII, 3, it exactly agrees with the age of Gelon; and Conon's account of the story may seem more credible than Aristotle's; and then all the argument that would settle Phalaris's age from the time of Stesichorus, will vanish into nothing.

But if any one will pay so much deference to the deserved authority of Aristotle, as to believe the story upon his word, I will not contest it with him. Let it be true then that Stesichorus made this speech upon Phalaris; so far is this from being a reason to bring Phalaris lower, that it rather ties and fastens him up to the period of Eusebius; for Suidas says Stesichorus was born Olymp. XXXVII, and died LVI, which makes him fourscore years of age, and wants but five years of Lucian's reckoning. Eusebius places him higher still; for he says he flourished Olymp. XLII, 1, and died Olymp. LV, 1. All this is confirmed by another passage of Suidas, where he says Simo-

[39]

* Lucian in Macrob.

† Ad Hesiod. p. 3.

‡ Arist. in Rhetor.

§ Conon, Narrat. 42.

|| Diod. xi. p. 18 and 21.

nides was μετὰ Στσίχρον τοῖς χρόνοις, "after Stesichorus's time*;" as in another place he says "Stesichorus was after Alcman's time†." Now as Alcman, who flourished Olymp. xxvii, was dead when Stesichorus was born, Olymp. xxxvii, so Stesichorus died Olymp. lvi, the very time that Simonides was born, according to Suidas. If we admit therefore of these testimonies about Stesichorus's age, and of Aristotle's testimony about his transaction with Phalaris, both together make a new argument for the period of Eusebius.

But then the Arundel Marble lies cross in our way, that makes "Stesichorus come into Greece no sooner than Olymp. lxxiii, 3‡." I have a great veneration for that incomparable monument; but I cannot but dissent from it in this particular, both upon the authorities already produced, and for a reason that I will now propose and submit to the reader's judgment. Simonides, as I will shew immediately, was no less than lxxii years old Olymp. lxxiii, 3, the year that Stesichorus came into Greece, according to the Marble; and I think that even Stesichorus himself can scarce be supposed older; for lxxii is a competent age to undertake such a long voyage. Simonides then, if the Marble say true, was as old as Stesichorus; but we have Simonides's own word to the contrary, where he cites Stesichorus in company with Homer, as an ancient author§; he is speaking of Meleager,

Ὅς διὰ πάντας νίκασε νέες
Διάνεττα βαλὼν Ἀναυρον ὑπὲρ
Πολυδότηρος ἐξ Ἰωλκῆ,
Οὕτω γὰρ Ὀμηρος ἠδὲ Στσίχορος αἶσιε λαοῖς.

"that excelled all the young men in casting the javelin, throwing it from Iolcus over the river Anaurus, as Homer and Stesichorus sung to the people." Now I appeal to any man of judgment and acquaintance with the writings of the Antients, if he can think Simonides would speak thus of one of his contemporary Lyricists: they were all rivals and enemies one to another. Pindar sometimes makes reflections upon Bacchylides and this Simonides that we are speaking of||; and it is always to their disparagement. Much less then would Simonides

* V. Σιμωνίδης,

† Τοῖς δὲ χρόνοις ἦν νώτιος Ἀλκμάνος τῷ λυρικῷ. Suid. v. Στσίχ. Cyril. contra Jul. Ol. μβ. Στσίχορος ἠναρίζετο.

‡ Ἀφ' ὧς Στσίχορος ὁ ποιητὴς εἰς τὸν Ἑλλάδα ἀφίκετο. Marm. Arundel. [I. 65.] § Apud Athenæum, lib. iv. p. 172.

|| Vid. Od. ii Olymp. & iii Nem. & ii Isth.

des's covetous humour that the Antients tax him of*, which made him envy all that intercepted any gain from him, have suffered him to do honour to Stesichorus, in joining him with Homer, had that Himerean been then alive to have rivalled him in his trade. Perhaps it may be objected that Simonides, though he was of a good age at Olymp. LXXIII, 3, might not be an author till afterwards, and so Stesichorus might be dead before Simonides set up for a Poet: but Herodotus† gives an answer to this, when he says that Simonides made odes upon Eualcidas of Eretria for his victories at the Olympian or some other games; for Eualcidas was killed‡ just after the burning of Sardes, which was Olymp. LXIX; so that Simonides was famed for his Poetry for at least twenty years before Stesichorus came into Greece, according to the Marble.

[41]

It remains now that I give an account of Simonides's age. There are three periods in the Arundel Marble where Simonides is mentioned.

1. Olymp. LXXII, 4. "Simonides, the grandfather of Simonides the Poet, a Poet too himself, at Athens §."

2. Olymp. LXXV, 3. "Simonides, the son of Leoprepes, the Cean, that found the art of Memory, got the prize at Athens, as Teacher of a Chorus, when Adimantus was Archon ||."

3. Olymp. LXXVII, 4. "Simonides the Poet died, being 90 years old, when Theagenides was Archon ¶."

The learned editors of the Marmora** have committed some mistakes in the explication of these three periods; but I think I have met with something that will set the whole matter right.

The person in the second period was our Simonides the Lyric, who made an epigram upon his own victory, this very victory here mentioned when Adimantus was Archon. It is extant in the Scholiast on Hermogenes ††.

* Pind. II Isth. Callimachus apud Scholiast. Athenæus, p. 656. Synes. Ep. 49. Suid. v. Σιμων.

† Herod. p. 102.

‡ Herod. ibid.

§ Σιμωνίδης ὁ Σιμωνίδου πάππος τῷ ποιητῇ ποιητὴς ἐν καὶ ἦν καὶ Ἀρχὸς τελευτᾶ. [I. 64.]

|| Σιμωνίδης ὁ Λεωπρέπης, ὁ Κεῖος, ὁ τὸ μνημονικὸν εὗρων, ἐνίκησεν Ἀθήνῃσι Μάχων Ἀρχοτος Ἀδίμαντι μάρτυ. [I. 70, 71. p. 554. ed. Maityre.]

¶ Σιμωνίδης ὁ ποιητὴς ἐτελεύτησεν βιὸς ἐν ἐνίκησιν, Ἀρχοτος Ἀθήνῃσι θία ἴδου. [I. 73.]

** Vid. notas Seldeni & Lydiati.

†† P. 410.

[42] Ἦρχε μὲν Ἀδείμαντος Ἀθηναίους, ὅτ' ἐνίκα
 Ἀντιοχίς φυλὴ δαυδαλέον τρίποδα·
 Ξεινοφίλῃ δὲ τις υἱὸς Ἀριστείδος ἐχορήγει
 Πεντήκοντ' ἀνδρῶν καλὰ μαθόντι χορῶ.
 Ἀμφὶ δ' ἐδασκαλίῃ δὲ Σιμωνίδῃ ἔσπετο κύδος,
 Ὀυδακονταίετι παιδὶ Λεωπρεπέος*.

The substance of it is this: "That in the year when Adimantus was Archon at Athens, the Chorus of the Tribe Antiochis got the prize, Aristides being the furnisher of it, and Simonides the son of Leoprepes the teacher, who was then 80 years old." It is as plain, I think, as the sun at noon-day, that the Marble and the Epigram speak of the same victory. And we have it here from Simonides's own mouth, that the 80th year of his age falls in with Olymp. LXXV, 3, in Adimantus's government. And of this same Victory and Epigram the words of Valerius Maximus are to be understood: "Simonides," says he, "HIMSELF glories that he was Teacher of a Chorus in the LXXXth year of his age†." And for those other words of the Marble, ὁ τὸ Μνημοσύνην εὐρὼν, "who invented the art of Memory," Simonides himself is the best commentator; for in this very year he made an Epigram in commendation of his memory‡:

Μνήμη δ' ἔτινα φημι Σιμωνίδῃ ἰσοφαρίζειν
 Ὀυδακονταίετι παιδὶ Λεωπρεπέος.

"Nobody," says he, "has a memory like to Simonides, who am 80 years of age, the son of Leoprepes."

[43] And now that we have established this point, it is an easy matter to explain the third period in the Marble, which belongs to the same Simonides; for he was 80 years old Olymp. LXXV, 3; and, says the Marble, Olymp. LXXVII, 4, "Simonides died at 90." Now the interval between those two Olympiads is 1x complete years, and inclusively x: and with this the testimonies of Suidas§ and Aristophanes's Scholiast exactly agree. "Simonides," say they, "lived 89 years,

[Addend. p. 541.] * A part of it is produced by Plutarch*, Εἶπε Σιμωνίδης μὲν ἐν γῆρας χοροῖς ἐνίκα, καὶ τὸ τρίποδον δὴλοι τοῖς τελευταίοις ἔτισιν,

* Plut. An Seni, &c. Ἀμφὶ δ' ἐδασκαλίῃ δὲ Σιμωνίδῃ ἔσπετο κύδος
 Ὀυδακονταίετι παιδὶ Λεωπρεπέος.

† Val. Max. viii. 7. "Simonides poeta octogesimo anno et docuisse se carmina et in eorum certamen descendisse ipse gloriatur."

‡ Arist. Orat. Tom. iii. p. 645.

§ Suid. v. Σιμων. Schol. Aristoph. Vesp. p. 362.

" and

"and died Olymp. LXXVIII." They were 89 complete years, and he had just entered upon the 90th*. And what the Marble puts at Olymp. LXXVII, 4, Suidas, with Diodorus and others, puts at LXXVIII, 1; for the Archontes in the Marble are all along one year before the accounts of other Chronologers.

And then the first period in the Marble will have little of difficulty, since both the others are settled. The Simonides there mentioned, was grandfather to him that we have been speaking of. The pedigree lies thus:—

Simonides.

Leoprepes.

Simonides.

It is a known thing, that among the ancient Greeks the name of the grandfather was commonly given to the nephew, according to that of the Poet:—

Ἰππόνικος, Καλλίς, καὶ Ἰπποῖνος Καλλίας.

Now suppose this Simonides was no more than XL years old when his nephew was born; at this Olympiad in the Marble, LXXII, 4, he must be CIX; so that I would fill up the gap in the Inscription thus:—*ποιητὴς ὧν καὶ αὐτὸς τελευτᾷ Ἀθήνῃσιν*, "Simonides the Poet died at Athens." For what else can he be mentioned here for, at that exceeding old age?

Now to sum up our argument about Stesichorus: If Simonides was LXXX years old at Olymp. LXXV, 3, as we have proved beyond all contradiction, he must then have been LXXII years of age at Olymp. LXXIII, 3, the year that Stesichorus took his voyage into Greece, according to the Marble. And this was the thing that I undertook to prove; and I conceive that the whole is a clear and convincing evidence, that Stesichorus's age was much earlier than the Marble has placed it.

But, however, if any one will still be so obstinate as to prefer the sole authority of the Marble before all the other proofs that we have produced against it, he will take a most effectual and compendious way to ruin the credit of Phalaris's Epistles; for, in short, if the date of Stesichorus's age be true in the Marble, the Epistles are certainly false; for if Stesichorus was alive Olymp. LXXIII, 3, the pretended Phalaris was then on the throne, because he speaks of Stesichorus's death in several places†. But two whole years before that

[44]

* Lucian says "above 90." *ὑπὲρ τὰ ἑννῆκοντα.* in Macrob.

† Aristoph. Aves, p. 379.

† Ep. 15, 31, 33, 54, 103.

time,

[45] time, Olymp. LXXIII, 1, as Diodorus assures us*, there was another Tyrant of Agrigentum, Theron the son of Ænesidamus; and two years more before that, his brother Xenocrates, living in the same city†, won the victory at the xxiv Pythiad, which is coincident with Olymp. LXXII, 3. And if any body can think he put in at that prize with his chariot while Phalaris was Tyrant, I wish him joy of his opinion.

The very learned Mr. Dodwell‡, being sensible that Phalaris could not be alive LXXII, 3, because Theron was then in the throne, sets both his and Stesichorus's death iv years before that time, Olymp. LXXII, 3, and so leaves Theron the space of two years to make his way to the crown, Olymp. LXXIII, 1; but it seems he was not aware of the Scholiast on Pindar§, who, from a good Author Hippostratus, himself too a good Author, makes not Theron, but his great-grandfather Telemachus, to be one of Phalaris's deponents; neither was Theron the next Tyrant of Agrigentum immediately after Phalaris, as Mr. D. here supposes; but first there was one Alcamenes||; and after him one Alcander, who had a very prosperous reign; but besides this, why must Stesichorus die at Olymp. LXXII, 3? Either let us follow the Marble, or let it alone. If we reject the authority of the Marble, Stesichorus must be supposed to die about Olymp. LVI, as the other Authors affirm; if we adhere to it, then he lived till Olymp. LXXIII, 3, after Phalaris's death; and it is observable that the Marble does not say "he died, Olymp. LXXIII, 3; but ἀφίκετο εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα, "he then went into Greece," as Gorgias and other Sicilians did to get money and fame; so that he might survive that period many years, according to the Marble, which is still a further confutation of Phalaris's Epistles; yet Mr. D. first interprets the Marble as if that was said to be the last year of Stesichorus's life; and then, for the sake of the Epistles, without any other Author to warrant him, he cuts that life iv years shorter.

The second argument that Mr. Dodwell brings to establish his new opinion about Phalaris's age, may be summed up in this form:—

[46] "Pythagoras was at Agrigentum at the time of Phalaris's

* Diod. p. 39.

† Pindar. Schol. ad vi Pyth. & ii Isth.

‡ De Cyclis Vet. p. 261.

§ See above, p. 34.

|| Heraclides Ponticus de Politicis. Μετὰ τὸν Φάλαριν Ἀλεαμίνης παρίλας τὰ πρᾶγματα, καὶ μετὰ τούτον Ἀλεανδρὸς προέβη αὐτῆς ἐπιστολῆς καὶ εὐθίστησαν ἄνω, ὥς περιπέφυρα ἔχειν ἱμάτια.

"death,

" death, and was the principal occasion it; but Pythagoras
 " was never in Sicily till after the Pythagorean College at
 " Crotona was burnt by Cylon, which was Olymp. LXXII. 2;
 " Phalaris therefore was not dead before that Olympiad."

I am very sorry to differ from this learned man's judgment in a point of Chronology, where he is so great a master; but, having examined the whole story of Pythagoras as carefully as I can, I am quite of another opinion in every part of this argument; for I think it more probable that Pythagoras had no concern in the deposing of Phalaris; and that he was in Sicily before Cylon's conspiracy; and that the time of that conspiracy was before Olymp. LXXII.

The chief actor in deposing Phalaris was Telemachus, an ancestor of Theron's; as we have seen already in the Scholiast of Pindar; and the thing was done four generations before ever Pythagoras set foot in Sicily, in Mr. D.'s way of reckoning. Jamblichus is the first and only man that gives Pythagoras any share in that action. Laërtius and Porphyry, who have written the life of our Philosopher, have not one word of it. And how could they omit such a singular thing, had they known it? or where could Jamblichus, that came after them, and did little else but pillage their writings, discover this new piece of History? It is observable that he cites no Author for it, which he ought to have done if he could, because this was one of the greatest strokes in his whole narrative, and was a thing unsaid before. Porphyry indeed says " When [47]
 " Pythagoras came to Italy and Sicily, he restored several cities there to their liberty: Crotona, Sybaris, Catana, Rhegium, Himera, AGRIGENTUM, Tauromenium, and others*," And Lucian, whether in jest or earnest, makes Phalaris brag of Pythagoras's company†. These two passages, perhaps, were the sole foundation of Jamblichus's story; for if Pythagoras conversed with Phalaris, and delivered Agrigentum out of slavery, here was a fair occasion offered to Jamblichus, to put both ends together and dress up his legend.

But if we should allow Jamblichus's story for a truth, we need no other argument against Mr. D. but the very story itself to prove the Epistles a cheat; for the Epistles make the Tyrant and the Philosopher to be very good friends, " and have five months pleasant conversation together‡;" and the Tyrant talks of Providence like any Pythagorean, " while

* Porph. vit. p. 189.

† Luc. in Phal.

‡ Ep. 74. Πίμπλεται ἥδη μῆνα συνίται μεθ' ἡδονῆς.

" the

"the governing Providence," says he, "preserves the same "system of the World*;" but Jamblichus's Phalaris is the very reverse of this. He is all fury and blasphemy,—a rank Atheist,—he reviles and contemns the Gods,—he denies Prophecy and Providence,—he contrives Pythagoras's death; and Pythagoras effects his†. How can these two stories hang together? If Jamblichus's account be true, the Epistles must be false. I must own it is beyond my little understanding to reconcile them: let others attempt it.

[48] And again this same story of Jamblichus plainly proves against Mr. D. that Pythagoras was in Sicily before Olymp. LXXII, 2. Jamblichus indeed says nothing about the time when Pythagoras deposed Phalaris; but since he brings in Abaris, the Hyperborean, in company with Pythagoras at the time of the action‡, we are assured by that circumstance, that the date must be much earlier than Mr. D. has placed it. The time when Abaris came into Greece is very variously told; some put it at Olymp. III, others at XXI, others much lower§; which very diversity is a good argument that he came not so late as Mr. D. sets him, when chronology was pretty certain; but there is one authority beyond exception. Pindar says "He came in Cræsus's time," who was conquered by Cyrus Olymp. LIX¶;—and with him Eusebius and Syncellus agree, both of them placing him about the reign of Cræsus. Now Pindar himself was xxx years old at that very year, Olymp. LXXII, 2, when Mr. D. makes Abaris to have been in Greece¶¶; but if Abaris had been truly there at that time, surely Pindar at xxx years of age would have had better information; and not have cast him back to the reign of Cræsus, above 50 years before.

If we admit then of Jamblichus's narrative, we must place the time much higher than Mr. Dodwell has done. The only reason that Mr. D. has for it is this: "That Pythagoras "did not go into Sicily till after Cylon's conspiracy**," which, with submission, I think is a very precarious assertion. It is true he did not leave Italy for good and all till that time; but what forbids us to suppose he might make now and then

* Ep. 104. Ἔως ἂν ἡ διοκῦσα πρόοια τὴν αὐτὴν ἀρμόιαν τῷ κόσμῳ φυλάτῃη.

† Jambl. p. 184, 5, 6.

‡ Jambl. ibidem.

§ Harpocrat. & Suidas, v. Ἀβάρης.

¶ Harpoc. Ὁ δὲ Πίνδαρος κατὰ Κροῖσον τὸν Λυδῶν βασιλέα φησὶν Ἀβάρην παραγισθῆναι.

¶¶ Pindar born Ol. LXV, forty years old at Xerxes's expedition, Ol. LXXV, 1. Suidas.

** De Cyclis vet. p. 26.

a short

a short voyage into Sicily? "Why," Justin says, "he came to Crotona, and continued there for twenty years*." But this imports no more than that generally and for the main he resided at Crotona: it is not to be so rigidly taken as if he never went out of town; for he was frequently at Metapontium and Tarentum, and the neighbouring cities†; why may we not then as well suppose him to have stept into Sicily? Porphyry and Jamblichus talk of his jourmies in Sicily‡ long before Cylon's conspiracy. Nay, we have the express testimonies of them both that he was in Sicily before that time; for they say "He" was present the same day both at Tauromenium in Sicily, and "Metapontium in Italy, at the meetings of his scholars§." But it is agreed by all, that he had no society of scholars at Metapontium, or anywhere in Italy, after that villany of Cylon; almost all his followers being burnt or killed then, except Archippus and Lysis.

[49]

Neither can I assent to Mr. D.'s opinion, when he places that conspiracy of Cylon at Olymp. LXXII. 2. This has no express authority in history, nor any other foundation than Mr. Dodwell's calculations from some periods of Pythagoras's life. And since I differ from his opinion in stating those periods, in consequence I must dissent too about the time of Cylon's treachery; but because this controversy cannot be well managed without giving a whole view of Pythagoras's life, I will here present the reader with a table of it, which shall comprehend the various accounts of the ancient chronologers, to which I shall subjoin some annotations, to shew the reasons and authorities for assigning every period. It is a subject that deserves our nicest examination; and though I shall determine nothing myself, I may give an occasion to others of bringing it to a certainty.

[50]

| OLYMP. | | <i>Years of Pythagoras.</i> | |
|---------|----|-----------------------------|---|
| XLIII, | 4. | 1. | Pythagoras born. |
| XLVIII, | 1. | 18. | Won the Prize at Olympia, Ol. XLVIII, 1. Eratosth. Phavor. Lucian, S. Augustin. |
| XLIX, | 2. | 23. | Pythagoras at mau's age. Antiochus. |
| LIII, | 3. | 40. | Pyth. 40 years old, went to Italy. Aristoxenus. |

* Justin. xx. 5. "cum annos xx Crotonæ egisset."

† Livy I. 18. Porph. p. 189. ‡ Porph. p. 189. Jamblichus 46.

§ Porph. 192. Jamb. 128. Καὶ διελύχθαι κοινῇ τοῖς ἑκατέρωθεν ἰταῖροις.

OLYMP.

| OLYMP. | | Years of Pythagoras. | |
|------------|----|----------------------|--|
| LIII, | 4. | 41. | Pyth. in Italy after Olymp. L. Dion. Halicarn. |
| LIV, | 1. | 42. | Pyth. famous Olymp. LIV, 1. Chron. Alexand. |
| LVIII, | 2. | 59. | Pyth. went to Italy about 60 years old. Jamb. |
| LX, | 1. | 66. | Pyth. flourished Ol. LX. Laërt. |
| LXI, | 1. | 70. | Pyth. famous Ol. LXI. Diod. |
| | 4. | 73. | Pyth. came to Italy in the reign of Superbus (<i>i. e.</i> from Olymp. LXI, 4. to LXVII, 4.) Cicero. |
| LXII, | 1. | 74. | Pyth. Ol. LXII. went to Italy. Jamblichus. |
| | 2. | 75. | Pyth. famous Olymp. LXII. Cle- mens. Cyril. Euseb. Tatian. |
| LXIII, | 3. | 80. | Pyth. died, 80 years old. He- raclides. |
| [51] LXIV, | 1. | 82. | Pyth. taken captive by Cam- byses in Ægypt, Ol. LXIV, 1. Jambl. Syncellus. |
| LXVI, | 1. | 90. | Pyth. died at 90. Laërtius. |
| LXVII, | 2. | 95. | Pyth. died at 95. Syncellus. |
| | | | { Pyth. went for Italy when Bru- tus was Consul, <i>i. e.</i> Olymp. LXVIII, 1. Solinus. |
| LXVIII, | 1. | 98. | { Pyth. in Italy when Brutus was Consul. Cicero. |
| | | | { Pyth. at Crotona, when Sybaris was taken, Olymp. LXVIII, 1. Diod. Jambl. |
| | 2. | 99. | Pyth. died at 99. Tzetzes. |
| | | | Pyth. died near 100. Jamb. |
| | 3. | 100. | { Pyth. died Olymp. LXVIII, 3. |
| | 4. | 101. | { Some MS. of Euseb. others LXVIII, 4. |
| LXIX, | 3. | 104. | Pyth. died at 104. Incertus apud Photium. |
| LXX, | 4. | 109. | Pyth. died Olymp. LXX, 4. Eusebius vulgat. |
| LXII, | 4. | 117. | Pyth. died, aged 117. Author de Med. par. fac. |

I. The

I. The reason for assigning Pythagoras's birth to Olymp. XLIII, 4. is taken from the next period, his victory at the Olympian Games, Olymp. XLVIII; for he was then *εξήνητος*, 17 years of age; his 18th year commencing with Olymp. XLVIII. Eratosthenes, a very great man, that wrote a chronology of the Victors at Olympia, says, "Pythagoras, Olymp. XLVIII, offered himself at the boys match to fight at cuffs; [52] "but being voted by the judges to be above a boy's age, and "laughed at as a coward for putting himself among boys, "he presently offered himself at the match for men, and beat "them every one*." The Catalogue of the Stadionicae says the very same thing, at Olymp. XLIII †; so that there can be no mistake in the number; though Georgius Syncellus, who tells the same story, sets the time of it at Olymp. LI ‡; but his copy may have been corrupted, which could not possibly happen in the other case. The true reading of that passage of Syncellus I have given in the margin; and the meaning of it, which is much mistaken by his last Editor, is no other than that of Eratosthenes before. Pausanias has a like account of "one Hyllus, a Rhodian, that would have wrestled among the "boys; but, being excluded by the judges because he was 18 "years old, he presently wrestled with the men, and carried "the victory §." This Hyllus did the very same thing (*πάλη*) "at wrestling" that Pythagoras did (*πυγμή*) "at cuffing;"—and from this last instance, it appears that the age of XVIII was above the match for boys. The allowed time seems to be XVI, the year when they were called Ephebi||.

But

* *Ερατοσθένης δὲ φησι τοῦτον εἶναι τὸν πρῶτον ἐντίχωνς συντεύσαντα ἐπὶ τῆς ὀγδοῆς καὶ τετραρακοῆς Ὀλυμπιάδος, κομήτην, καὶ ἀλουργίδα φοροῦντα· ἐκκριθῆναι τε ἐκ τῶν παίδων, καὶ χλευασθέντα, αὐτίκα προσβῆναι τοὺς ἀνδρας καὶ νικῆσαι.* Laërt. in Pythag.

† *Πυθαγόρας Σάμιος ἐκκριθεὶς παίδων πυγμὴν, καὶ ὡς θῆλυς χλευαζόμενος, προσβὰς εἰς τοὺς ἀνδρας ἀπαντας ἐξῆς ἐνίκησε.* Apud Scaligeri Euseb. p. 40.

‡ *Πυθαγόρας ὁ Σάμιος Ὀλύμπια ἀθλήσων, ἐξεκρίθη παίδων πυγμὴν [καὶ χλευασθεὶς] ὡς ἀπαλὸς, προσβὰς εἰς τοὺς ἀνδρας νίκᾳ κατὰ τὴν ἰα Ὀλυμπιάδα.* Syncellus, p. 239.

§ Paus. Eliac. II. p. 191. "Ἄλλος δὲ Ῥόδιος ὄγδοον ἐπὶ τοῖς δέκα ἔτεσι γιγνὸνός, μὴ παλαιῖσαι μὴν ἐν παισὶν ὑπὸ Ἡλείων ἀπηλάθη, ἀνηγορεύθη δὲ ἐν παιδείᾳ, ὥσπερ γὰρ καὶ ἐνίκηθη.

|| In the account of the Ephebi I followed Censorinus and Didymus: [Addend. but others in Harpocration * make the *Ἐφηβοί* begin at XVIII years of age, p. 541.] and continue so to XX, and then they were called *Ἄνδρες*: before the XVIII * Harpoc. year they were *Παῖδες*. And this account agrees better with the story of v. *Ἐπιδι- Pythagoras's fighting at Παίδων πυγμῇ*. He and Hyllus, the Rhodian men- τὶς & Ἐπά- tioned νῦμαι.

[53] But it is not agreed among the Antients that this Pythagoras was he that afterwards was the philosopher. Hesychius says, "They mistake that say so*." And an epigram calls this Pythagoras the son of Crates†; but the other's father was Mnesarchus; yet Eratosthenes, a very accurate author, believed he was the same; and so probably did Favorinus, another great man, who cited Eratosthenes‡. Lucian too was of this opinion§, and St. Austin||. And the epigram that Theætetus made upon this Pythagoras, exactly fits the philosopher:—

Πυθαγόρην τινὰ, Πυθαγόρην, ὃ ξεῖνε, κομήτην, &c.

for the philosopher "wore his hair long," which is the meaning of κομήτης; so that even Jamblichus, who applies the proverb, ἐν Σάμῳ κομήτης¶, to Pythagoras the philosopher, may be added as another authority for settling this period, though it be against his own computations.

But, perhaps, it may be thought improbable that a man that was bred up to fighting, should turn himself to the study of philosophy; for it was a common observation, that the gamesters at those exercises were very stupid and thick-skulled fellows||; but, however, there are several examples that may warrant this story of Pythagoras. Cleanthes the Stoic philosopher, when he was young, was "a fighter at cuffs††," πύκτης, just as Pythagoras was. And his scholar Chrysippus, the acutest of all the Stoicks, was at first a racer‡‡. Even Plato himself was "a wrestler§§," παλαιστής, at the Isthmian and Pythian Games; and so was Lycon of Troas, a Peripatetic, at the Ilian. Διὰ ταῦτα δέ, says Laërtius, καὶ παλαῖσαι λέγεται

[54]

toned by Pausanias, offered themselves to fight with the boys; but being complete xviii years old they were excluded, because they were no longer Παιδῖς, but Ἐφηβοί. Vexed at this disappointment, they offered themselves to contend at the match for men, though they wanted two years of man's age; and, being admitted, they carried the victory from them all. This is that which made Pythagoras's victory at Olympia so memorable. * Hesych. ἐν Σάμῳ κομήτης. † Laërt. in Pythag.

‡ Ἐρατοσθένης Φησί, καθὼ καὶ Φαῶντιος ἐν τῇ ὁγδόῃ παντοδαπῆς Ἰσορίας παρατίθεται. Laërt. in Pythag.

§ Luc. in Gallo. Ἀθλητῇ ποτε γινομένῳ, καὶ ὀλύμπια οὐκ ἀφαιρῶς ἀγωνισαμένῳ.

|| Augustin, tom ii. Ep. 3. "Pherecydes—Pythagoram Samium—ex athleta in philosophum vertit." ¶ Jambl. 31 and 44.

** Od. Ἀθληταὶ ἀναισθητοί.

†† Laërt. in Cleanthe & Suidas.

‡‡ Laërt. in Chrysippo, δολιχὸν ἦσαν.

§§ Laërt. in Platone, Apulcius Cyrillus.

τάτε

τάτε ἐν τῇ πατρίδι Ἰλεια, καὶ σφαιρίσαι*. Where, instead of Ἰλεια, I would rather read it Ἰλίσια; that is, the Ilian Games, from Ilium; as [Ἐφεσῆα] Ἐφεσῆια from Ephesus†. So Athenæus, lib. viii. Πυνθανόμενος δὲ Στρατόνικος ὁ κιθαρωδὴς τὸν σοφιστὴν Σάτυρον ἐπιδημεῖν ἐν τοῖς Ἰλίοις, Ἀεὶ, ἔφησεν, Ἰλίσια κατὰ‡. There is nothing then so very unlikely in this story of Pythagoras: and the description they have given us of his person makes the account the more probable; for he was a lusty proper man§; and built, as it were, to make a good boxer. Besides that, they add, that this young Pythagoras was the first that boxed ἐντέχνως, “according to art;” which shews a promising genius, and agrees with the character of the philosopher; who, as Favorinus and Porphyry say, so instructed one Eurymenes in his exercises, that he won the prize at Olympia||.

II. The next period in the table is Olymp. xlix, 2, from which an ancient writer Antilochus, or rather Antiochus, dates Pythagoras’s ἡλικία. They are the words of Clemens Alexandrinus:—“Antilochus, that wrote the book called Ἰστορίαι, reckons 312 years from Pythagoras’s ἡλικία to the death of Epicurus¶.” Now it is agreed that Epicurus died Olymp. cxxvii, 2, when Pythagoras was Archon; reckon therefore backwards 312 years, and the ἡλικία of Pythagoras falls upon Olymp. xlix, 2. But what is the meaning of ἡλικία? The very learned Mr. Dodwell interprets it “The nativity of Pythagoras**;” and, to accommodate the passage to his own calculations, for δώδεκα he reads δέοντος ἐνός, that is, 299 for 312. I am afraid the world will not allow us such a liberty in our corrections, as for δώδεκα to put δέοντος ἐνός, where but one letter is the same; and not one, if you write δώδεκα in numerals, ιϚ. But I suppose he will not insist on this emendation, if it appear that ἡλικία does not signify “nativity;” for then the emendation will not agree with his accounts any more than the vulgar reading does.

[55]

* Laert. in Lycone. † See Marmora Arundel. [Maitt. VII. 14.]

‡ P. 350. § Porph. p. 188. Τὴν τε γὰρ ἰδίαν ἰλευθέρην καὶ μέγαν.

|| Laert. in Pythag. Porph. p. 186.

¶ Strom. i. p. 133. Ἀντίλοχος, ὁ τὸς Ἱστορίας πραγματευσάμενος, ἀπὸ τῆς Πυθαγόρου ἡλικίας ἐπὶ τὴν Ἐπικύρεω τελειωτὴν, ἔτη φέρει τὰ πάντα τριακίσια δώδεκα.

** De Cyclis Vet. p. 147. “Fieri tamen potest, ut scripserit Antiochus, τριακοσία δέοντος ἐνός. Exinde Librarius, si primam litteram duntaxat manifestam habuerit, facillimo errore δώδεκα reposuerit. Sic omnia rectissime procedent.”

H

“nati-

Let us examine then what the word *ἡλικία* means in other passages of Clement. "The years," says he, "from Moses to Solomon's *ἡλικία* are 610*." The particulars of his account are these:—

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|------------|
| Moses's life, | - | - | - | - | 102 years. |
| Thence to David's accession to the throne, | | | | | 450 |
| David's reign, | - | - | - | - | 40 |

610

by which it appears, that the *ἡλικία* of Solomon is not meant of his "Nativity," but of the beginning of his reign, when he was 23 years of age†.

In another place he says, "Esaiah, Hosea, and Micah, "lived after the *ἡλικία* of Lycurgus‡." And he proves it in this manner:

| | | |
|------|--|--------------|
| [56] | From the destruction of Troy to the <i>ἀκμή</i> of | } 290 years. |
| | Lycurgus §, | |
| | From Solomon, in whose reign Troy was taken, | } 300 |
| | to the time of those prophets, | |

It is manifest here that *ἡλικία* and *ἀκμή* are put as synonymous words, to signify the same thing; "youth," or "middle age, the flower of one's age."

"Eratosthenes," says Clemens, "places the *ἡλικία* of "Homer a hundred years after the taking of Troy||. That in this place also *ἡλικία* means *ἀκμή*, we may understand several ways. Crates, says Tatian, "Ὁμηρον ἡμικαμέναι φησι, says "Homer flourished within 80 years after the taking of Troy; "but Eratosthenes says, after 100¶." "Some," says Plutarch, "affirm that Homer lived at the time of the Trojan "war, and was an eye-witness of it; others, that he lived "100 years after it**." The word is here *γενέσθαι*, not "born," but "lived;" as *fuisset* is in Latin writers. For,

* Strom p. 140. edit. Commelini. *Γίνονται ἀπὸ Μωϋσέως ἐπὶ τὴν Σολομῶντος ἡλικίαν ἑπτὰ τὰ πάντα ἑξακόσια δέκα.*

† See Petav. in Chron.

‡ Ib. p. 141. *Λέγονται δὲ ἔσσι μετὰ τὴν Λυκέργη ἡλικίαν γεγονέναι.*—

§ *Ἡσαΐας δὲ ἀπὸ τῶ Σολομῶντος διακοσιοῦ ἔστι.* correct it *τριακοσιοῦ*.

¶ *τὴν ἀκμὴν Λυκέργη.* Clem. ibid.

|| Ib. p. 141. *Ἐρατοσθένης μετὰ τὸ ἑκατοστὸν ἔτος τῆς Ἰλίου ἀλώσεως τὴν Ὁμήρου ἡλικίαν φέρεται.*

¶ Tatian. p. 288. ed. Gesneri.

** Plutarch. in V. Homer. p. 44. *Γενέσθαι δ' αὐτὸν φησι τοῖς χρόνοις, οἱ μὲν κατὰ τὸν Τρωϊκὸν πόλεμον ἔ' καὶ αὐτόπῃν γενέσθαι· οἱ δὲ μετὰ ἑκατὸν ἑπτὰ τὴν πολέμῳ.*

if it signified "was born" at the time of that war, he could not have been an eye-witness of it, for it lasted but 10 years, and he had been a child when it ended.

Thus we see all along in Clement, *ἡλικία* is taken for the "flourishing age;" and so it is generally in other writers. Plutarch, in the life of Homer, after he had spoken of his childhood, *γενόμενος δὲ ἐν ἡλικίᾳ*, but when he was of age," says he, "and had already a taste for poetry*." I do not believe there is any example that *ἡλικία* means "nativity." When Clemens would express the time of one's birth, he does not say *ἡλικία*, but *γένεσις*. Ἀπὸ τῆς Μωϋσεως γενέσεως †, and εἰς ἐπίδειξιν τῆς τῷ Σωτῆρος γενέσεως ‡. So that, upon the whole, there is no question but the *ἡλικία* of Pythagoras, in the passage we are speaking of, means the "flower of his age." In the table it falls upon his xxiii year; and this exactly agrees with Solomon's age, when he began his reign; which Clemens, as above, calls his *ἡλικία*. But Pythagoras himself had a peculiar way of distinguishing the age of a man's life; he divided it into four twenties: "A boy twenty, a youth twenty, a man twenty, and an old man twenty§." And Antilochus perhaps might have a respect to this doctrine, when he puts his *ἡλικία* at Ol. xlix, 2; for it is not improbable that he took his measure from Ol. xlviii, 1, when Pythagoras got the victory at Olympia. And if he supposed him but xvi years old at that time, which was the legitimate age for boys exercises, his account then proceeds exactly from the xxth year of Pythagoras. The Reader, if he pleases, may follow his reckoning, and place the nativity of Pythagoras at Ol. xlii, 2. But I rather chose in the table to set it a little higher, for the reasons given above.

[67]

III. The next portion of his life, according to his own distribution, from his xxth year to the xlith, was spent in study and travelling. While he was young he was scholar to Thales, and Bias, and Pherecydes, and Epimenides, and Hermodamas ||. Indeed, when he conversed with Epimenides,

[58]

* Id. p. 42. So in vita Lycurgi. And so Xenoph. ἐν ἡλικίᾳ γενόμενοι, come at age: So οἱ ἐν τῇ ἡλικίᾳ. Young men, those arrived at the age of men, Thucyd. Æschines. † P. 145. ‡ P. 146.

§ Laërt. in Pythag. Παῖς εἴκοσι ἔτια, νέησκος εἴκοσι, νεηίας εἴκοσι, γέρον εἴκοσι.

|| Νίος ὦν ἀπιδήμησι, Laërt. Νεανίας γενόμενος, Porphy. Ἐτι ἰφη-
ρος ὦν. Κομιδὴ τι νίος ἐτι ὑπάρχων. Περὶ οκτακαιδικατον μάλισα ἔτος γε-
γονός. Jambl.

he must needs be very young, for Epimenides died μετ' ἑπολῶ, not long after Olymp. XLVI *, when he had expiated Athens from the murder of Cylon. Suidas places that expiation at Olymp. XLIV †, but it is probable μετ' may be a fault of the Writer, instead of μέ or μζ'. And that he died *not long* after it, Suidas seems to confirm; for he says he was then "old," γηραιός. Plato indeed, makes him to have come to Athens, Ol. LXX, 1. But that great man did not tie himself in his discourses to exactness of time, as I shall shew at large hereafter. His words are, "Epimenides came to you (to Athens) "ten years, πρὸ τῶν Περσικῶν, before the Persian affairs; and "the Athenians being then afraid of an expedition from Persia, "φοβημένων τὸν Περσικὸν πόλεον, he told them it would be ten "years before they came, and then they should be beaten ‡." He means the battle at Marathon, which was Olymp. LXXXII, 3. It is true Aldobrandinus makes Plato agree with Laërtius §; for he interprets him, of the Persian Expedition into Lydia, when Cyrus took Sardes. But why should the Athenian "be "afraid" of that into Lydia? Plato himself, in another place, declares his own meaning. "Ten years," says he, before the sea-fight at Salamis, came Datis, Περσικὸν πόλεον ἄγων, with the Persian forces ||. As for our Philosopher's other masters, Thales and Pherecydes, the first was born Ol. xxxv, 1, and died above 90 years old, Olymp. LVIII ¶. The latter is supposed to have died about Ol. LIX; and being then 85 years of age **, he must have been born about Ol. xxxvii, 4; so that Thales was in his xxxvth year, and Pherecydes in his xxvth, at the birth of Pythagoras.

[59]

IV. In the xli.th year of his life our Philosopher went to Italy. "When he was XL years old," says Aristoxenus, "and "was uneasy under Polycrates's tyranny, he made his voyage "for Italy ††." This year of his life falls in with Ol. LIII, 3,

* Laërt. in Pherecyde. Eusebius edit. Pontaci. Some copies of Laërtius have Olymp. XLVII. And so has Eusebius of Scaliger's Edition.

† Suid. v. Ἐπιμενίδης.

‡ Plato de Legibus, lib. I.

§ In notis ad Laërt. in Epimenide.

[Addend. p. 542.]

|| De Legib. lib. III. So Clemens Alexandrinus * declares that the expedition was not upon the Lydians, but the Athenians. Τὸ κρητὸς Ἐπιμενίδῃ αἱ θυαίαι Ἀθηναίοις τὸν Περσικὸν πόλεμον εἰς δεκάτῃ ὑπερίβητο χρόνον.

* Strom. vi. p. 268. He seems to have had this passage from Plato, whose words I have cited.

¶ Laërt. in Thalete.

** Lucian. in Macrob.

†† Porphyr. p. 184. Γεγονότα δ' ἔτων τεσσαράκοντα, φησὶν ὁ Ἀριστοξένος, καὶ ὄντων τῇ Πολυκράτῃ τυραννίδι συντονιστῶν ἔσαν, &c.

according

according to our table. But at what period Aristoxenus himself placed the birth of Pythagoras we cannot be certain. There are some reasons that make us doubt whether he set that period as high as Eratosthenes did, whom we follow in the table. And there are other considerations that seem to make it probable that these two great persons were both of one opinion. I will represent the case on both sides, and leave the determination to the judgment of the Reader.

Dionysius Halicarnassensis, a very accurate Writer, seems to countenance that Epocha that is set in the table. "Pythagoras," says he, "after the 1th Olympiad, lived in Italy*." If after the 1th, then the 1111, 3, may possibly be the very year that Dionysius meant. But the learned Hen. Valesius suspects the reading to be false†; and for 1 he corrects LX; because several Writers, and especially Ecclesiastical, have set his time about Ol. LX, and LXII. But the whole context in Dionysius reclains against this emendation. The author's design is to prove Pythagoras's age to be very remote from Numa's. "Numa," says he, "came to the crown Olymp. xvi, 3." How then could he be acquainted with Pythagoras, that flourished after the 1th Olymp. four generations after him‡? The interval between these two Olympiads is 134 years. Now three generations, as I have shewn before, make 100 years; four therefore are 133 and $\frac{1}{3}$, which wants but a small fraction of 134. It is plain then that our Author meant Ol. the 1th; for to Ol. LX there are above five generations from Numa; and his business was to make the distance as wide as he could. In Mr. Dodwell's account, who keeps Pythagoras out of Italy till Olymp. LXVII, 2, there are above six generations.

[60]

Another, that seems to favour Eratosthenes, is no less a writer than Livy. "Numa," says he, "could not converse with Pythagoras, who lived in the utmost coast of Italy, above 100 years after him, in the reign of Servius Tullius §." Now from the death of Numa, Ol. xxvii, 1, to the period we speak of, Ol. 1111, 3, there are 105 years;

* Dionys. Hal. lib. ii. p. 120. Ὁ μὲν Νομᾶς ἐπὶ τῆς ἐκκαίδεκάτης ἐλ. μεσότης (he says before, ἐπὶ αὐτῇ τρίτῃ τῆς 15 Ὀλυμπ.) τὴν βασιλείαν παρέλαβε. Πυθαγόρας δὲ μετὰ τὴν σικεττοσὴν Ὀλυμπιάδα διέτριβεν ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ.

† Valesius not. ad Excerpta, p. 41.

‡ Dionys. ibid. Τῷ μετὰ τίσσaras γενεᾷ ἀμάρσαντι, — μετὰ τὴν 1 Ὀλυμπιάδα.

§ Livius i. 18. "Auctorem doctrinæ ejus (Numæ) falso Samium Pythagoram edunt; quem, Servio Tullio regnante Romæ, centum amplius post annos, in ultima Italiæ ora juvenum coetus habuisse constat."

which exactly suits with Livy's expression, *centum amplius*, "above a hundred." But if Livy had been of Mr. Dodwell's opinion, he might have said "above an hundred and sixty." Besides that, Servius Tullius was 23 years dead before Mr. D. allows Pythagoras to set foot in Italy.

- [61] Plutarch mentions the same mistake, that Numa was Pythagoras's scholar. But he adds, that "Numa, as they say, "was elected King, Ol. xvi, 3; and Pythagoras was long "after Numa's time, even five generations*." He seems to have taken this passage out of Dionysius Halicarn. whose words we have cited before. But whereas Dionysius says *four* generations, Plutarch says *five*. The reason of this difference seems to be, that the latter allows but 30 years to a generation, as we may learn from another place†. Five generations then, according to Plutarch, make 150 years; but from Ol. xvi, 3, to our period, Ol. liii, 3, are 148 years; as near the mark as can possibly be expected.

Within two years of the same period, the Alexandrine Chronicon says "Pythagoras was famous, Ol. liv. 1‡;" so that this Writer's testimony, such as it is, concurs exactly with the others above.

- But we must observe the words of Aristoxenus: "When "Pythagoras," says he, "was 40 years old, and saw the tyranny "of Polycrates grow more violent§." These last words, if they be not an addition of Porphyry's, make it dubious whether Aristoxenus set the Philosopher's birth as early as Eratosthenes; for by this account Polycrates must begin his tyranny about Ol. liii, 3; and it is agreed by all Historians that he held it till Ol. lxiv, 1, when Cambyses was in Ægypt; which is 42 years, and may seem too long a time to be allowed for his government. But did Amasis, his contemporary, reign 44 years after he had usurped the government in Ægypt, just as the other did in Samos? If we admit of the present calculation, they began their reigns almost at the same time; and that perhaps might be some reason of their friendship that is so spoken of in History. But Polyænus's relation of the tyranny of Polycrates will scarce allow of so
- [62]

* Plut. in vita Numæ. Οἱ δὲ Πυθαγόραν μὲν ὀψὲ γενέσθαι καὶ τῶν Νεμῶ χρόνῳ δμῶ τι πῖντε γενναῖς ἀπολειπόμενον—ἐπὶ τῆς ἐκκαίδεκάτης ἀσπρ-φιάδος, ἔτι τρίτῃ, Νεμῶς εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν κατέστη.

† Plut. de Orac. defectu, p. 415. Ἐτη τριάκοντα ποιῶσι τὴν γενεὰν καθ' Ἡράκλειτον.

‡ Ὀλυμπ. ιδ. α. Πυθαγόρας φυσικὸς φιλόσοφος ἐγνωρίζεται.

§ Ὁρώμετα τὴν Πολυκράτους τυραννίδα συντονωτέραι ἔσαν.

early a beginning; for he says, "at the time of his usurpation he borrowed soldiers of Lygdamis, tyrant of Naxos*." Now Lygdamis got the government of Naxos by the assistance of Pysistratus, after his third return to Athens†; which could not be before Ol. LIX, 1. But perhaps it may be answered, that Polyænus might call him "Tyrant of Naxos" by an anticipation; meaning that Lygdamis that was afterwards Tyrant there. For Lygdamis might assist Polycrates with soldiers, as he helped Pysistratus both with men and money before he got the government‡. Jamblichus plainly confirms this account of Polycrates's long reign; for he says his Tyranny was *beginning* at the xviiith year of Pythagoras§; and he speaks of it as still continuing after his lvith year||. Now the lvi of Pythagoras, as Jamblichus reckons it, falls in about Ol. LXII. So that his xviiith year, when Polycrates's Tyranny commenced, concurs with Ol. LII, 3, which is just four years before Pythagoras left Samos, according to our table;—and to Jamblichus we may add Suidas¶, who places Polycrates's government about the same Ol. LII**. But the same Author in another place says, that "one Polycrates, the father of the Tyrant, governed Samos about Ol. LIV, in Croesus's time††." This is a piece of History that I know not what to say to; for the father of Polycrates the Tyrant was called Ælæces‡‡; and Croesus's reign did not begin till Olymp. LV, 3.

[63]

But though Aristoxenus, says our Philosopher, went to Italy at XL years of age, yet Jamblichus makes him about LX; and

* Polyænus Strat. i, 23. Μεταπειψάμενος παρὰ Λυγδάμιδος τῷ Ναξίῳ τυράνῳ στρατιώτας.

† Herodotus i. cap 64.

‡ Herod. i. c. 61.

§ Jamb. p. 31. Ὑποφυγμένης δὲ ἄρτι τῆς Πολυκράτους τυραννίδος, περὶ ἣν μάλιστα ἔτος γεγινώς.

|| Idem p. 90.

¶ Suid. v. Ἀνακρέων. Γίγνεται κατὰ Πολυκράτην τὸν Σάμου τύραννον ὀλυμπιάδι ιβ'.

** The famous Apollodorus seems to favour this early beginning of [Addend. Polycrates's reign; for he says, Anaximander was LXIV years old at p. 542.] Olymp. LVIII, 2; "and died soon after, having flourished most in the time of Polycrates, Tyrant of Samos;" καὶ μετ' ὀλίγον τιλευτῆσαι, ἀμύσαντά πη μάλιστα κατὰ Πολυκράτην τὸν Σάμου τύραννον*. Now if we * Laërt, in place the first year of Polycrates at Olymp. LIII, 3, Anaximander at Anaximand. that time was in his XLVth year; which seems old enough in all reason to begin his ἀρχή at.

†† Suid. v. Ἴβυκος. Εἰς Σάμον ἦλθεν, ὅτ' αὐτῆς ἤρχε Πολυκράτης ὁ τῷ τυράνῳ πατὴρ· κρόνος δὲ ἔτος ὁ ἐπὶ Κροίσῳ, ὀλυμπιάς ιδ'.

‡‡ See Herod.

whether of them must we follow? If we regard the authority of the two parties, I am afraid Jamblichus must be laid aside; for he is both inferior to the other, and inconsistent with himself. But let us consider the nature of the thing, and the circumstances of the story. Hermippus, a considerable Author, tells us*, "That when Pythagoras came to Italy, he made
 " a private room under ground; and having caused a report
 " to be spread of his death, he hid himself in that room,
 " ordering his mother to let him down meat privately from
 " time to time, with an account in writing of all affairs that
 " happened in Crotona, and the places about. After a time
 " he comes abroad†, pretending to be risen from the dead;
 " and tells all the things that had happened since his supposed
 " death, as if he had learnt them in the other world. Which
 " project procured him a mighty authority." The same story is told us by Sophocles's Scholiast‡; who thinks the Poet himself alluded to it in these verses in his Electra:—

[64]

Ἦδη γὰρ εἶδον πολλάνικς καὶ τὰς σοφῆς
 Λόγῳ ματὴν θνήσκοντας, εἶθ' ὅταν δόμος
 Ἐλθῶσιν αὔθις, ἐκτετίμηνται πλέον.

And Tertullian too, a man of admirable wit and learning, in his Book "about the Soul," gives the same account of this story; and he adds this particular, that he staid under ground *seven years*§; which without question he speaks from some good authority; and the design itself that Pythagoras had in it, seems to require so long a time; for the cheat might have been suspected if he had soon appeared abroad again; neither would there have been matter of fact enough, as deaths, marriages, and births, and public transactions, the account of which he pretended to have learnt below from the Ghosts of those that died after him. Now I suppose this design of Pythagoras will seem a very absurd one; if he was *lx* years old when he went to Italy, as Jamblichus makes him. Besides that, he must have lived no little time there, so as to be generally known before he undertook it; or else they would never have believed that he had rose from the dead, had they not known him alive before. He must be well advanced

* Apud Laërt. in Pythag.

† So Lucian in Gallo, p. 252. ἤκουσα ταῦτα, καὶ ὡς δόξιας ἀναβῆναι κίμαι ἀποθανόν.

‡ Schol. ad Electram, p. 83.

§ Tertull. de Anima, c. 28. "Mortem simulat, subterraneo latitat, septenni se illic patientia damnat—cum fraude vitæ septennio ex-cruciatæ infra terram."

then

then beyond LX when he began this design. But what could one of that great age propose to himself from so tedious a project?

“ Vitæ summa brevis spem cum vetat inchoare longam.”

He might die indeed in jest when he went down to his vault, but he might fear it would be in good earnest before seven years were over: or, if he was sure to come out alive again, yet the remainder of life after LXX years of age, when he was to enjoy the fruits of this pious fraud, was not worth so long a penance; for he came out half starved, a mere skeleton, to make it the more credible to them that he rose from the grave*. But there is another circumstance that makes it still more unlikely that he was LX years old then; for the only person privy to his design was his mother†; and was . . . she then at a fit age for the whole plot to depend upon? Suppose her to be but XX when Pythagoras was born, though she had another son before him‡, even at this rate she would be about fourscore and ten before the intrigue could be finished. This surely was too slender a thread to trust a business of that weight to. It is very probable, therefore, if this story be true, that Pythagoras was but about XI when he went into Italy: nay, though the story be false, it is still a very good argument; for it shews, at least, that all those that have reported it must have believed he was not much older. [65]

But we have another piece of history, which most writers agree in, that seems to make him much younger when he went for Italy than Jamblichus's account does; that is, the πεντατία, “ the five years silence§ ” that was enjoined to his disciples before they were admitted to his conversation, or, as some say, even to the sight of him. Now it appears, from the whole conduct of Pythagoras, that he aimed to be founder of a sect; and, by the interest of his scholars, to change the forms of several governments: but would any man of threescore years of age, if he had such designs in his head, have taken such a slow method of bringing them about? He must surely be a younger man, and have the prospect of many years before him when he began such a discipline, or else he must needs apprehend that old age and death would be at his heels before the [66]

* Hermippus, ἰσχνὸς καὶ κατισκαλευμένος. Tertull. “ Corpulentiam interpolasse visus ad omnem mors tui veteris horrorem.”

† Herm. Τῇ μητρὶ ἐντέλειτο. Tertull. “ ab unica conscia & ministræ matre.” ‡ Porph. Jamblich.

§ Laërt. Porphyr. Jambl. &c.

ceremonious

ceremonious silence was over. This *quinquennium*, therefore, even alone, makes it very unlikely that he was LX when he went for Italy; but if it be added to the story above, his "seven years stay in the vault," it will make that account of his age still the more improbable; for at that rate he was near LXX years old when he began that tedious method.

Another confirmation of Aristoxenus's account, that Pythagoras was but XL when he first came to Italy, is his marrying a wife at Crotona, Theano, the daughter of Brontinus; by whom he had two sons and two daughters*. About his love to Theano we have these elegant verses of Hermesianax, the Colophonian Poet, that lived in Alexander's time†:

Οἷη μὲν Σάμιον μανίη κατέδησε Θεανῆς
 Πυθαγόρην, ἐλίκων κομψὰ γεωμετρίας
 Εὐράμενον, καὶ κύκλον ὅσον περιβάλλεται αἰθήρ,
 Βαιῇ τ' ἐν σφαίρῃ παντ' ἀποτασσόμενον.

[67] Here we see he had such a passion for his mistress Theano, that the Poet calls it madness; which better agrees with the age of 50 than 70, after he had stayed seven years in the vault: for that he had no wife till after that time may be fairly gathered from this circumstance, that his old mother, and she only, was conscious to his plot. The names of his two sons are Telauges and Mnesarchus. The former is mentioned by Empedocles‡, whose verse must be amended thus:

Τηλαυγῆς, κλυτὲ κῆρε Θεανῆς Πυθαγόρεώ τε.

and by Jamblichus, Τηλαυγῆς κομιδῇ νεὸς ἀπὸ τὸν Πυθαγόρε θάνατον ὑπολειμμένος ἦν περὶ θεῶν οἱ τῇ μετρί: where the Latin version has it "In spectaculo matris Deum:" but for περὶ θεῶν οἱ τῇ μητρί, it ought to be corrected, παρὰ Θεανοῦ τῇ μητρί. The other son, in Jamblichus, is called Μνήμαρχος, Mnemarchus, which perhaps is a reading not to be rejected; for Festus tells§ us Pythagoras had a son called Mamercus, which seems to be formed from the Doric pronunciation of the Greek word Μνάμαρχος.

V. Most of the Ecclesiastical Writers date the ἀκμή, "the flourishing age" of Pythagoras, at Olymp. LXII. Tatian|| and Clement¶ are the first of them; and their very subject, which was to shew the Greek antiquity to be more recent than the Jewish, induced them to bring his time down as low as

* Laërt. in Pythag.

† Athen. xiii. p. 599.

‡ Laërt. in Pythag. Ἰππόβοτος φησι λέγειν Ἐμπεδοκλῆα Τηλαυγῆ, κλυτὲ κῆρε Θεανῆς Πυθαγόρεώ τε.

§ Festus, v. Æmil.

|| Tatian ad Græcos, pag. ult.

¶ Clem. Strom. i. p. 130 & 143.

they

they could. No wonder then that they rather followed those writers that placed him at Olymp. LX, than those others which, as we have already said, have put him something higher. Clement's computation is subscribed to, as in most other cases, by Cyril*. St. Austin says† he began to be famous at the return of the Jewish captivity; that is, about Olymp. LXII. Eusebius indeed, according to Scaliger's edition, fixes his time at Olymp. LXV, 1; but some MS. copies of him, which I think are here in the right, set it at Ol. LXII, 3, or 4. But in all this there is no contradiction between those that say he flourished Olymp. LXII, and those that say about LII; for since he lived to be above ninety-nine years old, we may truly say he flourished at 40, 50, 60, nay 80 years of age.

[68]

But Cicero says‡ he *came* into Italy in the reign of Superbus, which could not be before Olymp. LXI, 4; and Jamblichus § dates his voyage thither at Olymp. LXII, when Eryxidas, or, as others call him, Eryxias|| of Chalcis, won the race at Olympia. These are plain and direct testimonies against the opinion of those above; and the judicious Reader must consider which account is the more probable; only let him remember, that the later he brings Pythagoras into Italy and Sicily, the more surely he detects the forgery of Phalaris's Epistles. But what if it may be suspected that Cicero and Jamblichus, or the Authors they had it from, mistook out of forgetfulness? so as, when others had said he was in Italy Ol. LXII, these might say he *came* thither. We have a near instance of an error exactly like this: Cicero had said "That Pythagoras was in Italy at the same time that Brutus delivered his country ¶;" that is, Ol. LXVIII, 1. This seems to have been the sole foundation of Solinus's new doctrine, "That Pythagoras *CAME* to Italy when Brutus was consul**."

[69]

As for Jamblichus, he has so managed his accounts, that he has discovered how little he was versed in ancient chronology.

* Cyril. contra Julian. p. 12.

† Aug. de Civitate Dei, xviii. 37.

‡ 1 Tuscul. "Pythagoras, qui cum Superbo regnante in Italiam venisset."

§ Παρεγένετο εἰς Ἰταλίαν κατὰ τὴν ὀλυμπ. ξβ. καθ' ἣν Ἐρυξίδας ὁ Χαλκιδεύς γάδιον ἐίκησιν. Jamb. p. 47.

|| Catalog. Stadion. in Euseb. Scaligeri.

¶ 1 Tuscul. iv. "Pythagoras, qui fuit in Italia temporibus iisdem, quibus L. Brutus patriam liberavit."

** Solinus, c. xxi. "Pythagoras, Bruto consule, qui reges urbe ejecit, Italiam advenietus est,"

"Pytha-

"Pythagoras," he says, "went into Ægypt, and continued there xxii years *, till he was carried by Cambyzes to Babylon, where he stayed xii years †; and from thence, being about 56 years old, he returned to Samos ‡; where, not finding things to his desire, he left it, and went to Italy, Olymp. LXII, when Eryxidas got the prize §." Here is a story so well told, that it contradicts itself in the reckoning no less than xx years; for it was viii years after Olymp. LXII, when Cambyzes was in Ægypt; and xii more, he says, were spent at Babylon. Who would depend upon such a computation, or indeed upon any part of it, when the whole is so inconsistent? Yet the learned Mr. Dodwell has assumed that 12 years stay at Babylon, that has nothing to vouch it but this lame and self-confuted story, for the basis of all his calculations in Pythagoras's life, though at the same time he makes very bold with the other parts of the story; for he differs from the date at Eryxidas's victory no less than five whole Olympiads; and instead of xxii years in Ægypt, he allows something "above one ||," though Plutarch says it is confessed he was there "long time ¶;" and "no little time," says Cyrillus **.

[70] Syncellus indeed agrees with Jamblichus in his narrative of Cambyzes; for he also says that Pythagoras was found by him in Ægypt and carried away prisoner ††: but Apuleius tells the story quite another way; for he says, Pythagoras was carried to, and not FROM Ægypt, among the captives of Cambyzes ††. And he seems to refer to that stratagem of Polycrates §§, when, under pretence of sending forces to the aid of Cambyzes, he selected all the men he was jealous of, with private directions to the king that he should let none of them return home. Apuleius therefore adds, in contradiction to this, "That the more general report was, that Pythagoras

* Jambl. p. 36.

† P. 37.

‡ P. 37.

§ P. 47.

|| De Cycl. Vet. p. 138. "Spatio plusquam annuo."

¶ Plut. Symp. Quæst. viii. 8. Αἰγυπτίῳ τοῖς σοφῶς συγγινώσθαι Πυθαγόρῃ πολλὸν χρόνον ὁμολογεῖται.

** Cyrillus contra Jul. p. 15. Πυθαγόρας καὶ Θαλῆς ἐκ εὐαρίθμητον ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ διατετρηφότες καιροῖν.

†† Syncell. Πυθαγόραν εὐρὼν ἐπιξενωθέντα διὰ φιλοσοφίαν σὺν τοῖς αἰχμαλώταις εἰς Πέρσας ἦγε.

‡‡ Apuleius Florid. ii. "Sunt qui Pythagoram aiunt, eo temporis, inter captivos Cambyse regis Ægyptum cum adveheretur, doctores habuisse Persarum Magos; posteaque eum a quodam Gillo Crotoniensium principe recipratum."

§§ Herod. lib. iii. cap. 44. "went

"went voluntarily into Ægypt *;" that is, he was not pressed by Polycrates into the Persian service. This, as I take it, is the true meaning of Apuleius; and the Reader may consider what credit a story deserves that is told such different ways. But what will he say to the other piece of secret history, "That one Gillus, a prince of Crotona, redeemed Pythagoras out of captivity?" Some take this Gillus to be the same with Cylon of Crotona; but he is Gillus of Tarentum †, who, living in exile at Crotona, redeemed some Persian slaves there, and carried them into Persia to Darius, about Ol. LXV, 1. Here we see how the story is turned. Gillus really redeemed slaves at Crotona, and carried them to Persia; but Apuleius makes him redeem one in Persia, and carry him to Crotona. I know it is easy to be said that he might do both; but he had another errand to Persia than buying of slaves, as may be seen in Herodotus.

VI. We come now to the several periods of Pythagoras's death. The most early that we meet with (for perhaps *or*, 75, in Syncellus, is an error for *pe*, 105) is thus delivered by Laërtius:—"Pythagoras," says he, "as Heraclides the son of Serapion says, died LXXX years old, κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν ὑπογραφὴν τῶν ἡλικιῶν, according to his own distribution of ages ‡." This Heraclides had epitomized Sotion's work, "about the succession of Philosophers," and another work of Satyrus's "about the Lives of famous Men." In one of these two treatises he is supposed to have said this that Laërtius cites from him. Upon which the very learned Mr. D. observes, that this was not Sotion's nor Satyrus's opinion, but the private one of Heraclides; because it was "according to his own description of ages §;" and from thence he makes a conjecture what Sotion's account might be; and believes it to be a "wonderful confirmation ||" of what he had delivered; but I am sorry this learned person should so widely mistake the sense of his author, who does not mean Heraclides's own distribution of ages, but Pythagoras's own; for Pythagoras, as the same Laërtius relates ¶, divided the whole life of man into four ages, *ἡλικίαι*, to each of which he assigned the space of xx years; so that the complete life of man was, according to him, LXXX years.

* Ibid. "Celebrior fama obtinet, sponte eum petisse Ægyptias disciplinas."

† Herod. iii. c. 138.

‡ Laërt. in Pythag. Πυθαγόρας, ὃς μὲν Ἡρακλείδης φησὶν ὅτι τῷ Σεραπίωνος, ὀγδοηκοντῆτος, ἐτελείτα κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν ὑπογραφὴν τῶν ἡλικιῶν.

§ De Cyclis Vet. p. 144, 145.

|| Ibid. "Faciunt hæc mirifice ad ea confirmanda, quæ hactenus observavimus."

¶ Laërt. in Pythag. sect. 10.

Pythagoras

Pythagoras therefore, says Heraclides, died LXXX years old, after his own description of ages, *κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν ὑπογραφὴν τῶν ἡλικιῶν* *.

[72]

But to determine the years of Pythagoras's death, we must endeavour, in the first place, to discover the time of Cylon's conspiracy; for they all say that he either lost his life at that time, or survived but a few months after. It could not happen before Olympiad LXVII, 4, if Diodorus † and Jamblichus ‡ may be believed, who affirm that Pythagoras was then alive, and in Italy, when the Crotonians went to war with the Sybarites; for that war, by Diodorus's computation, was about that Olympiad. And Cicero also concurs with them, for he says "Pythagoras was in Italy when Brutus delivered his country," which happened at the very same time, Olympiad LXVII, 4; but that Cylon's villany was committed presently after that war, it appears from Jamblichus, or rather Apollonius, whom he cites for it: — "After the Crotonians had destroyed Sybaris," says he, "then Cylon's faction put their malice in execution||." And in Cylon's invective against the Pythagoreans, when he incensed the government against them, there is this expression: — "That it was a shame that they who had conquered 300,000 men at the river Traïs, should now be enslaved at home by the 1000th part of that number¶." By the 1000th part he understands the disciples of Pythagoras, that were in all about 300**; and by the victory at Traïs, he means the battle with the Sybarites††, who brought into the field 300,000 men. *Τράευντα* I read in Jamblichus for *τετράευντα*; for I find in Diodorus ‡‡ that Traïs is a river near Sybaris. These passages of Jamblichus will, I suppose, be allowed to prove that the conspiracy of Cylon must

[73]

[Addend. * Censorinus * says the very same thing about Plato, that he died at p. 542.] LXXXI, which he counted the legitimate extent of human life. "Annun

* Cap. xv. "octogesimum & unum, in quo Plato finem vitæ & legitimum esse existimavit, & habuit."

† Diodor. Sic. p. 77.

‡ Jambl. p. 125, 157.

§ Cic. Tuscul. Quæst. iv.

|| Jambl. p. 212. *Ἐπὶ δὲ Σύβαριν ἐχειρώσαντο, ἐξέρραγη, τὸ σιωπᾶμενοι μῖσος.*

¶ Jambl. p. 217. *Αἰσχροὶ εἶναι τὸς τριάκοντα μυριάδων περὶ τὸν Τετράευντα ποταμὸν περιγενομένους, ὑπὸ τῷ χιλιοστῷ μέρει ἐκείνῳ ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ πόλει φανῆναι κατεγασσασμένους.*

** Jamb. p. 212. Julin. xx, 4. Athenagoras.

†† Diod. Siculus, p. 76 & 77. *Στρατεύσαντων τῶν Συβαριτῶν τριάκοντα μυριάσιν, Strabo, vi. τριάκοντα μυριάσιν ἀνδρῶν ἐπὶ Κροτωνιάταις ἐστράτευσαν.*

‡‡ Diod. p. 85. *Διαφεύγοντες τὸν ἐν τῇ γαστρὶ κίνδυνον Συβαρίτας περὶ τὸν Τετράευντα ποταμὸν κατέκταναν.*

be

be dated very soon after the destruction of Sybaris, which was Olympiad LXVII, 4. Let it be put then about two years after it, Olympiad LXVIII, 2; and it concurs with the 99th year of Pythagoras, according to Eratosthenes, and the calculation in our table; all which tends to make it still more probable that the computation is true; for that very year of his age Pythagoras died, as the generality of authors say. "He died," says Tzetzes, "a hundred years old, wanting only one*;" "Near a hundred†," says Jamblichus. Laërtius indeed says "at ninety‡"; but Casaubon and Menagius, and other judicious critics, think the author wrote it *ninety-nine*; his copies being now corrupted; and some MSS. of Eusebius place his death at the very next year, Olympiad LXVIII, 3§.

This last passage of Jamblichus, where he intimates that Cylon's conspiracy came quickly after the Sybaritic war, being not only corrupted in the original, but most miserably handled in the Latin translation, it cannot be imputed as a fault to the learned Mr. Dodwell, that he did not take direction from it when he made his computations. He has dated that conspiracy at Olympiad LXXII, 3; which is almost xx years after the war with the Sybarites; but his reckoning proceeds upon two suppositions, that perhaps will hardly be granted him. First, he assumes that Pythagoras staid a dozen years at Babylon after Cambyzes's expedition into Ægypt. But this, I presume, will now appear to be a false account, by the authorities I have produced above. Then he adds that Pythagoras continued just xx years at Crotona in Italy; and since, according to his calculation, he came thither at Olympiad LXVII, 2, he must consequently be driven out of it at Olympiad LXXII, 3; but the only voucher for that xx years stay at Crotona is a passage in Justin, which we have cited already||; and that seems to be spoken roundly and in the gross, without taking notice of odd years; but Jamblichus says he continued there 39 years; and perhaps it may be suspected that the true reading in Justin is xl, and not xx; for the copies are not much to be trusted when there is nothing but bare figures, without circumstances to specify the time.

[74]

* Tzetzes, p. 206. Ἐτῶν ὑπάρχον ἐκατὸν πλὴν ἑνὸς ἐνὸς μόνα.

† Jamb. p. 220. Βιώσαντα ἔτη ἑξήκων ἐκατὸν. Read with Mr. D. ἑξήκτα τῶν ἐκατὸν or rather ἑξὺς τῶν, for the MS. had it ἑξήκων.

‡ Laërt. in Pythag. Ὡς δὲ πλείους, ἔτη βίος ἐννεήκοια, they read ἐννεήκοια ἑννία.

§ Euseb. edit. Pontac.

|| P. 49.

It

[75] It is true Jamblichus does not say expressly that Pythagoras staid in Italy 39 years, but only "that he presided over the Pythagorean School*" so long. Mr. D. therefore, comparing these two passages of Jamblichus and Justin together, has inferred from them both that Pythagoras lived xix whole years after the conspiracy of Cylon. This is a history entirely new, and his own; and I am sorry it has no better foundation than two figures (xx) in Justin, and those also misapplied to a place of Jamblichus; for I think nothing can be plainer than that Jamblichus understood the whole 39 years to have been spent before the treachery of Cylon; for when he first enters upon his narrative about Cylon, he tells us of Pythagoras's death at Metapontium†; and after he has finished it, his very next words are an account of Pythagoras's successors‡. Several writers have affirmed that Pythagoras himself was burnt at the same time with his scholars§. And the rest that disagree with these make him die presently after. And some tell us the several steps of his escape; that first he fled to Locri||, thence to Tarentum, and thence to Metapontium; where he took sanctuary in the temple of the Muses, and was starved there after 40 days fasting. All this they describe as done without any stop or stay, so as the Locrians met him at the very confines, and would not let him set foot upon their territory. Others therefore take no notice of his going to Locri and Tarentum; but carry him immediately and directly from Crotona to Metapontium, where he ended his days¶. Thus we see the whole stream of historians runs against Mr. Dodwell.

But the same very learned person has proceeded yet further; and has told us the place where Pythagoras lived for those xix years after the sedition of Cylon. Even in Sicily, where he deposed Phalaris, and rescued Himera, and Catana, and other cities from the yoke of tyranny. The only fund for this conjecture is Hermippus's relation of Pythagoras's death, which differs from all the rest. He says "When the Agrigentines
[76] "were at war with the Syracusians, Pythagoras went with "some of his scholars, and headed the Agrigentines; but his

* Jamb. p. 220. Αὐτὸν μὲν γὰρ Πυθαγόραν ἀφηγήσασθαι λέγεται ἐνὸς δίοκλου ἐν τῇ τισσαράκοντα. † P. 208. ‡ P. 219.

§ Quidam apud Laërt. Suidas. Plutarch de Repugn. Stoicorum, p. 1051, & de Socratis Genio, p. 583. Arnob. lib. i. Athenagoras. Valer. Max. viii, 7. Firmicus Astron. i. 5. Tzetzes, Chil. xi, 366.

|| Porph. de vita Pyth. 206. Themistius, Orat. iv. Firmicus, ibid.

¶ Dicæarchus apud Laërt. Justin. xx, 4. Jamblichus, 208.

" party

"party was routed and himself slain, being overtaken in his flight, because he would not go through a field of beans*." Now what is there in these words that shews Pythagoras to have lived in Sicily before? Why might he not go from Crotona to the assistance of the Agrigentines? Is there any thing more common in history than to have the Sicilians and the inhabitants of Magna Græcia engaged with one another? But allowing he was fixed in Sicily before, yet here is nothing determined about the time of this war: why may we not then suppose it was about the time of Cylon's sedition, rather than as Mr. D. sets it, XIX years after? Hermippus's own words seem to favour us to it, for he adds, "That the rest of his scholars, being XXXV in number (all but those that were slain in the fight with the Syracusians) were burnt at Tarantum for disturbing the government†." Now this burning at Tarantum appears to be the same that was contrived by the Cylonian faction, presently after the sedition at Crotona‡. But Mr. D. thinks Pythagoras was slain in that war that Thrasydæus tyrant of Agrigentum made upon Hiero of Syracuse, Olymp. LXXVII, 1§. Which is to add another improbability to all that have gone before; for who will believe that Pythagoras would side with Thrasydæus, a tyrannical and profligate man, in a groundless and unjust war|| against Hiero, who was the bravest prince of his time, and a great patron of learning,—some of the greatest wits of that age residing at his court, Simonides, Pindar, Bacchylides, Æschylus, and (which is still a further argument) Pythagoras's own scholar, Epicharmus?

[77]

But Mr. Dodwell fetches two new arguments, from the successions of the Pythagorean school, to confirm his assertion about the age of Pythagoras¶. "For Lysis, one of the scholars of Pythagoras, was preceptor to Epaminondas and Philip of Macedon; both of whom lived after Olympiad c.

* Laërt. 'Εξελθείν μετὰ τῶν συνέθων τὸν Πυθαγόραν καὶ περὶ τῶν Ἀκραγαντίων.
† Laërt. *ibid.* 'Εν Τάραντι κατακαυθῆναι.

‡ Porphyr. p. 207. Εἰς Τάραντά πλεῦσαι, πάλιν δὲ καὶ ἐκπαρπλήσια παθόντα τοῖς περὶ Κρότωνα. See Jamb. p. 218.

§ Diodor. Sic. p. 40.

|| Diodor. *ibid.*

¶ De Cyclis Vet. p. 148. "Conveniunt certe Scholæ Pythagoricæ *δαδοχαί*." * Lysis enim Pythagoræ in Magna Græcia discipulus, Philippum Macedonem Alexandri M. patrem Thebis instituit atque Epaminondam, qui ipsi Olymp. c. superârunt, nec admodum remoti erant à Pythagora ipso, quos vidit † Aristoxenus Peripateticus Aristotelis discipulus." † Gellius, iv, 2.

“ And Aristoxenus, a scholar of Aristotle’s, had some Pythagorean acquaintance, that were not very remote from Pythagoras’s own time.”

[78] That one Lysis, a Pythagorean, lived at Thebes with Epaminondas, is a thing not now to be questioned, since so many writers of good note have affirmed it*. But there is good reason to doubt whether this was the same Lysis that was an auditor of Pythagoras, though several of these authors expressly say it was he; for if we compute the interval of years between the sedition of Cylon and the age of Epaminondas, they will be found too many to be allowed for one life, even in Mr. D’s own reckoning. For let us suppose with Mr. D. that Cylon fired the Pythagorean college at Olymp. LXXII, 3, though this appears to be set XVII years too low, Lysis then at that time may be supposed about XX years of age; for he and Archippus, being the youngest and the strongest, are said to have escaped out of the fire in which their companions were burnt†. Now Epaminondas’s age might be determined with sufficient exactness from the time of his death at the battle of Mantinea, Olymp. CIV, 2; for he was then in the vigour of his years, and died fighting heroically‡. But we can fix it precisely out of Plutarch§, who informs us that he was XL years old when he was first made General, which was Olymp. CII, 2||. He was born then at Olymp. XCI, 1, and we must suppose he was no less than XX years of age before the death of his tutor; otherwise he could not have made these mighty improvements under his discipline that Historians speak of. I conceive, all we have hitherto allowed in our computation is very fair and reasonable; and yet, at this rate, from the nativity of Lysis to the XXth year of Epaminondas, there are CXIX years, too long a time certainly for the life of Lysis, whom neither Lucian nor any one else have mentioned in their Catalogues of long-lived men. Nay, we must still stretch it out longer; for ¶ Plutarch, telling a story of one Theanor, a Pythagorean, who upon the news of Lysis’s death was sent by the society out of Italy to Thebes, to per-

* Diod. Sic. in Excerpt.—Cornel. Nepos.—Pausanias.—Ælian. in Var. Plutarch. de Socratis Genio.—Porphy. — Jamblich. — Hieronymus contra Rufinum.

† Porphy. Jamb. p. 208. Οὗτοι τελιώτατοι ὄντες καὶ εὐρωστότατοι. Corrige, Οὗτοι τι νεώτατοι. So Plutarch. de Socr. idem p. 583. Νέων ὄντων ἔτι βῶμῃ καὶ καφύτῃ διωσαμένων τὸ αὐτῶν. † Ἡρωικῶς. Diod.

§ Plut. de Λάβῃ Βιώσας. Ἐπαμινώνδας εἰς τισσακοσὸν ἔτος ἀγνοηθεὶς, ἔγερσεν δὲ πωλεῖταις καὶ ἀρχαῖς.

|| Diodorus, 367.

¶ Plut. de Socratis Dæmoni.

form some ceremonies at his sepulchre*, makes him arrive there the very time that the Thebans returned home, which was Olymp. c, 3†. If we admit this account, we must add fourteen years more to Lysis's life, which is already so much too long; for from the birth of Lysis to Olymp. c, 3, there are cxxxii years. But we must prolong this life still further, according to Diodorus, who is followed by Mr. Dodwell; for Diodorus says †, that Philip of Macedon, the father of Alexander, was educated at Thebes under the same Pythagorean with Epaminondas, and made a considerable progress in philosophical knowledge. But we are certain that it was Olymp. cii, 4, when Philip was sent an hostage to Thebes. This is expressly said by Diodorus §, and clearly intimated by Plutarch ||, and fully confirmed from the account of Philip's age; for he died Olymp. cxi, 1 ¶, when he was XLVII years old **; and consequently at Olymp. cii, 4, he was but XIV; which is an age young enough in all reason for the understanding of the Pythagorean doctrines. If the same Lysis therefore was both scholar to Pythagoras and master to Philip, he must survive the sedition of Cylon (when we suppose him xx years old) till Ol. cii, 4; so that he must live in all cxli years. This is a life of such an extraordinary length, that I am persuaded, even Mr. D. himself rather than he will believe this, will come over to my opinion, that there were two Pythagoreans of the same name; and that Historians have confounded two Lysises together. And yet in all this computation I have followed Mr. D's own sentiment about the date of Cylon's conspiracy. But if we place it at Olymp. Lxviii, 2, which I conceive I have proved above to be the more probable opinion, then the longevity of Lysis will be still augmented more extravagantly, even to clviii years.

Mr. Dodwell's next argument is taken out of A. Gellius,

* Olynthiodorus, in his MS Commentary on Plato's Phædon, says it [Addend. was Philolaus, one of those that escaped "ex incendio Cylonis," who p. 542.] came to his master's Lysis's sepulchre at Thebes. *Γύλων ἐφ' ἧς πύρ τῷ διδασκαλείῳ, καὶ πάντες ἐκαύθησαν πλὴν δύο Φιλόλαος καὶ Ἰππάρχης. Ἦλθεν ὁ Φιλόλαος εἰς Θήβας, ἐφείλων χάρις τῷ οἰκίῳ διδασκάλῳ τιθιέντι καὶ ἐκὶ τεταμμένῳ ποιήσασθαι τῷ Δύσιδι.* † Diodor. 344.

† Diod. xvi. p. 407. *Μετίσχει ἐπὶ πλείων τῶν Πυθαγορείων λόγων ἀμφοτέρων διὰ τῶν μαθητῶν, &c.*

‡ Diod. xv. p. 379.

§ Plut. in Pelopide.

|| Diod. xvi. [Addend. p. 543.]

¶ Justin. ix, 8. Pausanias says, "above XLVI," *Φίλιππος μὲν ἔσ' ἐπὶ προσιώσα, ἐξ καὶ τισσαράκοις ἐτῶν.*

I 2

who

who, reporting a thing from Aristoxenus, a disciple of Aristotle's, says, "He seems to have had it from his acquaintance "Xenophilus, and other ancient Pythagoreans, that lived at "no great distance from Pythagoras's own age*." But, as I humbly conceive, this expression of Gellius is too loose and general to determine so nice a point; for who can tell whether *haud multum* shall signify fifty years, or fourscore, or perhaps a hundred? This Xenophilus was præceptor of Aristoxenus †; who, upon the death, as it seems, of his Pythagorean master, was a follower of Aristotle. Aristotle set up his school at Athens about Olymp. cx. ‡; and without question Aristoxenus was one of the first of his scholars; for he expected to have succeeded him after his death, which he could not have presumed upon a short acquaintance. We will suppose then that Xenophilus might die about Olymp. cx; but he lived above a hundred and five years, as Aristoxenus himself has told us§. He was born therefore about Olymp. LXXXIII, which is xxv from Pythagoras's days, according to Mr. Dodwell; and after the other reckoning LX. Either of these sums is *haud multum*; so that this point cannot be decided from that passage of Gellius. But there are other

[81]

writers that speak more particularly of the successions of the Pythagorean school; and they perhaps may enable us to determine the controversy. "Pythagoras flourished," says Laërtius, "about the LX Olymp. and his school continued for "nine or even ten generations; for the last of the Pythagoreans "were Xenophilus, Phanto, Echecrates, Diocles, and Polym "nastus; these were known to Aristoxenus, and had been the "scholars of Philolaus and Eurytus||. But what does he call a generation? The very argument itself will assist us to find his meaning; for he proves from the interval between Olymp. LX and the deaths of those last Pythagoreans, that the generations were nine or ten. He cannot then here allow xxx or xxxiii years to a generation, as those authors we have cited

* Gellius iv. 11. "Quam rem videtur Aristoxenus cognovisse ex Xenophilo familiari suo, & ex quibusdam aliis natu majoribus: qui ab ætate Pythagoræ haud multum aberant." † Suidas Ἀριστοξένου

[Addend. p. 543.] † At Olymp. cx1, 2. when Euxenetus was Archon. Dionys. Halicarn. de Demosth. § Apud Lucianum in Macrob.

|| Laërt. in Pythag. "Ἡμεῖς δὲ κατὰ τὴν ξ' Ὀλυμπιάδα, καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ σύστημα διέμεινέ μέχρι γενιῶν εννέα ἢ καὶ δέκα· τελευταῖοι γὰρ ἐγένοντο τῶν Πυθαγορείων, οὗς καὶ Ἀριστοξένος εἶδε, Ξενοφίλος τε, &c. The vulgar lection is *ἑννακαίδεκα* but the MSS have it *εννέα ἢ καὶ δέκα*, which is the true reading.

above

above did, for at that rate there would not be above six generations. But he seems to take a generation for xx years, as Hesychius* and some others define it. Now, if we reckon from Olymp. lx to the death of Xenophilus, Olymp. cx, there are ten such generations; but Xenophilus, being above 105 years of age when he died, may be supposed to have outlived all his school-fellows by one whole generation. So that here appears an evident reason why our author says "nine or even "ten;" for they are but nine if we count to the deaths of Phanto and Echecrates, and the generality of them; but if we measure to the long extent of the life of Xenophilus, who perhaps for xx years together was the only genuine Pythagorean left in the world, they are even ten generations. Diodorus says "The last of the Pythagoreans were alive at Olymp. ciii, [82] "3†;" which wants but half a dozen years of nine generations. But the learned Mr. Dodwell's computation will in nowise agree with this passage of Laërtius; for Mr. D. sets the founding of the Pythagorean school xxx years later than Laërtius does; which cuts the account shorter by a generation and a half. Tully says the Pythagorean sect continued "many generations‡" after the death of their master; which expression seems not to favour those that would shorten the duration of it.

This I take to be a true explication of this place of Laërtius, which has given so much trouble to his interpreters. And I conceive it may be further confirmed by the testimony of Jamblichus, who, when he speaks of the successions of the Pythagorean school, makes Aristæus, Pythagorus's immediate successor, to have been "very near vii generations before Plato§." Now let us suppose Aristæus to have been lx years old when he took Pythagorus's chair, about Olymp. lxviii, 2, for he was the eldest of all the society, and for that reason succeeded him||, he was born then at Olymp. liii, 3; and from that time to the nativity of Plato, Olymp. lxxxviii, 1, there are 138 years; which wants but two years of vii generations. But if Mr. D.'s computation were allowed, there would be 102 years only between Aristæus and Plato; that is, five generations.

* Hesych. v. γενιά. Τὴν δὲ γενιὰν ὑφίστανται ἰτῶν οἱ μὲν ἑξοστή.

† Diod. p. 386. "Ἐτι δὲ τῶν Πυθαγορικῶν φιλοσόφων οἱ τελευταῖοντες.

‡ Cicer. Tuscul. i. "Multa sæcula postea viguit."

§ Jambl. p. 219. Ἀριστᾶς, ἐπὶ τὰ γενεαῖς ἑβδόμη πρὸς Πλάτωνα. lege, πρὸ Πλάτωνος.

|| Jambl. p. 220. Παραδῆναι Ἀριστᾶν τὴν σχολὴν πρεσβυτάτῃ ὄντι.

[83] The same Jamblichus has given us a list of the whole succession of the Pythagoreans; which, being very faulty in the present edition, I hope it will not be unacceptable to the Reader to see some of it here corrected; and it will supply us with some considerable hints about the age of Pythagoras.

1. Pythagoras.
2. Aristæus.
3. Mnemarchus, Pythagoras's son.
4. Bulagoras.
5. Tydas.
6. Aresas.
7. Diodorus.
8. Clinias. Philolaus. Theoridas. Eurytus. Archytas.

Aristæus, he says, was not only made Pythagoras's successor, but "he had the honour to marry his widow Theano, and to be "guardian to his son; and that because of his extraordinary "knowledge in the Pythagorean doctrines*." But this place is very corrupt in the original; and so is the next, where he says "Mnemarchus the son of Pythagoras succeeded Aristæus†." The name of Tydas‡ too seems to be wrong; but whatever his true name was, "He was so much concerned for the sacking of Crotona, which happened while he was travelling "abroad, that he died with grief not long after his return: and "he was the only person in the whole succession that had an immature death, all the rest living to an extreme old age§.

[84] The next successor, Aresas, is quite lost by the Latin interpreter, who translates *ἀρέσαν tulerunt* ||, as if he had read it *ἤρεσαν*. But the passage is plain and easy, if we write it with a capital letter to denote it a proper name.

Well, we see here are no fewer than eight lives in the Pythagorean succession; and this very number is attested by another ancient writer, who says "Plato was the ninth successor from

* Jambl. p. 220. Τῆς παιδοτροφίας καὶ τῷ Θεανῶς γάμῳ κατηξιώθη, διὰ τε, ἐξαιρέσιως περιεκικρατῆσθαι τῶν δογμάτων. lege, διὰ τὸ ἐξαιρέτως; as the Annotator has observed.

† Ibid. Μεθ' ὃν ἡγήσασθαι Μνήμαρχον τὸν Πυθαγόραν. lege, Πυθαγόρα.

‡ Ibid. Μεθ' ὃν γὰρ Τύδαν. forte, μεθ' ὃν Γορτύδαν, vel simile quid.

§ Ibid. Ἐνὰ δὴ μόνοι γινέσθαι τῶτοι ὡς ἐπὶ λύπης πρέλιπι τὸν βίον. lege, Ἐνα δὴ μόνοι γ. τῶτοι ὡς ἐπὶ.

|| Ibid. Χρόνῳ μέντοι γε ὕστερον ἀρέσαν ἐκ τῶν Λευκάων σωβίτα. lege, Ἀρέσαν.

"Pytha-

"Pythagoras, having been the disciple of Archytas*." Now it is known that Plato conversed with the Pythagoreans in Italy about Olymp. xcv †, to which time, from the death of Pythagoras, according to Mr. D.'s scheme, there are no more than LXX years; which, without question, is too small an allowance, being but x years apiece to the several successors: whereas we know, in the Peripatetic school, Aristotle presided XIII years, Theophrastus after him about XXXIV, and then Strato XVIII, and then Lycon XLII. In the same manner, if we examine the Platonic, or Stoic, or Epicurean successions, and compute by a middle rate, and allow the same measure to the Pythagoreans, we shall find a necessity of dating the original of the Pythagorean school as high as it is placed in our table, which is LXXVI years earlier than Mr. D. has set it.

Now, to sum up the evidence about the Pythagorean succession: first, Laërtius says the sect continued nine or ten generations; then Jamblichus says Aristæus, the second in the Pythagorean line, was about seven generations before Plato, who was scholar to the last of the Pythagoreans; and Photius's author, says Plato, was the tenth successor from Pythagoras. All these accounts conspiring so together, seem to make the thing pretty certain: but yet, in the particulars that Jamblichus has given us relating to this succession, there are some things unaccountable; whether they be owing to the ill copies of Jamblichus's book, or to the author himself, I cannot tell. As when he says "That in the time of Bulagoras, the *fourth* in the succession, the city of Crotona " was taken and sacked ‡," I suppose he means the time when Dionysius the Elder conquered the Crotonians and the neighbouring cities, and held them in slavery for many years, as we are taught by Diodorus§, Dionysius Halic. and Livy; which happened at Olymp. xcvi, 1. Now Plato was XI years old at the time of this Olympiad; and this Bulagoras is but the second from Aristæus in the line of succession: How then can this be consistent with what Jamblichus has said before, that Plato was near seven generations from the time of Aristæus?

[85]

* Scriptor vitæ Pyth. apud Photium. "Ενατος ἀπὸ Πυθαγόρου διάδοχος γίγνται Πλάτων, Ἀρχύτας τῷ πρεσβυτέρῳ μαθητῇ γενόμενος.

† Laërt. in Platone.

‡ Jambl. p. 220. 'Εφ' ᾧ διαπρασθῆναι συνέβη τὴν Κροτωνιατῶν πόλιν.

§ Diod. 317. Dionys. in Excerpt. p. 539. Livy, l. xxiv.

Again, Jamblichus* puts Diodorus the Aspendian in the line of succession before Philolaus, and Eurytus, and Archytus, the youngest of whom was preceptor to Plato. But this Diodorus appears to have been younger than Plato himself; for Plato died above LXXX years old at Olymp. CVIII, 1: but Diodorus† was an acquaintance of Stratoniceus the Musician, who was in the court of Ptolemæus Lagi‡, which must be after Olymp. CXIV. Again, Archestratus the Syracusian was junior to Plato, as we may gather from Athenæus's words: "Archestratus," says he, "knows not that in Plato's convivium there were [86] "XXVIII guests§." But Archestratus mentions this Diodorus as a person then alive, in these elegant verses:

Ἄλλ' ἔ πολλοὶ ἴσασι βροτῶν τόδε θεῖον ἔδεσμα,
 Οὐδ' ἔσθειν ἐθέλωσιν, ὅσοι κέρην τελεῶδη
 Ψυχὴν κέκηνται θνητῶν, εἰσὶν δ' ἀπόπληκτοι,
 Ὡς ἀνθρωποφάγε τῷ θηρίῳ ὄϊλος ἄπας δὲ
 Ἰχθὺς σάρκα φιλεῖ βροτέην, ἀν περ περικύρη.
 Ὡς γὰρ πρέπει καθαρῶς ὅποσοι τάδε μυρολογεῖσι,
 Τοῖς λαχάνοις προσάγειν καὶ πρὸς Διόδωρον ἰόντας
 Τὸν σοφὸν, ἐγκρατέως μετ' ἐκείνῃ Πυθαγορίζειν ||.

They are fools, says he, that refuse to eat the dog-fish, because it devours human bodies; for any fish will eat man's flesh if it can find it: so that they that are scrupulous upon that account must live upon sallads, and go to Diodorus and turn Pythagoreans. The second verse the learned Casaubon has observed to be faulty;

— ὅποσοι κέρην τελεῶδη

Ψυχὴν κέκηνται.

for there is no such word as τελεῶδης. He offers a double emendation of it; one, κέρην κίρεῶδης the other, οἱ κέρην κέλλε-
 σοῶδης. But the first of these cannot be allowed; for it ought to be κίρεῶδης, and then the first syllable will be long: the second is too remote from the common reading. After so great a man, it will be pardonable if I mistake in my conjecture. The same verse comes again in page 510; and there it is ὅσοι κέρην γε λεῶδης. I would correct it

— ὅσοι κέρην ἀτίλεῶδης

Ψυχὴν κέκηνται.

Ἀτίλεος is a locust, or a sort of grasshopper: he means per-

* Jambl. 220.

† Athen. p. 163.

‡ Id. 350.

§ Athen. p. 4.

Ibid. p. 163.

sons of a "light and desultory temper," that skip about, and are blown with every wind, as grasshoppers are. But I would go a little further, and join the words together thus: ὅσοι κερφαττελεῶδη. Κέφρος is a small light sort of a bird, that is tossed about with the wind; and is metaphorically taken for a foolish light-witted fellow. See Hesychius the Scholiast on Aristoph. and others; so that κερφαττελεῶδης is a very fit compound from κέφρος and ἀττελεῶς. [87]

But it is time to take notice of another contradiction in this account of Jamblichus; for in another place he makes Philolaus, and Eurytus, and Archytas, contemporaries with Pythagoras*, though here we see he has placed them at seven generations from him. It is a wonder, that in so short a work he should be so often inconsistent with himself. But which of his assertions shall we follow? no doubt that which he says oftenest, and which agrees best with what others have said. And what can be more express than his own words? "In so many generations nobody had ever seen one of the Pythagorean books till Philolaus's time†." Does he not here declare there were "many generations" between Pythagoras and Philolaus? And Laërtius has preserved for us one of Archytas's letters to Plato, who had desired to purchase the writings of Ocellus Lucanus; and there Archytas says "He had made an enquiry after them, and had spoken with the grandchildren of Ocellus about them‡." Here are plainly three generations between Archytas and Ocellus; and yet nobody has said that even Ocellus himself was contemporary with Pythagoras. And so much by way of enquiry about the age of that philosopher.

THE very learned Mr. Dodwell§ has advanced some other arguments to establish his opinion about Phalaris's age, which must here be considered. In the pretended Epistles|| there is mention of one Clisthenes, who was banished, it seems, out of some democratical city; but the name is not set down. This person Mr. D. supposes to be the famous Clisthenes the [88]

* Jambl. p. 103. Οἱ παλαιότατοι καὶ αὐτῷ συγχρόνισαινες, καὶ μαθηταί-σαις τῷ Πυθαγόρῃ περισβύτη νιοί, Φιλόλαός τε, καὶ Εὐρυτος, Ἀρχύτας τε ὁ προσβύττος, &c.

† Id. p. 172. Ἐν τῶν αὐτῶν γυναιῶν ἐδὲ ἐδὲν φαίνονται τῶν Πυθαγορείων ὑποσημαμάτων περὶ τιτυχίως πρὸ τῆς Φιλόλαου ἡλικίας. lege, περιτετυχίνας.

‡ Laërt. in Arch. Ἀγάθομος ὡς Ἀσικανὸς, καὶ ἐντεύχομος τοῖς Ὀκέλλω ἡγετοῖς.

§ De Cyolis Vet. p. 253.

|| Phal. Epist. 77. 95, 110.

Athenian,

Athenian, who had almost as great a share in driving out the family of Pisistratus, as Brutus the Roman had in expelling the Tarquins. Now Pisistratus's sons were driven out at Olymp. LXVII, 1*; and there must be an interval of some years between that and Clisthenes's exile. Phalaris therefore, who relieves Clisthenes after his banishment, must have been still in the throne about Olymp. LXVIII; that is, XL years after Eusebius's period, which I follow as a rule and standard through all my Dissertation.

But I must here again profess my sorrow to see this excellently learned writer so imposed on by these spurious letters; for all this affair of Clisthenes was nowhere but in the Sophist's head. Neither is the scene of it laid at Athens; for our Phalaris's Clisthenes was the son of Autonoë†, a kinswoman of the Tyrant's; but the Athenian's mother was called Agariste, as Herodotus‡ and Ælian§ assure us; and a niece of the same Clisthenes, the mother of Pericles||, was called Agariste, in memory of the other. Perhaps it may be suspected that Autonoë in the Epistles may be only a mother-in-law; but this I think would be a sorry evasion, though we had not that direct answer to it which the Letters themselves afford us, where they call her "his own mother¶." If the fault be laid on the copies of Phalaris, and Autonoë be supposed a corruption of the true word Agariste, there will be no dealing upon this argument with such masters of defence: but then again, Phalaris's Clisthenes was fined three talents, and all he had was seized on and confiscated to the public use**. Now this story will never suit with the circumstances of the Athenian Clisthenes, who being banished, as Ælian says††, by way of exostracism, must consequently have the free use and enjoyment of his estate all the time of his exile; for this was one difference between exostracism and ordinary banishment, that the former allowed to the person the entire right of his own revenues‡‡. Herodotus so represents this transaction, as if Clisthenes had quitted Athens by order of Cleomenes, king of Sparta, without suffering any exostracism; but even this account sufficiently proves that he was not the

* Marm. Arund.

† Ep. 95.

‡ Herod. vi, 126.

§ Ælian. xii, 24.

|| Herod. vi, 131. Plutarch. in Pericle.

¶ Ep. 110. Παρὰ τῆς αὐτῆς μητρός.

** Ep. 95.

†† Ælian. xiii, 24.

‡‡ Plutarch. in Aristide. Ἐξέκρηστον εἰς ἔτη δέκα κατεμένον τὰ ἑαυτοῦ. Suid. v. Ὀφρακρυμός. Schol. Arist. 238 et 344.

Clisthenes.

Clisthenes in the Epistles; for here was no fine or confiscation of goods, if he only retired in obedience to Cleomenes. "Clisthenes, the Athenian," says Cicero, "having a mistrust of his affairs, deposited money for his daughters Photions in Juno's temple at Samos*." This mistrust appears to have been a little before his banishment; and if he had money of his own lodged then in Samos, it is pretty hard to believe that he would send a begging to Sicily, the quite contrary way, and so much further than Samos. But what need of many words? Let but any body read the history of Clisthenes in Herodotus, and then look upon the Letters, where he will not find one circumstance mentioned, not so much as Athens named, nor Clisthenes's rival Isagoras, nor Cleomenes, but some general heads only, and common-places; and let him believe, if he can, that the writer of those Epistles speaks of the Athenian; or if he do speak of him, even this may go among the other arguments to detect him a Sophist.

[90]

Mr. Dodwell† adds one little suspicion more towards settling the age of Phalaris. There is one Epistle directed to Hiero, and two to Epicharmus‡. Now, if this Epicharmus be the Comic Poet, and this Hiero the Tyrant of Syracuse, their ages will agree well with Mr. D.'s notion, that makes him alive at Olymp. LXXII. But I will not lose any time in refuting this suspicion: since Mr. D. himself seems not to rely upon it, it is enough if we remark that there is not the least hint in the Letters, that the Epicharmus there was a Poet; which the Author, had he meant the Comedian, would hardly have omitted, if we may guess at his humour by his many Letters to Stesichorus. As for Hiero, the Epistles have represented him as a citizen of Leontini; where the Hiero of Syracuse had no concern that we know of.

And now, I think, I have gone through the most memorable passages that have relation either to Phalaris's or Pythagoras's age; and I have considered all that Mr. Dodwell has made use of to support his new assertions. I do not pretend to pass my own judgment, or to determine positively on either side; but I submit the whole to the censure of such readers as are well versed in ancient learning; and particularly to that incomparable Historian and Chronologer, the Right Reverend the Bishop of Coventry and Litchfield§.

[91]

* Cicero de Legibus, II, 16. "Cum rebus timeret suis."

† De Cyclis Vet. p. 253.

‡ Ep. 86, 61, 98.

§ Dr. William Lloyd.

In

I.

IN the last Epistle to those of Enna, a city of Sicily, Phalaris says the Hyblenses and Phintienses had promised to lend him money at interest; *Oi δὲ ὑπέρχοντα δανείσειν, ὡς Ὑβλαῖοι καὶ Φιντιεῖς*. The Sophist was careful to mention such cities as he knew were in Sicily; for so Ptolemy places *Φιντία* there *; and Antoninus, Phintis †; and Pliny, Phintienses ‡; but it is ill luck for this forger of Letters, that a fragment of Diodorus, a Sicilian, and well acquainted with the history of his country, was preserved to be a witness against him. That excellent Writer informs us that Phintias, Tyrant of Agrigentum (the very place where Phalaris was before him), first built Phintia, calling it by his own name; *Κτίζει δὲ Φιντίας πόλιν, ὀνομάσας αὐτὴν Φιντιάδα* and that this was done while the Romans were at War with King Pyrrhus, that is about Ol. cxxv §; which is above cclxx years after Phalaris's death, taking even the later account of St. Hierom. A pretty slip this of our Sophist, who, like the rest of his profession, was more versed in the Books of Orators than Historians, to introduce his Tyrant borrowing money of a city almost ccc years before it was named or built.

THE preliminaries about Phalaris's age being agreed on between Mr. B. and me (for he consents to place him as I have done, at Olymp. LVII, 3) we are at last come to the business itself. And what does the learned Examiner advance against our first argument?

P. 122. "For *method's* sake," says he, "the Doctor begins at the last Epistle;" for modesty's sake, the gentleman begins with a very worthy cavil; as if I was not to rank my arguments according to their force, rather than to take them as they happen to rise? But he will find, by and by, that I put this argument in the front, because it is one of the strongest, and can never be eluded.

* Ptok p. 79a

† Plin. iii, 8.

‡ Anton. p. 21.

§ Diod. p. 867.

" But

" But the copies of Phalaris have Ὑλαῖοι, and I make use P. 122.
 " of the Examiner's conjecture Ὑλαῖοι." I conceive it is
 but a small fault to *make use* of it in a citation, if I do not
 assume it to myself; but he resents, I suppose, that I did not
 name him, and give him the glory of his correction. If that be
 it, I can heartily excuse him; for his true emendations being so
 very few, he has reason to look after them; but, to speak freely,
 the correction is so very easy, that the honour of it is but mode-
 rate; for "if in all the editions of Phalaris it has been Ὑλαῖοι,"
 the reason was, that, before Mr. B. arose, nobody of eminent
 learning would debase himself by the publication of those
 Epistles.

" But granting it to be Ὑλαῖοι, whether any of the Si- P. 122.
 " cilian Hyblas be here meant is dubious." Though all [93]
 this be wide from the question, for I fetch no argument from
 Hybla; yet it has a worse quality than that, for it is not true.
 "I have sent," says Phalaris, "over all Sicily to borrow
 " money at interest; and some freely gave me money, as the
 " Leontines and Geloans; others promised to lend me, as the
 " Hyblæans and Phintians*." Is it dubious now whether
 any of the Hyblas of Sicily be meant in this place? Does he
 not say expressly that he sent to borrow in Sicily? I am sorry
 our Honourable Editor is no better versed in his own Author:
 I am glad, I would say; for it is to be hoped he employs his
 time better.

I may now put in one word about those Ὑλαῖοι, " a people P. 122,
 " that are not in Sicily; so that I was unlucky in saying
 " The Sophist took care to mention such towns as he knew
 " were in Sicily." Though the Examiner's emendation Ὑλαῖοι
 be so obvious and certain, yet he is half in the mind to re-
 nounce his own correction, out of pure contradiction to me.
 Let it then be Ὑλαῖοι, to humour him a little. What spoils
 now does the Examiner carry with him, but a manifest detec-
 tion that his Epistles are a cheat? For the Writer declares
 " that it was Sicily" where he borrowed his money; but when
 he comes to name those that lent it, he talks of " Ὑλαῖοι, which
 are nowhere in Sicily." Now a Sophist might be guilty of
 this mistake; but the true Phalaris could not.

At last the Examiner is come to the merits of the cause;
 for he will prove there were two Phintias in Sicily. " For P. 122.
 " the Phintia built by Phintias, which is mentioned in Dio-
 " dorus †, was a maritime Town; but the Phintia of Pto- [94]

* Ep. 148. Εἰς ἅπασαν Σικελίαν.

† Diod. p. 867.

lemy* and Pliny† was *mediterranean*: and this latter may be the place that is meant in the Epistles.

Thus it is to have a reach of thought and a sagacity peculiar to a great genius. These are the very passages that I had cited; and yet so dull was I, that I could not discover that the authors spoke of different Phintias; for I fancied, if Pliny or Ptolemy had meant another Phintia besides that of Diodorus, they would have given us an account of two; for Diodorus's Phintia was too considerable to be omitted. Since therefore they mention one only, it was a plain argument to me that they knew but of one; nay, I went further, and imagined I had found the true reason why these Authors disagreed so in the account of its situation; for when a city is situated but a little within land, near the mouth of a river as Phintia was, it is no wonder that writers differ, some calling it a maritime town because it is near the sea, and has a harbour for ships; others calling it an inland town, because it really lies within land, and not in the verge of the sea-coast. As in the very same place Ptolemy reckons Agrigentum among the mediterranean towns, though Pliny and every body else call it a sea-town; for, as Polybius says‡, it was seated xviii stadia, one league only within the mouth of the river; and the same Ptolemy calls Gela and Camarina inland towns for the very same reason; though every novice in geography know they were maritime. Virgil§ describes the promontories and sea-towns of Sicily that Æneas saw as he coasted it: —

[95]

“ Hinc altas rupes projectaque saxa Pachyni
 “ Radimus; et fatis nunquam concessa moveri
 “ Apparet Camarina procul, campique Geloi,
 “ Immanisque Gela fluvii cognomine dicta:
 “ Arduus inde Agragas ostentat maxima longe
 “ Mœnia, magnanimum quondam generator equorum.”

Here we see are three maritime cities, Camarina, Gela, and Agrigentum: will our Examiner therefore double these as he has done Phintia, because Ptolemy calls them mediterranean? If he pleases to publish a new map of Sicily with these noble discoveries in it, he will meet with his deserved applause.

P. 123. But the Gentleman proceeds, and tells us “ Phintia in the
 “ Epistle must therefore be the mediterranean town, because
 “ Hybla, which is there joined with it, is mediterranean.

* Ptol. iii, 4.

† Plin. iii, 8.

‡ Polyb. ix.

§ Æn. iii.

“ This,

" This, he says, is a way of arguing that I myself use in the " next Section*," which I will shew him to be mistaken in when I come to that paragraph. In the mean time why so positive that this Hybla in the Epistle must needs be mediterranean? Did he not newly say " It is dubious whether any " of the Sicilian Hyblas be there meant? and the supposed Hyblas out of Sicily might be maritime for aught he knows. But allow this to be a Sicilian Hybla, were all of that name in Sicily mediterranean towns? This he must affirm, or else his argument is lame of one foot, which we ought not to suspect in so great a logician. To be sure then he imagines that all the Hyblas of Sicily were inland cities, as it farther appears from his Index to Phalaris †, where that Hybla that was really maritime is described to be mediterranean: — a manifest error, and plainly refuted by Thucydides ‡, Cicero, Virgil, Ovid, Mela, Pliny, and others: so very happy is our Examiner in every step he takes.

[98]

But he fancies " I may maintain that all those Authors, P. 122.
" Diodorus, Ptolemy, and Pliny, may mean the same Phintia."
(And if all his fancies were as true as this, I would not write one word against him.) " If so, why may not Diodorus be
" mistaken as much in the date of this town, as two good wit-
" nesses prove him to be in the situation of it?"

I have already shewn, that none of them were mistaken in the situation of Phintia; for they all knew that it was a port-town seated a little within land, near the mouth of the river Himera. The only difference is in the name; some calling such a situation maritime, others mediterranean. But that it was really a port-town, there are two as good witnesses on Diodorus's side, Antonine (in his Itinerary §) and Cicero ||; so that we have three testimonies against two. But let us see what evidence may be produced from matter of fact. " Carthago, " the Carthaginian admiral, hearing the Roman fleet was gone " from Syracuse, came towards them with *cx* sail. The Ro- " mans not daring to engage him, got into the harbour of Phin- " tia; whither the Carthaginians pursued them, and sunk 67 of " their ships, and disabled 13. Soon after, the Roman Consul, " knowing nothing of what had happened, comes from Messana

* Ep. 148. Ὑβλαῖος καὶ Φιντίας.

† V. Megarenses. " Hyblæi, quorum urbs Megara Mediterranea."

‡ See Cluverius's Sicil. 133. § P. 21. " Per maritima loca," &c.

|| iii. in Verrem. " Coge ut ad aquam tibi frumentum metiantur, vel Phintiam, vel Halesam," &c.

with

P. 137. [97] “with 36 sail, and cast anchor before Phintia.” This action is told at large in Diodorus*: and can we think all this a mere dream of his, “written when he was fast asleep?” as our Examiner expresses it. He was born within 60 miles of Phintia: and surely he that travelled through Europe and Asia to view the places he wrote of†, could scarce be so ignorant at home as to make whole fleets engage and be sunk upon dry land; but if the Examiner will still remain obstinate against Diodorus and the rest, I have one witness more in reserve, whom; I dare say, he will allow to be a good one. It is the Honourable Charles Boyle, Esq. the learned Editor of Phalaris, who in his Index there has these very words: — “Phintia, now called Lycata, a maritime town in the east of Sicily, not a mediterranean as Ptolemy calls it‡.” Here is an authority beyond all exception, not only that there was a maritime Phintia, but that Phalaris meant it. The Gentleman perhaps may blush at this passage, and therefore I will not bear hard upon him, but only ask him one short question. “Phintia, a maritime town,” says the Editor; “a mediterranean,” says the Examiner; now whether is harder to be proved, that the maritime and the mediterranean are the same town, or that the Editor and the Examiner are the same person?

P. 123. [98] But let us observe the inference he makes from this *error*, as he thought it, of Diodorus; for here we may expect the very quintessence of logic. “Why may not Diodorus be mistaken as much in the date of this town as he is in the situation of it?” Now the mistake is in the *situation*, even supposing it a mistake, might perhaps be five miles, for that is enough to denominate it an inland town. But the mistake about the *date* must be no less than CCLXX years; for any thing less than that will do the Epistles no service; so that here lies the true import of our Examiner’s query:—If Diodorus might mistake a league or two, why might he not mistake CCLXX years? that is, if Milo the Crotonian could carry a bull, why might he not carry a brace of elephants?

But that Diodorus has not mistaken himself in his account of the *date* of Phintia any more than in the situation, we may be as sure as any history can make us. (1.) For, first, he could not mistake in the age of Phintias the Tyrant. He has involved him in so many circumstances, and linked him

* Diod. 880.

† Diod. in Præf.

‡ “Phintia, hodie Lycata, urbs maritima in Orientali Siciliæ latere; non mediterranea, ut Ptolemæus.”

with

with so many contemporaries, that a man must hate his own reputation who will presume to say that this Phintias was older than Phalaris. He had war with Hicetas, Tyrant of Syracuse*; that Hicetas that had another war with Mano the poisoner of Agathocles, and was succeeded by Thynio, or Thæno, an ally of king Pyrrhus. He is mentioned with Decius Jubellius the Roman tribune†, whose age we know from Polybius, and Livy, and Appian. He had concerns with the Mamertines of Messina‡: a people never heard of in Sicily before the age of Agathocles. He razed to the very ground the city of Gela§, which a whole cloud of Historians witness to have been standing long after Phalaris's time. What man of common modesty or sense will say all these actions are confounded, and that Phintias lived three centuries before? Can so excellent an Historian be suspected of such a gross piece of negligence? It is as absurd as to affirm that the right Reverend the Bishop of Sarum, in his immortal "History of the Reformation," may have mistaken the affairs of Henry III. for those of Henry VIII.

There is a medal in Goltzius and Paruta, with this inscription, BACIAEΩΣ ΦINTIA. On one side it has a dog; and on the other a head crowned with laurel. Goltzius thinks it is the head of Gelo; and that ΦINTIA means the city of Phintia. And the learned Harduin concurs with him, that ΦINTIA relates to the city, and not to a person||. But I am entirely of Paruta's opinion, who interprets it of king Phintias; for is not Βασιλέως Φιντία in the genitive case, exactly like those other inscriptions, ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΥ, ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΙΕΡΩΝΤΜΟΥ, ΑΓΑΘΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ? And the inscription is placed in the same manner in all of them; not where the head is, but upon the reverse. Besides, the very word BACIAEΩΣ shews it belongs not to Gelo; for in his and his brother Hiero's coins, that word is not used; Dionysius, as it seems, being the first Sicilian that styled himself Βασιλεύς in his money. Without question therefore, this Phintias was a long time after Phalaris's age, as appears not only from the word Βασιλεύς, but from the head of the laurel; for it was not the custom in Phalaris's time for princes to set their images upon the public money.

(2.) Neither could Diodorus mistake in the second part, that this Phintias founded the city Phintia, and called it after

* Diodor. lib. xxii.

† Diod. ibid. & Excerpt. Vales. 265.

‡ Ibid.

§ Ibid.

|| Harduin, Nummi Antiqui Illustrati.

his own name. It is observable, that he says it more than once: "Phintias," says he, "builds a city, naming it Phintia:" and in another place, "Phintias, the founder of Phintia*." He is very particular in the circumstances of it. "The Ma-
 [100] "mertines †," says he, "of Messana having sacked the city
 "of Gela, Phintias king of Agrigentum pulls down all the
 "houses and the walls of the place, and removes the people that
 "were left, and builds a city for them (within the territory of
 "Agrigentum) with good fortifications, and a fine market-
 "place and temples ‡." Will our Examiner say that all these
 buildings were castles in the air? No; but perhaps there might
 be a city there called Phintia before, and Phintias might only
 repair it. No doubt of it: he was at all that trouble and ex-
 pence purely for the sake of "a refreshing quibble." The
 P. 133. town was a name-sake of his, and therefore he would rebuild it.
 By the same argument, there was an Alexandria before Alexan-
 der, and a Rome before Romulus. But no body heard, you will
 say, of these names before the times of those founders. No
 matter for that: who ever heard of Phintia before Phintias's
 time? Yet our Examiner can give you a view of it in the
 region of possibilities.

Give me leave to add one short remark about the building
 of Phintia. Diodorus has passed his word, that the city of
 Gela was quite razed and dispeopled before Phintia was built;
 and that the residue of the Geloans were transplanted to this
 new Phintia, and from that time were called Phintienses. But
 the pretended author of the Epistles mentions the Geloans and
 Phintienses as different people; as if Gela and Phintia were
 Ep. 148. both standing at once. "The Leontines," says he, "and
 "Celoans gave me money; the Hyblenses and Phintienses
 "promised to lend." So that here we have a double discovery
 that the Epistles are spurious; first, because they talk of the
 Phintians: a name not heard of in Phalaris's time; and then
 because they make them quite different from the Geloans,
 though they were both the same people, the new city arising
 out of the reliques of the old.

[101] Mr. Boyle is pleased to end this paragraph with a little in-
 P. 123. nocent mirth. "Unless," says he, "this Phintia be such
 "another place as Agrigent, a sea-port town in the middle of
 "Sicily." Those words of mine that he refers to are, "The
 "letters are dated in the middle of Sicily §;" where there is

* Diod. p. 868. Κρίζει δὲ Φιντίας πόλιν ὀνομάσας αὐτὴν Φιντιάδα, and
 Φιντίας ὁ Φιντιάδης κτίσας.

† Diod. p. 874.

‡ Diod. p. 868.

§ Diss. p. 50.

not

not one syllable about Agrigentum; but he adds that of his own, to make way for his jest. But pray, Sir, where had you the secret that all Phalaris's Letters were dated at Agrigentum? does not Suidas say he was master of all Sicily*? Do not the Letters pretend that he conquered the Leontines, the Tauromenites, the Zancleans? Did he not vanquish the Sicani, the inhabitants of the mid-land country†? And could he not write a Letter in any of these expeditions, as well as at home? or were ink and paper such heavy baggage that they could not be carried after him? By the subject of several of the Letters, one would guess they were dated from the castle where his bull was kept, which was XVIII miles from Agrigentum‡. But for the most part they are such common-place stuff, without any note of place or time, that one cannot tell where nor when they were written;—and the Reader may observe this as another mark of their spuriousness. But what then, if I had meant Agrigentum, when I said “The Letters are dated in the middle of Sicily?” Is not Agrigentum in the very middle of the island, between the East and West point of it, Pachynus and Lilybæum? And, I conceive, there is a middle of a line, as well as of a surface. And now if Agrigentum be a mediterranean town, what will then become of your jest? I have two very good authors to bear it out: Ptolemy in his Tables, that reckons it among the *μεσογειας*, “mid-land cities;” and Mr. Boyle, in his Index to Phalaris: “Agrigent,” says he, “a mediterranean city§.” If Mr. Boyle “be so quarrelsome that he cannot agree with himself, how is it possible for other people to agree with him?”

[102]

P. 119.

If the Reader now pleases to review what the Examiner has said upon the first argument, he will join with me in this character of it, That all the authorities he has brought were already in my Dissertation; and that all his inferences are false, and may have the honour to be his own.

II.

IN the xcii Epistle, he threatens Stesichorus, the Poet, for raising money and soldiers against him at Aluntium and Alæsa, καὶ εἰς Ἀλάντιον καὶ εἰς Ἀλαίσαν: and that perhaps he might be snapt before he got home.

* Suid. v. Φαλ.

† Polyænus, v, 1.

‡ Diod. 741.

§ “Agrigentum urbs mediterranea.”

again from Alæsa to Himera, *ἐξ Ἀλαίωνς εἰς Ἱμέραν*. What a pity it is again, that the Sophist had not read Diodorus! for he would have told him that this Alæsa was not in being in Phalaris's days. It was first built by Archonides, a Sicilian, Olymp. xciv, 2*; or, as others say, by the Carthaginians, about two years before †. So that here are above cXL years slipt since the latest period of Phalaris. And we must add above a dozen more to the reckoning, upon the Sophist's own score; for this letter is supposed to bear date [103] before Stesichorus and Phalaris were made Friends; which was a dozen years, as he tells his tale ‡, before Stesichorus died; and Phalaris he makes him to survive him. I am aware that the same author says, that there were other cities in Sicily called Alæsa §; but it is evident from the situation, that this Alæsa of Archonides is meant in the Epistles; for this lies on the same coast with Himera and Aluntium (to which two the Sophist here joins it) and is at a small distance from them. And indeed there was no other town of that name in the days of the Sophist, the rest being ruined and forgotten long before.

IF our Examiner's performance in the last Section was very poor and jejune, we may expect an amends in this; for, to encourage himself with a small victory, he begins his attack upon a fault of the press, cxx for cXL; though it was nothing to his subject, even allowing it to be my own mistake. And being flushed with this little advantage over the Printer, he then proceeds with his victorious forces against the argument itself. But we shall see by the event, that not the Author of the Epistles only, but one of his Editors too, may be guilty of sophistry.

P. 123.

"The Doctor," says he, "finds Stesichorus in danger of being snapt in his intended journey from Alæsa to Himera."

[104]

Now, with the Examiner's leave, the Doctor was more inclined to think it a *voyage* than a *journey*; for both Himera, where Stesichorus lived, and Alæsa and Aluntium, whither he went, are maritime towns. And the very words of Phalaris ||

* Diod. p. 246. † P. 247. ‡ Epist. 103. § Diod. *ibid.* || Ep. 62.

confirmed

confirmed the Doctor in this opinion; for he makes this sarcasm upon Stesichorus:—"I hear," said he, "you are writing *Nóras*, the return of the Greeks from Troy; but you take no thought for your own return from Alæsa to Himera. But it shall be hard for you to escape my hands; and that shall be as bad to you as the Capharean rocks and Charybdis were to them." There is a greater propriety in this comparison, if Stesichorus was to come home by sea, than if he was to come by land. And it was at sea, as it is pretended*, that he was snapt at last, as he was sailing from Pachynus to Peloponnesus.

I observed that, because there had been several Alæsas in Sicily, this argument would be of no force, unless we could know which of them was meant in the Epistles; and that I thought might be determined from the very circumstances of the action. Stesichorus is supposed to sail from Himera to Alæsa and Aluntium. Now the Alæsa of Archonides being a sea-port town, and lying exactly in the way between Himera and Aluntium, there was no question, as I thought, but this was the place mentioned in the Epistles; especially since there is good reason to suppose that the other Alæsas (if there were any other) were mediterranean towns; for if they had been port-towns, and more ancient than the age of Phalaris, it is almost impossible but that in the Punick, or Athenian, or Roman, or Civil Wars in Sicily, there must have been some naval actions there; and then the Historians could never have been so ignorant of them as it appears they all were.

[105]

But Mr. B desires "to borrow this argument for a moment, and he will prove just the contrary to what I have proved, that this Alæsa is not upon the coast with Aluntium." I perceive it is dangerous *lending* this Gentleman any thing. He borrowed the MS Phalaris, and now he borrows an argument; but he makes a wrong use of both of them; and then calumniates him that lent them. First, he quite mistakes the form of the argument; and supposes that to be the conclusion which is the minor proposition; for I do not *prove* by this way of argument, "that Alæsa is upon the same coast with Aluntium." That I *suppose* and *premise* as known from Antoninus's Itinerary, Diodorus, and Strabo; who all describe it in that situation. Methinks, a man that had a system of Logic made and printed for his own use, might have been able to reduce an argument into the form of a syllogism. My argument lies thus:—

P, 124.

* Ep. 108.

Alæsa, Himera, and Aluntium, are mentioned together in the Epistle as sea-towns, and near one another.

But Alæsa of Archonides is a sea-town in the neighbourhood of Himera and Aluntium.

Therefore Alæsa of Archonides is the Alæsa mentioned in the Epistle.

- P. 124. But let us see what exploits he will do if I *lend* him the argument. "Tully says, Halesini, Catinenses, Panormitani, &c.; and again, Halesini, Catinenses, Tyndaritani, &c.* "it is evident, therefore, that Alæsa is upon the same coast with Catana; that is, upon the coast directly opposite to Aluntium." This he nick-names "my way of argument;" though it be just as much like it as Planudes's picture of Æsop is like the original. When either the design of the Writer, or the circumstances of the thing itself, plainly intimate that the places mentioned together are near one another, we may infer that they are so. As first, I know from the design of the Writers (because Strabo and Antoninus mention the towns in order) that Alæsa of Archonides is in the neighbourhood of Himera: and again, I know that Alæsa in the Epistle is supposed in the neighbourhood of Himera, from the circumstances of the action. But what is there like these in the passage of Cicero? All Sicily had been pillaged by Verres; and there were people from all the towns to inform against him at Rome. Now Cicero was not obliged, like a geographer, to mention each of them according to their situation; but rather according to the quality and wealth of the people.

- But who is this that makes all this controversy about Alæsa in the Epistle? Is this the same Mr. Boyle that was the Editor of these Epistles? So he gives himself out to be; and yet that Editor has described this Alæsa in the Epistle to be the very same that I say it is; for he says † "Alæsa is a sea-port town on the West side of the island. Cic. in Verrem iii." Now this situation agrees with no other than the Alæsa of Archonides; and we are sure Cicero meant that very town, from those words of Diodorus ‡, "That the Romans gave to Alæsa of Archonides an immunity from paying taxes," compared with these of Cicero §, "Centuripa and Alæsa,

* Cic. ii. in Verrem.

† Index. Phal. *Alæsa*.—Cic. in Verr. iii. "Maritima est in occidentali insulæ latere." And again, "Aluntium, non procul ab Alæsa."

‡ Διὰ τὴν ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων δοθεῖσαν ἀτίμειαν. Diod. p. 246.

§ "Immunes civitates ac liberæ Centuripina, Halesini," &c. iii. in Verrem.

"free

"free cities, and exempt from paying taxes." What shall we say to such an Examiner? He could speak the truth freely, as long as truth was not against him; but when he sees things turned upon him, to expose his admired Author, and pull down the honour of his Edition, then he reverses his own judgments; and what was white before, must now be black; but perhaps some white may turn red when the Examiner pleases to reflect upon these self-contradictions.

To shew his talents once more at misrepresenting, he repeats another argument of mine thus:—"Alæsa of Archonides must be meant in the Epistles, because there was no other town of that name in the days of the Sophist." Now in those words of mine that he refers to, there is nothing like *because*; neither are they brought there as an argument to prove what he says they are. After I had fully proved that the Writer of the Epistles meant Archonides's Alæsa, I concluded with this, "And indeed there was no other town of that name in the days of the Sophist;" which I did not design for a separate argument, for that would plainly suppose the thing in question, that the Epistles were writ by a Sophist; but I added them only as an account *à priori*, how it came about that the Sophist should mention that Alæsa. And the account I take to be good and rational, that no other Alæsa was heard of in the days of the Sophist.

The very design then of this period is misrepresented by the Examiner; but he is mistaken too incidentally as he dresses up his inference. "We find," says he, "in these Epistles the names of Astypalæa, Himera, Zancle, towns out of date long before the days of the Sophist." If Mr. B. means Astypalæa*, a city of Crete, where he fancies Phalaris was born, I can readily agree with him, that that town was out of date both before and after the days of the Sophist, till Phalaris's Editors first found it out. "But Mr. B. forgets that he is disputing with a strange sort of people, who will not allow" that Astypalæa in the Epistles is a town of Crete, but a city and island in the Ægean Sea; which city, they believe, was not out of date in the days of the Sophist; for it was standing in Tiberius's† and Titus's‡ time; and for aught Mr. B. or I know, many centuries after: but grant it only as low as Titus: I believe the Author of Phalaris's Epistles might live before that time; for I find the forged Letters of Euripides were extant in Tiberius's days; and I can allow the same antiquity

P 124.

[108]

P. 125.

P. 125.

* Phal. Edit. Oxon.

† Strabo, p. 488.

‡ Plin. iv, 23.

to the counterfeit Phalaris. It is a query, therefore, whether I do not think him older than the Examiner himself does.

I would sum up the particulars of this second head if the Examiner's performance could bear recapitulating; but it is too thin and tender to endure handling again. I refer it all to the Readers, and let it stand or fall by the judgment of that jury.

[109]

III.

THE LXX Epistle gives an account of several rich presents to Polyclitus the Messenian Physician, for doing a great cure upon Phalaris. Among the rest, he names ποτηρίων Θηρι λείων ζεύγη δέκα, "ten couple of Thericlean cups." But there is another thing, besides a pretty invention, very useful to a liar, and that is a good memory; for we will suppose our Author to have once known something of these cups, the time and the reason they were first called so; but he had unhappily forgot it when he wrote this Epistle. They were large drinking-cups, of a peculiar shape, so called from the first contriver of them, one Thericles, a Corinthian Potter. Pliny*, by mistaking his Author Theophrastus, makes him a Turner. The words of Theophrastus are these: Τορνέυσθαι δ' ἐξ αὐτῆς (τερμίνθη) κύλικας Θηρικλείας, ὥστε μὴδ' ἂν ἓνα διαγνῶναι πρὸς τὰς κεραμέας; "That the Turners make Thericlean cups of the turpentine-tree, which cannot be distinguished from those made by the Potters†." Here can nothing be gathered hence to make Thericles himself a Turner; for after he had first invented them, they were called [110] Thericlean, from their shape, whatsoever artificer made them, or whether of earth, or of wood, or of metal. But, as I said, by the general consent of Writers, we must call him a Potter. Hesychius, Θηρίκλειος, κύλικος

* Lib. xvi. cap. 40. "Celebratur & Thericles nomine, calices ex tercbintho solutus facere toruo."

† Hi Plant. l. v. cap. 4.

ἥδος ἀπὸ Θηρίκλεις κεραμεύς. — Lucian*, Καὶ γηγενῇ πολλὰ; οἷα Θηρικλῆς ὤπια. — Etymologicon M. Θηρί λειον κύλικας ἦν λέγουσι, πρῶτος κεραμεὺς Θηρικλῆς ἐποίησεν, ὡς φησιν Εὐβούλος; ὁ τῆς μέσης Κωμωδίας ποιητής. The words of Eubulus †, whom he cites, are extant in Athenæus :

Καθαρώτεραν γὰρ τὸν κέραμον εἰργαζόμεν,

Ἦ Θηρικλῆς τὰς κύλικας, ἥνικ' ἦν νέος.

And again,

Ὡ γαῖα κεραμίτ', ἥσε Θηρικλῆς ποτε

Ἔτιόξε, κείλης λαγόνος εὐρύνας βάβος.

Now the next thing to be enquired, is the age of this Thericles; and we learn that from Athenæus: one witness indeed,—but as good as a multitude in a matter of this nature. “ This cup,” says he, “ was invented “ by Thericles the Corinthian Potter, who was contemporary with Aristophanes the Comædian †.” And, in all probability, he had this indication from some Fable of that Poet’s, now lost; where that Corinthian was mentioned, as one then alive. But all the Plays that we have left of his, are known to have been written and acted between the LXXXIX and xcvi Olympiads, which is an interval of xxxvi years. Take now the very first year of that number; and Thericles, with the cups that had their appellation from him, come above cxx years after Phalaris’s death.

[111]

But I must remove one objection that may be made against the force of this argument; for some ancient Grammarians give a quite different account why such cups were called Thericlean. Some derive the word Θηρίκλειος, ἀπὸ τῶν θηρίων, “ from the skins of beasts “ that were figured upon them § :” and Pamphylus the Alexandrian would have them called so, ἀπὸ τῶ θήρας κλονεῖν, “ because beasts were scared and frightened “ when, in sacrifices, wine was poured upon them,

* In Lexiphane, p. 960.

† Lib. xi. p. 471.

‡ Pag. 470. Κατασκευάσαι λέγεται τὴν κύλικα ταύτην Θηρικλῆς ὁ Κορίνθιος κεραμεύς, γεγόνως τοῖς χρόνοις κατὰ τὸν Κωμικὸν Ἀριστοφάνη.

§ Athenæus, p. 471.

“ out

“ out of those cups.” So I interpret the words of Pamphylus: ἀπὸ τῶν τὸν Διόνυσον τὰς θήρας κλονεῖν, σπένδοντα ταῖς κύλινξ ταύταις κατ’ αὐτῶν. For what is more ordinary in old Authors than the memory of that custom of pouring wine on the heads of victims?

“ Ipsa tenens dextra pateram pulcherrima Dido

“ Candentis vaccæ media inter cornua fudit.”

[112] Nor are wild beasts only called θήρες, but tame too ; such as bulls and cows ; as the Epigrammatist calls the Minotaure, ἄνθρωπον μυζοθήρα. I cannot therefore comprehend why the most learned Is. Casaubon would read σπειδοντα in this passage, and not σπένδοντα ; for, I own, I see little or no sense in it, according to his lection : — and as for the authority of the ancient Epitomizer of Athenæus, who, he says, reads it σπείδοντα, one may be certain it was a literal fault in that copy of him that Casaubon used ; for Eustathius, who appears never to have seen the true Athenæus, but only that epitome, reads it in his book σπένδοντα, and took it in the same sense that I now interpret it : — Ἡ δὲ θήρας κλονεῖ, σπένδοντι γὰρ κατ’ αὐτῶν κύλινξ τοιαύται *.

And now for these two derivations of the word Θηρίκλει⊙ was ever any thing so forced, so frigid, so unworthy of refutation ? does not common analogy plainly shew, that as from Ἡρακλῆς comes Ἡράκλει⊙ from Σοφοκλῆς, Σοφόκλει⊙, and many such like ; so Θηρίκλει⊙ must be from Θηρικλῆς ? besides so many express authorities for it, which I have cited before. To which I may add that of Julius Pollux †, Θηρίκλειον καὶ Κάνθαρον ἀπὸ τῶν ποιησάντων · and Plutarch, in P. Æmilium ‡, Οἷτε τὰς Ἀντιγονίδας, καὶ Σελευκίδας, καὶ Θηρικλείους ἐπιδεικνύμενοι, and Clemens Alexand. Ἐρρέτων τοίνυν Θηρίκλειοί τινες κύλικες, καὶ Ἀντιγονίδες, καὶ Κάνθαροι ; for one may justly infer, that both Plutarch and Clemens believed Θηρίκλειοι to be from Θηρικλῆς ; because they join them with those other cups : all which had their names from men that either invented or used them. And so says a manuscript note

* P. 1209. Iliad.

† Lib. vi. c. 16.

‡ P. 273.

upon

upon that passage of Clemens: *Θηρικλέιοι ἀπὸ Θηρικλῆς τῷ ἐφευρόντι*. So that, upon the whole, let Pamphylus and those other Grammarians help him as they can, our Sophist stands fully convicted, upon this indictment, of forgery and imposture.

THE Examiner has been frugal and sparing of his learning upon the former topics, that he might lay it out more profusely upon this third; at the same time that his friend Phalaris was exercising his liberality upon his physician Polyclitus.

And first he endeavours to cut the knot, that he may save the hard labour of loosening it. The text of Phalaris, as it stands now, is, *Καὶ ποτηρίων Θηρικλείων εὐύγη δέκα*. "What," says he, "if it was heretofore (*Ποτηρίων θ' Ἡρακλείων*) Herculean or "Herculean cups, instead of Thericlean; it is a very considerable alteration, and yet it salves all." I agree with Mr. B. that this alteration of his is every way "very inconsiderable." I will not contend with him about the unreasonable licence he takes in changing a plain reading against the authority of three MSS. and the whole set of Editions, purely to serve a turn. Another man perhaps would have disputed it; but I am willing to encourage criticism in every wellwisher. The only exception that I will now make against his emendation is this:— That there never was any sort or fashion of cups that were called Herculean.

P. 140.

[114]

It is true, Athenæus in his catalogue of cups reckons the Herculean (*Ἡρακλείων*); but he meant not that it was a species of cups of such a shape, so denominated from Hercules; but it was one single cup that Hercules made use of on a particular occasion. He tells us*, from Pisander, Panyasis, and Pherecydes, that when Hercules designed to go to Erythea, an isle in the Western Ocean, he forced the Sun to lend him his cup that he uses to sail in from West to East every night; and in that cup he passed over to Erythea. And he proves further, out of Stesichorus, Antimachus, and Æschylus, that there was such a fabulous tradition about the Sun's sailing over the ocean every night in a cup†. Apollodorus tells the same story‡, that the Sun lent Hercules his "golden cup" to sail in. "Antiqua historia est," says Macrobius, "Herculem poculo, tanquam navigio, vectum immensa maria transisse."

* Athen. p. 469.

† *Θιόλη, δέκα.*

‡ Apoll. lib. ii. p. 116.

The

The vulgar Editions read it *ventis*, instead of *vectum* *. “It is an old story, that Hercules passed over the sea in a cup, as if it had been a ship;”—and he names his authors, the same that Athenæus quotes, Panyasis and Pherecydes. But Athenæus adds, that according to Mimnermus, it is a “golden bed †,” and not a cup, that the Sun uses to sail in : nay, that if we believe the Author of Titanomachia, and one Theoclytus, it is “a cauldron ‡.” And thence it is that Alexander Ephésius says, Hercules sailed to Erythæa in a “brazen cauldron §.”

Χαλκίῳ δὲ λέγῃσι μέγαν διενύχαιο πόντον.

- [115] And so says Servius ||, and Albricus ¶ : but Euphorian denies this, and calls it “a brazen ship **,”

Χαλκίῃ ἀκάτῳ βεπληθείς ἐξ Ἐρυθείης,

if ἀκάτος in this place do not signify a cup in the fashion of a ship. Now, upon the whole, I conceive it is most evident that the Herculean was one single particular cup, used once only by Hercules upon extraordinary service; not imitated and multiplied into a sort or fashion, so as xx pair of such cups might be presented by Phalaris. It was so far from being a vulgar cup for domestic uses, that, as we have seen above, it is not known in writers what shape or fashion it was of, nor indeed whether it was a cup or no. This explication of Athenæus will perhaps seem new to the Examiner; but he will be satisfied it is the true one, if he pleases to take that Author whom he has abused and reviled so much, once more into his hand. Or, if authority goes further with him than bare reason, I have Eustathius to vouch for it; who, after he has set down this very passage of Athenæus, I mean out of his Epitome, concludes thus :—“So that the Herculean Cup is that “which is called also the Sun’s Cup ††.”

In the same manner Athenæus puts Νεστορίς, “the Nestorean,” in his catalogue of cups; not that there were a sort of cups of that name and fashion; but it was a particular cup of Nestor’s, described by Homer ‡‡.

Πὰρ δὲ δέπας περικαλλές, ὃ οἶκονεν ἢ γ’ ὃ γεραίος
Χρυσείοις ἤλοισι πεπαρμένον, &c.

* Macrob. Saturn. v. 21.

† Εὐνὴ χρυσῇ.

‡ Λέγῃσι.

§ Eustath. ad Dionys.

|| Serv. ad Æn. vii.

¶ Albr. xxii.

** Athen. Fr. Cas. p. 782.

†† Eust. ad Odyss. p. 359. Διὸ καὶ Ἡράκλειον δέπας λέγισθαι, τὸ καὶ Ἥλιον.

‡‡ Il. A. 631.

There

There were many disputes among the old Grammarians about the shape of this cup, which they gathered from Homer's account of it; and many Treatises were written upon the subject; which is a sure indication that it was not an uncommon use. Dionysius Thrax*, a Grammarian of great note, to shew his scholars the figure of it by a more sensible way than a verbal description, got a workman to make one in silver according to his directions, the metal being provided at the charge of his scholars. This, I presume, will convince the Examiner that no such cups, called "Nestorean," were then in fashion; and in truth, the *Ἡρακλειον* and the *Νεστωρίς* were words never heard of but out of the mouths of Grammarians. Athenæus, therefore, has not brought one single Author that used either of those names; nor has Pollux made any mention of them in his chapters "of Cups."

[116]

But Mr. B. will say, "Are not Heracleian cups mentioned in Cicero, among the wealth of Verres, which he had amassed together out of Sicily, the very place where the scene of these letters lay?" His words are "*Pocula duo quædam, quæ Heraclea nominantur*." This passage our Examiner met with in Salmasius's Notes upon Solinus; and perceiving that that great man did not approve this vulgar lection, he thus animadverts upon him:—"Salmasius," says he, "will not allow the present reading of *Heraclea*; but, like a true critic, without any authority, substitutes *Thericlea* in the room of it." He shews what class of critics himself is in, by this little insult upon a true one. But by what authority does our Examiner affirm that Salmasius did it "without any authority?" If he had but cast his eyes upon the most common Editions of Cicero, he would have seen there that two MS. copies have it "*Theridia*," and another "*et theridia*," which a man of the smallest acquaintance with Books will easily know to be for "*Thericlea*," *d* being put for *cl* in infinite places. And before Salmasius was born, this same correction was started by Gul. Canterus†; who says, some persons affirmed that the MSS. have it expressly *Thericlea*. Here, I suppose, is sufficient authority for substituting this reading. But the best authority is what I have newly laid before him, that there were no such cups called *Heracleian*; and if Cicero had meant such, he would have called them not *Heracleian*, but *Herculean*.

P. 146.
Ed. 2.

P. 147.

[117]

But Athenæus talks of a *κύπελλον* *Ἡρακλειανόν*; §; which the

* Athen. 469.

† Cic. iv. in Verrem.

‡ "Canterus Nov. Lect. v. 28. Nam in scriptis quidem libris Thericles se reperisse sunt qui asserunt."

§ Athen. apud Casaub. 782.

Examiner

- P. 146.** Examiner would interpret “ an Heracleian or Herculean bowl.” This objection therefore must be removed; and it will be done very easily. “ Some,” says Athenæus, “ call this bowl Heracleotick, from Hercules, who first used this sort in his expeditions *.” His way is, to set down the several opinions, though they be false and absurd, as the ridiculous derivation of Thericlean cups from *Θηρίων*, or *Θήρας κλονεῖν*, which we have spoken of above; and thus he has imparted to us that etymology of Heracleotic, though it be against all rules of analogy. But he has sufficiently intimated his own opinion, that they are called so from Heraclea, the town of their manufacture; and for the same reason they are called also Bæotic; because this Heraclea was in or near Bæotia. It is true, these cups had “ the Herculean knot †” wrought upon the ears of them; yet that did not give them their name: but it was put there because Heraclea, the town where the cups were made, had its original and name from Hercules; for this was Heraclea Trachin ‡, situate near the foot of Oëta, where Hercules was burnt. These bowls therefore were called Heracleotic from the place of their manufacture; as others upon the same account were called Rhodian, Syracusan, Chalcidic, *Δυκιεργαῖς*. So there was Heracleotic nuts, Heracleotic crabfish, so called from another Heraclea, a city of Pontus.

[118]

- Our Examiner being thus baffled in his alteration of Phalaris’s text, he now resolves to turn about, and try to maintain it as it now stands. Athenæus affirms, that Thericles lived in Aristophanes’s time: “ and he,” said I, “ in a case of history and philology, is a witness as good as a multitude.”
- P. 147.** The Examiner endeavours to ridicule the very expression, as far as his puerile jests can help him out. But methinks he might have remembered his Homer:—

Ἰντρος γὰρ ἀνὴρ πολλῶν ἀντάξιός ἄλλων §.

Or that Epigram upon Heraclitus || :

Εἰς ἑμὸν ἄνθρωπος τρισμύριοι —

“ One man to me is good as 30000.” Or the saying of Antimachus, “ Plato mihi unus est instar multorum millium ¶.” But for fear he should fall foul upon these Authors, as he has upon Manilius, and Laërtius, and others **, because he thought

* P. 500.

† *Ἡρακλῆϊος δεσμός*.

‡ See Athen. p. 500, & 461.

§ Iliad. A.

|| Anthol. iii.

¶ Cic. in Bruto.

** P. 28, 28, &c.

I had

I had an esteem for them, I will give him his own favourite Author Phalaris, who thus compliments one Epicharmus:— P. 32.
 “One such a man as you, is as much to me as all Sicily is*.”

The two next pages are spent in a “tedious insipid declamation” (they are his own words to a better Writer, Dion Chrysostom) about Athenæus’s not citing his Authors to shew the age of Thericles. The short of his speech is this, That he will not take Athenæus’s word for a single farthing, unless he get somebody to be bound for him. But there is one stroke in [110]
 it, of a more subtle turn than the rest, that shews the wonderful sagacity of our Examiner. Athenæus had made this Thericles contemporary with Aristophanes the Poet. This, says the Examiner, he had no downright witness of; but only he had never read, or did not then call to mind, any older Author that spoke of him. “For observable it is” (yes, I pray you, sirs, observe it) “that among the several quotations, in which he
 P. 140.
 “abounds on this head, there is none that runs higher than the age of that Poet.” Now certainly there was never such a sharp-sighted Observer, since the famous Lynceus saw through a mill-stone. Athenæus, when he enters upon this head, expressly declares that this Thericles lived in Aristophanes’s time; and yet “observable it is” that he quotes nobody that mentions him before Aristophanes’s time. Now, in my opinion, it had been much more *observable* if he *had* produced any testimony before the time of Aristophanes; for that would have been as flat a contradiction to what he had newly delivered, as our Examiner’s contradictions are to what the Editor of Phalaris says.

But, since Athenæus has so little credit with Mr. B. that he will not believe a word he says without a voucher, I will endeavour to produce a witness for him, — Eubulus the Comic Poet:—

Δίνιφα δ' ἔδεν σκεῦος ὑδατώποσι
 Καθαρώτερον γὰρ τὸν κέραμον εἰργαζόμεν,
 Ἡ Θηρικλῆς τὰς κύλικας, ἣν κ' ἦν νέος.

“I made,” says he, “the earthen ware purer than Thericles
 “did his cups when he was young†.” Those that know
 style and language will agree with me, that the last words,
 ἣν κ' ἦν νέος, must be referred to Thericles, and not be rendered in the first person, as the Latin Translator has mistaken [120]

* Ep. 98. Εἰς ἀπὸς ἰμοὶ τοιῦτος ἀπάσης ἐστὶ Σικελίας μέτρον.

† Athen. 471.

them :

them : and I take them to be an intimation that Thericles was alive when this play was acted; and that he was old then and past his work. This, I dare say, is the best and neatest explication that can be put upon the words, and therefore I believe it the truest; for if Thericles had been long dead before the age of Eubulus (so long as to be older than Phalaris) the Poet would not have added those words, "when he was young;" for how could he know then that Thericles lived so long, that he left off his trade, or at least did not work at it with his own hands, as the words imply? Thericles therefore, by this account, was an old man in the time of Eubulus, and flourished (κατὰ τὸν Ἀριστοφάνη) in Aristophanes's days; and this is remarkably confirmed by the testimony of Chronology; for Eubulus lived Olymp. c†, in the middle interval between the old and the new Comedy: and Plutus, the last of Aristophanes's Plays, was acted Olymp. xcvi, 4†; which is about x years before; so that the same man might be in his prime in Aristophanes's time, and decrepit in Eubulus's.

The Examiner has been so perpetually mistaken since his very first setting out, that I could wish, for a little variety, he would be once in the right; but I find he will not oblige me yet, for he falls into a new error in the very next paragraph. Athenæus's words are, "One Thericles, who lived about the time of Aristophanes, is said (or is reported) to have made this sort of cup†." It is the Examiner's own translation: and he makes this observation upon the place:—"That the [121] Author says, λέγεται is said, is reported; which is an expression of distrust; and that he was not satisfied of the truth of the report." Now to what purpose our Examiner remarked this, it is hard to understand; for that Thericles lived in Aristophanes's time, Athenæus speaks positively; witness Mr. B's own version of his words. And this is all we depended on Athenæus's credit for; for as to the other point, that Thericles invented the cups, we have ten witnesses at least, besides Athenæus. What service then can he do his cause from this λέγεται, though it really signified such a distrust? But this fancied distrust is another error of near affinity to the former; for λέγεται is so far from being a token of want of evidence, that it is principally used upon the con-

* Suid. v. ΕΥΒΟΥΛΟΣ.

† Schol. Vet. ad Plutum.

‡ Athen. 470. κατασκευάσκει δὲ λέγεται τὰ κύλικα ταύτην Θηρικλῆς, γεγονώς τοῖς χρόνοις κατὰ τὸν Ἀριστοφάνη.

trary account, when the generality of writers are agreed. When a single witness says a thing, he is commonly mentioned by name; but when the evidence is numerous, and cannot all be brought in, then they say *Λέγεται*, or *Φασί*. Even this passage under debate might have given the hint to the Examiner; for, after our Author had said *Λέγεται*, he brings three witnesses to that very point. But I will give him an instance of another Writer. *Λέγεται*, "it is said," says Laertius, "that as Pythagoras chanced to shew his thigh naked, it appeared to be gold*." The reason why he says *Λέγεται* here, when in other places he names his Author, is not the want of witnesses, but the abundance of them; so that it was needless to name particulars. And that this is true, it manifestly appears from the many Writers yet extant that affirm the same story: Apollonius, Plutarch, Lucian, Ælian, Porphyry, Jamblichus, Ammianus, &c. Again, says Laertius, *Λέγεται*, "Pythagoras is said to have advised his Scholars to say this verse every day when they came home†,

[122]

" Πῇ παρέστη, τίδ' ἔρεξα, τί μοι δεῖν ἔκ ἐτελέσθη."

Now the Authors that say the same thing, the Writer of the Golden Verses, Cicero, Porphyry, St. Hierom, are a full proof that this *Λέγεται* does not here import a defect of proof, but rather a superfluity of it.

I had said "Common analogy plainly shews, that as from Ἡρακλῆς comes Ἡράκλειος, from Σοφοκλῆς, Σοφόκλειος, and "many such like; so Θηρίκλειος must be from Θηρικλῆς." The Examiner acknowledges the derivation is true; but the argument, he says, is stark naught; "for let us try it," says he, "in another instance. As from Ἀπελλῆς comes Ἀπέλλειος, "so from Θαλῆς the philosopher must come Θάλειος, *virens*." Now, with the leave of our pert Examiner, this instance of his is no instance at all; for the analogy that I spoke of does not extend to all words that have termination in *ης*; but only to the compound words ending in *κλῆς*, from *κλέος*, *gloriæ*: as, besides the words I named before, Βαθυκλῆς, Βαθύκλειος; Ξενοκλῆς, Ξερόκλειος; Διοκλῆς, Διόκλειος; and so Φιλοκλῆς, Λαμπροκλῆς, Μεγακλῆς, Θεμισοκλῆς, &c. all form their adjectives in *κλειος*. Now let him give one single instance, if he can,

* Laërt. in Pythag. Λέγεται δὲ αὐτῷ τοῖς παραγυμνωθείας τὸν μηρὸν ὀφθῆναι χρυσῶν.

† Laërt. *ibid*.

L

of

of a word ending in *κλειος*, that does not follow this analogy; and then his boyish witticisms and doggeril rhimes, which he has spurted here, will come in more seasonably; but at present he only exposes himself, by breaking his unmannerly jests upon his own mistakes.

[123] But let Athenæus be as positive as he will that Thericles and Aristophanes were contemporaries, Mr. B. will confute him, out of his own words, *Καὶ μήποτε Ἀλεξίς ἐν Ἡσιόνη Θηρικλείῳ ποιεῖ τὸν Ἡρακλέα πινόυλα**; which he translates, "And does not Alexis introduce Hercules drinking out of a Thericlean cup?" Now our Examiner has committed a double error about this one sentence. First, he has not construed the words right; for *μήποτε* is not in this place a particle of interrogation, which is the most positive way of affirming; but, on the very contrary, it is a word of doubting, *fortasse*, "perhaps," or "it may be," that Alexis introduces. This the Examiner might have learnt in those very Dictionaries that he talks so much of; or in Budæus's Commentaries†, where several passages of Athenæus himself are cited to prove it. And indeed Athenæus could not be positive that Alexis meant the Thericlean cup; for the Poet's words are only these, as they now stand:

——Γενόμενος δ' ἔννης μόλις
 "Ἡτῆσε κύλην, καὶ λαβὼν ἐξῆς πυκνὰς
 ἔλκευ.—

But the true reading of them is rather thus:

——Γενόμενος δ' ἔννης μόλις
 "Ἡτῆσε κύλικα.

[124] "But at last, coming to himself, he called for a cup of wine." The very words *γενόμενος* and *μόλις* confirm the conjecture about *έννης*; for so Plutarch, *Τότε δὲ έννης γενόμενος*; and an Author in Suidas‡, *Ἐγερὸν έννης ἐγένετο*. And the last syllable in *κύλικα* was lost, because *καὶ* followed it. And so much by way of emendation; but, as I said, Athenæus could not be positive; for the whole stress lay upon the word *κύλικα*. Alexis, says he, introduces Hercules drinking in a chalice; and perhaps he meant the Thericlean; "For that the Thericlean was a *chalice*, Theophrastus is a plain witness§."

* Athen. p. 470.

† P. 910.

‡ Suid. v. Έννης.

§ Ὅτι δὲ κύλικε ἐστὶ Θηρικλείου, σαφῶς παρίστησι Θεόφραστος.

These

These are the very next words; and this is the true sense of that passage.

But, says Mr. B. "if Athenæus could suppose that Hercules and a Thericlean cup were brought upon the stage together, he must suppose too, that the Thericlean cup was as ancient as Hercules; or else it would have been absurd and ridiculous." Here is the second mistake of our Examiner; for Athenæus knew very well that the Writers of the Greek Comedies did not tie themselves so strictly to the rules of Chronology. He might have a thousand instances of it, which we cannot now come at; but there are enough yet extant to make the Examiner repent his rashness, in taxing so great an Author. Anaxandrides, in a play called Hercules (because Hercules was the chief person brought in upon the stage) mentions Argas the Musician, who was alive when the Play was acted*. The same Poet, in another Play, called Protesilaus, from the hero of that name that was slain by Hector, speaks of the same Argas, and Antigenidas, and Cephisodotus, three Musicians, and Iphicrates the Athenian General, and Cotys King of Thrace; all of them then living in the Poet's own time†. Diphilus the Comedian, in his Sappho, introduced Archilochus and Hipponax, as Gallants to that lady: though one of them was dead before she was born; and she dead before the other was born‡. Nay, Alexis himself, in his Linus, brings Linus upon the stage, instructing his pupil Hercules, and offering him books to chuse of§;

Ὀρφεὺς ἔνεστιν, Ἡσίοδος, Τραγῳδία,
Χοίριλος, Ὀμηρος, Ἐπίχαρμος, Συγγράμματα
Παντοδαπά —————

[825]

Orpheus, Hesiod, Tragedies, Choerilus, Homer, Epicharmus, and all sorts of Authors; but Hercules makes choice of one Simon's "Art of Cookery." Can we desire an instance more apposite, and more full against our Examiner? Here is the same Poet Alexis brings the same person Hercules with Epicharmus in his hand: and why might he not as well introduce him with a Thericlean cup in his hand?

But, besides all this, had we no such examples of this liberty of the Greek Comedians, we could still defend Athenæus against the insults of our Examiner; for he forgets that Hercules was a God, and consequently, in the Poet's creed, he ate and drank even in Thericles's time. And had not Hercules several temples? and were not cups frequently among the do-

* Athen. 638.

† Ibid. 131.

‡ Ibid. 599.

§ Ibid. 164.

naries presented to the gods? Nay, the Thericlean are expressly mentioned as donaries in the Acropolis at Athens*. Hercules therefore might have several Thericleans among his own plate; for what present could be more proper to such a fuddler as he was than a Thericlean, of the biggest fashion of cups, some of them holding above seven cotylæ, that is, five of our pints†?

[126] Nay, allow that Hercules was a hero only, and no god; even the heroes too might be introduced drinking in Thericles's ware; for they also had their temples and donaries, and they passed their time merrily, eating and drinking‡; and the mischief they were supposed to do (for they were thought to be very quarrelsome and dangerous) was attributed to their being so often in drink. But Hercules was particularly, and of them all, the most addicted to the juice of the grape§; so that he was commonly painted with his cup, and sometimes reeling and tumbling.

P. 153. But our Examiner makes yet another assault against Athenæus. That Author had said, Thericles was a Corinthian Potter; but Mr. B. will prove from his own words (which Athenæus's dullness did not suffer him to understand) that he was an Athenian Potter; if that invention was truly his. Lynceus Samius says, *Ῥόδιος ἀντιδημηργήσασθαι τὰς Ἡδυποτίδας πρὸς τὰς Ἀθηναίους Θηρικλείους*, "That the Rhodians wrought a "sort of cup, called Hedypotides, in imitation of the Thericlean, made at Athens||;" so Mr. B. translates it; but erroneously, as his manner is; for *ἀντιδημηργήσασθαι* is not to work "in imitation," but "in opposition." Now what will he infer from hence? That the Thericlean cups were invented at Athens? But the words do not imply it; but only that they were in great use and fashion at Athens, when Lynceus wrote this discourse; that is, a hundred years after Thericles's death. Now the cups might be invented at Coriuth; but, because they took mightily at Athens, they might afterwards be the best wrought there, and so be accounted an Athenian manufacture. But let us grant they were invented at Athens,—must Thericles therefore be an Athenian? A very precarious consequence; for he might be a Corinthian born, and yet be settled at Athens: for near half of the inhabitants there were strangers from other places; and the strangers ¶

* Polemon apud Athen. p. 472.

† Athen. 472.

‡ Athen. 46. Zenob. *Οἱ γὰρ ἥρωες κακῶν ἑτοιμοί, μᾶλλον ἢ εὐεργεταί.*

§ Macrobian Saturn. v. 21. || Athen. p. 469. ¶ Xenophon *Περὶ πόλεως*.

were

were commonly such as wrought in the manufactures*. In Demetrius Phalereus's time†, when the citizens were 21000, the μέτοικοι (strangers) were 10000. And where now is the [127] P. 154.
 "inconsistency and confusion" that our modest Examiner charges upon Athenæus? "Has he not reason to make the itch P. 157.
 "of opposing great names, upon very slight or no grounds,
 "a chief and distinguished mark of pedantry?"

The Examiner will still hang upon the cause; and if we will but allow that Thericles was an Athenian, he has found a very surprizing salvo to bring off the Epistles; "for then, perhaps, P. 153.
 "this Thericles was no Potter, but the Athenian Archon of
 "that name, Olymp. LXI, 4; and the cups might take their
 "name from him, because he first used them, as the Ἀντιγονίδαι
 "and Σελευκίδαι mentioned in Plutarch were so called from
 Antigonus and Seleucus, who delighted in those fashions.
 "And then, if Phalaris lived till Olymp. LXXII, 3, (as Mr.
 "Dodwell's opinion is) the Epistles may be an original still;
 "for, by this account, the name might be given to the Theri-
 "clean cups above XI. years before Phalaris's death."

What a parcel of suppositions are here, one in the neck of another! "If Thericles was an Athenian," which a good Author assures us he was not, "then he might not be a
 "workman, but a magistrate;" though no fewer than ten witnesses say expressly he was a workman:—Pliny, Hesychius, Lucian, Etymologicon, M. Scholion upon Clemens Alexandrinus, Pollux, Athenæus, Cleanthes, Theopompus, Eubulus; not one single evidence appearing against them. But suppose him to be a magistrate; "then suppose too that Mr. D's
 "notion is true;" but I have already considered that learned man's opinion; and Eusebius's computation is still as firm as ever. What a sorry crippled argument is here, even lame [128]
 upon all four! But there is a worse distemper in it still, either to be laughed at or pitied; I mean, that wretched and scandalous barbarism of Ἀντιγονίδαι and Σελευκίδαι. The words of Plutarch, which I had cited in my Dissertation, are, Οἱ τε τὰς Ἀντιγονίδας καὶ Σελευκίδας καὶ Θηρικλείας ἐπιδεικνύμενοι· which the Examiner having occasion to put into the nominative case, calls them Ἀντιγονίδαι and Σελευκίδαι (in both his Editions) as if the nominatives singular were Ἀντιγονίδης and Σελευκίδης. — The man that has a controversy with Mr. B.

* So Plutarch in his Life of Solon, Γεῖσθαι πολίταις ἐ δίδωσι πλὴν τοῖς φύγεσσι αἰφυγία τῇ ἰαυτῶν ἢ πανσίοις Ἀθήναζε μετοικιζομένοις ἐπὶ τέχῃ.

† Athen. p. 272.

must do the office of a schoolmaster, and teach him his declensions; for the cups are not to be called Ἀντιγονίδαι and Σελευκίδαι, but Ἀντιγονίδες and Σελευκίδες, from Ἀντιγόνις and Σηλευκίς. So Clemens Alex. *Οἱ ἡμέτεροι κύλικες καὶ Ἀντιγονίδες**, Athenæus: Σελευκίς, Ῥοδιάς, Ἀντιγονίς†, Pollux; Σελευκίδα καὶ Ῥοδιάδα. See Hesychius in Σελευκίς‡. Is not this now a formidable Writer, and born to be the terror and scourge of the Scaligers and Salmasiuses? It is to be hoped that henceforward he will not make so many awkward jests upon Lexicons and Dictionaries: any one of which upon this occasion might have done him good service.

The last effort upon this topic that Mr. B. makes for his Sicilian Prince, is a memorandum he gives his Reader, that this and all the other chronological arguments touch only those particular Epistles from whence they are taken. So that, should those Epistles be found spurious, yet the rest of the set may, "to his comfort," be genuine. What a passionate concern is here! who can find in his heart now to deprive the Gentleman of "his comfort?" I, for my part, whom he calls a man of "singular humanity, will reserve this point to some other Section towards the end of this Book, and let him enjoy his dear comfort as long as I can.

[129] And now, having exhibited these specimens of his learning, he takes the opportunity to shew his Reader a little of his temper. P. 156. "He assures them that I went no farther for ALL this learning about Thericlean cups than my Dictionaries, "and what one of those referred me to, Casaubon's Notes on "Athenæus." This he assured in his first Edition; but, in the second, he discovers, that I take some part of it from Salmasius; so that there he *assures*, that I went to my Dictionaries and Casaubon "for ALMOST ALL this learning." The Readers, P. 156. Edit. 2. without question, will allow that the Examiner's *assurance* is good that shall dare to *assure* two contrary things, and inconsistent with one another. A man that accuses at this rate, answers himself. But however, because it is such a matter of fact as I can give a direct reply to, I will shew him that piece of respect to return him an answer. He says I have taken some of it out of Salmasius: I answer directly, "I have not;" for I knew not then that Salmasius had said one word about it. Casaubon's notes, I own, I had seen; and I desire the Reader to see them too, that he may see the spirit of the Examiner. One main branch of what I said upon this

* Clem. Pædag. p. 69. † Athen. p. 497. 783. ‡ Pol. lib. vi. 26. head,

head, is a refutation of Casaubon. And did I gather out of Casaubon's Notes a refutation of himself? I wish I could truly own it; for the reputation of it would be the greater. And lastly, if this learning lay so very obvious, that, as Mr. B. says, "I went no further than Dictionaries for it," the greater is the shame for Him, that, when Phalaris was published, he was ignorant of such a common thing; for he neither translates the word *Θηρίκλεια* right, nor appears to have had any knowledge of the original of the name.

[130]

But now the storm begins to rise higher; "and I fall," he says, "upon Casaubon, against common gratitude, common sense, truth, decency, and reason." The occasion of all this outcry is this: Casaubon had endeavoured to correct the text of Athenæus, and alter *απένδογτα* into *σπεύδοντα*. But, in my Dissertation, I plainly shewed how that great man was mistaken; neither has the Examiner offered one word to justify his correction. What is it then that he is so incensed at? Casaubon had observed that the MS Epitomizer of Athenæus read it *σπεύδοντα*. "But one may be certain," said I, "it was a fault only in that copy of him that Casaubon used; for Eustathius, who appears never to have seen the true Athenæus, but only that Epitome, read it in his Book *σπένδοντα*." Here the Examiner swells and blusters; and indeed I must beseech the Reader to read over those pages of his: they are an original strain for civility and good manners, and yet he is all over mistaken in every paragraph of them.

P. 156,
157.

"It is certain," says he, "that Eustathius had seen Athenæus himself: and therefore Casaubon says only of him, that he did often use the Epitome*. And Dr. B. will not pretend even to have seen it, for it is unprinted to this day: so that he talks of a thing he knows nothing of, and can know nothing of but from Casaubon, and yet ventures to contradict him." Now to stop the Examiner a little in the career of his confidence. In the first place, that very copy of the Epitome that Casaubon used and possessed, among many other Books, was purchased of his Executors soon after his death, and deposited in the Royal Library: and I had the Book then in my hand, and newly consulted it (let the Examiner read this, if he can, without blushing) when I wrote this passage in my Dissertation; for suspecting from those instances which Casaubon had given, that Eustathius had only used the Epitome of Athenæus, without having the original,

P. 157,
158, 159.

[131]

* "Sæpe uti Epitome," p. 2.

I had the curiosity to examine near a hundred passages of Eustathius; and I perpetually found that he had taken them from the Epitome, and never from the true Author. Had I not then reason to say "That Eustathius APPEARS never to have "seen the true Athenæus?" Half of that Examination would have encouraged our Examiner into the positive style, that he had *certainly* never seen him.

For, without any grounds at all, he is positive of the contrary, though it "be a thing that he knows nothing of. It "is certain," "says he, "that Eustathius had seen Athenæus "himself." Why so? and whence has he this air of assurance? Because Casaubon says "He OFTEN followed the "Epitome." A very extraordinary inference; because he *often* followed the Epitome, therefore he *sometimes* followed the Original. If his new System of Logic teaches him such arguments, I will be content with the old ones. Mr. Casaubon had examined several passages of Eustathius, where he quotes Athenæus: and he cautiously says that he *often* uses the Excerpta; because perhaps he had no leisure or no desire to be satisfied further. I come after him, and examine many more passages of Eustathius; and I find that he appears to have [132] *always* followed the Excerpta. Both of our assertions are true, and consistent with each other; and yet the Examiner says "I P. 157. "contradict Casaubon:" but I would advise him to take one lecture more in his Logic, to know what contradiction is.

But I had said "It was a fault only in that copy of the "Epitome that Casaubon used." By a *fault only*, I meant, "it was only a fault;" nothing but an error of the Scribe, and a literal mistake. Here the Examiner argues against me, as if I had said "It was a fault in that only copy; and he presently falls into his old vein of civil language. Now this is just as good construction as if his own words in this very P. 157. page, "and therefore Casaubon says only of Eustathius," should be interpreted, "that he says it of Eustathius only." In which acceptation the thing is false; but a mistake of syntax is a small fault in our Examiner, after those great ones that have come before.

P. 158. The Examiner now "begs the Reader's pardon, while he "wanders a moment or two from his subject;" but I am very much mistaken if he will not find it the greatest difficulty to *pardon* himself. In my Latin Dissertation upon Johannes Antiochenus*, I had started a new observation about the measures of the Anapæstic verse. All the moderns before had

* Dissert. ad Joh. Antioch. p. 26.

supposed,

supposed, that the last syllable of every verse was common, as well in Anapæsts as they are known to be in Hexameters and others; so that in Poems of their own composing, the last foot of their Anapæst was very frequently a Tribrachys, or a Trochee, or a Cretic; or the foot ended in a vowel or an *m*, while the next verse began with a vowel or an *n*. In every one of these cases an error was committed; because there was no licence allowed by the Antients to the last syllable of Anapæsts; but the Anapæst feet ran on to the Paræmiac; that is, to the end of the set, as if the whole had been a single verse. This, I said, was a general rule among the Greek Poets; and even Seneca the Latin Tragedian (to shew he was conscious of this rule that I have now discovered) never ends an Anapæstic verse with a Cretic, as Buchanan, Scaliger, Grotius, &c. usually do; though sometimes indeed he does it with a Trochee, but even that "very seldom*," and generally at the close of a sentence. Even Envy itself will be forced to allow that this discovery of mine, if it be true, is no inconsiderable one. I am sure, had any man found it out before Buchanan and the rest had published their Poems, he would have had their hearty thanks for preventing those flaws in them. But see the hard fate of discoverers! At last the learned Mr. Boyle arises, and roundly tells the world, which had believed me for VIII or IX years, "That nothing can be falsèr, and fuller of mistake, than what I have there asserted." One would think, as he says, that a man that talks at this bold rate, "with such an air of self-sufficiency," had need to be "perfectly sure of his point." And is that the case of our Examiner here? has he "wandered from his subject" upon a sure and true scent? That the Reader shall presently judge of: but I must freely own to him before-hand, that some little disdain arises within me, to see myself employed in confuting such stuff as he has brought on this occasion.

[133]

P. 158.

"How durst you oppose," says he, "men of Grotius and Scaliger's character with such groundless assertions? For it is usual among the Greek Tragedians to end their Anapæsts with a Trochee or a Tribrach: and Seneca has done it at least forty or fifty times, where there is no close of the sense." The instances he gives are five out of Æschylus, and as many out of Seneca. The first from Æschylus is,

P. 159.

[134]

* "Semel atque iterum."

I. Th

I. Τὴν Διὸς ἀδλὴν εἰσοιχνεῦσι
Διὰ τὴν λίαν—

Prom. ver. 122.

And the IV. like it,

Τὸν δὲ χαλινοῖς ἐν πετρίνοισι
Χειμαζόμενον—

Ver. 565.

These two verses, as our Examiner imagines, are ended with Trochees, the last syllable being short. Now, methinks, a man of half the learning of Mr. Boyle, might have known that *σι* may be long here, by adding *ν* to it before a consonant, as Poets frequently do; *εἰσοιχνεῦσιν, πετρινούσιν*. This very Fable that Mr. B. quotes, might have taught it him;

Ἐπαιδαῖσι δέλξει τερέας.

Ver. 173.

Or that verse in Supplic.

Ὅμβροφόροις τ' ἀνέμοις ἀγρίας.

Ver. 36.

Or these of Aristophanes,

Ἰατρὸς ὦν καὶ μάντις ὥς φασὶ σοφός.

Plut [ver. 11.]

Ἄλσι διασμηχθεὶς ὄναϊ' ἂν ἔτοσί.

Nub. [ver. 1239.]

In all which places, and a hundred more that is easy to allege, the syllable *σι* is long; as if it was pronounced *εἰπαιδαῖσιν, ὁμβροφόροιςιν, ἀλσιν, and φασίν*. And these examples are all found in the middle of Verses, lest the Examiner should make any exceptions if they were in the end of Anapæsts.

II. But he may have better success with the next passage that he produces from Æschylus:

Εἰς ἄρθμὸν ἐμοὶ καὶ φιλότῃτα
Σπείδων—

Prom. ver. 191.

[135] Here too he supposes the last foot is a Trochee, because *τα* is a short syllable. But I must tell the learned Examiner, that *τα* in this place is long, because the next word *σπείδων* begins with two consonants. There is nothing more common among the Poets than this: as I will shew him, out of his own Author Æschylus, and that in the middle of Anapæstic verses:

Πῆμα γενάχω' πῇ ποτε μόχθων—

Prom. ver. 99.

Γένος ὠλέσατε πρυμνόθεν αὐθις.

Sept. Theb. ver. 1064.

Οὓς περὶ πᾶσα χθὼν Ἀσιήτης.

Pers. ver. 61.

Ἄλλὰ χθόνιοι δλίμῳνες ἀγνοί.

Ver. 630.

Have not *πῆμα, ὠλέσατε, and πᾶσα, and ἀλλὰ* their last syllables long here, because two consonants follow them? Has our Examiner forgot his Virgil too?

“ Terrasque,

“ Terrasque, tractusque maris, cœlumque profundum,
 “ Æstusque pluviasque, et agentes frigora ventos.
 “ Ferte citi flammam, date tela, scandite muros.”

III. Another of his instances out of Æschylus is,

— Στράμβοι δὲ κόνιν

Ειλίσσουσι —

Ver. 1084.

where he thinks the last foot of the verse is a Tribrachys, *νν* in *κόνιν* being short; but, under favour, I say it is an Anapæst, and the last of *κόνιν* may be long. So Homer,

Εὖρον ἔπειτ' Ὀδυσσεῖα Διὶ μῆτιν ἀτάλαντον.

Τῶν ἄρ' Ὀδυσσεύς ἦρχε Διὶ μῆτιν ἀτάλαντος.

And Aristophanes in his Ὀρνίθες

Ὅπότ' ἐξέλθοι Πριάμους τις ἔχων ὄρνιν ἐν τοῖσι τραγῳδοῖς.

IV. Let us see now the remaining example that he fetches out of Æschylus:

Νῦν δ' αἰθέριον κινυγμ' ὁ τάλας.

Ver. 156.

This also is one of his Tribrachs; for he is so well versed in Greek Poetry, that he believes the last syllable of *τάλας* is short. What says he then to this Anapæstic of the same Poet?

[136]

Τευξη κείνος δ' ὁ τάλας ἄγους. Sept. Theb. ver. 1071.

Will he make Tribrachs in the middle of the verse as well as at the end? And what says he to these of Euripides?

Καὶ μὴν ὁ τάλας ὅδε δὴ γείχεται

Hippol.

Απόλωλα τάλας οἶμοι, οἶμοι.

Or to those Iambics out of the same Play?

Οὐ τλητόν, ὅδε λεκτόν ὦ τάλας ἐγώ.

Ἀρῃεν ὡς ἵοικεν ὦ τάλας ἐγώ.

Or to these out of Sophocles?

Οἶμοι τάλας ἀλλ' ἔχ' ὁ Τυδείης γόνος.

Philoct.

Ἴησι δυσθρήνητον ὦ τάλας ἐγώ.

Antigone.

Οἶμοι τάλας ἵοικ' ἑμαυτὸν εἰς αἰράς.

Oed. Tyr.

Ὡς ὅδ' ἐχόντων

ὦ τάλας ἐγώ τάλας.

Ajace. [ver. 996.]

I believe there is scarce one Play extant, either Comedy or Tragedy, that does not afford us an instance against the Examiner. But let him find, if he can, “or his Assistant that “searches for him,” one single passage there that makes *λας* in *τάλας* to be short. Where had he his eyes then, or what was he thinking on, when he made this observation? Perhaps he might remember that verse of Theocritus:

“Ο,

Ὅς μοι δωδεκαταῖς ἄφ' ἧ τάλαις ἐδέποθ' ἦκει. Id. ii. 4.

for there indeed *τάλαις* is short. But surely such a learned Grecian would know that this was the Doric idiom, and not to be drawn into example where that dialect is not used; for the Dorians abbreviate even *ας* in the accusative plural, as the same Theocritus,

Βόσκειναι κατ' ὄρος, καὶ ὁ Τίτυρος αὐτὰς ἐλαύνει.

Τίτυρ' εἰμὶν τὸ καλὸν πεφιλαμένε, βόσκει τὰς αἴγας. Id. iii. 2.

[137] I have now gone over all the instances that the Examier has thought fit to produce out of the Greek Poets; and I must own that, when I look back upon them, I cannot think without some astonishment upon the hardness of this forward Writer, who, when he was utterly unfurnished of this part of learning, could venture so beyond his depth without any necessity. He has gone, as he says, "out of his way," to seek an occasion to expose himself; which was a needless ramble, for he can expose himself in every page without stirring a foot from his subject. And what provocation could He have to be meddling with Greek Anapæsts, who has shewn his ignorance of the most vulgar measures in Latin lambics? In the LXXXI Ep. of his Phalaris, he has thus translated a Greek distich:—

" Multo videtur satius, timentem nihil

" Futura fata, quam timentem, perpeti."

The first of which is a false verse, and betrays the skill of its Author; who, if he had been in the least sensible that his verse was lame, might have had another word (*metuentem*) ready at hand for him.

But our Examiner, not content to have lessened his reputation for verses by an unfortunate essay upon Æschylus, seems resolved to be prodigal of that little which is yet left him, and lose it all with playing the Critic upon Seneca's Tragedies.

I. His first attempt is upon a passage in Agamemnon :

" — Trucibus monstribus. Stetit imposita

" Pelion Ossa : pinifer ambos

" Pressit Olympus."

Agam. ver. 337.

[138] This he produces as an instance, that a Tribrachys may be the last foot of an Anapæstic verse; which supposes that he thought *imposita* had its last syllable short here; and consequently *imposita ossa*, in Mr. B.'s construction, are the nominative case. Now I would desire a small favour of him; that, if it be not too great a secret, he will acquaint us how he construes this passage.

passage. Is it "*Ossa imposita stetit Pelion?*" but the word *stetit* with an accusative after it, will be a very great rarity; or is it "*Ossa stetit imposita Pelion?*" but this *imposita* before an accusative will be a greater rarity than the other. Besides, if *imposita* be a Tribrachys at the end of the verse, then *ossa* will be a Trochee in the middle of the verse; which will not only be contrary to my new discovery about Anapæsts, but to all the old ones that ever were heard of. But one may suspect from this passage that Mr. B. has a particular Grammar made for his use, as well as a particular Logic. When he obliges the Public with it, we shall be ready to receive instruction; but till then, we shall take *imposita*, as every body before he arose understood it, to be the ablative.

" Stetit impositâ Pelion Ossâ " —

It has now been in the world about XVI whole centuries; and it is hardly to be believed that such an awkward construction has ever been put upon it before, except perhaps in some lower class at a Grammar School.

Of the four passages yet behind, which he cites as out of Seneca, no fewer than three are taken out of Hercules Oetæus, which is not a Play of Seneca's, as the learned Daniel Heinsius has proved fourscore years ago; so that the Examiner cannot cry out in his usual strain, that this is a paradox of mine.

[139]

V. There is *one* single example left then, out of Seneca's Medea, to confute me for asserting that he does it "once or twice." A very gentle and civil antagonist! though I must tell him, if he had brought six instances, and all of them legitimate ones, he hath only shewed his good-will to cavil and carp; for "*semel atque iterum*," ἀπαξ καὶ δις, are not strictly tied up to denote *twice*, and no more; they often signify *seldom*, as δις καὶ τρίς, "*bis terque, iterum atque tertium*," mean not *thrice* only, but *often*. Ten times therefore may be *seldom*, "*semel atque iterum*," if the whole number that they relate to be some hundreds or a thousand.

And now I have followed our learned Examiner "while he has been wandering from his subject;" and I leave him to reflect at his leisure how much honour he has acquired by this same ramble of his. It seems he, with his *fidus Achates*, sifted all that I had published in Latin; and he singled out this passage as the weakest place where he might make a successful attack; and the victory seeming to be worthy of a digression, he went out of his way to fetch it. But I suppose he may be sensible by this time "that it is not in every body's power to

P. 160.

" confute

“ confute me, that do but cast their eye on Seneca and the
“ Greek Tragedians.”

[140] A man that does not only “ cast an eye on,” but thoroughly reads the Books that he pretends to discourse of, would have been able to bring several seeming examples, where an Anapæstic is terminated with a Trochee, or a Tribachys, or a Cretic. This I was aware of when I published my observation, and yet I entered no caution about it to the Reader, but left the thing entirely to his own judgment and sagacity; supposing that, if he took notice of any such exceptions, he would be able of himself to give an account of them. But now because this observation of mine has been openly assaulted, and lest any body should think that not its own truth and solidity, but the weakness of the assailant, may be the reason of its holding out, I will here produce every single exception that I can meet with in the three Greek Tragedians, and Aristophanes, and Seneca, and shew they are all errors only, and mistakes of the copyers; and the very facility and naturalness of every correction will be next to a demonstration to an ingenuous mind, that the observation must needs be true.

1. Æschyl. Prom. ver. 279.

Καὶ νῦν ἐλαφρῶ ποδὶ κραιπνοσύνῳ
Θῶκον προλιπῆς —

Here is a Cretic terminates the verse; and if the reading be allowed, it plainly proves against me that the last syllable is common: but we must correct it, *κραιπνόσυνον*, with a single σ, and then it is an Anapæst. The Poets use either the single or double consonant, as their measures require. Hesychius, *Αὐτόσυνος, αὐτοκέλευτος, Σοφοκλῆς Σκυρίους.*

2. Æschyl. Eumen. ver. 1008.

Πρὸς φῶς ἱερὸν τῶνδε προπομπὸν
Ἴτε, καὶ σφαγίων τῶν δ' ὑπὸ σέμναν
Κατὰ γῆς σύμεναι, τὸ μὲν αἰτίριον
Χώρας κατέχευεν —

[141] The first verse here ends with a Trochee, and the third with a Cretic; both of which are seeming instances against my assertion. But in the first verse we must read *προπομπῶν*, as the learned Mr. Stanley* guessed from the sense of the place; and his conjecture is now confirmed by the measure of it.

* Stanley, in Not. “ Forsan προπομπῶν.”

And in the third verse, for ἀτήριον, I correct it ἀτηρὸν, which is a word of the same signification, and of more frequent use than the other: witness Æschylus himself:

Δυσχείμερόν γε πείλαγ' ἀτηρᾶς δῆς. Prometh. ver. 735.

3. Sophoc. Elect. ver. 112.

Σεμναίτε θεῶν παῖδες Ἑριννύες
Τὸς ἀδίκως θνήσκοντας ὀρᾶτε.

Here again is a Cretic in the close of the first verse; but it will be a Dactyl if the second verse be read as it ought to be, without τὸς:

Ἀδίκως θνήσκοντας ὀρᾶτε.

It is the Versus Paræmiacus, which always comes at the end of a set of Anapæstics; and there the Trochee in ὀρᾶτε is right and lawful.

4. Soph. Antig. ver. 129.

Ὑπερεχθαίρει καὶ σφᾶς εἰσιδὼν.

This Cretic foot, εἰσιδὼν, is an error of the copyer, instead of the Anapæst, εἰσιδών.

5. Soph. Philoct. in fine.

Χωρῶμεν νῦν πάντες ἀολλέες
Νύμφαις ἀλυσίαις ἐπευξάμενοι.

This Cretic too will become a Spondee by the easy and slight alteration of ἀολλέες into ἀολλεῖς, which is the true reading.

6. Eurip. Medea, ver. 1087.

Παῦρον δὲ γέν' ἐν πολλαῖσιν
Εὐροῖς ἀν' ἰσως —

Here is a Trochee in the end of a verse; but if we correct it πολλαῖσιν γ', it will then be a Spondee, as it ought to be.

7. Ibid. ver. 1103.

[142]

Ἐτι δ' ἐκ τέτων, εἴτ' ἐπὶ φλαύροις,
Εἴτ' ἐπὶ χρηστοῖς μοχθῶσι, τόδε
Ἔστιν ἄδηλον.

The middle verse here, as it is vulgarly read, is an instance against me; but the measures ought to be altered and distinguished thus: —

Εἴτ' ἐπὶ χρηστοῖς
Μοχθῶσι, τόδ' ἔστιν ἄδηλον.

Where

Where the last verse now is a Parœmiac; and the little verse, called the Anapæstic Basis, commonly comes before it.

8. Ibid. ver. 1405.

Ζεῦ τὰδ' ἀκνείς, ὡς ἀπελαινόμεσθ'.

This Cretic in the close is easily cured, by reading ἀπελαινόμεσθ'.

9. Ibid. ver. 1413.

Οὐδ' μή ποτ' ἐγὼ φύσας ὠφελον
Πρὸς σὺ φθιμένους ἐπιδίσθαι.

Correct it ὄφελον in the first verse, and then the Cretic will be an Anapæst, as it should be.

10. Eurip. Hippol. ver. 257.

Πολλὰ διδάσκει γὰρ μ' ὁ πολὺς βίος,
Χρὴν γὰρ μερίας εἰς ἀλλήλας, δεῖ.

Here again is a Cretic in the first verse: but the word γὰρ there is superfluous, as the very sense evinces; for this sentence is not given here as a reason of the other that precedes it, as it must be, if γὰρ be allowed for a true lection. I correct it, therefore,

Πολλὰ διδάσκει μ' ὁ πολὺς βίος.

and I do not question but men of judgment will subscribe to the emendation.

[143]

11. Eurip. Troad. ver. 781.

Λαμβάνετ' αὐτὸν, τὰ δὲ τοιαῦτα χρὴ
Κηρυκεῖν, —

A small change of a word, by reading it τὰ δὲ τοιάδε χρὴ, will substitute an Anapæst in the place of the Cretic.

12. Aristoph. Nub. [ver. 915.] page 106.

Γνωσθήσῃσι πότε 'Αθηναίοισιν,
Οἷα διδάσκεις τὸς ἀνοήτους.

If we add γ' to the end of the first verse, this little flaw will be healed.

There, I believe, are all the verses in the Four Poets of the Greek Stage, that are exceptions to my observation about the measure of Anapæsts; or, if perhaps I have overlooked one, I dare engage before-hand, that it may as easily be corrected as these that I have noted. But if the Examiner thinks fit

Et to "cast his eye" again, to search for more that he thinks may have escaped me: I would advise him to take care that his instances be not of the same stamp with those he has brought already; for it is good to understand a matter first, before we pretend to confute it.

As for Seneca: — among all the Plays that judicious persons suppose to be his, I have not once observed a Tribrachys, nor a Cretic, at the end of an Anapæstic; nor have I met with a Trochee, without a pause or close of the sense after it, except in these two places: —

Herc. Fur. ver. 170.

"Fluctuque magis mobile vulgus.

"Aura tumidum tollit inani."

Medea, ver. 384.

" — Spargeret astra Nubesque ipsas —"

These two, I believe, are the only examples: and had I not [144] reason then to say that "semel atque iterum," once or twice only he made use of a Trochee? It is true, there may be an instance or two where a verse ends in a long vowel, and the following begins with another vowel, as

Thyest. ver. 946.

"Pingui madidus crinis amomo

"Inter subitos stetit horrores."

But in this case the measure is right, and agreeable to our observation; only the vowels must be supposed to stand and to be pronounced without a Synalæpha, as they often are in Virgil:

"Glauco, et Panopeæ, et Inoo Melicertæ.

"Nereïdum matri, et Neptuno Ægeo."

Upon the whole then, there is not *one* true and lawful exception in all the Greek Poets; and but *two* in the genuine pieces of Seneca. But the writers that came after him degenerated more from their Greek masters, and did not so strictly observe the measures that the rules of their art prescribed to them; for in the tragedy Agamemnon, this measure is four times broken*; and in Hercules Oetæus, six times†; and in Octavia, no less than eleven‡: which may pass for a new argument, that Seneca is not the author of them. But if one cast his eyes upon Buchanan's pieces, or Scaliger's, or Grotius's,

* Agam. ver. 79, 89, 356, 380.

† Herc. Oet. ver. 181, 594, 1210, 1282, 1876, 1988.

‡ Octav. ver. 27, 62, 93, 289, 306, 315, 318, 331, 336, 809, 899.

or indeed of any of the moderns (for none were aware of this observation) he will not find ten lines together where this measure is not violated; which I take for an infallible demonstration, that it was design and not mere accident that kept the antients from breaking it.

[145] To put an end therefore to this long debate about the The-riclean cups. If the Examiner's cavils against Athenæus are all fully and seriously answered; — if his quirks and witticisms upon me are all grafted upon his own mistakes; and, by being falsely applied to another, become "true jests" upon himself; — and if "his wandering from his subject," to seek an occasion of refuting me, has proved a very unfortunate excursion, and sent him back with loss and disgrace: — if this, I say, be the issue of this present Section, I conceive, there appears no good reason as yet, why I should repent of my judgment about Phalaris's Epistles.

IV.

IN the LXXXV Epistle, he boasts of a great victory obtained over the Zancleans: Ταυρομενίτας καὶ Ζαγκλείας συμμαχήσας Λεοντίνοις εἰς τέλος νενίκηκα but the very preceding Letter, and the XXI, are directed to the Messenians, Μεσσηνίοις, and the city is there called Μεσσήνη and in the First Epistle he speaks of Πολύκλειτος ὁ Μεσσήνη. Here we see we have mention made of Zancleans and Messenians, as if Zancle and Messana were two different towns. Certainly the true Phalaris could not write thus; and it is a piece of ignorance inexcusable [146] in our Sophist, not to know that those names belonged to one and the same city at different times. "Messana," says Strabo*, "which was before called "Zancle." See also Herodotus†, and Diodorus‡, and others. Perhaps it may be suspected, in behalf of these Epistles, that this change of name was made during those XVI years of Phalaris's Tyranny; and then, supposing the LXXXV Letter to be written before

* Lib. vi. Μεσσήνη, Ζάγκλη πρότερον καλεμένη.

† Lib. vii. Ζάγκλην, τὴν ἐς Μεσσήνην μεταβαλῶσαν ἑνὸς ὀνόματος.

‡ Diod. iv. Ζάγκλης, οὗν δὲ Μεσσήνης ὀνομαζομένης.

the

the change, and the other three after it, this argument will be evaded; but Thucydides will not suffer this suspicion to pass, who relates "That the Zanclæans were " driven out by the Samians and other Ionians that " fled from the Medes," which was about Olymp. LXX, 4. " and that, & πολλῶ ὕστερον, not long after " (perhaps about the time of Xerxes's expedition into Greece, Olymp. LXXV, 1.) " Anaxilaus, King of Rhegium, " drove the Samians themselves out, and called the " town Messana, from the Peloponnesian Messana, " the country of his ancestors." The first part of this account is confirmed by Herodotus*; and, agreeably to these narratives, Diodorus† sets down the death of this Anaxilaus, Olymp. LXXVI, 1, when he had reigned XVIII years. Take now the latest account of Phalaris's death, according to St. Hierom, and above LX years intervene between that and the new naming of Zancle; so that, unless we dare ascribe to the Tyrant a spirit of vaticination, we cannot acquit the Author of the Letters of so manifest a cheat. [147]

But I love to deal ingenuously, and will not conceal one testimony in his favour, which is that of Pausanias‡, who places this same Anaxilaus of Rhegium about CLXXX years higher than Herodotus and Thucydides do, and tells the story very differently: that he assisted the refugees of Messana in Peloponnesus, after the second war with the Spartans, to take Zancle in Sicily, which thereupon was called Messana, Ol. XXIX. " These things," says he, " were done at the " XXIX Olympiad, when Chionis the Spartan won the " Olympic race the second time, Miltiades being " Archon at Athens §." Now, if this be true, we must needs put in one word for our Sophist, that Phalaris might name the Messenians without pretending

* Lib. vi. cap. 23.

† Lib. xi. p. 37.

‡ Messen. p. 184.

§ Ταῦτα δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς Ὀλυμπιάδος ἐπαύλει τῆς ἐνάτης καὶ ἑκοστῆς, ἣν Χίων ἐκεῖν τὸ δεύτερον ἔνικα, Μιλτιάδης παρ' Ἀθηναίων ἀρχόντων.

to the gift of prophecy. Cluverius indeed * would spoil all again, for he makes it a fault in our copies of Pausanias, and for *εικοστής* the xxix Olymp. reads *ἑξήκοντος* the lxix, which is too great a number to do
 [140] our Author any service; but we will not take an advantage against him from a mistake of Cluverius; for, without question, the true lection is *εικοστής*, the xxix; because the time of the Messenian war agrees with that computation, and not with the other; and the ancient Catalogue of the Stadionicæ puts Chionis's victory at that very year †. So that if Pausanias's credit is able to bear him out, our Author, as to this present point, may still come off with reputation; but, alas! what can Pausanias do for him, or for himself, against Herodotus and Thucydides, that lived so near the time they speak of?—against those other unknown Authors that Diodorus transcribed?—against the whole tenor of History, confirmed by so many synchronisms and concurrences, that even demonstrate Anaxilaus to have lived in the days of Xerxes and his Father, when Theron, and not Phalaris, was (*Μένανχος*) Monarch of Agrigentum ‡? Nay, though we should be so obliging, so partial to our Sophist, as for his sake to credit Pausanias against so much greater authority, yet still the botch is incurable; it is running in debt with one man to pay off another; for how then comes it to pass that
 [140] the Messenians, in another Letter, are in this called Zancleæans, which, by that reckoning of Pausanias, had been an obsolete forgotten word a hundred years before the date of this pretended Epistle.

THE main controversy in this Section, between the learned Mr. Boyle and me is, — Whether Pausanias, who stands alone, or Herodotus, Thucydides, and others, are to be followed in the story of Anaxilaus Tyrant of Rhegium? Mr.

* Sicil. Antiq. p. 85.

† Euseb. Scalig. p. 39. Ὀλυμπιάς εἰκοστή ἡνάτη· Χίωνος Λάκων γάδιον. Τρι-
 ακοστή. ὁ αὐτὸς τὸ δεύτερον.

‡ Herodot. lib. vii. p. 438.

Boyle says " he has Ubo Emmius, Lydiate, Scaliger, Petavius, P. 131.
 " and Meursius, on his side," (all of them great names in the
 commonwealth of Learning) " besides half a dozen more that
 " he will throw into the scale the next time he and I talk toge-
 ther." Hitherto, as I think, he has had nobody on his side;
 and yet his style has been as pert and positive as if he carried
 demonstration in every sentence. No wonder then, that, in
 this Section, where he is so powerfully backed, his bold air
 and his scornful language rise so much the higher; but this I
 easily neglect and forgive; it is my business now to shew my
 reasons which oblige me to dissent from those great men that
 have followed Pausanias: and the Examiner's cavils and excep-
 tions shall be all considered in the rear.

I. In the first place, therefore, I will prove that Pausanias
 and the rest do all mean the same person; the only difference
 being about the time when he lived, and some circumstances of
 his story; for Pausanias's Anaxilas was " Tyrant of Rhegium *,
 " and he besieged and took Zancle †; and on that occasion [150]
 " the name of Zancle was changed into Messana ‡." And so
 the Anaxilas of Thucydides was Tyrant of Rhegium §, " and
 " took Zancle, and called it Messana from the country of his
 " ancestors ||." These circumstances are a plain demonstra-
 tion that Pausanias and Thucydides speak of one and the same
 man; for it is incredible that there were two Anaxilases Ty-
 rants of Rhegium, and that both of them took Zancle; and it
 is impossible that both of them should first name the town of
 Messana.

And then the Anaxilas of Herodotus is the same person
 that Thucydides and Pausanias speak of; for Thucydides's
 Anaxilas took Zancle " not long after the Samians ¶," who had
 fled from the Medes, settled there; and Herodotus's Anaxilas
 was then Tyrant of Rhegium " when the Samians fled from
 " the Medes, and was the man that persuaded them to settle
 " at Zancle **;" and " He had a servant and a steward called
 " Micythus, the son of Choerus ††;" but the same man was
 servant too to the Anaxilas of Pausanias, that cites Herodotus
 to witness it ‡‡. This too is a clear argument that Pausanias
 in both places means one and the same Anaxilas §§.

* Paus. p. 133. Ἐννεάμιστον μὲν Ῥηγίῳ. p. 175. Ῥηγίῳ τυραννήσας.

† P. 134.

‡ Ibid.

§ Ῥηγίῳ τύραντος, Thuc. p. 114.

|| Ibid.

¶ Οὐ πολλῷ ὕστερον, Thuc. ibid.

** Herod. p. 341.

†† Her. p. 440.

‡‡ Paus. p. 175.

§§ P. 133, 175.

The Anaxilas too in Diodorus is the very same that is mentioned by Herodotus and Pausanias; for he also was "Tyrant of Rhegium and Zancle; and had a steward called Micythus, the guardian of his children*."

[151] Macrobius says, that Anaxilas, Tyrant of Rhegium, who "built Messana in Sicily, made Micythus his servant a trustee for his sons, till they were of age to come to the government†." So that this too is the same person that is spoken of by the others.

"Among the Sicilian Tyrants," says Justin, "Anaxilas was as eminent for his justice as the others for their cruelty‡; and he left his sons in their minority under the tutelage of Micythus his servant." Here again is the very same person. Stobæus gives us a saying of Anaxilas, Tyrant of Rhegium, "That to be never outdone in beneficence, was a more happy thing than to wear a crown§." This is the same that Justin speaks of, as it appears from the character of his justice.

In the Scholiast of Pindar we are told too of one "Anaxilas, the Tyrant of Rhegium and Messana||," who must needs be the same with him that Thucydides, and Diodorus, and Herodotus mention, because the time of Tyranny exactly agrees. There is mention there of a son of his, called Cleophron¶.

Dionysius Halicarnassensis says, "That one Anaxilas seized the castle of Rhegium, and so became Tyrant there; and left the government to his son Leophron**;" which is a clear intimation that he means the same person that the Scholiast of Pindar does; for Cleophron in the Scholiast is the same that is here called Leophron. Justin too mentions this "Leophron, the Tyrant of Rhegium††;" so that it seems that the name in the Scholiast should be corrected from these two Authors.

[152] Aristotle tells us "That the government of Rhegium was once an Oligarchy, and was changed into a Tyranny by Anaxilaus‡‡:"—and this was the same Anaxilaus with him in Dionysius; for he too had not the Tyranny from his father by succession, but usurped it, by seizing the citadel.

* Diod. 37. ὁ Πηγίς καὶ Ζάγκλης τύραννος, & p. 50.

† Macrob. Saturn. i. p. 203.

‡ Just. iv, 2. "Anaxilaus justitia eum cæterorum crudelitate certabat."

§ Stob. Sermon. xlv. Τυραννίδος μακαριώτερον, τὸ μηδὲποτε ἐνερχέσθαι νικηθῆναι.

|| Pyth. i. & Pyth. ii. 'Αναξίλας Πηγίς καὶ Μισσηνῆς τύραννος.

¶ Pyth. ii. 'Αναξίλας καὶ Κλεόφρων ὁ τότε παῖς.

** Excerpt. Vales. p. 539. Λεόφρωνι τῷ πατρὶ.

†† Just. xxi, 3. "Leophron Rheginorum Tyrannus."

‡‡ Polit. 6. 'Εν Πηγίῳ ἐξ ἀνταρχίας εἰς Ἀναξίλας τυραννίδα.

And lastly, Heraclides says " That the Rhegians were formerly an Aristocracy, till Anaxilas the Messenian made himself Tyrant there*" which shows him to be the person already mentioned by Diquysius and Aristotle.

Thus, I conceive, I have made it clear and beyond all rational doubt, that all these Authors mean one and the same man, Anaxilaus the Tyrant of Rhegium and Messana; for all their testimonies are here linked one to another by some certain circumstance and characteristic that specifies and determines him to be the same person.

II. In the next place I proceed to enquire about the age that he lived in; and I am very much in the wrong if it will not presently appear that Anaxilas was alive, not Olymp. xxix, as Pausanias says, but near cc years after it, in the reigns of Darius and Xerxes.

First, Herodotus gives a particular account†, that when Miletus was sacked by the Persians in Darius's time (about Olymp. lxx, 3.) the Zanclæans invited the remainder of the Milesians to come and plant themselves in Sicily, at a place called Calacta. The Milesians accept the offer; and taking the Samians to be partners with them, set sail for Sicily; but by the way they touch at Locri in Italy, where Anaxilas, Tyrant of Rhegium, hearing of their design, persuades them to quit the thoughts of founding a town at Calacta, and to seize upon Zau- cle, a brave city, ready built to their hands; for it happened that at that juncture the Zanclæans were employed abroad in besieging some other town, and had left their own without defence. The Samians and Milesians take his advice, and possess the empty city without opposition. [153]

And the substance of this whole narrative is confirmed by Thucydides, who expressly says " That the Zanclæans were dispossessed of their city by those Samians and other Ionians, that fled from the Medes‡;" that is, after the destruction of Miletus, Olymp. lxx, 3. The same is intimated too by Aristotle, where he says " That the Zanclæans, permitting the Samians to dwell with them, lost their own city§." But Thucydides goes on, and informs us " That not long after, these Samians themselves were beat out of Zaucle by Anaxilas, Tyrant of Rhegium, who planted a new colony there, a medley of several nations, and named the city Messana, from Mes-

* In Polit. *Ἀριστοκρατικὴν πολιτίαν.*

† Herod. vi. 22, 23.

‡ Thuc. vi. p. 414.

§ Arist. Polit. v.

" sana in Peloponnesus, whence his ancestors were derived*." Now this last particular is not touched upon by Herodotus, but only the former, that had happened *not long* before it; neither is there any inconsistency, as the Examiner imagines, in the accounts of these two Authors.

[154] We have lost those Books of Diodorus's Annals, where these actions ought to be recorded; for what is extant of them commences at the expedition of Xerxes, Ol. LXXV, 1. But, however, we have enough of him preserved to demonstrate what side he was of; for he places the death of this same Anaxilas at Ol. LXXVI, 1 †; and says that he had reigned XVIII years, that is, from Olymp. LXXI, 3. This is positive and full against Pausanias's reckoning. It is true there is a seeming disagreement between Diodorus and Herodotus; for the latter calls him Tyrant at the time of his congress with the Samians, which is supposed to be a year or two before Ol. LXXI, 3; but if the number in Diodorus be not an error of the Copyer, we may compound the difference thus: That Herodotus might call him Tyrant, because he knew he was so afterwards, though at that time he was only a leading man, and had not actually seized the government.

When Anaxilas advised the Samians to set upon Zancle, one Scythes was at that time Tyrant of the Zancleans ‡. Now the age of this Scythes, and consequently of Anaxilas, is well known by his story; he was kept a prisoner at Inycum, a Sicilian town §; but made his escape into Persia, and there lived in the court of Darius, the son of Hystaspes; and having got leave to make a visit to Sicily upon a promise to return when his affairs were dispatched, he was as good as his word; and was much esteemed afterwards by the King for his honesty and veracity; but Pausanias's date is above a hundred years before this Darius was born.

[155] Anaxilas married Cydippe, the daughter of Terillus, Tyrant of Himera ||, who was driven out of his government by Theron of Agrigentum, and fled for succour to Carthage; and Anaxilas, endeavouring the restoration of his father-in-law, invites Hamilcar, the Carthaginian General, to make a descent upon Sicily, and gives him his sons to be hostages for his fidelity ¶. Upon these invitations Hamilcar comes with a mighty fleet, and having landed them at Himera, was entirely

* Οὐ πολλῶν ὕστερον.

† Diod. p. 37.

‡ Herod. vi, 23.

§ Ibid. vi, 24. Ælian. Var. Hist. viii, 17.

|| Herod.

¶ Herod. Diod. &c.

routed

routed by Gelo the Syracusian, at the very same time that Xerxes was beat by the Greeks. All Historians are agreed upon the year when this action was done, which is almost two whole centuries after Olymp. xxix. Even Pausanias himself affirms that this Gelo got the government of Syracuse, Olymp. lxxii, 2; and enjoyed it at the time of Xerxes's expedition*.

When the Samians invaded Zancle, a great agent in that affair was Hippocrates, Tyrant of Gela; for he betrayed the Zancleans his allies, and shared the booty with the Samians†. But we know Hippocrates's time from one certain circumstance among many others, that the famous Gelo, afterwards Monarch of Syracuse, whom we have just now spoken of, was master of his horse, and afterwards succeeded him in the government of Gela‡.

Our Anaxilas had war with the Locrians of Italy, and was resolved to extirpate them, had not Hiero, Tyrant of Syracuse interposed. This is intimated by Pindar, who lived at the very time, in two Odes to Hiero; but the Scholiast, who is a very credible Writer, says it expressly§; and he adds, that one of Hiero's wives was Anaxilas's daughter; and that Epicharmus, in a play of his, called "The Islands," relates how Anaxilas had a design to ruin the Locrians, and was hindered by Hiero||. What can be said against so clear and convincing a testimony? Epicharmus lived in Hiero's court; he tells a thing done within his own memory; and he might be personally acquainted with Anaxilas, whom we are speaking of. Now Pausanias himself, as well as other Historians, declares that Hiero was contemporary with Xerxes¶; and that Epicharmus was contemporary with Hiero**, is as certain as the other.

[166]

Aristotle tells a pleasant story of Simonides, the Lyric Poet††; that when one that had got the prize at Olympia with his Chariot of Mules, offered him a small fee to make an ode upon his victory, he pretended he would not disgrace his Muse by so mean a subject as Mules; but when the person advanced a great price, he could presently call them, not Mules, but "the Daughters of Mares."

Χαίρετ' ἀλλοπρόδων θύγατρες ἵππων.

* Paus. p. 186 & 272.

† Herod. vi, 23.

‡ Herod. vii, 154. Timæus apud Schol. Pindari Nem. ix.

§ Pind. Schol. ad Pyth. i. & ii.

|| "Ὅτι δὲ Ἀναξίλας Λευκὸς ἐβίβησεν ἄρδην ἀπολίσσαι, καὶ ἐκαλύθη πρὸς Ἴωνος, ἱεροῦ καὶ Ἐπίχαρμου ἐν Νάσονι." ¶ Paus. p. 272.

** Marm. Arund. &c.

†† Arist. Rhet. iii, 2.

Aristotle

Aristotle indeed does not say who it was that had won the prize; but his Scholar Heraclides does. "When Anaxilas," says he*, "the Messenian, the Tyrant of Rhegium, had got the victory with his Mules at Olympia, he gave a treat to the spectators; and Simonides made a copy of verses upon his victory:

"Χαίρετ' ἀελλοπόδων θυγατέρες ἵππων."

and, in memory of this prize, as the Antiquaries suppose, some of the coins of the Messenians† have on their reverse an Ἀπὴν, or chariot drawn by Mules‡. Now the age of Simonides can never agree with Pausanias's date, Olymp. xxi; for he was not born till Olymp. lv, 3, as we have it under his own hand§; but it exactly hits with the other reckoning, for he was in mighty esteem in Greece during the whole reign of Anaxilas, from Olymp. lxxi, 3, to Olymp. lxxvi, 1.

[157] Again, we have another argument from this Olympian victory, which will confute the account of Pausanias, even from his own words; for the Ἀπὴν, "the chariot that was drawn with Mules instead of Horses, was not used at the Olympics till Olymp. lxx," as Pausanias confesses||; "and it was cried down again, Olymp. lxxxiv." And "the first," he says, "that won the prize at this match, was one Thersias a Thessalian¶." So that Anaxilas's victory cannot possibly be dated before Olymp. lxxi. And besides Pausanias, we have another very good authority for the first usage of the Ἀπὴν for Pindar, it seems, whether he was less scrupulous than Simonides, or else as well fee'd as he, has left us two odes upon victories by Mules**; and the first victory was gotten Olymp. lxxxii††; and there the Scholiast informs us, Ὅτι Ἀπὴν ἐστὶν ἄρμα ἐξ ἡμίονων ζευχθέν· εἰσθισμένοι δὲ ἵπποις ἀγωνίζεσθαι, Ἀσανδράτος ἐπετήδευσε καὶ ἡμίονοις ἀγωνίζεσθαι χρόνος δὲ τις ἔμικρος ἀλλὰ δεκάτης τῆτο διέλυσε, διελύθη γὰρ περὶ

* Heracl. de Polit.

† Goltz. Paruta.

[Addend. p. 543.] † Pollux also * speaks of Anaxilas's victory with the Ἀπὴν and he adds, That at that time he brought a breed of Hares into Sicily, which before had none of those animals; and in the money of the Rhegians he stamped an Ἀπὴν and a Hare. This Pollux tells us out of Aristotle; but he seems to have mistaken the money of the Rhegians for that of the Messenians; for among the Rhegian coins that can now be heard of among Antiquaries, there are none of that stamp; but of the Messenian coins there are viii in Paruta, with an Ἀπὴν on one side, and a Hare on the other; ii with an Ἀπὴν without a Hare, and ii with a Hare; and on the reverse an Olympic crown.

§ See above, p. 41, 42.

|| Paul. p. 155. ἡμίονος ἀπὲρ ἵππων.

¶ Θεοφύλακτος, ibid.

** Olymp. v. & vi.

†† Schol. ibid.

ὀλυμπιακὸν

ὄγδομος ἐννάτην ὀλυμπιάδα· “That the Ἀθήνη was a chariot
 “drawn by Mules; and the old custom at the Olympics being
 “only to use Horses, Asandrastus first introduced there the
 “chariots with Mules; but they did not continue long; for
 “they were left off in ten years’ time, about Ol. LXXXIX.”
 There is a fault, it is true, either in one or both of these num-
 bers; for if Psauis’s victory, which Pindar here celebrates,
 was Olymp. LXXXII, there are about ten years from that time
 to Olymp. LXXXIX. Yet, however, this passage, even taken
 with its faults, is sufficient for our purpose; for it implies that
 the Ἀθήνη could not be in use in the Olympic games, Ol.
 XXXIX. The great Scaliger has made a great slip here*; for,
 by mere carelessness, he has placed this passage of the Schol-
 iast at Olymp. LXXXIX; which, without doubt, he designed to
 set at Olymp. LXXXIX: and this has produced errors upon
 errors. The learned Meursius, who has confounded several of
 his own Books by unfortunately mistaking that Ἀναγραφὴ ὀλυμ-
 πιάδων for an ancient piece (though Scaliger had expressly owned
 it to be of his own composing†) makes strange work with this
 passage. If I may venture after such great men, I would
 correct in the Scholiast δώδεκαετής, “a dozen years,” for δεκαετής,
 “ten years;” and instead of ὄγδομος ἐννάτην, “LXXXIX
 Olymp.” I would read ὄγδ. πέμπτην, “Olymp. the LXXXV.”
 For this latter alteration I have a good voucher, even the Schol-
 iast himself; who says in another place, “That the Ἀθήνη
 “was put down, as some say, at Olymp. LXXV; as others say,
 “at Olymp. LXXXVI‡.” And this agrees punctually with Pau-
 sanias, quoted above; for if it was “cried by the public crier§,”
 at Olymp. LXXXIV, that thenceforward there should be no more
 races with Mules, then the first time that it “was left off||”
 was Olymp. LXXXV. Now, if we reckon from Olymp. LXXXII,
 the date of Psauis’s victory, which was the subject of this ode
 of Pindar’s, there are exactly “a dozen years” to Olymp.
 LXXXV. But who is that same Ἀσάνδρατος that the Scholiast
 says was the Author of these Mule-races? Scaliger, I see, and
 Meursius, have let the name pass for good; though I verily
 believe that both of them suspected it to be faulty; for it has
 not the turn and composition of a Greek name, as those that
 know the language will readily acknowledge. The words, as

[159]

* Scalig. in Ὀλυμπ. Αναλ. † P. 431. Not. ad Græca Eusebii.

‡ Puth. vi. Κατάθετο δὲ Ἀθήνη ὡς τιμὴς φρενι, πρὶ ὀλυμπιάδων, κατ’ ἐνάτης
 δι πρ’.

§ Κήρυγμα ποιήσας Paus.

|| Διελύθη, Schol.

they

[159] they lie together, are ἀγωνίζεσθαι ἀσάνδρατος ἐπετήδευσε; which I would read ἀγωνίζεσθαι Θέρσανδρός τις ἐπετήδευσε, "One Thersander was the author of it." Θαι, which in pronunciation and old writing was θαι, stuck to the preceding word: as in that famous passage of Plutarch, Ἀρμονίαν καλεῖσθαι μέροπιν, I have shewn formerly that the true reading is ἁρμονίαν καλεῖ θεμερῶπιν *. And then the particle τις is almost necessary in this place; for, being to mention an obscure unknown person, he was obliged to say "one Thersander." But, to confirm and establish the whole conjecture, this Thersander of the Scholiast is the very same person with Pausanias's Thersias; so that both the Writers are agreed about the first introdcer of Mule-races at Olympia; for the Greek names of this form are equivalent, and are frequently confounded together: Θερσίας and Θέρσανδρος, as Νικίας and Νίνανδρος, Ἠγησίας and Ἠγήσανδρος, Ἀλεξίας and Ἀλέξανδρος, Ἀναξίας and Ἀνάξανδρος, and many more like them.

Though I persuade myself that I have already effectually confuted Pausanias's date of Anaxilas, yet I have one argument more, that will quite overthrow his opinion; and every part of it shall be taken from his own Book. "Micythus," says he, "the servant and steward of Anaxilas, Tyrant of Rhegium, set up a great many statues and other donaries at Olympia *; and the workmen, that made them, were Dionysius and Glaucus, natives of Argos. Who was the master of these two statuaries, they give us no account; but we know the age they lived in, from Micythus that employed them to work for him †." This inference is very true, and by consequence the reverse of it is true too, — that we may know the age of Micythus, if we can discover the age of these workmen. But Pausanias himself acquaints us §, "that one of them, Dionysius, did a piece of work for Phormis the Syraeusian, the General of Gelo and Hiero." And he is positive "that Gelo and Hiero lived at the expedition of Xerxes ||;" the very time when I state the Tyranny of Anaxilas. There is no evasion to be made from this argument; for that Micythus was our Anaxilas's steward, we have, besides Pausanias, a whole crowd of good witnesses: Herodotus, Diodorus, Justin, Macrobius; — and that he gave these donaries at such a

* See Dissert. ad Johan. Malal.

† Paus. p. 175.

‡ Τὴν ἡλικίαν αὐτῶν ὁ τὰ ἔργα εἰς Ὀλυμπίαν ἀναθεῖς ἐπιδικῆναι ὁ Σμικυθός.

§ P. 176.

|| P. 272.

time,

time, not only Herodotus*, but the very inscriptions of them declare; for his own and the workman's name were engraven on them before their dedication; and Pausanias read them with his own eyes.

To return now to our Examiner, who has thus stated the present question, "That Anaxilas changed the name of Zancle into Messana, is agreed between Dr. B. and me; the only question is about the date of this change." Now, if that was agreed between us, that Anaxilas changed the name, I presume the question about the date of the change will be at an end. But to take no advantage of this concession: I will remit it to him again, and suppose in his favour, that though Pausanias was mistaken in introducing Anaxilas as an agent with the Messenians, yet, for all that, he may be in the right that the Messenians took Zancle, and called it Messana at Ol. xxix. But even in this part of the story (without bringing in Anaxilas) the whole current of history bears against Pausanias; for nobody besides him relates that the Messenians went directly to Zancle; but they all say to Rhegium: and they all call the town by the name of Zancle for *CL* years after HE says it was called Messana. Hippocrates besieged the Zancleans; Cadmus the Coan came to the Samians at Zancle; the Zancleans invited the Milesians to settle themselves in Sicily †; Xenophanes the Colophonian left his native country, and dwelt at Zancle ‡. But the dates of all these are many generations below Olymp. xxix. Neither is there one single example of its being called Messana before the age of Anaxilas.

Let us see now the Examiner's cavils, and dispatch them as briefly as we can. Thucydides says, the Samians, flying from the Medes, possessed Zancle. This business of the Medes, the Examiner says, "Dr. B. calls Xerxes's Expedition; as if the Medes had never made an incursion upon Greece till the time of Xerxes." Whether he has wilfully or innocently thus misrepresented me, I know not; but if he had compared my words with Thucydides's, he might have spared this little cavil. "Not long after," *ἔ πολλαῖ ὕστερον*, says Thucydides, "that the Samians, who had fled from the Medes, possessed Zancle, Anaxilas beat them out of it." My own words are, "That at the time of Xerxes's expedition, An-

* Herod. p. 440. *Ἀνέθηκε ἐν Ὀλυμπίῃ τὸς πολλὰς ἀνδριάντας.*

† Herod. Thucyd.

‡ Laërt. v. XENOPH.

"*axilas*

"anaxilas took Zancle." Now how could Mr. B. infer from hence that I took the Samians' affair with the Medes to be Xerxes's expedition? On the contrary, they must needs be different, for it was "at the time" of the one, and "not long after" the other. And it was an inference which I made, that, if it was "not long after" the first (Olymp. LXX, 3,) it was likely to be *at* or *about* the latter (Ol. LXXV, 1). But the reason our Examiner gives is pretty remarkable; "as if the Medes had never made an incursion upon GREECE before:" which implies, that he took the Medes affair with the Samians to be an invasion upon Greece; but it was only upon the Ionians and the Asiatic towns, when Miletus was taken.

[162]

- P. 127. He says "Herodotus contradicts the story that Thucydides tells;" which I have already disproved: "that Anaxilas assisted the Samians to take Zancle;" which he did not, but only *advised* them to attempt it: "That he will deal ingeniously, and give my authorities all the force that they will bear;" and yet he quite drops that of Thucydides, the most positive and full of all that I had produced. He has spent two pages in a sort of declamation, to dress up and to varnish the story of Pausanias; which he may now be pleased to call home again, for he may have need of such declaiming eloquence to excuse his own errors.
- P. 129. "He supposes that I keep by me in reserve those synchronisms and concurrences" that fix the age of Anaxilas: and now, to oblige him, I have produced some of them; but have a few still behind, that shall be at his service: and I hope he will be so kind, in requital, as "to throw into the scale those half a dozen" he speaks of, besides his Scaligers and Petaviuses that have fallen in with the account of Pausanias." The more "he throws into the scale," the greater compliment he will make me, by telling the world that I have hit upon the truth, where so many and such great men have failed before me.

[163]

There is another small controversy upon this topic between the Examiner and me, that must be debated before we conclude this Section. I had observed that the pretended Phalaris, in one Epistle, mentions the Zancleans; and in another the Messenians. Now, if Historians say true, that the name of Zancle was changed into Messana after Olymp. LXX, the Tyrant Phalaris, that died at Olymp. LVII, could not call them Messenians: or, if Pausanias says true, that Zancle was called Messana at Olymp. XXIX, then the Tyrant, that lived
above

above c years after, could not call them Zancleans : — chuse which way you will, therefore, the Epistles are a cheat. The first part of this dilemma we have sufficiently established ; but to the latter Mr. B. has made an exception, that shall here be considered.

He observes very acutely, that the Epistles do not expressly say Zancle, “ the town ;” but only “ the people,” Zancleans : P. 126, and he conceives that, though Zancle was called Messana at Olymp. xxix, according to Pausanias, yet there were Zancleans left still, and might be called so by Phalaris, at Olymp. lvi. If the Author of the Letters had named “ the town,” he would not have justified him ; but nothing can be justly inferred to his disadvantage from his naming “ the people.”

This is so ingenious a distinction, that I desire “ to borrow “ it of him for one moment,” and apply it to a passage of his Author Pausanias. He has *borrowed* several things of me ; and I hope he will not take it ill if I once use the same freedom with him. Pausanias, among other donaries at Olympia, describes a statue of Hercules fighting with an Amazon. The man that dedicated it was Evagoras, a ZANCLÆAN*, and the workman one Aristocles a Cydonian. “ Now the age,” says he, “ of this Aristocles cannot be exactly known ; but it is [164] “ evident he lived before Zancle was called (as it now is) Messana †.” Now Mr. B. may tell Pausanias that his inference, like mine, is very erroneous ; for the town Zancle not being named here, but only Ζάγκλις, a Zanclean, he cannot infer, as he does, about the age of Aristocles ; because Evagoras might be a Zancleān, long after the name of Zancle was changed into Messana. What now has Pausanias to say for himself ? for it is plain that he was not aware of the Examiner’s distinction. When Pausanias’s friends will condescend to give an answer to so poor a cavil, the same apology will serve both for him and myself.

Mr. B. has another passage of the same Pausanias ; by which he will make it appear that there were a people named Zancleāns, when there was no city Zancle. “ Pausanias,” says he, “ where P. 126. “ he observes, that during the Messenians’ absence from Peloponnese, but two of their nation, Leontiscus and Symmachus, Messenians of Sicily, won the prize at the Olympics,” adds, “ that the Sicilians say these were not Messenians, but

* Paus. 175. Εὐαγόρας γίνος Ζάγκλιος.

† Δῆλα δὲ, ὡς πρότερον ἔτι ἐγίνετο, πρὶν ἢ τῇ Ζάγκλῃ τὸ ὄνομα γινώσθαι τὸ ἐφ’ ἡμῶν Μιᾶσσηνι.

descended

descended from the old Zancleans*. This "implies," says Mr. B. "that the Zancleans kept their families unmixed with "their new conquerors." But I am sure this argument *implies* that Mr. B. has not read his System of Logic so well as he ought to do; for allow him that the families were unmixed for a while, does that *imply* that those families had still the name of Zancleans? is it not evident from Pausanias himself that Leontiscus and Symmachus registered themselves MESSENIANS at Olympia†? But, if the old name was still kept up, why did they not style themselves ZANCLEANS? The Catalogue of the Stadionice enters this Symmachus at Ol. LXXXVIII. Ὀλυμπ. ὀγδοηκοστῇ ὀγδοῇ. Σύμμαχος⊕ Μισσηνίου⊕ γάδιον. Here, we see, he is recorded a Messenian, and not a Zanclean. Nay, I think the passage of Pausanias does more than *imply* that there were none called Zancleans in Symmachus's time; for he says "he was descended of the *ancient* Zancleans." As if I should say Mr. B. is descended from the "ancient Picts," would this imply that there is a nation called Picts, or rather the quite contrary?

But, pray how does Mr. B. prove that "the Zanclean Families continued unmixed?" Because the Sicilians could know that Leontiscus and Symmachus were descended from them? But this is "a consequence too nearly related to some "we have lately parted with;" for we have seen already that Symmachus's age was Olymp. LXXXVIII; and Leontiscus's was about the same time, or before it; for his statue was made by Pythagoras Rheginus‡, who, as Pliny says, lived Ol. LXXXVII §; but, as Pausanias says, made the statue of Euthymus, who got the prize at the Olympics, Olymp. LXXVII ||. Now the remotest of these Olympiads is but L years from Anaxilas's time, who changed the name of Zancle into Messana; so that, for aught Mr. B. knows, both Leontiscus's and Symmachus's parents might be married before the time of that change: and where then is his consequence "that "the families continued unmixed?" Nay, although the interval had been much longer, yet the Sicilians might easily guess that those two were not descended from the Messenians of Peloponnesus: because, in truth, there was no such colony of Messenians that had settled at Zancle, as Pausanias believed;

* Paus. 179. Εἶπαι δὲ οἱ Σικελιώται καὶ τέττοις τῶν ἀρχαίων Ζαγκλεῖων, καὶ ὁ Μισσηνίου φασί.

† Λεόντισκος καὶ Σύμμαχος τῶν ἐπὶ πορθμῷ Μισσηνίων.

‡ Paus. p. 181.

§ Plin. xxxiv, 8.

|| Paus. p. 183.

for,

for, though the name was given by Anaxilas, in memory of his [166]
ancient country, yet the people that he planted there were "a
medley of several countries *."

His next argument, to prove that "the Zancleans continued
"many ages in a distinct body, and under the old name," after
the city was called Messana, is taken out of Diodorus; "who
"tells us," says Mr. B. "that in the LXXIX Olympiad the Zan- P. 126.
"clæans recovered their city out of those strangers hands that
had possessed it so many years." So many years? Pray, how
many had they possessed it, according to Diodorus? Anaxilas,
that changed the name of Zancle, died, as he says †, at Olymp.
LXXVI, 1; and his children were dispossessed of it Olymp.
LXXIX, 4 ‡; which is but the short interval of xv years. What
does the Examiner mean then, by "his so many years" and
"continuing many ages?" I will open the case a little, and
shew his mistake; for I am persuaded he is very innocent in
this place, and does not wilfully deceive his Readers. Diodorus
says the Zancleans recovered their liberty at Olymp. LXXIX,
4. This the Examiner took notice of; and at the same time
there ran in his head the account of Pausanias, that the Zan-
clæans lost their liberty Olymp. xxix, 1. The Gentleman, out
of his great circumspection, tacks these two accounts together,
and argues from them as if Diodorus espoused them both. But
I have already shewn that Pausanias's date differs from Di-
odorus's, almost two whole centuries. There is nothing there-
fore in Diodorus about "possessing it so many years." That
is the Examiner's Commentary upon the Text. His words are
only these: "At Olymp. LXXIX, 4, (Ρηγῖνοι μετὰ Ζαγκλαίων) the
"Rhegians with the Zancleans drove out the sons of Anaxilas, [167]
"and freed their countries from their Tyranny." The Rhe-
gians had been under the Tyranny of Anaxilas and his children
for the space of xxxii years only, and the Zancleans not so
long; which is the true reason why Diodorus here calls them
ZANCLÆANS, though the town was then called Messana. "The
"Zancleans," says he, "delivered their country;" because they
were really the very same persons that were formerly called
Zancleans; for the same generation saw both revolutions;
both the conquest of their city by Anaxilas, and the recovery of
it from his children. This once therefore he calls them Zan-
clæans; but ever after they are Messenians, and the town is
Messana; as at Ol. xci, 2 §; xcii, 4 ||; xcvi, 1 ¶. So in Hero-

* Σύμμικτοι Ἀνθρώποι, Thucyd.

† Diod. p. 37.

‡ P. 58.

§ Diod. p. 136.

|| P. 185.

¶ P. 282, 297.

N

dotus's

dotus's time, about Olymp. LXXXIII, it was not Zancle, but Messana. And when Thucydides relates the Athenian invasion of Sicily, Olymp. xci, 2, he talks all along of Messana and the Messenians; never naming Zancle but once only, when he was treating of the antiquities of the country.

P. 126, "But we are sure," says Mr. B. "the Zancleæans preserved
127. "themselves in a separate body even till Pliny's time, who expressly distinguishes them from the Messenians, and tells us "Messana was a free city; but the Zancleæans were tributaries*." The first Edition of Mr. B.'s Book has only a reference to the passage of Pliny; but the second thus sets down the words in the margin: — "Messana civium Romanorum, qui Mamertini vocantur, Latinae conditionis, Zancleæi." Thus, as I say, the words of Pliny are cited in the margin. But the passage of Pliny is really in this manner: "Intus *Latinae conditionis* Centuripini, Netini, Segestani. *Stipendiarii*, Assorini, *Ætenses*;" (and so through the whole Alphabet, to) "Zancleæi Messeniorum in Siculo Freto." Here I think it is as plain as the sun, that Mr. B. the Writer of the first Edition, took *stipendiarii* in Pliny to signify *tributaries*, as it truly does: but the Marginal Writer in the second Edition, believed that *Latinae conditionis* signified *tributaries*; and that *stipendiarii*, like the other words on each side of it, was the name of a people of Sicily; which I think, without any aggravation, to be a brace of such monstrous and infamous blunders, as can hardly be matched again but by him that made these. But that which troubles me more is this, that the learned Mr. B. in his Letter from Paris, before the second Edition, gives out all those alterations, of which this is one, to be his own. Now how shall we reconcile these matters together? for the Text, we see, looks one way, and the Margin another. If Mr. B. be a man of honour and veracity, as he is, he made this Marginal note; if he be a man of wit and judgment, as he is too, it is impossible he should make it. Here is a terrible quarrel between his honour and his judgment; and I could wish the matter was fairly ended. I have this expedient to offer towards it, That the Text being written at London and the Margin at Paris, may perhaps be a physical account why the sense of them is so wide asunder.

But what do I say to the passage of Pliny? Why, I will give Mr. B. an answer, when he pleases to tell me the meaning of it. Cluverius, a man of learning and other abilities not much inferior to Mr. B. knew not what to make of it. "Hinc

* Lib. iii. c. 8.

"mira

"mira brevitatē," says he, "& historiarum confusione Plinius, [169]
 "Zanclæi Messeniorum in Siculo Freto*." This great man, it seems, could see nothing in it but *darkness* and *confusion*. — But I have the less reason to be concerned about it, because I have plainly shewn that Pausanias is quite out in his reckoning; so that I do not charge it as the Sophist's error that he names the Zanclæans (which Pliny is cited for) but that he talks of the Messenians, who were not heard of in Sicily in the days of the true Phalaris.

And so much about the Zanclæans; for I hope this article is sufficiently settled; and I would make bold to ask my learned Examiner "the next time He and I talk together," if he still retains his loyalty to his Sicilian Prince? If he does, much good may it do him; he shall adore his Perkin Warbeck as long as he pleases. P. 131.
P. 43.

V.

THAT same xcii Letter, which has furnished us already with one detection of the imposture, will, if strictly examined, make a second confession, from these words: — ὅς αὐτάς ἐκτρίψω πέντε δίκην it is a threat of Phalaris to the Himeræans, "That he would extirpate them like a pine-tree." Now here again am I concerned for our Sophist, that he is thus taken tripping; for the original of this saying is thus related by Herodotus †: — When the Lampsaceni in Asia had taken captive Miltiades the Athenian, Croesus king of Lydia sent them a message, That, if they did not set him free, he would come and "extirpate them like a pine;" [170]
 σφέας πέντε τρόπον ἀπείλεε ἐκτρίψειν. The men of Lampsacus understood not the meaning of that expression, "like a pine," till one of the eldest of them hit upon it, and told them "That, of all trees, the pine, when once it is cut down, never grows again, but utterly perishes." We see the phrase was then so new

* Sicil. Antiq. p. 81.

† Lib. vi. cap. 37.

and unheard-of, that it puzzled a whole city. Now if Cræsus was upon that occasion the first author of this saying, what becomes of this epistle? for this, as I observed before, being pretended to be written above a dozen years before Phalaris's death, carries date at least half a dozen before Cræsus began his reign.

[171] Nay, there is good ground of suspicion, that Herodotus himself, who wrote a hundred years after Phalaris was killed, was the first broacher of this expression; for it is known, those first Historians make every body's speeches for them; so that the blunder of our Sophist is so much the more shameful. The Third Chapter of the VIII Book of A. Gellius, which is now lost, carried this title, *Quod Herodotus parum vere dixerit, unam solamque pinum arborum omnium cæsam nunquam denuo ex iisdem radicibus pollulare*, "That Herodotus is in the wrong, in saying that, of all trees, "a pine only, if lopt, never grows again." I suppose, Gellius, in that Chapter, told us, out of Theophrastus*, of some other trees, beside the pine, that perish by lopping: the pitch-tree, the fir, the palm, the cedar, and the cypress. But I would have it observed, that he attributes the saying, and the mistake about it, not to Cræsus, but to Herodotus: after whom it became a proverb, which denotes an utter destruction, without any possibility of flourishing again. See Πεύκης τρόπον in Zenobius, Diogenianus, and Suidas. And it is remarkable, that our Letter-monger has Herodotus's very words, πίτυς and ἐκτρίψειν; when all the other three Writers have πεύκη for πίτυς, and κόπλειν instead of ἐκτρίψειν; which shews he had in his eye and memory this very place of Herodotus: — a strange piece of stupidity, or else contempt of his Readers, to pretend to assume the garb and person of Phalaris, and yet knowingly to put words in his mouth, not heard of till a whole century after him.

* Hist. Pl. lib. iv. c. 19. Caus. Pl. l. v. c. 24. Pl. l. xvii. c. 24.

MR. B. goes on, and begins his remarks upon this Article with his common-place eloquence, about the uncertainty of this way of proof from sentences and sayings. In his opinion, his Sicilian prince may make use of the very phrases, not the thoughts only, but the expressions too, of Herodotus, Euripides, and others, and yet come a whole century or two before them. This, as weak and absurd as it is, shall not pass without an answer, in a place that is more proper for it than this.

P. 134.

[172]

He asks, "How do I prove that the expression puzzled the 'whole city?'" And he answers himself,— "Plainly! because 'one of the eldest citizens hit upon it, and told the meaning of it. This is very nice reasoning.'" If he was half as nice in his representing, he would not fill his papers with such mean and unworthy frauds as he would put upon his Readers; if any of whom will but look upon my words as they stand in the Dissertation, they will see his fair dealing. They are the express words of Herodotus, that the whole City "was puzzled" a good while*, even the old man himself, who at last, "with 'much ado," found out the meaning†.

P. 135.

I had observed "That the first Historians make every body's 'speeches for them." Mr. B. takes me up; for this "of Cræsus 'is no speech, but only a message." Wonderful exactness! Pray, Sir, accommodate us out of your new Logic with a definition of a message. I thought formerly, that "a message was a 'speech sent:" and, when Neptune rebukes the Winds, in Virgil,

"Maturate fugam, regique hæc dicite vestro,
"Non illi imperium pelagi," &c.

I believed it was both a speech and a message at once: — and surely there are infinite such in Poets, and Historians, and common life. Nay, Herodotus's own phrase is a sufficient warrant for me; for he says that "Cræsus spoke to the Lampsaceni by a messenger‡.

[173]

But it is probable, said I, that Herodotus "invented this 'phrase himself." Here Mr. B. insults and briskly asks me these questions: — "Does Herodotus tell us that the Lamp-
"sacenes were puzzled with an expression invented by He-
"rodotus? Werè the men of Lampsacus in Cræsus's time at
"a loss to undertand a phrase that was not thought of till

P. 136.

* Πλατωμένῳ δὲ Λαμψακηνῶν.

† Μόγισ ποτε μαθών.

‡ Πέμπωνι προσηγόρευσι.

"Herodotus, 100 years afterwards, coined it? It is wonderful to me how such a piece of reasoning as this could ever enter into a head that has brains in it." Who can deny but that the wit of this expression is as great as the civility of it? But, to let that pass, I am afraid it would not much tend to the Examiner's reputation, if the world should determine from this very passage, whether his own head be so very full of brains as he and I think it is.

The falseness of his reasoning lies open enough. I argued from a double supposition: first, If Herodotus give us the very words of Cræsus, they are six years at least younger than the Epistle pretends to be; or, secondly, If Herodotus, as his and other Historians' custom is, fathered a saying upon Cræsus, which he invented himself, then it is a hundred years younger than the Epistle. Now our Examiner, in his wisdom, tacks both these together, and disputes, as if I had maintained that both parts of the dilemma were true at once; that both Cræsus used the expression, and Herodotus invented it! Was there ever such "a piece of reasoning" to be met with in print till his Examination blessed the world, and furnished it with store of them?

[174] To shew Mr. B. a picture of his reasoning in a light that is clearer: — Homer makes Achilles's speeches for him, just as, according to my opinion, Herodotus makes Cræsus's; and the Learned World has all along considered some passages in those speeches as the invention of Homer. "Say you so, Gentle-men?" starts up our Examiner. "Does Homer tell us that Agamemnon was affronted with an expression invented by Homer? were the men of Troy frightened with language that was not thought of till Homer, five hundred years afterward, coined it? It is wonderful to me, sirs, how such a piece of reasoning as this could ever enter into heads that have brains in them." This is a true representation of the Examiner's argument; and I might tell him, in another of his civil phrases, "That surely the man that wrote this must have been fast asleep, or else he could never have talked so wildly." But I hear of a greater paradox talked of abroad; that not the *wild* only, but the *best* part of the Examiner's Book may possibly have been written while he was "fast asleep."

P. 137. Mr. B. goes on: — "If Herodotus is to be believed, Cræsus used this expression; if he is not, why is he brought to prove any thing?" Wonderful again! By the same way of reasoning, he may ruin at one blow the reputation of Thucydides,

eydides, Xenophon, Livy, Sallust, and almost all the Historians; for their manner is, before their speeches, to say "Such a one spoke thus and thus, in these very words," though everybody knows they are the Historian's own speeches; and it happens not seldom that into the mouth of the same person, and on the very same occasion, one Historian puts one speech, and another a quite different one. Now to argue in our Examiner's words: "If Thucydides be to be believed, Pericles [175.] "used such expressions; if he is not, why is he brought to "prove any thing?" By the same way, he may cashier Xenophon and the rest; and we are in danger of losing the noblest parts of Ancient History, if Mr. B. be not merciful, and put his syllogism into its sheath again.

"But would Cræsus, who expected his message should immediately be obeyed, put it into such a phrase as they were "not likely to apprehend?" If this argument had any force in it, it would fall upon Herodotus himself; who expressly says that the message "was sent," and yet was hardly understood. The Lampsacenes understood in general the import of the message; Miltiades was to be set free, or else they were to be extirpated. The word ἐκτρέχειν alone implied some terrible threat; for to be "cut down," like any tree whatsoever, was a vengeance severe enough. But the metaphor πίτυο δίκην was not plain to them at first; why a pine, rather than any other tree? However, this would not have defeated the design of the message, had the Lampsacenes never found the reason of that metaphor: but we see they did hit upon it, after they had cast about for it; which is a full justification of Herodotus from this cavil of the Examiner. P. 137.

The command, we see, was clear enough that they should release Miltiades; but the threat had something of dark in it; and this is censured by Mr. B. as a piece of absurd management. But see the difference among great wits; for Demetrius, in his elegant Book of Rhetoric*, extols the conduct of Dionysius of Syracuse in a case exactly like this. He sent a message to the Locrians, "That they should do such a thing, [176] "or else their Cicadæ should sing upon the ground†." A command plain and express; but a threat new and obscure: and perhaps, as the facetious Examiner has it, "it might puzzle "the Mayor and Aldermen, nay, and the Recorder too, of

* Περὶ Ἑλληνίας.

† Τρίθγες, which sing upon the tops of trees; not our English Grasshoppers.

- P. 135. "Locri." "Now there is something great in allegory," says Demetrius, "especially when it is used in threatenings; as "when Dionysius said, That their Cicadæ should sing upon the "ground; for if he had said plainly, That he would ravage "their country and destroy their wood, he had appeared more "angry and less terrible. But he used the allegory, as it were "a covering to his threat; for a threat that has a hidden meaning is so much the more dreadful; one man apprehending "one thing, and another another." Aristotle* attributes this saying to Stesichorus; but that difference is not material. It is enough that he agrees with Demetrius in his character of it, that it is no less ingenious than ænigmatical†. And has not Mr. B. then a particular taste about good sense and decorum?

Gellius, as I remarked, ascribes that saying to Herodotus himself, and not to Cræsus: Mr. B.'s answer is, That Gellius might not speak accurately, nor nicely examine what he was about: which is an excuse fitter for the crude pieces of one that I know, than so exact a Writer's as Gellius. But, besides him, Eustathius says, "That ἐχέπευκες in Homer signifies "deadly‡; because πεύκη, the pitch-tree, when once it is cut "down, grows no more. We must take notice, therefore," says he, "of that saying of Herodotus §, That a pine, of all "trees, will not grow again after the felling; for if the pitch-tree and cypress live no more after they are cut down, how [177] "comes Herodotus to say this of the pine-tree alone?" Here is another Author, we see, that was no *nicer* than Gellius: and Mr. B. perhaps will be no nicer towards them, but roundly tell them, as his plain manner is, that "both their heads had *no brains in them*."

But, before he quits his hold, he will have one fling at my translation of Gellius. *Pinum cæsam*, in my language, a *pine-tree lopt*. "This," says he, "is falsely rendered, instead of cut "down: for that a pine-tree perishes by lopping, is news to "the Naturalists." To such Naturalists as I have to deal with, I believe it may be news; but not to those that have read either Pliny or Theophrastus: "Lopping," says Pliny, "is fatal to "the cypress, the pitch-tree, and the cedar; for these die, if "the top be lopt off, or burnt with fire||." The other says, "That the beech, the pitch-tree, the pine, the palm, and, as

* De Rhet. lib. ii. & iii.

† Ἀγῶν, αἰνισματικόν.

‡ Eustath. ad Iliad. p. 32.

§ Τὸ τῷ Ἡροδότῳ.

|| Plin. xvii. 24. Decacuminatio."

some say, the cedar and cypress die with lopping; κατὰ τὴν “ἐπικοπήν. And that is termed ἐπικοπή (*lopping*) when the “side branches are stript, and the top is cut off*.” This, it seems, is *news* to the Examiner; I hope therefore I shall have his thanks for it, for I have a great deal more to tell him, before I take my leave of him.

One of the main things that I here pointed at, as a plain detection of the Sophist, was his using the very expression of Herodotus, πίτυϙ δίκην ἐκτρίβειν when some others, that mentioned the proverb, yet differed a little in the phrase, having it πεύκης τρόπον κόπειν. This I observed, as a plain token that he had Herodotus’s passage in his eye; as Eustathius, when he brings that saying, expressly cites him for it†. And so Ælian appears to have had him in his thoughts, when he says τὸ δαιμόνιον παραχρήμα ἐκτρίβον τυράννης πίτυος δίκην‡. Now the Examiner, that he might do one discreet thing in this chapter, has dropt this, and taken no notice of it. And “he was tempted,” he says, “to leave this whole part of my Dissertation unexamined.” An innocent temptation indeed! How much better had he yielded to it, than have made such miserable work both with Logic and Critic!

[178]

P. 134.

VI.

IN the LXXXV Epistle, we have already taken notice of our Mock Tyrant’s triumph; ὅτι Ταυρομενεΐτας καὶ Ζακκλείας εἰς τέλϙ νενίκηκε, “That he had utterly routed “the Tauromenites and the Zancleæans.” But there is an old and true saying, Πολλὰ καινὰ τῷ πολέμῳ, “Many “new and strange things happen in war;” for we have just now seen those same routed Zancleæans rise up again, after a thousand years, to give him a worse defeat. And now the others too are taking their turn to revenge their old losses; for these, though they are called Tauromenites, both here and in the xv, xxxi, and xxxiii Epistles, make protestation against the name, and declare they were called Naxians in the days of the true Phalaris. “Taurominium, quæ antea

* Theoph. de Caus. v. 24.

† P. 32.

‡ Var. Hist. vi, 13.

“Naxos,”

[179] “Naxos,” says Pliny*: “Taurominium, quam prisci
 “Naxon vocabant,” says Solinus†. Whence it is that
 Herodotus and Thucydides, because they wrote before
 the change of the name, never speak of Taurominium,
 but of Naxos and the Naxians. A full account of the
 time, and the reason, and the manner of the change, is
 thus given by Diodorus‡. Some Sicilians planted
 themselves, Olymp. xcvi, 1, upon a hill called Taurus,
 near the ruins of Naxus, and built a new town there;
 which they called Tauromenion, ἀπὸ τῆ ταῦρος καὶ μένειν,
 from “their settlement upon Taurus.” About forty
 years after this, Olymp. cv, 3, one Andromachus, a
 Tauromenite, gathered all the remnant of the old Naxi-
 ans that were dispersed through Sicily, and persuaded
 them to fix there§. This is such a plain and punctual
 testimony, that neither the power and stratagems of
 the Tyrant, nor the rhetoric of the Sophist, are able
 to evade it. Where are those then, that cry up Pha-
 laris for the florid Author of the Letters? who was
 burnt in his own bull, above cL years before Tauromi-
 nium was ever thought on!

[180] But I shall not omit one thing in defence of the
 Epistles; which, though it will not do the work, let it
 go, however, as far as it can. We have allowed that
 Pythagoras was contemporary with Phalaris; and yet,
 in the history of the Philosopher, we are told of his
 conversation and exploits at Taurominium. Porphyry
 says, “He delivered Croton and Himera, and Tau-
 rominium from Tyrants||:” and “That in one
 “and the same day he was at Metapontium in Italy,
 “and Taurominium in Sicily¶.” The same story is
 told by Jamblichus**; who supplies us too with ano-
 ther, “That a young man of Taurominium being drunk,
 “Pythagoras played him sober by a few tunes of

* Plin. iii, 8.

† Solin. c. xi.

‡ Lib. xv. p. 282.

§ Lib. xv. p. 411.

|| Vita Pythag. p. 169. καὶ Ταυρομένιον.

¶ P. 192, & 193.

** Jamb. p. 128.

“grave

"grave spondees*." Conon also tells a story "How a certain Milesian left his country in the time of Cyrus, and went to Taurominium in Sicily †." These several passages seem to concur with and confirm the credit of the Letters; that Taurominium had a name and being in the time of Pythagoras and Phalaris. All this would be very plausible, and our Sophist might come off with a whole skin, but for a cross figure in his own art, Rhetoric, called *Prolepsis*, or Anticipation; viz. when Poets or Historians call any place by a name which was not yet known in the times they write of: as when Virgil says of Æneas,

" — — Lavinaque venit Littora ;"

and of Dædalus,

"Chalcidicæque levis tandem superadstitit arce ;"

he is excused by *prolepsis*, though those places were [181] not yet called so in the times of Dædalus and Æneas. The same excuse we may make for Ovid, when he tells us that Taurominium, and Himera, and Agrigentum, were as old as the Rape of Proserpine :

"Himeraque et Didymen Acragantaque Tauromenenque ‡." —

So, when Porphyry and Jamblichus name Taurominium in the story of Pythagoras, and Conon in the story of his Milesian, meaning Naxos, which was afterwards called so, the same figure acquits them; for it is no more than when I say "Julius Cæsar conquered France, and made an expedition into England," though I know that Gaul and Britain were the names in that age. But when Phalaris mentions Taurominium so many generations before it was heard of, he cannot have the benefit of the same *prolepsis*; for this is not a poetical, but a prophetic anticipation: — and he must either have had the præscience and divination of the Sibyls, or his Epistles are as false and commensurable as our Sibylline Oracles.

* P. 109. Ταυρομινίτην μετράω.

† Conon. Narrat. 38. Εἰς τὸ ἐν Σικελίᾳ Ταυρομίνιον.

‡ Fast. IV. ver. 476.

Mr.

P 132. MR. B. is pleased to object "That Diodorus is in two stories about the founding of Tauromenium. In one place " he says the Sicilians first called it Tauromenium, Olymp. xcvi, 1; in another, that Andromachus named it so about " xl years after. Either of these accounts, he confesses, [182] " would serve my purpose; but since they contradict one " another, neither of them is to be depended on." That is hard indeed. What, neither of them to be depended on? Not so much as this to be concluded from them, That at least the city was not built above cl years before the earlier date of the two? This is just such a strain of reasoning as he treated us with in the last Section. The best refutation of such arguments is not to answer them, but to use them; for by a short trial, they shew their bad metal, and quickly lose their edge. Let us make therefore an experiment or two. There are different accounts about the year of our Saviour's nativity; and, " since they contradict one another, neither of " them is to be depended on;" so that we cannot justly infer from them that he was not as old as the Macchabees. Some say Alæsa in Sicily was built by Archonides, Olymp. xciv, 2*; but others say, by the Carthaginians, Olymp. xciii, 4. These stories " contradict one another, and neither can be de- " pended on;" therefore the town may be as old as Troy. One man told me in company that the Examiner was xxiv years old, and another said xxv. Now " these two stories contradict one another, and neither can be depended on;" we are at liberty therefore to believe him a person of about l years of age.

As for the two stories of Diodorus, I believed the former was the true one; and therefore I represented the latter so as to make it consistent with it. Cluverius indeed prefers the latter account; but I cannot yet be of his opinion, because [183] Diodorus calls the place Taurominium at Olymp. xcvi, 1†, and xcvi, 3‡, and xcvi, 1§, three several times before Andromachus is mentioned.

P 132. " But there were people of old that inhabited the hilly " parts about Naxos, where Taurominium stood." Right again; and therefore Taurominium was built long before Diodorus's date of it. I will make bold to use this argument too, and that will serve for an answer. Arrian, in his History " of Alexander||, has the face to tell the world that that prince

* Diod. p. 246.

† Ibid. p. 282

‡ Ibid. p. 305.

§ Ibid. p. 309, 310.

|| Lib. iii. p. 230.

built Alexandria at Mount Caucasus. "But there were people of old that inhabited those hilly parts," as that writer himself confesses; Ἐπαρκέτο πολλοῖς ἀνθρώποις*, "The mountain," says he, "had many inhabitants." It is plain then, that there was an Alexandria at Caucasus before ever the Macedonian set foot there. Is not Arrian cut down now with this mighty argument? and which of the Historians may not be in the same condition, when a fit of disputing takes the Examiner?

"Ay, but the people might be called Tauromenites before the city was built; and it is observable that Phalaris names the people, but not the city; nor uses any such expression as implies they were formed into a politic body, or belonged to any city." I remember Mr. B. says somewhere, "that there is a quaintness of pedantry in some observations." He might have *observed* too, if he had pleased, that Phalaris mentions the Syracusians, but never names the place Syracuse: must the Syracusians therefore *belong to no city*? If so small an observation can raze cities at this rate, the Tyrant, by Mr. B.'s conduct, will be more terrible now than when he was alive.

The reason why he mentioned not the place Taurominium, but only the people, is no secret at all; for he neither took the town, nor besieged it, nor carried his bull thither for a rare-show, nor had any other concerns there; and why then should he mention it? The people indeed he had some transactions with; for he says† "They began an unjust war with him; they redeemed their captives by a price in common; and he remitted to them that price in common, at the request of Stesichorus." And surely this is a hint broad enough that they were "formed into a politic body, and belonged to a city," unless Mr. B. will have nothing less than the Mayor, and Aldermen, and Recorder, to be named, for a proof that it was a city.

Mr. B. adds a passage of Vibius Sequester: "That Taurominium had its name from the river Taurominius, that runs by it." And he infers, "that there might be a people Tauromenites, as well as a river Taurominius, before there was a city Taurominium." The Gentleman loves to surprize us with a consequence: "A river Taurominius; *ergo*, a people Tauromenites." Now if the Tauromenites were a sort of fish, this argument drawn from the *river* would be of great force. But, with submission to Mr. B.'s better judgment, I humbly

* Diod. p. 231.

† Ep. 3. 33.

conceive the Tauromenites were flesh and blood like the rest of the Sicilians.

- P. 133. But the Examiner's expression deserves our remarking: "If
 " Vibius Sequester be to be credited." I doubt not but he
 tacitly answered himself, that he is not to be credited; for
 Mr. B. appears to have had this notice of Vibius from Clu-
 verius in his Sicily *; but with great candour and integrity he
 [185] suppresses what Cluverius proves there,—“ that Vibius is quite
 “ mistaken; for the river had that name from the town, and
 “ not the town from the river; which was called, not Tauromi-
 nius, but Onabala, till after the time of Augustus;” that is,
 till cccc years after the date of Taurominium.

The words of Vibius Sequester are these: “ Taurominium,
 “ inter Syracusas & Messanam, à quo oppidum Taurominium;
 “ quod oppidum aliter Euseboneora dicitur †.” It had become
 Mr. B.'s great learning to have cited this passage at large, and
 have given the world an emendation of it. The fault, I suppose,
 is manifest enough; for who ever heard of Euseboneora? Clu-
 verius endeavours to correct it Eusebio Naxos. I will give
 no character of that learned man's correction, but only propose
 another of my own, which is, Eusebon Cora. The Author
 meant Εὐσεβῶν Χώρα, *Regio Piorum*; a place so called in the
 neighbourhood of Taurominium and Catana, from the famous
 story of the two *pious brothers*; who, upon an eruption of
 Ætna, when the liquid fiery mass ran down towards their dwell-
 ing, took their aged parents in their arms, and escaped with
 them, neglecting all their own goods and treasure. Conon
 gives us a narrative of it, which he closes with this, “ That the
 “ Sicilians from that occasion called the place ΕΥΣ. ΧΩΡΑ, of
 [186] *the Pious* ‡. Lycurgus the Orator tells the same story; and
 adds, “ That from thence the place was yet called ΕΥΣΕΒΩΝ
 ΧΩΡΟΣ §. Aristotle ||, Strabo ¶, and Pausanias **, call those
 brothers ΕΥΣΕΒΕΙΣ; and Claudian, ΠΙΙ FRATRES ††; and So-
 linus names the place CAMPUS PIORUM ‡‡. Ælian says §§
 this eruption happened at Olymp. LXXXI; but I suspect there is
 a mistake in the number.

* Clav. Sicil. y. 90, 91.

+ Vib. Sequester de Fluviiis.

† Conon Nar. 43. Διὰ ταῦτα οἱ Σικελῖται τὸν ἕρπον ἱκτίον Εὐσεβῶν
 χώραν ἱκάλισαν.

§ Lyourg. contra Leocrat. p. 60.

|| Arist. Θάυμ.

¶ Strabo vi.

** Pausan. Phoc.

†† Claud Epig. 35.

‡ Solin c. 5.

§§ Æl. apud Stob. Sermon. 77.

To return now to the subject under debate: — We have other evidence unquestionable, that confirms the narrative of Diodorus about the origin of Taurominium; for Pliny and Solinus say expressly “That Taurominium was the city which was “formerly called Naxos.” Taurominium therefore cannot be older than the destruction of Naxos. But we are certain that that city was destroyed by Dionysius of Syracuse, at Olymp. xciv, 2*. And seven years after, says Diodorus, Taurominium was founded, Ol. xcvi, 1. The whole account is clear, and every part of it is consistent with and confirmed by the rest; and agreeably to this, Herodotus † calls the city Naxos, and the inhabitants Naxians, about Olymp. lxx; and so does Thucydides at Olymp. xci, 2 ‡. Nay, the very medals of the Tauromenites are an infallible proof that they came from the Naxians: there are five several pieces in Paruta that have, on one side, TATPOMENITAN; on the reverse, Apollo’s Head, with an inscription APXAGETA. Now Apollo Ἀρχαγέτας was the tutelar God of the Naxians. “The Chalcidians of “Eubœa,” says Thucydides §, “founded Naxos, and built an “altar to Apollo Archagetas, which is yet standing on the out- “side of the town.” And we have Appian’s testimony §, that the Tauromenites were under the patronage of the same Archagetas; “the very same that had an altar and statue built by the “Naxians.” But the original money of the Tauromenites is a surer evidence of it; and it is allowed by all antiquaries, that the inscription is in memory of their Naxian ancestors.

Our Examiner hinted at this objection against the Epistles, from the date of Taurominium, in his Preface to Phalaris; and it is an unusual piece of moderation in him that he has not charged me with stealing it from him. He had as good pretence to do so as when he accused me of *pillaging his poor Notes*, and robbing Vizzanius and Nevelett; of which hereafter. But I will give the Reader the secret why he dropt this opportunity of calling me a plagiary. Both in his Preface and his Index, he says “Naxos was destroyed by Dionysius the *Younger*, as Diodorus relates it ¶.” Now if a man dips only into Diodorus, or “casts his eye” on him, as Mr. B. says, he may possibly mistake so; because the story is touched upon in the Annals of Dionysius the Younger*. But the truth is, that Naxos was razed by Dionysius the ELDER, at Ol. xciv, 2 †; which is

[187]

* Diod. p. 246.

† Lib. vii.

‡ Lib. vi.

§ Lib. vi.

|| De Cicil. b. v. p. 1162.

¶ “Post Naxum à Dionysio juniore dirutam.”

xxxv years before the other came to the crown. Now some kind Assistant, I suppose, had informed Mr. B. of this shameful flaw in his Preface †; and so the consciousness of his own guilt made him slip this fair occasion of traducing me. But, if the Reader pleases to see how each of us have managed this topic, I will ask no other justification.

P. 133. But he asks me "Where do I find that Phalaris was burnt in his bull?" I find it in Ovid's Ibis:

"Utque ferox Phalaris, lingua prius ense resecta,

"More bovis, Paphio clausus in ære, gemas."

and in the old Scholiast upon the place: "Phalaris ipsemet

"resecta lingua in taurum æneum conjectus est."—"But do

P. 28. "you take up," says Mr. B. "with the trifling Author of the Verses upon Ibis?" A little while ago, "Ovid was one of

[188] "the greatest wits of the antients; and as much above Ma-

"nilius, as Nireus was handsomer than Thersites." But now the wind is changed again, and he is "a trifling Author." Mr.

B. I see, will let nobody else contradict him, but reserves that

for a compliment which he will pay to himself. But why, I

pray, so severe upon Ovid? why must he have no credit in a

matter of history? Will Mr. B. stigmatize him for "a lye-

"maker by profession; such as he obligingly declares all Poets

P. 164. "are akin to?" Of all the various Histories that are touched

on in Ovid's Ibis, there is not one in forty but what we have

at this day other good vouchers for besides the Poet himself;

and without question he had Authors for the rest, though they

are not now extant. But Mr. B. requires some "grave Writer's

P. 133. "testimony," and not "a trifling Poet's." I had quoted a very

grave and learned Writer for it, Heraclides Ponticus; but he

tells me I cite him *falsely*; or else "I use some copy of Hera-

P. 133. clides that he has not seen." What Mr. B. has not seen, his

137. Assistant knows better than I do. But in all the copies of Her-

aclides, it is, I think, sufficiently hinted that Phalaris was burnt

in his bull: I mean the Greek copies; for the Latin translation,

which is sometimes easier *seen* than the original, does not ex-

press it. "Phalaris," says Heraclides, "burned several persons

"in his brazen bull; but the people took vengeance on him, and

* Diod. p. 411.

† Ibid. 246.

[Append. p. 543.] † I was mistaken here, when I thought the Examiner had discovered his own mistake; for he continues the blunder about Dionysius Junior, p. 183 of his Examination; and is still so little sensible of it, that he tells me I borrowed the argument from him, without "making the least improvement."

"they

" they burned his mother too, and his friends *." If they burned his mother *too*, then surely that implies that Phalaris himself was burned. And indeed, how could the Agrigentines forget to burn him? The revenge was so proper and natural, and the thought so very obvious and uppermost, that it is hardly credible they should not burn him in his bull, if they had him alive in their power. Tully says " That the whole multitude of [189] " the Agrigentines fell upon him †." This is consistent enough with Ovid's account of him; for they " fell upon him," and seized him, and so haled him to the bull. As for Valerius Maximus, who says " He was stoned to death at the instigation " of Zeno Eleates ‡," it is plain he mistakes Phalaris for Nearchus §, who was Tyrant of Velia in Italy, an hundred years after Phalaris. Jo. Tzetzes says " He was starved to death in a coat of lead ||:" but he scarce deserves our consideration: or, if he did, yet here are three Authors for his *burning*; and he alone for his *starving*.

But, to take leave of this topic, let us see how the balance stands here between the Examiner and me. In the one scale there are Diodorus, Pliny, Solinus, Thucydides, Herodotus, and the original medals of Taurominium: in the Examiner's scale there are two false surmises, two vicious consequences, and one *refreshing quibble*? for the quibble is his own, by the P. 133. old rule, " Qui capit, ille facit."

VII.

THE xxxv Letter to Polygnotus presents us with a sentence of moral: ὅτι λόγος ἔργε σκιὰ παρὰ τοῖς σφρονετέροις πεπίτευται—" That wise men take words for [190] " the shadow of things;" that is, as the shadow is not alone without the presence of the body, so words are accompanied with the action. It is a very notable saying, and we are obliged to the Author of it: and, if Phalaris had not modestly hinted that others had said it before him, we might have taken it for his own; but

* Herac. in Polit. Ἐνέπρησε δὲ καὶ τὴν μητέρα.

† De Offic. ii, 7. " Universa Agrig. multitudo impetum fecit."

‡ Val. Max. iii, 3. § See Laërt. in Zen. Eleate. || Chil. p. 95.

then there was either a strange jumping of good wits, or Democritus was a sorry plagiarist; for he laid claim to the first invention of it, as Diogenes Laertius says: *Τότα ἔστι καὶ τὸ, λόγος ἔργα σιὴ** and Plutarch, *Λόγος γὰρ ἔργα σιὴ, κατὰ Δημόκριτον†*. What shall we say to this matter? Democritus had the character of a man of probity and wit; who had neither inclination nor need to filch the sayings of others. Besides, here are Plutarch and Diogenes, two witnesses that would scorn to flatter, and to ascribe it to Democritus, had they ever read it in others before him. This bears hard indeed upon the Author of the Letters; but how can we help it? He should have minded his hits better, when he was minded to act the Tyrant; for Democritus, the first Author of the sentence, was too young to know even Pythagoras: *τὰ τῶν χρόνων μάχεται*, says Diogenes †; and yet Pythagoras survived Phalaris; nay, deposed him, if we will believe his Scholars. We may allow forty years' space for Democritus's writing, from the LXXXIV Olymp. to the xciv, in which he died. Now the earliest of this is above a hundred years after the last period of Phalaris.

[191]

I am sensible that Michael Psellus refers this saying to Simonides §; and Isidorus Pelus. to the Lacedæmonians ||. But these two are of little authority, in a case of this nature, against Plutarch and Diogenes: neither would the matter be mended, should we accept of their testimony; for Simonides was but seven years old when Phalaris was killed: and, were it a Lacedæmonian apophthegm, though the date be undetermined, it might fairly be presumed to be more recent than he.

P. 138. MR. B. animadverts, that, among the several pretenders to this sentence, *Λόγος ἔργα σιὴ*, "I decide in favour of Democritus, for a very good reason; because otherwise it would

* Vita Democrit.

† De Educat. Puer.

‡ Vita Democ.

§ De Dæm.

§ Epist. 252, & 259.

" be

"be of no use to me in the present debate." One half of which words are misrepresentation, and the other half a mistake.

I decided in favour of Democritus, not to serve a present turn, but for just and perpetual reasons. There are two that ascribe it to Democritus; and but one to each of the others. Nay, I will now add a third in Democritus' behalf; Πένταθλο, ὁ Δημόκριτος ὁ Ἀθηναῖος, &c. Τέτα ἐστὶ καὶ τὸ, Λόγος ἔργου αἰκίν* which, according to the present reading, is "Oratio Mercurii flagellum," as Wolfius and Portus translate it; but it ought to be corrected Λόγος ἔργου σιμιά. And besides the number, even the quality of Democritus' witnesses is greater than the others in a case of this nature; for Isidorus, a Christian writer, was not versed so well in Heathen authors as Plutarch and Laertius; and Psellus, I suppose, is too modern to be set in competition with them, being a thousand years younger than Plutarch, and nine hundred than Laërtius. In this part, therefore, Mr. B. has misrepresented me.

[192]

The other, as I said, is a mistake; where he says "otherwise it would be of no use to me:" and, "if any of them have it, except Democritus, Phalaris might have used it after them." What will not a man say that can say such things, "with equal regard to truth and honour?" If we attribute it to Simonides, could Phalaris use it after him? though it be evident, beyond all question, that Simonides was a very child at the latest period of Phalaris's life†! I had observed this in my Dissertation, Mr. B. has not one word in refutation of it; and yet he could suffer these crude assertions to drop from his pen. Nay, farther, if we allow Isidorus' account, and give the saying to the Lacedæmonians, yet it is a very great odds that it is younger than Phalaris; for, if we examine the Laconic sentences collected by Plutarch, we shall find four parts of five there to be later than Phalaris' time.

P. 139.

But Mr. B. adds, that the words of Plutarch, κατὰ Δημόκριτον, do not imply "That he thought Democritus to be the Author of the saying; but only that he had met with it in Democritus's works." I am weary of dealing with such poor objections, that have no sap nor spirit in them. In another place, the same Author says that, "according to Simonides ‡,

P. 139.

[193]

* Ἀθλος ἵππου πῶλος ὡς ἅμα τρέχειν.

* Suid. in. Πίη.

† See here, p. 42, 43.

‡ κατὰ τὸν Σιμωνίδην.

" And, according to Plato, Λόγος, κεφοτάτε πρᾶγματος, βαρὺ-
 " τάτη ζημία *." Does not Plutarch here intimate that Simo-
 nides and Plato were the first Authors of these sayings? There
 is nothing more common, in him and others, than κατὰ τὸν
 Αἰσχύλον, κατὰ τὸν Εὐριπίδην, κατὰ τὸν Μένανδρον, &c. Now, if we
 allow of Mr. B.'s exception, that these may not be the Authors
 of the passages there attributed to them, but may have pillaged
 them from others, — we shall have as many Plagiaries as
 Writers.

P. 138. He insists farther, " That Laërtius tells us, Solon used to
 " say Λόγον εἰδῶλον εἶναι τῶν ἔργων" so that he does not make
 " Democritus the Author of the Sentence we speak of." But,
 with the Examiner's leave, there is a difference between Λόγος
 εἰδῶλον τῶν ἔργων, and Λόγος ἔργου σκιά· and if Laërtius had not
 thought so, he would not have named them both. If the words
 in Phalaris' Epistle had been Λόγος εἰδῶλον τῶν ἔργων, I had never
 made an objection from them against the Epistles, because
 Solon was as old as the true Phalaris. But since the words
 are Λόγος ἔργου σκιά, which, as Plutarch, Laërtius, and Suidas
 assure us was the peculiar phrase and turn that Democritus
 gave to that thought, it is an objection unanswerable.

P. 137, But, by virtue of an old saying, as he calls it [*Nihil est dictum,*
 139. *quod non dictum prius*] " he believes that Λόγος ἔργου σκιά
 " might be lit upon a hundred times before Democritus made
 " it famous." I perceive, the Gentleman understands not the
 [194] *old saying* he speaks of. The first that used it was Terence, in
 the Prologue to Eunuchus; where he excuses himself for
 borrowing some characters from Menander, in these elegant
 verses :—

" Quod si Personis iisdem uti, aliis non licet ;
 " Qui magis licet currentes servos scribere,
 " Bonas matronas facere, meretrices malas,
 " Parasitum edacem, gloriosum militem,
 " Puerum supponi, falli per servum senem,
 " Amare, odisse, suspicari? denique
 " Nullum est JAM dictum, quod non dictum sit prius."

His excuse is this: " That all characters were already ex-
 " hausted, by the numbers of Poets that had gone before"
 (there being at that time above 2000 Greek Comedies extant,
 besides the Latin ones); " so that nothing could now be said
 " that was not said already." NOW, he says, that is, *in his*

* κατὰ τὸν Πλάτωνα.

own time, in the rear of so many Poets ; but it had been very absurd in Epicharmus's mouth, or any other of the first Writers of Comedy. And it is absurd in our Examiner to infer from this *saying*, that a saying could not be first lit upon by Democritus, who comes so early in the chronology of learning. Surely, every saying had some beginning : unless Mr. B. will suppose that the world and the human race have been eternally as they are now. But he himself affords a full refutation of his *Nihil est dictum* ; for there are many such *nostrums* in his Book, such proper and peculiar mistakes as were never thought on, nor said by any man before him.

VIII.

IN the LI Epistle to Eteonicus, there is another moral [195]
sentence : Θνητὸς γὰρ ὄντας ἀθάνατον ὀργὴν ἔχειν, ὡς φασί
τινες, ἔ προσήκει “ Mortal men ought not to entertain
“ immortal anger.” But, I am afraid, he will have no
better success with this than the former ; for Aristotle,
in his Rhetoric *, among some other sententious verses,
cites this Iambic, as commonly known :

Ἀθάνατον ὀργὴν μὴ φύλαττε, θνητὸς ἂν.

This, though the Author of it be not named, was, probably, like most of those proverbial *gnomæ*, borrowed from the Stage ; and, consequently, must be later than Phalaris, let it belong to what Poet you please, Tragic or Comic.

But, because it may be suspected that the Poet himself might take the thought from common usage, and only give it the turn and measure of a verse, let us see if we can discover some plainer footsteps of imitation, and detect the lurking Sophist, under the mask of the Tyrant. Stobæus † gives us these verses, out of Euripides' Philoctetes : —

Ὡσπερ δὲ θνητὸν καὶ τὸ σᾶμ' ἡμῶν ἔφω,
Οὕτω προσήκει μηδὲ τὴν ὀργὴν ἔχειν
Ἀθάνατον, ὅστις σωφρονεῖν ἐπίσταται.

[196]

* Lib. ii. cap. 21.

† Tit. xx. Παρὰ Ὀργῆς.

Now to him that compares these with the words of this Epistle, it will be evident that the Author had this very passage before his pen: there is *ἔχειν*, and *προσθήκει* not only a sameness of sense, but even of words, and those not necessary to the sentence; which could not fall out by accident. And where has he now a friend at a pinch to support his sinking credit? for Euripides was not born in Phalaris's time. Nay, to come nearer to our mark; from Aristophanes * the famous Grammarian (who, after Aristotle, Callimachus, and others, wrote the *Διδοσκαλίας*, "A Catalogue and Chronology" of all the Plays of the Poets: a work, were it now extant, most useful to ancient History) we know that this very Fable, Philoctetes, was written Olymp. LXXXVII; which is CXX years after the Tyrant's destruction.

I HAD said that the Iambic verse quoted by Aristotle,

Ἀθάλαστον ὄργην μὴ φύλαττε, θνητὸς ἄν,

P. 140. [197] "was probably borrowed from the Stage." This does not please the Examiner; for he comes upon me with this graveling question, "Why more *probably* borrowed from the Stage than from Archilochus' Iambics, the fragments of which are full of those proverbial sentences?" I will tell you, Sir, why more *probably* from the Stage than from Archilochus. First, because in Aristotle's time there were a thousand Iambics of the Stage for one of Archilochus'. The Plays of the old Comedy were CCCLXV†; of the middle Comedy, DCXVII: nay, Athenæus says‡ That he himself had read above DCCC plays of the middle Comedy. Add to these all the Tragedies, which in all probability were more than the others, and it will be reasonable to suppose that there were as many whole Plays in Aristotle's days, as there were single Iambic verses in all Archilochus' Poems. And, secondly, because Aristotle, in the very same place where he cites this sentence, brings several others; all of which, except one, we are sure are fetched from the Stage, out of Euripides and Epicharmus: and even that one is very likely to be taken from the same place. And now I would beg leave, in my turn, to ask the Examiner a question:

* Argument. Medææ. Eur.

† Prolog. ad Arist.

‡ Athen. p. 366.

What

What he means when he says "The Fragments of Archilochus' Iambics are full of those Proverbial Sentences?" for I believe there are not ten Iambics of Archilochus now extant; and but two of them are Proverbial Sentences. He tells me, in another place, "That collecting Greek Fragments is a fit employment for me, and I have succeeded well in it." But when he pleases to produce those Iambics of Archilochus, *full* of such sententious sayings, I will acknowledge his talent at that employment to be better than *mine*. P. 285.

My inference was, that if this Iambic came from the Stage, "it must be later than Phalaris, let it belong to what Poet [198] soever, Tragic or Comic."

This consequence, says Mr. B. "I can never allow, because P. 140. I am very well satisfied that there were both Tragic and Comic Poets before the days of Phalaris." The age of Tragedy he reserves for another Section; but for Comedy, he produces Susarion, who is said to have invented it before the Tyranny of Pisistratus.

It is the Examiner's good fortune to be never more in the wrong than when he talks most superciliously, and with the greatest assurance. He *can never allow* my inference; and he is *very well satisfied*. But I must tell him, to his farther *satisfaction*, that, though we suppose Plays were acted a little before, or in Phalaris's time, yet it does not presently follow as a consequence that Phalaris could cite that verse out of a Poet, whether Tragic or Comic.

First, because it is an Iambic verse; and it was a good while after the invention of Comedy and Tragedy before that measure was used in them. Aristotle assures us of this, as far as it concerns Tragedy: "The measure," says he, "in Tragedy was changed from Tetrametres to Iambics; for at first they used Tetrametres, because the Trochaic foot is more proper for dancing*." And the same reason will hold for Comedy too, because that, as well as Tragedy, was at first "nothing but a Song, performed by a Chorus dancing to a pipe†." It stands to reason, therefore, that there also the Tetrametre was used, rather than the Iambic; which, as the same Aristotle observes‡, was fit for *business* rather than dancing, and for *discourse* rather than singing.

* Poet. c. iv. Τὸ μὲν πρῶτον τετραμέτρῳ ἐχρῆντο. So also in Rhet. iii. 1.

† "Donatus, Comœdia fere vetus, ut ipsa quoque olim Tragœdia, simplex carmen fuit, quod Chorus cum Tibicine concinebat."

‡ Poet. c. xxiv & iv.

[199] And secondly, because both Comedy and Tragedy, in their first beginnings at Athens, were nothing but *extemporal* diversions, not just and regular Poems; they were neither published, nor preserved, nor written; but, like the Entertainments of our Merry Andrews on the Stages of Mountebanks, were bestowed only upon the present assembly, and so forgotten. Aristotle declares it expressly:—"Both Tragedy and Comedy," says he, "were at first made *EX TEMPORE* *;"—and another very good Writer, Maximus Tyrius, tells us "That the ancient Plays at Athens were nothing but Choruses of Boys and Men; the husbandmen in their several parishes, after the labours of seed-time and harvest, singing *EXTEMPORAL* Songs†." Donatus, or whoever is the Author of that Discourse about Comedy, says, "Thespis was the first that wrote his Plays, and by that means made them public‡." But He was younger than the Tyrant's time, as it will appear more manifestly anon; so that Phalaris, as I conceive, could not meet with this verse in those days, when the Plays were not written, unless Mr. B. will bring him over the sea *incognito* to the merriments in the Attic villages.

And this perhaps may be the true reason why the most of those that have spoken of the origin of Comedy, make no mention of Susarion or his contemporaries, but ascribe the invention of it to Epicharmus; for, as it seems, nothing of that kind was written and transmitted to posterity before the time of that Sicilian. Theocritus therefore is express and positive "That Epicharmus INVENTED Comedy."

[200]

Ἄτε φωνὰ Δάριος, Χωὴρ ὁ τῶν Κωμῳδῶν
Εὐρὼν Ἐπίχαρμος §.

"Comedy," says Themistius, "began of old in Sicily; for Epicharmus and Phormus were of that country||."—"Epicharmus," says Suidas, "together with Phormus, INVENTED Comedy at Syracuse¶." And Solinus, in his description of Sicily: "Here," says he, "was Comedy FIRST INVENTED**." "Some are of opinion," says Diomedes, "that Epicharmus first made Comedy††." Aristotle makes some small intimation of Susarion's pretences; but he expresses himself so, that he does as good as declare in favour of Epicharmus. I

* Poet. c. iv. Γεομίτην ἔν' ἀφ' ἀρχῆς ΑΥΤΟΣΧΕΔΙΑΣΤΙΚΗ, καὶ αὐτὴ καὶ ἡ κωμῳδία. † Dissert. xxi. Ἀσματα ἄδοτες ΑΥΤΟΣΧΕΔΙΑ.

‡ "Thespis autem primus hæc scripta in omnium notitiam protulit."

§ Theoc. Epig. 17.

|| Them. Orat. xix.

¶ Suid. Ἐπιχ.

** Solin. "Ilic primum inventa Comœdia."

†† Diom. p. 486.

will

will give the Reader his own words: — “The pretenders,” says he, “to the invention of Comedy are the Megarenses;” “both those here (he means the Megarenses near Attica) “and those in Sicily; for Epicharmus was of that place, who “is much older than Chionides and Magnes*.” When he says “The Megarenses that are here,” he may hint perhaps at Susarion, who was born at that Megara; but he plainly signifies that his claim was of no great weight, by passing him over without a name. He might allow him to be the Author of some *extempore* Farces, that may be called the first rudiments of Comedy; and that is all that with justice can be granted him. And with this opinion all those fall in who assert that Comedy is more recent than Tragedy; for the same persons suppose Thespis to be the inventor of Tragedy, who lived about Olymp. LXI. Horace, after he had given an account of the rise of Tragedy and Satyr: “AFTER these,” says he, “came the old “Comedy:” *Successit vetus his Comædia*†. “His,” says the ancient Scholiast, “scil. Satyris et Tragædiæ.” And Donatus is very “positive that Tragedy is senior to Comedy, both in “the subject of it, and the time of its invention‡.”

Well then,—If Epicharmus was the first Writer of Comedy, [201] it will soon appear that the true Phalaris could not borrow an Iambic from the Stage; for it is well known that Epicharmus lived with Hiero of Syracuse§: and the Author of the Arundel Marble places them both at Olymp. LXXVII, when Chares was Archon at Athens, which is LXXVIII years after Phalaris’s death. It is true, Epicharmus lived to a very great age: to xc years, as Laërtius says||; or to xcvi, as Lucian¶. Now allow the greater of these for the true term of his life; and suppose too that he died that very year when he is mentioned in the Marble (though it cannot fairly be presumed so) yet he would be but xviii years old in the last year of Phalaris’s reign, which perhaps will be thought too young an age to set up for an inventor; for all great Wits are not so very early and forward as “a young Writer**” that I have heard of.

Or again, if Phormus, who is joined with Epicharmus, be supposed the first Poet of the Stage, the matter will not be at all mended; for even he too is too young to do the Epistles any service. His name is written different ways: Athenæus and

* Arist. Poët. c. 3.

† Arist. Poët. v. 281.

‡ De Com.

§ Plut. Schol. Pind. &c.

|| Laërt. Epich.

¶ Luc. in Macrob.

** Pref. p. 3.

Suidas call him Phormus*; but Aristotle, Phormis†. In The-
mistius it is written Amorphus‡, which is an evident deprava-
tion. Some learned men would write it Phormus too in Aris-
totle; but if that be true which Suidas relates of him, that he
was “an acquaintance of Gelo the Syracusian’s, and tutor to
his children§,” the true reading must be Phormis; for he is
the same Phormis that, as Pausanias tells at large||, came to
great honour in the service of Gelo, and of Hiero after him;
[202] and that I think is a proof sufficient that he did not invent Co-
medy as early as the time of Phalaris.

Upon the whole matter, I suppose, from what has been said,
these four things will be allowed: That the authorities for Epi-
charmus are more and greater than those for Susarion; — That,
if Epicharmus was the first Comedian, Phalaris could not cite
a passage out of Comedy; — That, allowing Susarion to have
contributed something towards the invention of Comedy, yet
his Plays were extemporal, and never published in writing, and
consequently unknown to Phalaris; — and lastly, That, if they
were published, it is more likely they were in Tetrametres and
other Chorical Measures, fit for Dances and Songs, than in Iam-
bics. So far is it from being a just consequence, “If Comedy
“was but heard of at Athens, Phalaris might quote Iambics
“out of it,” though it gave such *great satisfaction* to the learned
Examiner.

It is true, there are five Iambics extant that are fathered
upon Susarion, and perhaps may really be his:

Ακίετε, λεὼς· Συσαρίων λέγει τὰδε,
Τῖος Φιλίης Μεγαρόθεν Τριποδίσκιος·
Κακὸν γυναῖκες· ἀλλ’ ὅμως, ὦ δημόται,
Οὐκ ἔστιν οἰκεῖν οἰκίαν ἄνευ κακῶ.
Καὶ γὰρ τὸ γῆμαι, καὶ τὸ μὴ γῆμαι κακόν.

The first four of these are produced by Diomedes Scholiasticus,
in his Commentary on Dionysius Thrax, a MS. now in the
Royal Library; the last, with three others, by Stobæus¶; the
first, third, and fourth by Diomedes the Latin Grammarian**;
and the third and fourth by Suidas††. The emendation of the
second verse is owing to the excellent Bishop Pearson‡‡, for

* Φόρμος.

† Φόρμις, Poet. c. v.

‡ Ἀμορφος.

§ Suid. in Φόρμ.

|| Eliac. i.

¶ Stob. Tit. lxvii.

** Lib. iii. p. 486.

†† Suid. v. οὔτε σύν.

‡‡ Vind. Ignat. ii, 11.

it is very faulty in the MS.; but the first verse, as he has published it, [203]

Ἀκούετε λέξεως, Συσσάρων τάδε λέγει,

has two errors in it against the measures of Iambics; so that, to heal that flaw in the verse, for λέξεως, it is written λέξιν in the Latin Diomedes; but the true reading is Ἀκούετε, λῆος, as it is extant in Stobæus; that is, "Hear, O people." It is the form that criers used; and means the same thing with our "O Yes*." Plutarch tells us "That in the parish of the Pallenians of Attica, it was unlawful for the crier to use that common form (Ἀκούετε, λῆος) because a certain crier, called Leos, had formerly betrayed their ancestors†." Stratoniceus the Musician made a quibble about it; for, as he once was in Mylasa, a city that had few inhabitants, but a great many temples, he comes into the market-place, as if he would proclaim something; but instead of Ἀκούετε, λαοί, as the form used to be, he said Ἀκούετε, ναοί‡. In Lucian's "Sale of Philosophers," the form that Mercury the crier uses, is Ἀκούε, σίγα. And so much by way of digression, to supply the emendation of the incomparable Pearson.

If I would imitate somebody's artifice, in suppressing and smothering what he thinks makes against him, I might easily conceal a passage of this yet unpublished MS. which carries in it a specious objection against something I have said. Diomedes introduces those verses of Susarion with these words:—"One Susarion," says he, "was the beginner of Comedy in verse, whose Plays were all lost in oblivion; but there are two or three Iambics of a PLAY of his still remembered§." [204] Here is an express testimony that Susarion used Iambics in his Plays, though I have newly endeavoured to make it probable that, in the first infancy of Comedy, the Iambic was not used there; as we are certain from Aristotle, that it was not in Tragedy||. But I have one or two exceptions against Diomedes's evidence: first, he stands alone in it; he is a man of no great esteem; he lived many hundreds of years after the thing that he speaks of; so that it ought to pass for no more

* Or Oyez. The Attic idiom has it Ἀκούετε, λῆώ. Aristoph*.

Ἀκούετε, λῆώ. Κατὰ τὰ πάτρια τὰς χοῶς, &c.

And again †,

Ἀκούετε λῆώ. Τὸς γειτοὺς ἀπῖναί, &c.

† Plut. in Thes.

‡ Athen. p. 348.

§ Πρῶτον μὲν ὅν Συσσάρων τις τῆς ἑμμέτρῃ Κωμῳδίας ἀρχηγὸς ἰκάνειτο, ὃ τὰ μὲν δράματα λήθη καταμνησθῆσαν· δύο δὲ ἢ τρεῖς ἱαμβοὶ τῶ δράματι ἐπὶ μνημὴ φέρονται.

|| Vid. supra, p. 198.

[Addend. p. 544.]

* Acharn.

p. 300.

† Iren.

p. 454.

than

than a conjecture of his own. And again, I would have it observed, that these five Iambics are spoken in the person of Susarion, which will go a great way towards a proof that they are no part of a Play; for, when the Poet in his own name would speak to the spectators, he makes use of the Chorus to that purpose; and it is called a *Παράθεσις* *; of which sort there are several now extant in Aristophanes. But the measures that the Chorus used at that time are never Iambics, but always Anapæsts or Tetrametres; and I believe there is not one instance that the Chorus speaks at all to the Pit in Iambics; to the Actor it sometimes does. And lastly, if these verses of Susarion's had been known to be borrowed from a Play, it could not have been such a secret to Aristotle; for it is plain, I think, that he had met with no certain tradition of any Play of Susarion's; if he had, he would never attribute the invention of Comedy to the Sicilians, so long after him. This argument will not seem inconsiderable, if we remember what an universal Scholar that Philosopher was, and that he had particularly applied himself to know the history of the Stage; having written a Treatise of the *Διδασκαλίαι*, [205] “an account of the Names, and Times, and the Authors of all “the Plays that were ever acted.” If the verses therefore are truly Susarion's, it is probable they were made upon some other occasion, and not for the Stage.

To return now to our Examiner:—Let us see a little how he manages his Susarion; for it is a wonder if, besides a general fault in producing a weak argument, he do not add several incidental ones, which a more skilful manager might have avoided; and to justify my suspicion of him, his very first sentence has two or three errors in it:—“The Chronicon
P. 140. “Marmoreum,” says he, “informs us that Comedy was brought
“INTO ATHENS by Susarion, or rather, that a STAGE was
“by him first erected in Athens.” And from the word
P. 141. STAGE, he would draw an inference “That Susarion was
not the Inventor, but an Improver only, of Comedy.” Now I affirm that the Marble Chronicon says nothing here about ATHENS or a STAGE. I will set down the whole paragraph as it was published from the original, by Mr. Selden and Mr. Young:—

Ἀφ' ἧ ἐν Ἀθ . . . αἰς κωμῶ . . . ρ . . . ἐθῆ . . . σάνι . . . των Ἰκα-
ριέων ἡγρόντος Σαρσίωνα καὶ δολον . . . τεύ . . . ππω τον ισχα . . .
δ . . . αρσιχο . . . νοινε . . . ερ . . . ος . . .

* Schol. Aristoph. Hephæst. Pollux.

In this worn and broken condition the passage was printed by Mr. Selden; and the Supplements that have been made to it since, are only learned men's conjectures, and may lawfully be laid aside if we have better to put in their places. The first words of it (ἐν αθ . . . αῖς) Mr. Selden guessed to be ἐν ἀθήναις, in Athens; wherein he is followed by Palmerius, Pearson, Marsham, and every body since. But, with humble submission to those great names, I am persuaded it should not be so corrected; for the Author of the Marble, when he would say in Athens, always uses Ἀθήνησιν, and never ἐν Ἀθήναις. So in line the 5th, Ἀφ' ἧ δίκη Ἀθήνησι, and 33, Ἀφ' ἧ Ἀθήνησι and 61, . . ἐν Ἀθήνησιν and 70, Ἐνίκησεν Ἀθήνησι διδάσκων so in 79, 81, 83, 85, besides what comes almost in every Epoch of it, Ἀρχοντος Ἀθήνησιν. It is not credible, therefore, that in this single passage he should say ἐν Ἀθήναις: besides, that it is not true in fact that Susarion found Comedy at Athens; for it was at Icarus, a country parish in Attica, as Athenæus informs us*; which is the reason that Clem. Alex. calls Susarion an Icarian†: and the Marble itself, in this very place, names the Icarians τῶν Ἰκαρίων. But surely the same person could not act *first* both at Icarus and Athens; in country and city at once. It is observable, therefore, that in another Epoch, where the Marble says "That Tragedy was first acted" by Thespis‡, who was an Icarian too, there is nothing said of Athens. Our Examiner, therefore, is quite out when he quotes it as the words of the Marble, "That Susarion brought Comedy into Athens."

[206]

His next mistake is when he tells us, as out of the Marble, "That Susarion set up his Stage at Athens." The whole foundation of this imaginary Stage is that fragment of a word σανι which the very ingenious and learned Palmerius fancied to be ἐπὶ σανίσι, acted upon boards§; and his conjecture is approved by the great Pearson||. This, in the Edition of the Marmora Oxoniensia, was, I know not why, changed into ἐν σανίσι, in boards. And the Examiner, who, without question, understands how Comedies may be put into boards (though the groaning board of famous memory might rather belong to some Tragedy) judiciously follows this casual oversight in that elegant Edition¶.

P. 140,
141.

[207]

* P. 40.

† Συσαρίων Ἰκαρίεύς. Strom i.

‡ Suid. Θεσ.

§ Exercit. p. 702.

|| Vind. Ignat. ii, 11.

¶ See the Notes there, p. 203, 204.

I desired

I desired my worthy Friend Dr. Mill to examine with his own eyes this passage in the Marble, which is now at Oxford, and makes part of the glory of that noble University; and he informs me, that those Letters which Mr. Selden and Mr. Young took to be ΣΑΝΙ, are now wholly invisible, not the least footstep being left of them; and as for ΕΝΑΘ . . the two last letters are so defaced that one cannot be certain they were ΑΘ, but only something like them. I am of opinion, therefore, that the entire writing in the Marble was not ἐν Ἀθήναις, but ἐν ἀπῆναις, *in plaustris*; and that ΣΑΝΙ has no relation to Σανίδες, *boards*, but is the last syllable of a verb. So that I would fill up the whole passage thus: — ΑΘ ΟΥ ΕΝ ΑΠΗΝΑΙΣ ΚΩΜΩΙΔΑΙ ΦΟΡΕΘΗΣΑΝ ὑπο ΤΩΝ ΙΚΑΡΙΕΩΝ ὑΠΟΝΤΟΣ ΣΟΥΣΑΡΙΩΝΟΣ· that is, “Since Comedies were carried in carts by the Icarians, Susarion being the inventor.” That in the beginning the Plays were *carried* about the villages *in carts*, we have a witness beyond exception: —

“ Ignotum Tragicæ genus invenisse Camenæ

“ Dicitur, et PLAUSTRIS VEXISSE poemata Thespi*.”

And so the old Scholiast upon the place: “Thespi primus “Tragœdias invenit; ad quas recitandas circa vicos PLAUSTRO “quoque vehabatur ante inventionem scenæ.” And I suppose it is sufficiently known that Ἀπῆνη is the same with PLAUSTRUM. Hesychius and Suidas, Ἀπῆνη, ἄμαξα. Eustathius twice, Ἀμαξαν μὲν καὶ Ἀπῆνην εἰπεῖν ταυτὸν εἶναι. Glossarium Philoxeni, Plaustrum, ἄμαξα. Plostrum, ἄμαξα.

[208] If this conjecture of mine may seem probable, the next, I dare pass my word, will amount even to certainty. The words in the Marble, as Mr. Selden published them, are these: Καὶ δολον. τεθ. πτωτονισχα . . . δ . . . αρσιχο . . . δ . . νοινε . . . ερ . . . © Out of which broken pieces the ingenious Palmerius† endeavoured to make this sentence: καὶ Δόλωνος τεθρίπῳ, τὸν ἰσχάδων ἄρσιχον, πίθον οἶνε· that is, “Dolon (together with Susarion) was inventor of Comedy; the prize “of which was a basket of figs and a hogshhead of wine; which “were carried home by the victor in a chariot with four “horses.” But he ingenuously confesses, That he never read any thing of this Dolon, a Comic Poet; nor of such prizes as a basket of figs, and a hogshhead of wine; nor that they were conveyed home in a chariot. However, this emen-

* Horat. in Art. Poet.

† Palmer. ibid.

dation of his is approved, and followed, by the learned Publisher of Marmora Oxoniensia,

I was led by the very sense of the place to suspect that Mr. Selden or Mr. Young had copied the inscription wrong; and that, instead of ΔΟΛΟΝ . . ΤΕΘ . . ΠΠΩΤΟΝ, they ought to have read it ΑΘΛΟΝ ΕΤΕΘΗ ΠΡΩΤΟΝ for the difference in these letters is very small, and such as might escape even a curious eye in so dim an inscription. I communicated by letter this suspicion of mine to the Reverend Dr. Mill; who will bear me witness that I sent this correction to him before he had looked upon the stone; and I asked the favour of him, that he would consult the marble itself: and he returned me this answer, That the writing in the Marble is fair and legible enough in this very manner: ΚΑΙ ΑΘΛΟΝ ΕΤΕΘΗ ΠΡΩΤΟΝ

[200]

ΙΣΧΑΔΩ . . ΑΡΣΙΧΟ . . ΚΑΙ ΟΙΝΟΤ. I conceive, therefore, that this whole passage should thus be restored: καὶ ἄθλον εἰσέθη πρῶτον, ἰσχαδῶν ἄρσιχος, καὶ οἶνε ἀμφορεὺς: that is, "And the prize was first proposed, a basket of figs, and a small vessel of wine." Dolon, we see, and his *coach and four*, are vanished already: and as for the prizes for the victory, which Palmerius owns he knew nothing of, I think I can fairly account for them out of a passage in Plutarch*: — "Anciently," says he, "the Feast of Bacchus was transacted country-like and merrily: first there was carried (Ἀμφορεὺς οἶνε) A VESSEL OF WINE and a branch of a vine; then followed one that led a GOAT (τράγον) after him; another carried (ἰσχαδῶν ἄρσιχον) A BASKET OF FIGS; and last of all came the Phallus (ὁ Φάλλος)." Now as both Tragedy and Comedy had their first rise from this feast of Bacchus, the one being invented by those that sung the Dithyramb †, and the latter by those that sung the Phallic, so the prizes and rewards for those that performed best were ready upon the spot, and made part of the procession. "The vessel of wine and the basket of figs" were the præmium for Comedy; and "the goat" for Tragedy. Both the one and the other are expressed in these verses of Dioscorides', never yet published; which shall farther be considered in the XI Section, "about the Age of Tragedy:—"

Βάκχος ὅτε τρίτῳ καταγοι χορὸν ὃ ΤΡΑΓΟΣ ἄθλον,
Χ' ὠτίλιος ἦν ΣΤΚΩΝ ἈΡΡΙΧΟΣ, ὕθλος ἔτι.

Now, I would ask the Examiner one question: If he can really think Susarion made regular and finished Comedies with the

* Plut. Περὶ φιλοπλῆτ.

† Arist. Poet. c. iv.

solemnity

- solemnity of a Stage, when the prize, we see, that he contended for was the cheap purchase of a cask of wine and a parcel of dried figs? These sorry prizes were laid aside when Comedy grew up to maturity; and to carry the day from the rival Poets, was an honour not much inferior to a victory at Olympia.
- P. 141. I will forgive Mr. B. his double mistake of xxx years, when he says "Susarion must fall in between the 610th and 589th year before Christ;" for I find some other person has already reprehended him for it. And I am well pleased with his judgment of Bishop Pearson's performance*, "That he has proved, BEYOND ALL CONTROVERSY, that Susarion is a distinct Poet from Sannyrion." I see the Gentleman, if he be free and disinterested, can pass a true censure. Casaubon and Selden, as famous men in their generations as Mr. B. is in this, thought both those names belonged to the same person; but Bishop Pearson, by one single chronological argument, has refuted them, says Mr. B. "beyond all controversy." I may say, without breach of modesty, I have refuted Phalaris' Epistles by a dozen chronological proofs; each of them as certain as that one of the Bishop's, besides my arguments from other topics: and yet (to see what it is to be out of favour with Mr. B.) "I have
- P. 141. "proved nothing at all." Mr. B. no doubt has good motives for his giving such different characters; but I would ask him why he says "Mr. Selden's opinion would bring Susarion *down* to Aristophanes's time?" It would just do the contrary; and carry Sannyrion *up* above Pisistratus' time; for the Epoch in the Marble was not doubted by Mr. Selden.
- [211] "The Bishop," says Mr. B. "has proved that Sannyrio "must live in Aristophanes' time." This is true; but it still leaves his age undetermined, within the wideness of xxxxx years; for so long Aristophanes was an Author. If Mr. B. had been cut out for improving any thing, he might easily have brought Sannyrio's time to a narrow compass; for Sannyro, in his play called Danaë, burlesqued a verse of Euripides' Orestes†. But Orestes was acted at Olymp. xcii, 4, when Diocles was Archon at Athens‡. Danaë therefore must have come soon after it, or else the jest would have been too cold. The Frogs of Aristophanes, where the same verse is ridiculed*, was acted the third year after, Ol. xciii, 3; so

* Vind. Ignat. ii, 11.

† Schol. ad Ranas Aristoph. p. 142. Schol. Orest. ver. 279.

‡ Id. ver. 371, 770.

that

that we may fairly place the date of Sannyrion's Danaë between Olymp. xcii, 4, and Ol. xcv*.

We are come now to the Second part of my argument from this passage in Phalaris' Epistle, *Θνητὸς γὰρ ὄντας ἀθάνατον ὀργὴν ἔχειν, ὡς φασι τινες, ἐπρόσκει*. "Mortal en, as some say, ought "not to bear immortal anger." The thought, as I observed, was to be met with in two several places: in a Poet cited by Aristotle, and in Euripides' Philoctetes. Allow then, *first*, that the Writer of the Epistle borrowed it from the former of these; then, as I have hitherto endeavoured to prove, and as I think with success, he could not be as ancient as the true Phalaris of Sicily. But the Reader, I hope, will take notice that all this was *ex abundanti*; for there are plain and visible footsteps that he has stolen it, not from Aristotle's Poet, but out of Philoctetes, which was not made till sixscore years after Phalaris' death; so that, let the dispute about Comedy and Susarion fall as it will (though I think that to be no hazard) yet he will still be convicted of a cheat upon this second indictment.

The words of the pretended Phalaris are, *Θνητὸς ὄντας ἀθάνατον ὀργὴν ἔχειν ἐπρόσκει*. The words of Euripides are, [212]

Ὀσπηρ δὲ θνητὸν καὶ τὸ σῶμα ἡμῶν ἔφυ,
οὕτω πρόσκειμι μηδὲ τὴν ὀργὴν ἔχειν
Ἄθανατον——

In the comparing of which, I remarked, that, besides the words *Θνητὸς* and *Ἄθανατος ὀργή*, there are other words also, that are found in both passages: *ὀργὴν ἔχειν* and *πρόσκειμι*. As for *Θνητὸς* and *ἀθάνατος ὀργή*, they are necessary to this sentence, and the thought cannot be expressed without them; for one cannot express this opposition of mortal and immortal, upon which the whole thought turns, in other Greek words than *Θνητὸς* and *ἀθάνατος*. It might be said, therefore, in Phalaris' behalf, That, if two or more persons should hit upon this thought (which is far from impossible) there is no avoiding but they must needs fall into the very same expressions of *Θνητὸς* and *ἀθάνατος ὀργή* and yet none of them might steal them from any of the rest; as we see all the three words are found in that other verse quoted by Aristotle,

Ἄθανατον ὀργὴν μὴ φύλαττε, θνητὸς ὢν.

To occur then to this plausible pretence, I observed there

* Argum. Ranar.

were other words in both passages alike (*ὀργὴν ἔχειν* and *προσθήκει*) and that here there was no room for this specious objection; for *ἔχειν* and *προσθήκει* are not necessary to the thought, as *θνητὸς* and *ἀθάνατος* are, because there are several other words that signify the same things; so that the sentence, as to this part of it, might be varied several ways; as one may say *ὀργὴν φυλάττειν*, as well as *ἔχειν* (and so the Poet in Aristotle has it) or *ὀργὴν τηρεῖν*, or *ὀργὴν τρέφειν*, &c.; and so, instead of *προσθήκει*, one may say *ἔδει*, *ἔπρεπε*, *ἔπρεπον ἔστιν*, *ἔπροσῆκόν ἔστιν*, or *ἐτηρητέον*, *ἐφυλακτέον*, and many other ways; which, by being intermixed, would produce a great number of changes; so that, upon the whole, since the Writer of the Epistle has the very numerical words of Euripides in a case where it is so much odds that he would not have lit upon them by chance, I looked upon it, as I still do, to be a plain instance of imitation; and consequently, a plain proof of an imposture.

- Well, what says our severe Examiner to this? Why, truly, with a pretended jest, but at the bottom in sober earnest, “He
- P. 143. “lets Phalaris shift for himself; and is resolved not to answer “this argument.” I will not say how ungenerous a design this is, to leave his Sicilian Prince in the lurch; but, I fear, it is too late now to shake him off with honour: his Phalaris will stick close to him longer than he will wish him. However, instead of an answer to Me, he desires me to answer Him,
- P. 143. “Whether it was prudent in me to accuse Phalaris of a theft, “by a pair of quotations pillaged from his poor Notes on this “Epistle?” Poor Notes! he may be *free with them*, because
- P. 35. he claims them as *his own*; and yet, as *poor* as he calls them, if common fame may be believed, somebody run in debt for them. But he *desires my answer*; and I will give it him; for the accusation is a very high one. “To pillage his poor Notes” would be as barbarous as to rob the naked; and I dare add, to as little purpose. My defence is, That these two passages which I have quoted are in Aristotle and Stobæus; and, I believe, I may truly say that I had read them in those two Authors before Mr. B. knew the names of them. In other
- [214] places he confesses, and makes it part of my character, “that I have applied myself with success to the “collection of Greek fragments” Why might I not then have these two out of the
- P. 285. original Authors? are these sentences vanished out of Aristotle and Stobæus since the memorable date of Mr. B.’s Edition of Phalaris? If ever they were used since, or shall be used hereafter, must they needs be *pillaged* from Him? Alas! one may safely predict, without setting up for a Prophet, that these sentences

tences will still be quoted, when his *poor Notes*, and his *poor Examination* too, will have the happiness to be forgotten. If Mr. B. had made the same inference that I do from these sentences, there had been some colour for his accusation of theft; but he barely cites them in his Notes; and it is another great instance of the sagacity of our Examiner, that, even when he stumbled upon arguments, yet he could not *make use of them*.

I had taken notice from the Scholiast on Euripides, "That Philoctetes was acted Olymp. LXXXVII." But an unknown Author*, that has mixed himself in this controversy, has been pleased to object "That some others say the Phœnissæ was acted then: so Scaliger's Ὀλυμπιάδων ἀναγραφῇ, and Aristophanes' Scholiast." But here are several mistakes committed in this short objection. First, the Author seems not to have known that there were four Plays of Euripides acted in one year; there is no consequence, therefore, in this argument; for Phœnissæ and Philoctetes might both of them be acted at Olymp. LXXXVII. Then, both here and in other places, he argues from the Ὀλυμπιάδων ἀναγραφῇ, as if it was an ancient piece. But Scaliger himself confesses it is his own work; and in this passage that great man mistook himself, either by haste, or by trusting to his memory; for, instead of Φοίνισσαι, he designed to have written Μῆδεια, out of the Scholiast on Euripides: and such oversights are not unfrequent in that collection of his†. Again, the Author is very much out, in quoting the Scholiast on Aristophanes; which I suppose he might copy from the learned Mr. Barnes' Life of Euripides‡. But, so far is that Scholiast from affirming that the Phœnissæ was acted Olymp. LXXXVII, that I will prove from him it was acted after Olymp. xci, 2; for he twice declares§ that the Phœnissæ was not then acted when Aristophanes brought his Aves upon the Stage; which was at Olymp. xci, 2 ||, when Chabrias was Archon. And again¶, he gives an account why Aristophanes, in his Ranæ, rather chose to ridicule the Andromeda of Euripides, which was "then VIII years old," than Hypsipyle or "PHŒNISSÆ, or Antiope;" all which had been acted a little while before**: but the Ranæ was acted Olymp. xciii, 3, when Callias was Archon††. It is plain, therefore, that the

[115]

*View of Dissert. by the Rev. John Milner, B. D. late vicar of Leeds in Yorkshire, p. 19.

† See here, p. 157, 158.

§ P. 382, 585, ed. Basil.

** Περὶ ἐλίγης διδασχθέντων.

|| Ibid. 366.

† Sect. xxvi.

¶ Ibid. 132

†† Ibid. p. 128.

Phœnissæ must have been acted between Olymp. xci, 2, and xciii, 3. I dare so far rely upon this unknown Author's candour, as to believe he will be satisfied with this reply; and I think there are no more of his animadversions that concern Me or these Dissertations, that require a particular answer.

[216]
P. 142.

I have nothing more to say at present upon this article of Comedy; but, that I may not break it off abruptly without taking leave of the Examiner, I would desire one piece of justice at his hands: that, the next time he burlesques some *knotty* paragraph of mine, or any of his future antagonists, he would not add to it, of his own, four marks of Parentheses, () () like knots upon a string, to make it look the more *knottily*. — It would be a very dear bargain to purchase a much better jest than that, at the expence of truth and integrity.

IX.

THE XII Epistle exhibits Phalaris making this compliment to his Friends: Ὡν εὐτυχόντων, καὶ αὐτὸς ἑτέρῳ συμπλακῶ δαίμονι, ἥσθεῖς ἔδην ἥττον εὐτυχεῖν δόξω. — “That while
“ they continued in prosperity, his joy for that, though
“ he should himself fall under misfortunes, would still
“ make him happy.” But, methinks, those words, Ἑτέρῳ Δαίμονι, “the other God or Genius;” that is, the *bad* one, have a quaintness in them something poetical; and I am mistaken if they be not borrowed from some retainer to the Muses. And now I call it to mind, they are Pindar’s*,

Δαίμων δ’ ἕτερος
Ἐς κακὸν τρέψαις, ἑδαμῖσά το νῦν

or Callimachus’; for this Scazon of his is there cited by the Scholiast,

Οὐ πάντες, ἀλλ’ ὅς τις ἔσχειν ἄτερος Δαίμων

Whether of these our Author made bold with, I cannot determine. Pindar, I should incline to guess; but that I find him familiar with Callimachus, upon an-

*Pyth. iii.

other occasion (Epist. cxxii) speaking of Perillus's invention of the Brazen Bull : Ὑπὲρ ἐμῆ τὸν ὀλεθρον εὔρε κατὰ τῶν ἐπιβλεπόντων ἀχθιρότατον where he has taken that expression, τὸν ὀλεθρον εὔρε, from these verses of Callimachus*, that concern the same business ;

Πρῶτος ἐπεὶ τὸν ταῦρον ἐκαίνισεν, ὃς τὸν ὀλεθρον
Εὔρε, τὸν ἐν χαλκῷ καὶ πυρὶ γινόμενον.

But, be it either of them as you will, I suppose the ages of both those Poets are well enough known ; so that, without any computation of years, one may pronounce these fine Epistles not to belong to Phalaris himself, but to his Secretary, the Sophist.

THE Examiner, after a long prologue of *banter* and *grimace*, which he thinks he has a great talent at, comes at last to that little reasoning that he can spare upon this article. He will not allow ἕτερος δαίμων to be a poetical expression ; “ for which,” says he, “ of the words is poetical, ἕτερος or δαίμων ? ἕτερος “ here signifies neither more nor less than *another* ; and δαίμων “ is taken for *τύχη*, *fortune* ; and so they are used in Prose “ Authors.” Was there ever such an admirable touchstone found out to try poetical expressions by ? If the several words taken asunder have nothing poetical in them, then, to be sure, the whole can have nothing poetical. Will he please to lend it me a little, to make an essay upon a verse or two ? as,

“ Luna, dies, & nox, & noctis signa severa † ;”

The Men of Letters have believed hitherto, that the latter part of this verse was in the poetical style, and that the prose of it was *sidera* ; but, by the touchstone, I discover that *nox* signifies neither more nor less than *night* ; and *signa* nothing but *signs* ; and *severa* nothing but *severe* ; which are the common meanings of those words : there is nothing therefore of “ an air of poetry” there ; but it is all plain and vulgar language : —

“ Cum Proteus consueta petens è fluctibus antra
“ Ibat : eum vasti circum gens humida ponti
“ Exultans, rorem late dispergit amarum ‡.”

* Schol. Pind. Pyth. i.

† Lucret. V.

‡ Virgil. Georg. IV.

I believe, the Author of these Verses thought himself above the pitch of common prose when he called the fish "*humida gens*" "*ponti*," and the sea-water "*rorem amarum*;" but Mr. B. can prove he was mistaken; for he can shew him in Varro's prose, which was written before the *Georgics*, *gens* "a nation," and *humida* "moist," and all the rest, if you take them single, in the very same sense that Virgil uses them. If the Examiner by this time be out of love with his touchstone, I will then make bold to tell him That it is not the separate words *ἑτερος*, *δαίμων*, but the particular sense that is put upon them when they are joined together, that gives them a poetical air. That *ἑτερος δαίμων*, "the other Genius," should, without reference to the opposite one, signify absolutely "the Evil Genius," is truly "a quaintness something poetical." So the Scholiast on Pindar thought it: a Writer of very good esteem, if we may put his judgment in the scale against Mr. B.'s; for he explains it *ἑτερος, ὁ κακοποιός* and adds the passage of Callimachus, to justify Pindar in the use of the phrase: which certainly he needed not have done, were it as familiar and prosaical as our Censurer would make it.

[219] His next exception, of the very same features and complexion with the former, is about *ἄλεθρον εὔρε* which I had charged upon the Sophist as a phrase borrowed from Callimachus. "The P. 145. "Latin," he says, "of this Greek, *invenere tormentum*, is in "Horace; and he will engage at a venture to find these two "words together in a prose-writer." Here is your man of resolution, "he will engage at a venture;" and indeed his whole Book seems to be written so. But I will excuse him that trouble; and, since it will so much oblige him, I will shew him those two Greek words (which will serve his turn much better than his Latin ones) as close together as can be, in a verse of *Hermesianax**,

Εἰσόκε τοι δαίμων, Εὐριπίδῃ, ΕΤΡΕΝ ΟΛΕΘΡΟΝ
'Αμφὶ εἰς συγνῶν ἀντιάσαντι κυνῶν.

But I hope, in return, he will be pleased to remember that I did not lay the stress of the argument upon this, that the two words *ἄλεθρον εὔρε* came together in Callimachus; but "that "they concerned the same business;" for both the Sophist and the Poet were speaking of *Perillus* and his Bull. And if Mr. B. with his *Index-hunting*, "will engage" to find the same words in another Author, and upon the very same oc-

* Athen. p. 598.

casion,

passion, I will *engage* too, without any *venture*, to shew that this Author too had been trading with Callimachus.

Mr. B. will not pass even the shortest Section without giving us a cast of his learning, though it be quite beside the subject. "Callimachus," he says, "*Dorizes*, in saying ἄτερος for ἕτερος." If the Examiner here had not caught at a jest, he might have saved a mistake in earnest; for, under favour, this ἄτερⓈ is not the Doric idiom; but the Ionic and the Attic. Herodotus uses it, Ἐστὶ δὲ καὶ ἄτερⓈ λέγⓈ*: and Sophocles in his Ajax, Εἶδ' ἄτερος στρατηγός and some other Writers in those dialects: but if Mr. B. has some second-hand Writers, which tell him it is Doric too, he will find them mistaken. P. 143.

He concludes this article with telling the world "That I have lately reprinted these two criticisms with my fragments of Callimachus;"—and yet the world very well knows that those fragments of Callimachus were printed a good while before the Dissertation: and I will tell him further, that the fragments were *printed* before one single line of the Dissertation was *written*. This it is to "engage at a venture:" but he ventures on still; and, "if he guesses right, it is the only part of the Dissertation that I ever will put into Latin." Now I seriously protest, that, out of kindness to him, besides other reasons, I have no design nor desire to have it in Latin; yet, when I consider what an awkward guesser he is, and perpetually in the wrong, it is a kind of presage to me that he now *guesses* no better. [220]

X.

THE xxiii Epistle is directed to Pythagoras; and there he gives to his doctrine and institution the name of Philosophy: Ἡ Φαλάριδος τυραννὶς τῆς Πυθαγόρε ΦΙΛΟΣΟΦΙΑΣ πλείστον ὅσον δοκεῖ κερχωρίσθαι. And so again, in the lvi, he gives him the title of Philosopher: Πυθαγόρος τῷ ΦΙΛΟΣΟΦΩΙ. I could shew now, from a whole crowd of Authors, that Pythagoras was the first man that invented the word: but I shall content myself with two; Diogenes Laertius and Cicero. The former says † Φιλοσοφίαν πρῶτος ὠνόμασε Πυθαγόρας, καὶ αὐτὸν Φιλόσοφον, ἐν Σικυῶνι διαλεγόμενος Λέοντι, τῷ Σικυωνίων τυράννῳ, ἃ Φλιασέων "Pythagoras first named Philosophy, and [221]

* Herod. iv, 11.

† P. 3. & 26.

“ called himself a Philosopher, in conversation with
 “ Leon, the tyrant of Sicyon; or, as some say, of
 “ Phlius.” The latter tells us * “ That, when Pythago-
 “ ras had discoursed before Leon,—the Tyrant, much
 “ taken with his wit and eloquence, asked him what
 “ Art or Trade he professed. Art, says Pythagoras, I
 “ profess none; but I am a Philosopher. Leon, in
 “ admiration at the newness of the name, enquires
 “ what those Philosophers were; and wherein they
 “ differed from other men †.” What a difference is
 here between the two Tyrants! The one knows not
 what Philosopher means; the other seems to account it
 as threadbare a word as the name of Wise Men of
 Greece; and that too, before ever he had spoken with
 Pythagoras. We cannot tell, at this distapce of time,
 which conversation was first; that with Phalaris, or that
 with Leon. If Phalaris was the first, the Epistles must
 be a cheat. But, allowing Leon’s to be first, yet it could
 not be long before the other; and it is very hard to
 [222] believe that the fame of so small a business could so
 soon reach Phalaris’ ear in his Castle, through his
 guard of Blue Coats ‡, and the loud bellowing of his
 Bull. Nay, could we suppose him to have heard of it,
 yet surely, when he had written to Pythagoras, he
 would have ushered the word in with some kind of in-
 troduction, “ That Science, which you call Philosophy;”
 and not speak of it as familiarly as if it had been the
 language of his Nurse.

THE sum of my argument from the word *Φιλόσοφος* is this:
 That it was invented in Pythagoras’ time, and by himself; and
 perhaps not till after his conversation with Phalaris: or, if be-
 fore, yet it is very improbable that Phalaris should have heard
 of the word before he had ever seen the man; nay, though he
 had heard of it, he would not have used it so vulgarly and sa-

* Tuscul. Quæst. l. v.

† “ Quinam essent Philosophi; & quid inter eos & reliquos interesset.”

‡ This is not said at random; for I find the Agrigentines forbade their
 citizens to wear blue clothes, because blue was Phalaris’ livery. So
 says Hadr. Junius de *Coma*, cap. vi.—S. S.

miliarly,

miliarly, but have signified by some short preamble that the word was new, and Pythagoras' own. Let us see now how the candid Mr. B. represents it. "He finds fault," says he, "with Phalaris for calling Pythagoras *Philosopher*: why? because Pythagoras himself invented that word." Now this is so far from being the whole argument, that it is no part of it at all; for I do not blame his Phalaris for using the word φιλόσοφος, "because Pythagoras invented it," but "because he could not have then heard of it;" or, if he had, he should have "prefaced it with something to signify its newness, and that Pythagoras was its Author." Is not this a most proper and honourable way of "giving the world an account of my performance?" But, however, he harangues upon this argument of his own: "Could Phalaris, therefore," says he, "pay Pythagoras a greater compliment than by using the word? Queen Elizabeth first coined the word *Feminilis*, in a speech of hers to one of the Universities. Could that Body have shewed her a handsomer piece of respect than by using that very word to her afterwards, as freely as if it had been one of the best age of Latin?" All this, as I have plainly shewn, does not at all concern me or my argument; yet I mention it, that the Reader may see what a rare judge of decency and good sense the Examiner is; for I dare appeal to all persons truly of that character, if that wise princess would not have despised such a piece of mean pedantic flattery, and rather have commended the manly freedom of him that told a greater person than herself, upon his coining a barbarous word, *Hominibus, Cæsar, civitatem dare potes, Verbis non potes*: "Your Majesty may naturalize Men, but you cannot naturalize Words." And what a clamour does Mr. B. make, because I first used, as he thinks, the word *commentitious*? Yet the same man here, in his great wisdom, would have a learned University make barbarisms a-purpose*, because a lady chances to do so. But it is to be hoped that reverend body is not under the same direction with Mr. B.

P. 160.

Pref.
[223]

P. 287.

I had asked the question, "How came the fame of so small a business as Pythagoras' discourse with Leon, to reach the

* Bp. Lowth's *Introduct. to English Grammar*, art. PREPOSITION, cites this passage, in confirmation of his own opinion, that the particle *a*, before Participles and Nouns, in the phrases *a*-coming, *a*-bed, &c. (which Dr. Wallis supposes to be the preposition *at*) is the preposition *on*, a little disguised by familiar use and quick pronunciation. In the above phrase Dr. Bentley plainly supposes *a* to be the same with *on*; and thus J. Hopkins, Ps. lxxxvii. 16, "The depths *on* trembling fell;" or, as we now say in common discourse, "they fell *a* trembling."

"ear

P. 161. "ear of Phalaris," who was so difficult of access, being entrenched commonly within his castle, and encompassed with his guard of executioners? The Examiner, who is puzzled at nothing, can very easily account for this: "one may as well ask," [224] he says, "how he came to hear his name was Pythagoras: Fame, that told him the one, must tell him the other too." An extraordinary acuteness indeed! If he hear of any man's name, he can give an account, with the same facility, of all his conversation. A man that had gotten this admirable faculty, would have had mighty preferment in Phalaris' court. A certain gossip of old, as the story goes, would needs tell her comrades what Jupiter once whispered to Juno in her ear. The company was inquisitive how she could know it then: but Mr. B. would have answered for her, "That they might as well ask her how she came to know his name was Jupiter; — Fame, that told her the one, must tell her the other too."

These are all the animadversions that Mr. B. can afford upon this topic, except a small puny cavil against an expression of mine, "the first inventor;" which shall be answered when I come to examine his exceptions to my style. But on the next head, "the Original of Tragedy," he resolves to overflow all banks with a spring-tide of learning:—let the Reader therefore prepare, that he be not carried away with the flood.

XI.

[225] **I**N the LXIII Epistle, he is in great wrath with one Aristolochus, a Tragic Poet that nobody ever heard of, "for writing Tragedies against him;" κατ' ἐμὴ γράφειν Τραγῳδίας and in the xcvi, he threatens Lysinus, another Poet of the same stamp with the former, "for [225] "writing against him both Tragedies and Hexametres;" ἀλλ' ἔπη καὶ τραγῳδίας εἰς ἐμὴ γράφεις. Now, to forgive him that silly expression, of writing Tragedies *against* *Hi m* (for he could not be the argument of Tragedy while he was living) I must take the boldness to tell him, who am out of his reach, that he lays a false crime to their charge; for there was no such thing nor word as Tragedy while he tyrannized at Agrigentum. That we may slight that obscure story about Epigenes the Sicyonian,

Sicyonian, Thespis, we know, was the first inventor of it, according to Horace. Neither was the name of Tragedy more ancient than the thing, as sometimes it happens when an old word is borrowed and applied to a new notion; but both were born together, the name being taken from *Τράγος*, the goat, that was the prize to the best Poet and Actor; but the first performance of Thespis was about the LXI Olymp*, which is more than twelve years after Phalaris' death.

I HAD made this short reflection upon the Epistles, "That Aristolochus and Lysinus, two Tragic Poets mentioned there, were never heard of anywhere else" This is arraigned by Mr. B. with great form and solemnity; but, before he begins, he is inclined "to guess, from Aristolochus' name, P. 163. "that he was a Giant Tragedian, rather than a Fairy one;" but his consequences are all of a piece, both when he jests and when he is serious; for if he argue from the etymology of his name, *Aristolochus* denotes a person that was good at "lurking and ambuscade†;" which surely is not the proper character of a Giant. If he argue from the bigness of his name, he might have remembered that *Borborocætes* and *Meridarpax*, the names of two heroes in *Batrachomyomachia*, make a more terrible sound than *Achilles* and *Hector*. And we have instances in our own time, that a man may be called by a great name, and yet be no Giant in any thing. [226]

Well, now he begins his remarks, and he finds the footsteps of this Aristolochus in a nameless piece usually printed with Censorinus; "For there is Numerus Aristolochius, which P. 163. "must come from Aristolochus, a Poet, as Aristophanius there "comes from Aristophanes;" upon which he farther enlarges; and it is a difficult problem, whether he shews more learning here in the margin, or more judgment in the text. The passage which he cites is thus:—

"Numerus Saturnius:

"Magnum numerum triumphat | hostibus devictis.

"Sunt qui hunc Archebolion vocant;" that is, "Some call the Saturnian Verse Archebolion." Ludovicus Carrio makes this note upon it:—"That the common Editions, before his, had it Aristolochium; but the MSS. Aristodolium. Now, to which reading of the three must we stand?—to Archebolion,

* Marm. Arund. Suidas in *Θέσπης*.

† *Δόλος*.

OR

or Aristolochium, or Aristodolium? Mr. B. who will never be guilty of improving any place, leaves his Reader here at large to take which of them he pleases; only he puts in for his thirds, because Aristolochium has a chance to be the right as well as either of the others; but what if I shall prove that all three are wrong; and the true lection is ARCHILOCHIUM! Then his Aristolochus must vanish into Fairy-land again.

[227]

The first that used the Saturnian verse among the Latins was Nævius, an old Poet before Ennius's time; the measures of the verse will be best known by examples. The two first are out of Nævius*: —

“ Novem Jovis concordēs | filiæ sorores.
“ Ferunt pulchras pateras | aureas lepidas.”

The latter of which has two false measures in it, and ought to be corrected thus out of Plotius† and Nonius Marcellus‡: —

“ Ferunt pulchras creterras | aureas lepidas.”

The following was made by the Metelli, Nævius's enemies: —

“ Dabunt malum Metelli | Nævio Poetæ§.

Now it is observed by Terentianus Maurus||, a most elegant Writer, that the Latins were much mistaken in supposing the Saturnian verse to be an invention of their countrymen; for the original of it was from the Greeks. Fortunatianus says the same; and he adds, that it was to be met with in Euripides, and Callimachus, and ARCHILOCHUS. The instance that he brings is this, and he calls it ARCHILOCHIUM: —

“ Quem non rationis egentem | vicit Archimedes.”

And so Servius¶ brings another ARCHILOCHIUM: —

“ Remeavit ab arce tyrannus | hostibus devictis.”

These two verses indeed are not really Archilochus's, but made by those Grammarians conformably to his measures; but I can give you some that are truly his own**: —

Ἑρασμονίδη Χαρίλας | χοῦμά τοι γελοῖον.
Ἀγῶν δ' οἱ μὲν κατόπισθεν | ἦσαν οἱ δὲ πολλοί.
Ἑρέω πολὺ φίλταδ' ἑταίρων | τέρψεται δ' ἀκέων.
Φιλέειν συγγόν περ ἔοντα | μὴδὲ διαλέγεσθαι.

[228] And Hephæstion assures us “That Archilochus was the first
“ that used this sort of verse††.” Now, I suppose, I scarce

* Atilius Fortun. p. 2679.

† Plot. p. 2650.

‡ C. de Vasis.

§ Atilius ibid.

|| Terent. p. 2349.

¶ Centim. p. 1825.

** Hephæst. p. 48, 50.

†† Πρώτος τέτοις Ἀρχίλοχος κέχρηται.

need

need to observe, that these ARCHILOCHIAN verses are the same with the SATURNIAN; the measures themselves sufficiently shew that, for there is no difference at all, but only a Dactyl for a Spondee or Trochee, which was a common variation even in the Latin Saturnians; as in these two that follow, out of the *Tabulæ Triumphales*: —

“ Fundit, fugat, prosternit | maximas legiones.

“ Duello magno dirimendo | regibus subigendis*.”

I have distinguished the middle pause of every verse by this mark |, that the Reader, though perhaps unacquainted with this part of learning, may have a perception of the measure: and, I suppose, he may be pretty well satisfied that the true reading in Mr. B.’s Author is not *Aristolochium*, but *Archilochium*. As for the two other names, *Aristodolium* and *Archebolion*, the former is a manifest corruption; the latter (as it seems) was in no MS. nor Print, but a bare conjecture of Carro’s, and a very erroneous one; for the *Archebulion* (as he ought to have called it) had quite different measures, as will appear by these instances: —

Ἀγέτω θεός, ἐ γὰρ ἔχω δίχα τὰν δ’ ἀείδων †.

“ Tibi nascitur omne pecus, tibi crescit herba ‡.”

The Reader will excuse this digression, because I have given a clear emendation, where the great Mr. B. attempted it in vain; which would be an honour much more valuable if I had it not so very often.

“ But suppose,” says Mr. B. “ that nobody heard of these Tragedians but in Phalaris; what then? Will the Doctor discard all Poets that are but once mentioned in old Authors? What at this rate will become of Xenocles and Pythangelus, whom (at least the *first* of them) the Doctor will be hard put to it to find mentioned by any body, but once by Aristophanes?” Very *hard put to it* indeed! to find an Author that is mentioned in so common a Book as *Ælian’s Various History* §; where we have both the name of this Xenocles, and his age too, and the titles of four of his Plays, *Œdipus*, *Lycaon*, *Bacchæ*, and *Athamas*, with which he got the prize from his antagonist Euripides, *Olymp. xci. 1.* It is true, *Ælian* is in indignation at it: and “ It is ridiculous,” says he, “ that this little Xenocles should carry the prize from Euripides, especially when those Plays of Euripides were some of the best that he ever made. The judges were either senseless

P. 164.

[229]

* Atilius Fort. *ibid.*

† Hephæst. p. 27.

‡ Attil. p. 1673.

§ *Ælian. ii. 8.*

“ and

“and unlearned, or else they were bribed.” This is the just verdict and censure of impartial posterity; and Euripides, could he have foreseen it, would not have changed this posthumous honour for the applauses that Xenocles won from him. “And
 P. 163.] “by the way, therefore, I would advise Mr. B.” (if I may return him his own words) “not to be too vain upon his performance,” when he hears it cried up by those that are not competent judges. Bavius and Mævius (whom Mr. B. mentions here) had many admirers while they lived, or else they had been below the notice of Virgil and Horace: but posterity gave them their due; for that will flatter no man’s quality, nor follow the clamour of a party. But to return to Xenocles:—
 [230] There is a fifth Play of his, Licymnius, mentioned by the Scholiast on Aristophanes*; and two fragments of it are produced by Aristophanes himself. Mr. B. says he is but *once* mentioned by that Poet; but besides the passage of Ranaë†, which Mr. B. meant, there are three others‡ where he is spoken of, under the title of “the Son of Carcinus.” He is mentioned too in a fragment of Plato the Comedian:—

——— Ξενοκλῆς ὁ δωδεκαμήχανος
 *Ο Καρκίνου παῖς τῆ θαλαττίης.

He was ridiculed also by Pherecrates||, another Comic Poet; and we may hear of him in Suidas, in more places than one¶. What does the Examiner mean then by his *putting me hard to it*? I will do much harder matters than this to do him any service. But I am persuaded he was encouraged to write thus *at a venture*, because Vossius says nothing of Xenocles in his Book De Poetis Græcis.

If the Examiner had not had the ambitious vanity to shew, as he thought, his great reading and critic, he might fairly have escaped these two blunders about Aristolochus and Xenocles; for what is it he is driving at? or who is it he disputes with? Did I make that my argument against Phalaris, “That his two pretended Tragedians were nowhere also to be heard of?” No, surely; but “because he names two Tragedians in an age of the world when Tragedy itself was not yet heard of.”

This therefore is the main point which Mr. B. and I must now contend for, “The first date and origin of Tragedy.” In my Dissertation I espoused the opinion of those Authors that make Thespis the inventor of it, professing in express words, “That I slighted the obscure story of Epigenes the

* Schol. Arist. p. 120.

† P. 133.

‡ P. 120, 364, 464.

§ Ib. 465.

|| Ib. 364.

¶ Suid. in Καρκίνος, & Σφουγάρις, & Ἀξίρος.

“Sicy-

"Sicyonian." This, I think, is a sufficient proof that I knew there were some weak pretences made to Tragedy before Thespis's time; but I believed them overbalanced by better authorities. And yet what is there in this long-winded harangue of Mr. B.'s, from p. 165 to 180, but the bringing, with ostentation and grimace, those very obscure pretences which I declared I had slighted; and every bit of it (except his own faults as usual) scraped together at second-hand from the commonest Authors? In opposition to which tedious declamation, I shall first vindicate Thespis's title to the *invention* of Tragedy; and, in the next place, enquire into his *age*; and in the last, examine Mr. B.'s performance in the same order as he has presented it. [231]

The famous chronological inscription in the Arundel Marble, which was made Olymp. cxxix, in the time of Ptolemee Philadelphus, above cclx years before Christ, declares that Thespis was the FIRST that gave being to Tragedy*:—*Αφ' ἧς Θέσπις ὁ ποιητής ΠΡΩΤΟΣ ΟΥΣ ΚΑΙ ΕΔΙΔΑΞΕ . . .* The word *πρῶτος* is not in the printed edition; but my learned friend Dr. Mill, whom I consulted on this occasion, assures me it is plainly so in the Marble itself, which is now at Oxford. I shall give a farther account of this by and by; but allowing even the common Reading, as it is published by Mr. Selden, yet it is evident, and agreed by all, that the Author of this Inscription delivers this as the first æra of Tragedy. Besides him, the Epigrammatist Dioscorides gives the invention of it to Thespis:—

Θέσπιδ' εὖριμα τέτο, τὰδ' ἀγροῖῳτιν αἶν' ὕλαι
 Παίγνια, καὶ κόμης τὰς δι' ἐλαιοτέρης
 Αἰσχύλος ἐψύχωσε, νοήσιμα ἔτα χαράξας
 Γράμματα, χειμάρρῳ δ' οἶα καταρδόμενα
 Καὶ τὰ κατὰ σκηνὴν μετ' αἰνέουσιν· ὃ γόμα πάντων
 Δίξιον, ἀρχαίων ἢ θά τις ἡμιθίων. [232]

Thus the Epigram is published by the very learned Mr. Stanley, before his noble Edition of Æschylus; and I have not now leisure to seek if it was printed anywhere before. In the third verse, which is manifestly corrupted, Mr. Stanley corrected it *ἐνόςσιμα* for *νοήσιμα*, as appears by his translation, *UTILE*; the other word he leaves untouched. The Epigram itself is extant in the MS. Anthologia Epigram. Græc. a copy of which I have by me, by the kindness of my excellent friend the late Dr. Edward Bernard; and there the third verse is thus:—

Αἰσχύλος ἐψύχωσε νοήσιμα ἐντα χαράξας.

* Lin. 58.

Out

Out of which disjointed words I have extracted, as I humbly conceive, this genuine lection: —

Δισχύλος ἐξύψωσε, νεοσμίλευτα χαράξας
Γράμματα —————

A, the last letter of *νοήσῃμα*, was mistaken for Δ. 'Εξύψωσεν, he *raised and exalted* the style of Tragedy by *νεοσμίλευτα γράμματα*, his new-made and *new-carved* words; which is the very thing that Aristophanes ascribes to him*: —

Ἄλλ' ὃ πρῶτος τῶν Ἑλλήνων πυργώσας ῥήματα σεμνά

and the Writer of his Life †, Ζηλοῖ τὸ ἀδρὸν καὶ ὑπέρογκον ONOMATOΠΟΙΙΑΣ καὶ ἐπιθέτοις χρώμενος. But our Epigrammatist, though he gives Æschylus the honour of improving Tragedy, is as positive that (*εὔρεμα*) *the invention* of it belongs to Thespis; which will farther appear from another Epigram
[233] by the same hand, made upon Thespis himself, and never yet published; but it is extant in the same Manuscript Anthology:

Διοσκορίδῃ εἰς Θέσπιν τραγῳδῶν.

Θέσπις ὄδῃ, Τραγικῇ δὲ ἀνέπλασε πρῶτος αἰοδῶν,
Κωμήταις νιάρᾳ καινοτομῶν χάριτας
Βάκχος ὅτε τρίτον κατάγοι χορὸν, ὃ τράγος ἄθλος.
Χῳτικὸς ἦν σύκων ἄρριχος ἄθλος ἔτι.
Οἱ δέ με πλάσσανσι νοῖ, τὰ δὲ μῦριος αἰὼν,
Πολλὰ πρὸ σευ, φήσει, κἄτερ' αὖ τᾶλλα δ' ἱμά.

The second distich, which in the MS. is faulty and unintelligible, is thus perhaps to be corrected: —

Βάκχος ὅτε τρίτον κατάγοι χορὸν, ὃ τράγος ἄθλος,
Χ' ὡς ἑλικὸς ἦν σύκων ἄρριχος, ἄθλος ἔτι.

“ Cum Bacchus ducat triplicem chorum; cui Hircus,

“ Et cui Attica ficuum cista præmium erat, ut adhuc fabula est.”

By the three choruses of Bacchus, he means Trina Dionysia, the Three Festivals of Bacchus: — the Διονύσια τὰ ἐν Λίμναις, the Διονύσια τὰ κατ' αἶν, and the Διονύσια τὰ κατ' αἶγρος at which times, that answer to March, April, and January, both Tragedies and Comedies were acted. Afterwards indeed they added these diversions to the Παναθήναια, which fell out in the month of August; but, because this last was an innovation after Thespis' time, the Poet here takes no notice of it. But to dismiss this, the substance of the Epigram imports “ That Thespis was the FIRST contriver of Tragedy; which was

* Arist. Ran. p. 169.

† Anon. in vitâ Æsch.

then

then a NEW entertainment." After Dioscorides, we have Horace's testimony in 'Thespis' favour * :—

" Ignotum Tragicæ genus invenisse camænæ

" Dicitur, & plaustris vexisse poemata Thespis,

" Quæ canerent agerentque peruncti fœcibus ora."

And I think, this Poet's opinion is not only well explained, but confirmed too by the old Scholiast, who tells us " Thespis was the FIRST INVENTOR of Tragedy †." To all these we may add Plutarch, whose expression implies something farther : " That Thespis gave the rise and beginning to the very rudiments of Tragedy ‡;" and Clemens of Alexandria, who makes Thespis " the contriver of Tragedy, as Susarion was of Comedy §." And, without doubt, Athenæus was of the same judgment, when he said that " Both Comedy and Tragedy were found out at Icarius, a place in Attica ||;" for our Thespis was born there. And in another place, he says " The ancient Poets, Thespis, Pratinas, Cratinus, and Phrynichus, were called ὀρχηστικοὶ, dancers, because they used dancing so much in their choruses ¶." Now if we compare this with what Aristotle says, " That Tragedy in its infancy was (ὀρχησικωτέρα) more taken up with dances than afterwards **," it will be plain that Athenæus knew no ancienter Tragedian than Thespis; for, if he had, it had been to his purpose to name him. But there is a fault in that passage, which by the way I will correct: for ΚρατῖνⓄ (Cratinus) who is named there, was a Comedian; and does not suit with the rest. The true reading I take to be ΚαρκίνⓄ, Carcinus; who was an ancient Tragic Poet, and is burlesqued once or twice by Aristophanes, for this very dancing humour that Athenæus speaks of ††. He had three sons, that he brought up to dance in his choruses; who, upon that account are called there, among many other nick-names, ὀρχησταί, dancers. To go on now about Thespis. Suidas acquaints us that " Phrynichus was Scholar to Thespis, who FIRST introduced Tra-

* Hor. in Arte Poët. [Dr. Bentley has corrected these verses concerning Thespis, in his edition of Horace, published MDCCXI. But his correction there does not affect what he says here: for *Plaustra* were certainly used; whether to carry the Plays in, or the Authors, or the Players.]

† Schol. in edit. Cruquii.

‡ Plut. Solon. Ἀρχομένων τῶν περὶ Θέσπιν ἤδη τὴν Τραγῶδιαν κινεῖν.

§ Clem. Strom. i. ἐπενόησε Τραγῶδιαν.

|| Athen. p. 40.

¶ Id. p. 22.

** Arist. Poet. v.

†† Arist. p. 364, 464. Suid. in Καρκ.

Q

" gedy ;

[235] “gedy;” and Donatus passes his word, that “if we search into antiquity, we shall find that Thespis was the FIRST that invented it *.” But what need we any particular witnesses, when we have Plato telling us at once “That it was the universal opinion in his time that Tragedy began with Thespis or Phrynichus †?” and though he himself was of a different sentiment, yet he proposes it as a paradox ‡: and we may see what little credit his paradox had, when every one of those I have cited came after him, and yet for that matter begged his pardon.

The pretences that are made *against* Thespis, besides some general talk (which shall be considered when I examine Mr. B.’s advances upon this topic) are for one Epigenes, a Sicyonian. This is the only person mentioned by name that can contest the matter with Thespis. And who is there that appears in behalf of this Epigenes but one single witness? and he too does but tell us a hear-say, which himself seems not to believe. “Thespis,” says Suidas §, “is reckoned the xvth Tragic Poet after Epigenes, a Sicyonian; but some say Thespis was the second after him; and others, the very first of all.” And again, where he explains the Proverb, *Ὅθεν πρὸς τὸν Διόνυσον*, “It was occasioned,” he says, “by a Tragedy of Epigenes, a Sicyonian;” but he adds, “That others give a different and better account of it ||.” Now, if this be all that is said for Epigenes’ plea; nay, if it be all that is said of him upon any account (for I think nobody mentions him besides Suidas) I suppose this ill-supported pretence to Tragedy will soon be over-ruled, unless

* “Retro prisca volventibus reperietur Thespis Tragediæ primus inventor.”

† Plat. in Min. Ὡς οἴεται, ἀπὸ Θέσπιδος.

[‡ “Ἡ δὲ τραγωδία ἐστὶ παλαιὰ ἰθαῦτε, ἐχὼς ὡς οἴεται ἀπὸ Θέσπιδος ἀρχαίμην, ἐδ’ ἀπὸ Φρυγίου· ἀλλ’ εἰ θύλεις ἐποίησαι, πάλιν παλαιὸν αὐτὸ εὐρήσεις δι’ τῆς δὲ τῆς σόλωνος εἰρημίας· ἐστὶ δὲ τῆς ποιήσεως δημοτικῆς τῆς τε καὶ ψυχραγωγικώτατος ἡ τραγωδία. ΤΡΑΓΩΔΙΑ is here to be taken in its larger extent. There were no *Stage Plays* till the time of Thespis; and in this sense no *Tragedies*. But yet there were stories of a dramatic kind, formed into Dialogue; and Characters drawn, as of Minos, a cruel King. This manner of writing was not the invention of Thespis or Phrynichus, as people generally thought; confounding the Stage with the characteristic and dialogue manner of writing.” J. Upton, Dissert. on Shakespeare, § 14. p. 119.

But still we have no proof that the word *Tragedy* was known in Phalaris’ time; but only some sort of Dialogue; which, in Plato’s opinion, was the original of Tragedy.]

§ Suid. in Θέσπιδος.

|| In *Ὅθεν πρὸς Διόν.*

perhaps

perhaps the very weakness of it may invite Mr. B. to espouse the cause; for I observe that his judgment, like other men's valour, has commonly the generosity to favour the weaker side. It is true, there are two very great men, Lilius Gyraldus * and Gerard Vossius †, besides others, who affirm that this same Epigenes is cited, and some of his Tragedies named by Athenæus. If this be so, it will quite alter the case; and the trial must be called over again. But, with Mr. B.'s leave, I will once more take the boldness "to contradict great names;" for I affirm that the Epigenes in Athenæus was a Comic Poet, and many generations younger than his pretended name-sake, the Tragedian. Suidas himself is my voucher: "Epigenes," says he, "a Comic Poet, some of his plays are Ἡραίωνη, and Μνημάτιον, and Βαγχία, as Athenæus says in his Deipnosophists ‡." Gyraldus indeed would draw this testimony over to his own side; and for Κωμικός, he corrects it Τραγικός. But Athenæus himself interposes, and forbids this alteration: "Epigenes," says he, "the Comic Poet, says thus in his Bacchæ; Ἄλλ' εἰ τις ὥσπερ χῆν' ἔτρεφέ με λαβὼν σιτευτόν§." The verses are to be distinguished thus:—

[236]

Ἄλλ' εἰ τις ὥσπερ χῆνά μ' ἔτρεφεν λαβὼν
Σιτευτό.—

The words themselves shew they belong to Comedy, when they tell us of "fatted geese:" and, indeed, the very subject of all his Fragments plainly evinces it. The next tells us of "Figs at a supper ||:"—

Εἴτ' ἔρχεται χελιδονίων μετ' ὀλίγον
Σκληρῶν ἀδρὸς πινάκιονⓈ —

Correct it

— Εἴτ' ἔρχεται
Χελιδονίων μετ' ὀλίγον σκληρῶν ἀδρὸς
ΠινάκιονⓈ —

And another, out of the same Play ¶, and three out of Μνημάτιον, and two out of Ἡραίωνη, are all about Cups: the last of which will inform us a little about the Poet's age **:—

[237]

* Gyrald. de Poëtis. † Vossius de Poëtica. ‡ Suid. Ἐπιγ.

§ Athen. p. 384. Ἐπιγίνης ὁ κωμικοποιὸς ἐν Βαγχίαις.

|| P. 76. Ἐπιγίνης ἐν Βραγχίᾳ.

¶ P. 498. Ἐπιγ. ἐν Βαγχίᾳ.

** Athen. p. 502.

Τὴν Θηρίκλειον δεῦρο καὶ τὰ Ῥοδιακὰ
Κόμισον—

“Fetch hither the Thericlean and the Rhodian cups;” for by his naming the THERICLEAN cup*, we may be sure he was no older than Aristophanes’ time: nay, that he was considerably younger, Julius Pollux will assure us†; where he calls him one of the writers of New Comedy: Τῶν δὲ νέων τις Κωμικῶν Ἐπιγένης ἐν Ποντικῷ, Τρεῖς μόνες σκώληκας ἔτι, τέτους δὲ μ’ ἔασον καταγαγεῖν. The measures of the verses are thus:—

—————Τρεῖς μόνες
Σκώληκας ἔτι· τέτους δὲ μ’ ἔασον καταγαγεῖν.

Well, I hope, I have fully shewn, without offending their ashes, that Gyraldus and Vossius were mistaken about Epigenes. I would only add, that we ought to correct in Suidas, Ἡρώϊν for Ἡραΐν, and Βακχεία for Βακχεῖα and I take the three words in Athenæus, Βάκχαις, Βραγχία, and Βακχία, to be so many deprivations of one and the same title of a Play.

[238] The Reader will please to take notice of Phalaris’ expression, “That Aristolochus wrote Tragedies against him‡;” and to remember too, what I have shewn before, that both Comedies and Tragedies for some time were unpremeditated and extemporal, neither published nor written. Allowing then that this Epigenes, or any other Sicyonian started Tragedy before Thespis, still it will not bring Phalaris off, unless his advocate can shew that Tragedy was written before Thespis’ time. But there is no ground nor colour for such an assertion; none of the antients countenance it; no Tragedy is ever cited older than He. Donatus says expressly, he was the first that wrote: and it is incredible that the belief of his first inventing Tragedy should so universally obtain as we have shewn it did, if any Tragedies of an older Author had been extant in the world. Nay, I will go a step farther, and freely own my opinion, “That even Thespis himself published nothing in writing:” and if this be made out, the present argument against the Epistles will still be the stronger, though even without it, it is unanswerable, if Thespis be younger than the true Phalaris, which I will prove by and by. But I expect now to hear a clamour against “Paradoxes,

* See here, p. 109, &c.

† Poll. vii, 10.

‡ Ep. 63. ΓΡΑΦΕΙΝ τραγωδίας.

“ and

“ and opposing great Authors upon slight or no grounds; for the Arundel Marble mentions the Ἀλκίης of Thespis, and Julius Pollux his Περθεύς, and Suidas four or five more; and Plutarch, with Clemens Alexand. produce some of his verses. No question but these are strong prejudices against my new assertion, or rather suspicion; but the sagacious reader will better judge of it when he has seen the reasons I go upon.

This I lay down as the foundation of what I shall say on this subject, That the famous Heraclides, of Pontus, set out his own Tragedies in Thespis's name. “ Aristoxenus, the Musician, says” (they are the words of Diogenes Laërtius*) “ that Heraclides made Tragedies, and put the name of Thespis to them.” This Heraclides was a Scholar of Aristotle's, and so was Aristoxenus too, and even a greater man than the other; so that, I conceive, one may build upon this piece of History as a thing undeniable.

Now, before the date of this forgery of Heraclides, we have no mention at all of any of Thespis's remains. Aristotle, in his Poetry, speaks of the origin and progress and perfection of Tragedy; he reads a lecture of Critic upon the fables of the first Writers; yet he has not one syllable about any piece of Thespis. This will seem no small indication that nothing of his was preserved; but there is a passage in Plato that more manifestly implies it. “ Tragedy,” says he, “ is an ancient thing, and did not commence, as people think, from Thespis, nor from Phrynichus†.” Now from hence I infer, if several persons in Plato's time believed Tragedy was invented by Phrynichus, they must never have seen nor heard of any Tragedies of Thespis; for, if they had, there could have been no controversy which of the two was the inventor, for the one was a whole generation younger than the other. But Thespis's Tragedies being lost, and Phrynichus's being the ancientest that were preserved, it was an inducement to several to believe him the first Author. [239]

It is true indeed, that, after the time of Heraclides, we have a few fragments of Thespis quoted, and the names of some of his Plays; but I will now shew that those passages are, every one of them, cited from Heraclides's counterfeit Tragedies, and not the works of the true Thespis.

As for the Author of the Arundel Marble, who was but a

* Laërt. Herac. Φησὶ δ' Ἀριστοῦξενος ὁ Μουσικὸς καὶ Τραγωδίας αὐτὸν ποιῆσαι, καὶ Θίσσιδος αὐτὰς ἐπιγράφειν.

† Plato in Minoë.

Δικέρως, τίθεμαι βωμῶν ἁγίων.

"Ἴδε σοι Βρομὶς αἶθοπα ΦΛΕΓΜΟΝ Λεῖω——"

This supposed fragment of Thespis, as Clemens himself explains it, and as I have farther proved out of Porphyry *, relates to those four artificial words, Κναῖζζζι, Κύνπτις, Φλεγμῶ, Δρόψ, which comprehend exactly the whole xxiv letters of the Greek alphabet. Now I say, if these xxiv letters were not all invented in Thespis's time, this cannot be a genuine fragment of His. The consequence, I think, is as very plain, that even Mr. B. with his new System of Logic cannot give us a better. We must know then, that it was a long time after the use of Greek writing; nay, of writing books too, before the Greek alphabet was perfected as it now is, and has been for 2000 years. It is true there were then the very same sounds in pronunciation (for the language was not altered) but they did not express them the same way in writing. E served in those days for both E and H, as one English E serves now for two distinct sounds in THEM and THESE; so O stood for both O and Ω; and the sound of Z was expressed by ΔΣ, of Ξ by ΚΞ, of Ψ by ΠΣ; and the three aspirates were written thus, TH, PH, KH, which were afterwards Θ, Φ, Χ. At that time we must imagine the first verse of Homer to have been written thus:—

MENIN AEIΔE THEA ΠEΔEIAΔEO AKHIAEOΣ.

And the same manner of writing was in Thespis's time, because the alphabet was not completed till after his death; for it is universally agreed that either Simonides, or Epicharmus, or both, invented some of the Letters. Pliny says "That Z H Ψ Ω are reported to be Simonides's; and that Aristotle says There were xviii old Letters; and believes that Θ and Χ were added by Epicharmus rather than Palamedes†." Marius Victorinus says "Simonides invented Θ Φ Χ†." "Simonides added four," says Hyginus; "and Epicharmus two §;" but Jo. Tzetzes says "Epicharmus added three, and Simonides two||." But these little differences are of no consequence in our present argument; for the whole xxiv are mentioned in this pretended Fragment of Thespis. It is suf-

* See my Dissert. upon Malal. p. 47, 48, 49.

† Plin. vii. 56. "Simonidem Melicium ZHΨΩ. Aristoteles xviii priscas fuisse, et duas ab Epicharmo additas ΘΧ, quam à Palamede mavult."

‡ Mar. Victorinus, p. 2459.

§ Hygin. Fab. 277.

|| Tzetz. Chil. xii, 398.

ficient then for our purpose if any of them were invented either by Epicharmus or Simonides; for Epicharmus could not be above xxvii years old, and very probably was much younger at Olymp. lxi, which is the latest period of Thespiis; and Simonides, at the same time, was but xvi, as we have it upon his own word*. Now, to waive the authority of the rest, even Aristotle alone, who could know the truth of what he said from so many inscriptions written before Epicharmus's time, and still extant in his own, is a witness infallible. This passage therefore ascribed to Thespiis is certainly a cheat, and in all probability, it is taken from one of the spurious Plays that Heraclides fathered upon him.

[243] In the next place, I will shew that all the other passages quoted from Thespiis, are belonging to the same imposture. Zenobius informs us "That at first the Choruses used to sing
 " a Dithyramb to the honour of Bacchus; but in time the
 " Poets left that off, and made the Giants and Centaurs the
 " subject of their Plays; upon which the Spectators mocked
 " them, and said That was nothing to Bacchus. The Poets,
 " therefore, sometimes introduced the Satyrs, that they might
 " not seem quite to forget the God of the Festival†." To the same purpose we are told by Suidas, "That at first the subject
 " of all the Plays was Bacchus himself, with his company of
 " Satyrs; upon which account those Plays were called
 " Σατυρικά but afterwards, as Tragedies came in fashion, the
 " Poets went off to Fables‡ and Histories, which gave occasion to that saying, This is nothing to Bacchus§." And he adds, "That Chamæleon says the same thing in his Book about
 " Thespiis||." This Chamæleon was a very learned man, and a Scholar of Aristotle's. And we may gather from the very name of this treatise of his, that Thespiis was some way concerned in this alteration of Tragedy; either he was the last man that used all Satirical Plays, or the first man that left them off. But whether of the two it was we could not determine, unless Plutarch had helped us out in it: — "When Phrynichus and
 " Æschylus," says he, "turned the subject of Tragedy to
 " Fables and doleful stories, the people said What is this to

* See above, p. 42.

† Zenob. ver. 40. Αἰαντας καὶ Κενταύρους λέγειν ἐπιχείρειν Perhaps the true reading is Γίγαντας.

‡ Suid. in Οὐδὲν πρὸς Δίον.

§ Εἰς μύθους καὶ ἱστορίας ἐτραύπησαι.

|| Χαμαιλεῶν ἐν τῷ περὶ Θέσπιδος.

" Βας-

“ Bacchus * ? ” — for it is evident, from this passage of Plutarch, compared with the others before, that the true Thespis's Plays were all Satirical (that is, the plot of them was the story of Bacchus, the Chorus consisted of Satyrs, and the argument was merry) and that Phrynichus and Æschylus were the first introducers of the new and doleful Tragedy. Even after the time of Thespis, the serious Tragedy came on so slowly, that of fifty Plays of Pratinas, who was in the next generation after Thespis, two-and-thirty are said to have been satirical †. [244]

But let us apply now this observation to the Fragments ascribed to Thespis, one of which is thus quoted by Plutarch ‡ : —

Ὅρα'ς ὅτι Ζεὺς τῶδε πρωτεύει θεῶν,
 Οὐ ψεύδῃ ἐδὲ κόμπων, ἢ μωρὸν γέλων
 Ἀσκῶν τὸ δ' ἡδὺ μὲν ἐκ ἐπίσταται.

“ What differs this,” says Plutarch, “ from that saying of Plato, That the Deity was situated remote from all pleasure and pain § ? ” Why truly, it differs not at all, and I think there needs no other proof that it could not belong to a satirical ludicrous Play, such as all Thespis's were ; for surely this is not the language of Bacchus and his Satyrs ; nay, I might say it is too high and philosophical a strain even for Thespis himself. But suppose the Author could have reached so elevated a thought, yet he would never have put it into the mouth of that drunken voluptuous god, or his wanton attendants. Even Æschylus, the grave reformer of the Stage, would rarely or never bring in his Heroes talking sentences and Philosophy ||, believing that to be against the genius and constitution of Tragedy ; much less then would Thespis have done so, whose Tragedies were nothing but droll. It is incredible, therefore, that this Fragment should be genuine, and we may know at whose door to lay it, from the hint afforded us by Plutarch, though he was not aware of it ; for the thought, as he has shewn us, was Plato's ; and to whom then should the Fragment belong but to

* Plut. Symp. l. i. c. 1. Φρυνίχῃ καὶ Αἰσχύλῳ τὴν Τραγῳδίαν εἰς μῦθος καὶ πάθη προαγόρων.

† Suid. in Πρατ.

‡ Plut. de aud. Poët. Τὰ δὲ τῷ Θέσπιδος ταυτί.

§ Πόρρω ἡδονῇ καὶ λύπῃ ἴδρυται τὸ Θεῖον.

|| Τὸ γνωμολογικὸν ἀλλότριον τῆς Τραγῳδίας ἡγέμεθα. Vita Æsch.

[245] Heraclides, the counterfeit Thespis, who was at first a scholar of Plato's*, and might borrow the notion from his old Master?

Another Verse is quoted by Julius Pollux†, out of Thespis's Pentheus: —

Ἔργῳ νόμιζε νευρίδας ἔχειν ἐπενδύτην

where, for νευρίδας ἔχειν, we may correct it νευρίδ' ἔχειν. Now the very titles of this Play, Πενθεύς, and of the others mentioned by Suidas, Ἀθλα Περίσ' ἢ Φόρδας, and Ἰερεῖς and Ἡθῆροι, do sufficiently shew that they cannot be satirical Plays, and consequently not Thespis's, who made none but of that sort. The learned Casaubon, after he has taught us from the Antients that Thespis was the inventor of Satirical Plays,—“ Yet among the “ Plays,” says he, “ that are ascribed to Thespis, there is not “ one that appears to have been satirical. Πενθεύς indeed seems “ to promise the fairest to be so; but we have observed that the “ old Poets never brought the Satyrs into the story of Pen- “ theus‡.” I have willingly used the words of Casaubon, though I do not own the observation to him, because his judgment must needs appear free and unbiassed, since he had no view nor suspicion of the consequence I now make from it; for the result of the whole is this, That there was nothing published by Thespis himself, and that Heraclides's forgeries imposed upon Clemens, and Plutarch, and Pollux, and others, which, by the way, would be some excuse for Mr. B. if his obstinate persisting in his first mistake did not too widely distinguish his case from theirs.

[246] The next thing that I am to debate with Mr. B. is the age of the true Thespis. And the witness, that upon all accounts deserves to be first heard, is the Author of the Arundel Marble; for he is the ancientest Writer now extant that speaks of his age; he is the most accurate in his whole performance, and particularly he was curious and inquisitive into the history of Poetry and the Stage, as appears from the numerous æras there belonging to the several Poets; and, which is as considerable an advantage as any, we have the original Stone still among us, so that his numbers (where they are still legible) are certainly genuine, and not liable, as written books are, to be altered and interpolated by the negligence or fraud of Transcribers. The

* Laërt. Heracl.

† Poll. vii, 13. Θέσις ἐν τῷ Πενθεύ.

‡ Casaub. de Sat. p. 157, & 30.

remain-

remaining letters of Thespis's epoch are these: — Αφ' ἧ Θέσπις ὁ ποιητὴς . . . πρῶτον δὲ καὶ ἐδίδαξεν . . . τίην ὁ . . . παύσῃ which imply almost as manifestly as if the whole was entire, "That Thespis FIRST invented Tragedy; and the GOAT was made the prize for it." The very year indeed when this was done, cannot now be known from the Marble, for the numbers are worn out by time and weather; but we can approach as near to it as the present argument requires; for we are sure it must be some year in the interval between the preceding and following epochs, because the whole Inscription proceeds in due order and succession of time. Now the preceding epoch is "Cyrus's victory over Cræsus, and the taking of Sardes*," which, as all the best Chronologers, Scaliger, Lydiate, Petavius, &c. agree, was Olymp. LIX, 1; or, at lowest, at Olymp. LVIII, 2. The following is "The beginning of Darius's reign, Ol. LXV, 1†." But if Tragedy was invented by Thespis between the Olympiads LIX, 1, and LXV, 1, how could Phalaris have intelligence of it, who was put to death before, at Olymp. LVII, 3?

This account in the Marble establishes, and is mutually established by the testimony of Suidas, who informs us "That Thespis made (the first) Play at Ol. LXI ‡; which period falls in between two epochs that go before and after Thespis. And Mr. Selden, who first published the inscription and viewed and measured the stone, supplies the numbers there from this passage of Suidas:—and "the space," he says, "where the letters are defaced agree with that supplement§." Mr. Selden has been followed by every body since; and Suidas's date is confirmed by another date about Phrynichus, Thespis's scholar: "For Phrynichus taught at Olymp. LXVII ||, which is XXIV years after Thespis; and is a competent distance of age between the Scholar and the Master. But if Mr. B. will still protest against this supplement of the Marble, let him do here as he did before in the epoch to Susarion, "take fairly the "middle of the account," between the two epochs before and after it. And what will he get by it? The former epoch is Olymp. LIX, 1; the latter, LXV, 1; the middle of these two is Olymp. LXIII, 1, which is 14 years later than Suidas himself places him.

[247]

P. 141.

But let us see Mr. B.'s noble attempt to invalidate this tes-

* Lin. 57.

† Lin. 59.

‡ Suid. in Θέσπις. 'Εδίδαξεν ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτῆς καὶ ἑ' ἀνθυμιάδῃ.

§ "Spatio lacunæ annuente."

|| Suid. Φρύνιχος.

timony

timony of the Arundel Marble; for, like a young Phaëton, he mounts the chariot, and boldly offers to drive through the loftiest region of Critic; but he is tumbled down headlong in a most miserable manner. The thing he enterprizes is this, — he charges the *graver* of the Marble with an omission of a whole line, or perhaps of several; for this he does not determine. The original paper, which the graver was to copy, he supposes to have been thus:—

‘Αφ’ ἑ Θέσπης ὁ ποιητὴς ;

[248] Ἀφ’ ἑ Φρύνιχος ὁ ποιητὴς αχι . . . Θ. ἐδίδαξεν
 “Αλ τιν τέθη ὁ ράγος The space between
 Θέσπης ὁ ποιητὴς and Ἀφ’ ἑ Φρύνιχος, which is now omitted by
 the *negligence of the graver*, contained, as he imagines, the epoch
 belonging to Thespis; that is, the name and the date of his Play,

P. 168. and of the Athenian Archon. But, when the graver had cut
 the first line, as far as Ποιητὴς, he unluckily “throws his eye
 “ on the lower line; and finding the word Ποιητὴς there in the
 “ same situation, he thinks himself right, and goes on with the
 “ rest that followed it;” and so tacks the epoch to Thespis,

P. 169. which really and in the original belonged to Phrynichus. This
 wonderful achievement our Examiner seems mightily pleased
 with; he inculcates it once and twice, and applauds his own
 sagacity in it: but perhaps he will be a warning hereafter to all
young and unfledged Writers, — to learn to go, before they pre-
 tend to fly.

The pretences for this charge upon the Marble-graver are so
 very weak and precarious, so improper and useless to Mr. B.’s
 own design, that I confess I should be wholly astonished at his
 management, if I was not now a little acquainted with this

P. 68. “ odd work of his,” as himself calls it. His first pretence is,

P. 168. “ That “*Ἀλκην*, which the Graver has made to be Thespis’
 “ Play, was the name of a Play of Phrynichus; but is nowhere
 “ reckoned among Thespis’s but here.” But I have already
 shewn * that “*Ἀλκην* was only a supplement of Mr. Selden’s, and
 a very false conjecture, from the dim Letters ΑΛ . . . ΣΤΙΝ,

[249] which now are quite vanished; and that really neither “*Ἀλκην*,
 nor any other title of a Play, are mentioned in the Marble.
 But suppose it was “*Ἀλκην* there; — pray where is the conse-
 quence that Mr. B. would infer from it? Did Thespis make
 no Tragedies but what are mentioned by Suidas? Does not
 Suidas himself expressly say “ That those were the names of

See here, p. 240.

“ SOME

* SOME of his Plays *,—" not ALL that he ever made? And what an admirable argument is it:—"Alcestis was a Play of Phrynichus, therefore none of Thespis had the same title!"—as if the same story and the same persons were not introduced over and over again by different hands! Among the few Tragedies that are yet extant, we have an *Ἡλεκτρα* of Sophocles, and another *Ἡλεκτρα* too of Euripides. Nay, besides this very *Ἀλκήστis* of Phrynichus, and another called *Φοίνισσαι*, there was an *Ἀλκήστis* and *Φοίνισσαι* of Euripides too; both which are still in being: why then might not Phrynichus write one Tragedy after Thespis, as well as Euripides write two after Him?

The next pretence for accusing the Marble graver of an omission of some lines is, "Because it is a case that is known often to have happened in the copying of Manuscripts." Here is another consequence, the very twin to that which went before—"Because omissions often happen in copying MSS, therefore this is an omission in the epoch of Thespis." If this argument had any force in it, it would equally hold against all the other epochs of this Marble, and against all Marbles and MSS whatsoever; for what will be able to stand the shock if this can be thrown down, by saying "That omissions often happen?" Mr. B. if he would make good his indictment against the Graver, ought to prove from the place itself, from the want of connection, or some other defect there, that there is just reason to suspect some lines have been left out;—but to accuse him upon this general pretence, because "other Copiers have been negligent," has exactly as much sense and equity in it as if Mr. B. should be charged with meddling with what he understands not, and exposing his ignorance; "because it is a case that is known often to have happened in the crude Books of *young writers*." And besides this, there is another infirmity that this argument labours under; for though a Copier may sometimes miss a line or two by taking off his eye; yet, if he have but the common diligence at least to compare his copy with the original, he discovers his own omissions, and presently rectifies them; and by this means it comes to pass that such deficiencies in the texts of MSS are generally supplied and perfected by the same hand, in the margin. Though we should suppose, therefore, that the Stone-cutter might carelessly miss something, yet, Can we suppose too that the Author of the Inscription would never read what was engraved there? Would a person of learning

P. 168.

[250]

* Suid. *Θίσκ. τῶν δραμάτων αὐτῷ, Ἄθλα Πελία, &c.*—not τὰ δράματα.

and

and quality, as he appears to have been, who had taken such accurate pains to deduce a whole series of Chronology from before Deucalion's Deluge to his own time, and for the benefit of posterity to engrave it upon Marble, and set it up in a conspicuous place as a public Monument, be at last so stupidly negligent as not to examine the Stone-cutter's work,—where the missing of a single letter in the numbers of any æra would make the computation false, and spoil the Author's whole design? What mad work would it make then, if, as Mr. B. affirms, whole lines were omitted by the Stone-cutter, and passed uncorrected? [251] Is it possible that the worthy Author of the Monument (I might say perhaps *The Authors*; for it seems to have been done at a public charge) should act so inconsistently? Mr. B. if he pleases, may think so, or affirm it without thinking; but when he catches me affirming it, I will give him leave to tell me again in his well-bred way,—“That my head has no brains “ in it.”

For the epoch itself assures me that there was no omission here by the Stone-cutter. The words are, 'Αφ' ἧς Θέσπης ὁ ποιητῆς πρῶτος ὃς καὶ ἐδίδαξεν . . . τῆν δ' . . . γάγϙ. Now if all the words after ποιητῆς belong to Phrynichus, as Mr. B. says,—and not to Thespiis, as the Stone-cutter says,—pray, what is the meaning of ΠΡΩΤΟΣ, FIRST? Thespiis, I know, FIRST invented Tragedy; and that was worthy of being recorded here; as the invention of Comedy was before. But what did Phrynichus FIRST find out that deserved to be named here? Why, he “FIRST brought in women into the subject of his Plays*,” which is a business of less moment than that of Æschylus, who first added a Second Actor; or of Sophocles, who added a Third: yet neither of these two improvements are registered in the Marble: and why then should that of Phrynichus be mentioned when theirs are omitted? But I will not charge it as a fault upon Mr. B. that he neglected to gather this hint from the word ΠΡΩΤΟΣ; for the common Editions of the Marble have it not. But, I am afraid, he will not easily excuse himself for not observing the next words, . . . τῆν δ' . . . γάγϙ; [252] which have been always hitherto thought to signify “That the “GOAT was made the prize of Tragedy.” Now certainly the proper place of mentioning this prize was at the epoch of Thespiis, the Inventor of Tragedy; for so the prizes of Comedy, “the cask of wine, and the basket of figs,” are mentioned in the epoch of Susarion, the inventor of Comedy. And what a blind-

* Suid. φγϙ.

ness was it in Mr. B. not to observe this, when he so boldly tells the Stone-cutter, and the man that set him on work, that they had dropt a whole line; and that these words belong to Phrynichus? Pray what could ΤΡΑΓΩΣ the GOAT have to do in the epoch of Phrynichus? Does Mr. B. believe that sorry prize was continued after Tragedy came into reputation? Would Phrynichus, or any body for him, have been at the charge of a Stage, and all the ornaments of a Chorus and Actors, for the hopes of winning a Goat, that would hardly pay for one vizard? In the following epochs of Æschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, &c. there is no mention of the Goat: and, if this epoch had belonged to Phrynichus, no Goat had been here neither.

But Mr. B. rather suspects "That the Graver did make an omission, because the next æra in the Marble falls as low as Olymp. LXVII; before which time it is not to be doubted but the Alcestis of Phrynichus (that Phrynichus who was Thespis' scholar) was added." Now, with his leave, I shall make bold to ask him one question, in words of his own, "Whether it was proper and prudent in him to accuse the Stone-cutter of *negligence*," by an argument that discovers a shameful *negligence* in himself? for "the next æra is not so low as Ol. LXVII." As Mr Selden has published it, it is but Ol. LXV, 4. But without doubt Mr. Selden mistook the letters of the inscription (as the learned Dr. Prideaux has observed before me) and for III read III; i. e. 3, instead of 6; so that the true æra that comes after Thespis is Olymp. LXV, 1; but the æra that Mr. B. speaks of, Olymp. LXVII, is the *next but one* after Thespis. Is not Mr. B. now an accurate Writer, and a fit person to correct a Stone-cutter? or shall we blame his Assistant "that consulted Books for him?" But the Assistant may be rather supposed to have written this passage right; and the mistake be Mr. B.'s; "for that is a case known often to have happened in the copying of Manuscripts."

But the Gentleman makes amends, with telling us a piece of most certain news; "for it is not to be doubted," he says, "but the Alcestis of Phrynichus was acted before Olymp. LXVII." Now I would crave leave to enquire of him how he came to hear of this news? But perhaps he will tell me, "I may as well ask how he came to hear his name was Phrynichus? Fame, that told him the one, must tell him the other too." But, if he do not trust too much to Fame (which I advise him not to do, for she often changes sides) I would then tell him a piece of news, quite contrary to his, "That it is not

" to

“ to be doubted but Alcestis was NOT acted before Olymp.
 “ LXVII, because that Olympiad was the very first time that
 Phrynichus wrote for the Stage; and he was alive and made
 Plays still XXXV years after. I will tell him too some other
 particulars about this Phrynichus; but, before I do that, he will
 give me leave to expostulate a little about his conduct in this
 quarrel with the Stone-cutter; the whole ground of which, ‘as
 the case plainly appears, was this:—Mr. B. would have Thespis
 placed earlier in the Marble than Ol. LXI; because Phalaris
 [254] was dead before that Olympiad; and consequently could not
 hear of Tragedy, unless Thespis was earlier. Upon this, he in-
 dited the Stone-cutter for an idle fellow; who, after he had
 graved ‘Αφ’ ἔ Θέσπης ὁ ποιητής, skipped a whole line, and tacked
 the words which concerned Phrynichus to the name of Thespis.
 Now, allowing that the poor Stone-cutter should confess this
 and plead guilty, pray what advantage would Mr. B. and his
 Sicilian Prince get by it? for let it be as he would have it, ‘Αφ’
 ἔ ὁ Θέσπης ὁ ποιητής . . . and that the line that should have come
 after was really omitted,—yet, however, since THESPIΣ is
 named there, there is something said about him in the very ori-
 ginal which the Graver should have copied; and though the æra
 of it be lost by the Graver’s *negligence*, yet we are sure, from
 the method of the whole Inscription, that this lost æra must
 needs be later than that which comes before it. But the æra
 that comes before it, “Cyrus’ victory over Cræsus, is Olymp. LIX,
 1; or at soonest, LVIII, 3; and the death of Phalaris, as Mr.
 B. himself allows through all his Examination, was at Ol.
 LVII, 3. What is it then that he aims at, in his charge against
 the Stone-cutter?—could he carry his point against him ever
 so clearly, yet his Phalaris is still in the very same condition;
 for he died, we see, VIII years, or V at least, before Thespis
 is spoken of in the *original* Inscription. And is not this a
 substantial piece of *dulness* (it is one of his own civil words!)
 to make all this bustle about omissions in the Marble, when,
 if all he asks be allowed him, he is but just as he was before!
 I am afraid his Readers will be tempted to think that,
 [255] whether the Stone-cutter was so or no, his accuser has here
 shewn himself a very ordinary workman.

Having thus vindicated the Graver of the Inscription from
 the insults of our Examiner, I shall now put in a word in be-
 half of the Author of it. That excellent Writer here tells us,
 that the *first* performance of Thespis was after Olymp. LIX, 1;
 for this is the plain import of his words; and those learned men
 P. 141. “ who have taken pains to illustrate this Chronicle,” have all
 understood

understood them so. But Mr. B. will not take up with this authority; for he affirms "Some of Thespis's Plays were acted about Olymp. LIII; and if this here, about Olymp. LX, was his, it was rather one of his last than the first; but his real opinion is, that it was neither the first nor last, but Phrynichus's Play, erroneously applied to Thespis." Now, in answer to this, I dare undertake from the same topic that Mr. B. uses, *i. e.* "a comparison of Thespis's age with Phrynichus's," to prove the very contrary; — that this Play, about Olymp. LX, could not be Phrynichus's; and that in all probability it was the first of Thespis.

Suidas, to whom the whole learned world confess themselves much obliged for his accounts of the age and works of so many Authors, tells us "Phrynichus was Thespis's scholar*;" and Mr. B. himself expressly affirms the same†. Plato names them both together as pretenders to the invention of Tragedy; where he says "That Tragedy did not begin, as men believe, from Thespis, nor from Phrynichus‡." And if any one will infer from this passage of Plato, that the two Poets were nearer of an age than Master and Scholar usually are, he will make my argument against Phalaris so much the stronger; for by this means Thespis will be nearer to Phrynichus's age, and remoter from Phalaris's. But I am willing to suppose with Mr. B. that Phrynichus was Scholar to Thespis; so that, if we can but fix the Scholar's age, we may gather from thence the age of the Master. Now Phrynichus made a Tragedy at Athens, which he intituled (*Μιλήτης ἄλωσις*) "The Taking of Miletus." "Callisthenes says" (they are the words of Strabo) "that Phrynichus the Tragic Poet was fined by the Athenians a thousand drachms, for making a Tragedy, called The Taking of Miletus by Darius§." And Herodotus, an older Author than he: — "When Phrynichus," says he, "exhibited his Play, The Taking of Miletus, the whole Theatre fell into tears, and fined the Poet a thousand drachms; and made an order that nobody ever after should make a Play of that subject||." The same thing is reported by Plutarch¶, Ælian**, Libanius††,

P. 168,
169.

[256]

* Suid. in *Θρέν. Μαθητὴς Θέσπιδος*.

† P. 168.

‡ Plato in *Minoë*.

§ Strabo xiv. p. 635. *Μιλήτης ἄλωσις ἀπὸ Δαρείου*.

|| Herod. vi. c. 21.

¶ Plut. *Præc. Reip. gerendæ*.

** Æl. xii, 17.

†† Liban. tom. I. p. 606.

Antimachus Marcellinus *, the Scholiast on Aristophanes †, and Joh. Tzetzes ‡. But the Taking of Miletus, the whole story of which is related by Herodotus, was either at Olymp. LXX or LXXI, as all Chronologers are agreed; and the Tragedy of Phrynichus being made upon that subject, we are sure that he must be alive after Ol. LXX. But there is another Tragedy of his, called *Φοινισσαι*, which will shew him to have been still alive above xx years after that Olympiad. It is cited by the Scholiast on Aristophanes §; and Athenæus || gives us an Iambic out of it:—

Ψαλμοῖσιν ἀντίσπας' αἰδόντες μέλη.

[257] But the Writer of the argument of Æschylus's *Persæ* has the most particular account of it:—“Glaucus,” says he, “in his “Book about the Subjects of Æschylus's Plays,” says ¶ “his “*Persæ* were borrowed from the *Phœnissæ* of Phrynichus; “the first verse of which *Phœnissæ* is this:—

“Τὰδ' ἐστὶ Περσῶν τῶν πάλαι βεβηκότων

“and an Eunuch is introduced, bringing the news of Xerxes's “defeat, and setting chairs for the ministers of state to sit “down on**.” Now it is evident from this Fragment, that Phrynichus was yet alive after Xerxes's expedition, i. e. Olymp. LXXV, 1. Nay, three years after this Olympiad, he made a Tragedy at Athens, and carried the victory, Themistocles being at the charge of all the furniture of the Scene and Chorus ††; who, in memory of it, set up this inscription:—ΘΕΜΙΣΤΟΚΛΗΣ ΦΡΕΑΡΙΟΣ ΕΧΟΡΗΓΕΙ ΦΡΥΝΙΧΟΣ ΕΔΙΔΑΣΚΕΝ ΑΔΕΙΜΑΝΤΟΣ ΗΡΧΕΝ, i. e. “Themistocles, of the parish “of Phreari, was at the charge; Phrynichus made the Tragedy; “and Adimantus was Archon.” And I am apt to believe that *Phœnissæ* was this very Play which he made for Themistocles; for what could be a more proper subject and compliment to Themistocles than Xerxes's defeat, which he had so great a hand in? Now we are sure, from the name of the Archon, that this was done at Olymp. LXXV, 4; and how long the Poet survived this victory, there is nobody now to tell us.

* Amm. xxviii, 1.

† Schol. Arist. p. 364.

‡ Tzet. Chil. viii, 156.

§ Schol. Arist. p. 518.

|| Athen. p. 635. *Φρύν. ἐν Φοινίσσαις.*

¶ *Ἐκ τῶν Φοινισσῶν Φρυνίχῳ τὰς Πέρσας παραποιῶσθαι.*

** *Τὴν τῷ Ξέρξῃ ἦταν.*

†† Plut. in Themist. *Χορηγῶν τραγωδοῖς.*

To compare this now with Mr. B's doctrine about the age of Thespis and Phrynichus: "It is not to be doubted," says he, "but the *Alcestis* of Phrynichus was acted before Olymp. LXVII." There spoke an oracle,— "it is not to be doubted;" because we find him still making Tragedies xxxvi years after. Mr. B. declares *his opinion* twice, "That a Play acted about Olymp. LX. was not made by Thespis, but by Phrynichus." Who will not rise up now to this Gentleman's *opinion*? That Play must needs be Phrynichus', because he was working for the Stage still, nay and carried the prize there, LXIII years after that Olympiad. This, I think, is a little longer than Mr. Dryden's vein has yet lasted: which, Mr. B. says, "is about xxxvi years." But I can help him to another instance that will come up with it exactly to a single year; for Sophocles began Tragedy at the age of xxviii, and held out at it till the age of xci*; the interval LXIII. If this example will bring off Mr. B. for saying the Play is Phrynichus' against the plain authority of the Marble, it is at his service; but with this reserve, that he shall not abuse me for *lending* it; for I have had too much of that already.

But, if I may venture to guess any thing that Mr. B. will think or say, I conceive that, upon better consideration, he will be willing to allow Suidas' words, "That Phrynichus got the prize at Ol. LXVII †, to be meant of his *first* victory; for so we find in the Marble that the *first* victories of Æschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides, are the only ones recorded ‡. And if Phrynichus began at Olymp. LXVII, then the distance between his first and his last (that we know of) will be xxxvi years; which is the very space that Mr. B. assigns to Aristophanes and Mr. Dryden. And it hits too with what the same Suidas has delivered about Thespis, "That he exhibited a Play at Olymp. LXI §;" for, if we interpret this passage, like the other about Phrynichus, that it was Thespis' *first* Play, — then the Master will be older than the Scholar by about xxv years; which is a competent time; and, I believe, near upon the same that the very learned person whom Mr. B. so much honours "by letting the world know he had all his knowledge in these matters from him" (which they that know that person's emi-

P. 168.

P. 168.
169.

[258]

[259]
P. 60.

* Marm. Arund.

† Suid. in Φρύν. Ἐνίκη ἐπὶ τῆς ζ' ἑ' ἀλυμπιάδος.

‡ Marm. Arund. Πρώτων ἀνίκων.

§ Suid. in Θέσπ.

nent learning will think to be no compliment to him) is older than Mr. B. And I humbly conceive that all these hits and coincidences, when added to the express authority of the Marble, which sets Thespis after Olymp. LIX, will bring it up to the highest probability that Thespis first introduced Tragedy about Ol. LXI; which is XIV years after the true Phalaris was dead.

P. 168. I observe Mr. B's emphatical expression, "The Alcestis of Phrynichus, — that Phrynichus who was Thespis' Scholar;" which seems to imply that he thought there were two Phrynichuses, both Tragic Poets; and indeed the famous Lilius Gyraldus*, almost as learned a man as Mr. B. was of the same opinion. It is necessary, therefore, to examine this point, or else our argument from the date of Phrynichus' Phœnissæ will be very lame and precarious; for it may be pretended the Author of Phœnissæ was not "that Phrynichus that was Thespis' Scholar." Now, with Mr. B.'s gracious permission (for I dare be free with Gyraldus) I will endeavour to shew that there was but one Tragedian of that name. It is true there were two Phrynichuses that wrote for the Stage; the one a Tragic, the other a Comic Poet, that is a thing beyond question; but the point that I contend for is, that there were not two Phrynichuses, Writers of Tragedy.

The pretence for asserting two Tragic Poets of that name is a passage of Suidas; who, after he had named Φρύγχος, &c. "Phrynichus, the son of Polyphradmon or Minyras, or Choroelos, the Scholar of Thespis;" and "that his Tragedies are nine," Πλευρωνία, Αιγύπτιοι, &c. †. subjoins, under a new head, Φρύγχος, &c. — "Phrynichus, the son of Melanthes, an Athenian Tragedian; some of his plays are Ἀνδρομέδα, Ἡριγόνη, and Πυρρίχαι." This latter place is taken, word for word, out of Aristophanes' Scholiast ‡; who adds, that the same man made the Tragedy called "The Taking of Miletus." Now it may seem from these two passages, that there were two Phrynichuses, Tragic Poets; for the one is called the son of Melanthes, the other not; and the three Plays ascribed to the latter, are quite different from all the nine that were made by the former. But, to take off this pretence, I crave leave to observe that the naming his father Melanthes is an argument of small

* Gyrald. De Poëtis.

† Suid. in Φρύρ. leg. Πλευρωνίας. ex Tzetze ad Lycophronem.

‡ Σχολ. Arist. Vesp. p. 364.

force;

force; for we see the other has three fathers assigned to him; so uncertain was the tradition about the name of his father: some authors therefore might relate that his father was called Melanthas, and yet mean the very same Phrynichus, that, according to others, was the son of Polyphradmon. And then the second plea, that the Plays attributed to the one are wholly different from those of the other, is even weaker than the former; for the whole dozen mentioned in Suidas might belong to the same Phrynichus. He says, indeed, "Phrynichus, Polyphradmon's son, wrote nine plays;" because the Author he here copies from knew of no more; but there might be more, notwithstanding his not hearing of them; as we see there really were two, "The taking of Miletus," and "Phoenissæ," that are not mentioned here by Suidas.

Having shewn now what very slight ground the tradition about two Tragedian Phrynichuses is built on, I will give some arguments on my side, which induce me to think there was but one. And my first is, Because all the Authors named above, Herodotus, Callisthenes, Strabo, Plutarch, Ælian, Libanius, Amm. Marcellinus, Joh. Tzetzes, who speak of the play called "The Taking of Miletus," style the Author of it barely *Φρύνιχος ὁ Τραγικὸς*, Phrynichus the Tragedian," without adding *ὁ Νεώτερος*, "the Younger," as all of them, or some at least, would and ought to have done, if this person had not been the famous Phrynichus that was Thespis's Scholar. And so, when he is quoted on other occasions by Athenæus, Hephæstion, Isaac Tzetzes, &c. he is called in like manner "Phrynichus the Tragic Poet," without the least intimation that there was another of the same name and profession.

Besides this, the very Scholiast on Aristophanes, and Suidas, who are the sole Authors produced, to shew there were two Tragedians, do in other places plainly declare there was but one. "There were four Phrynichuses in all," says the Scholiast*;

1. "Phrynichus, the son of Polyphradmon, the Tragic Poet.
2. "Phrynichus, the son of Chorocles, an Actor of Tragedies†.
3. "Phrynichus, the son of Eunomides, the Comic Poet.

* Schol. Arist. p. 397, 130. And so Suidas in *Φέρν.* and *Δέκλ.*

† See also p. 113, 358. *τραγικὸς ὑποκριτής.*

4. " Phrynichus, the Athenian General; who was concerned
 " with Astyochus, and engaged in a plot against
 " the government."

[262] What can be more evident than that, according to this Catalogue, there was but one of this name a Tragedian? but it is no wonder if, in Lexicons and Scholia compiled out of several Authors, there be several things inconsistent with one another. So in another place, both the Scholiast* and Suidas† make this fourth Phrynichus, the General, to be the same with the third Comic Poet: on the contrary, Ælian‡ makes him the same with the first; and he adds a particular circumstance, " That in his Tragedy Πυρρίχαι, he so pleased the " Theatre " with the warlike songs and dance of his Chorus, that they " chose him as a fit person to make a General." Among the Moderns, some fall in with Ælian's story; and some with the other; but, with all deference to their judgments, I am persuaded both of them are false; for Phrynichus the General was stabbed at Athens, Olymp. xc.1, 2, as Thucydides§ relates; but a more exact account of the circumstances of his death is to be met with in Lysias|| and Lycurgus¶ the Orators. This being a matter of fact beyond all doubt and controversy, I affirm that the date of his death can neither agree with the Tragic nor the Comic Poet's history; being too late for the one, and too early for the other. It is too late for the Tragedian, because he began to make Plays, as we have seen above, at Olymp. Lxvii; from which time, till Olymp. xc.ii, 2, there are cii years; and even from the date of his Phoenissæ that were acted at Ol. Lxxv, 4, which is the last time we hear of him, there are Lxvi years to the death of Phrynichus the General; and then it is too early for the Comedian; for we find him alive v years after contending, with his play** called " The Muses" (quoted by Athenæus, Pollux, Suidas, &c.) against Aristophanes's Frogs at Olymp. xc.iii, 3; when Callias was Archon.

[263] Again, I will shew there was but one Phrynichus a Tra-

* Schol. p. 157.

† Suid. in Φρίν. & Παλαίσμασι.

‡ ÆL. Var. Hist. iii, 6.

§ Thucyd. viii. p. 617.

|| Lysias contra Agoratum, p. 136.

¶ Lycurg. contra Leocratem, p. 163, 164.

** Argum. Ran. Arist.

gedian.

gedian. Aristophanes, in his *Vespæ*, says that the old men at Athens used to sing "the old Songs of Phrynichus * :—"

—καὶ μινυρίζοντες μέλη
Ἀρχαιομελισιδωνοφρυνιχῆρατα.

It is a conceited word of the Poet's making; and *σιδωνο*, which is one member in the composition of it, relates to the Phœnissæ (i. e. the Sidonians) a Play of Phrynichus, as the Scholiast well observes. Here we see the Author of Phœnissæ (whom they suppose to be the latter Phrynichus) is meant by Aristophanes; but if I prove too that Aristophanes in this very place meant the Phrynichus, Thespis's Scholar, it will be evident that these two Phrynichuses (whom they falsely imagine) are really one and the same. Now that Aristophanes meant the Scholar of Thespis, will appear from the very words *μέλη ἀρχαῖα*, "Ancient Songs and Tunes." *Ancient*, because That Phrynichus was the second, or, as some in Plato thought, the first Author of Tragedy: and "Songs and Tunes,"—because he was celebrated and famous by that very character. "Phrynichus, says the Scholiast on this place †, "had a mighty name "for making of Songs;" but in another place he says the same thing of Phrynichus, the Son of Polyphradmon; who, according to Suidas, was Thespis's Scholar. "He was admired," says he, "for the making of Songs ‡;" "They cry him up for "composing of Tunes; and he was before Æschylus §." And can it be doubted then any longer but that the same person is meant? It is a problem of Aristotle's, *Διὰ τί οἱ περὶ Φρύνιχον μᾶλλον ἥσαν μελοποιοί*, "Why did Phrynichus make more Songs "than any Tragedian does now-a-days ||?" And he answers it, *Ἡ διὰ τὸ πολλαπλάσια εἶναι τότε τὰ μέλη ἐν ταῖς τῶν μέτρων τραγωδίαις*. Correct it *τὰ μέλη τῶν μέτρων ἐν ταῖς τραγωδίαις*. "Was it," says he, "because at that time the Songs (sung by "the Chorus) in Tragedies were many more than the Verses "spoken by the Actors?" Does not Aristotle's very question imply that there was but one Phrynichus a Tragedian?

[264]

I will add one argument more for it; and that, if I do not much mistake, will put an end to the controversy; for I will

* Arist. *Vesp.* p. 318.

† P. 138. *Δι' ὀνόματι ἧν καθέλεν ἐπὶ μελοποιῖα.*

‡ P. 397. *Ἐθαυμάζετο ἐπὶ μελοποιῖαις.*

§ P. 166. *Ἐπαύσαντο εἰς μελ. ἧν δὲ πρὸ Αἰσχύλου.*

|| Arist. *Prov.* xix.

prove that the very passage in Aristophanes, where the Scholiast, and Suidas from him, tell us of this supposed second Phrynichus the Son of Melanthas, concerns the one and true Phrynichus the Scholar of Thespis. "The ancient Poets," says Athenæus, "Thespis, Pratinas, Carcinus, and Phrynichus, were called ὀρχηστικοί, Dancers; because they not only used much Dancing in the Choruses of their Plays, but they were common Dancing-masters; teaching any body that had a mind to learn*." And to the same purpose Aristotle tells us "that the first Poety of the Stage was ὀρχησικωτέρα, more set upon Dances than that of the following ages†." This being premised (though I had occasion to speak of it before) I shall now set down the words of the Poet‡:—

Ὁ γὰρ γέρον, ὡς ἔπιδε διὰ πολλῶν χρόνων,
 ἤμσε τ' αὐτῷ, περιχαρὴς τῷ πράγματι,
 ὀρχόμενῳ τῆς νυκτὸς ἔδεν παύσεται
 Τάρχαϊ' ἐκεῖν' οἷς Θέσπιδις ἠγωνίζετο
 Καὶ τὰς τραγωδίας φησὶν ἀποδείξειν κρόνους
 Τὸν νῦν, διορχησόμενος ὀλίγον ὑγερων.

[265] Which are spoken by a Servant concerning an old fellow, his Master, that was in a frolick of Dancing. Who the Thespis was that is here spoken of, the Scholiast and Suidas pretend to tell us; for they say "It was one Thespis, a Harper; not the "Tragic Poet§." To speak freely, the place has not been understood this thousand years and more, being neither written nor pointed right; for what can be the meaning of Κρόνους τὸν νῦν? The word Κρόνῳ alone signifies the whole; and τὸν νῦν is superfluous and needless. And so in another place||:—

Οὐχὶ διδάξεις τῷτον, κρόνῳ ὦν.

I humbly conceive the whole passage should be thus read and distinguished:—

ὀρχόμενῳ τῆς νυκτὸς ἔδεν παύεται
 Τάρχαϊ' ἐκεῖν', οἷς Θέσπιδις ἠγωνίζετο
 Καὶ τὰς τραγωδίας φησὶν ἀποδείξειν κρόνους
 Τὸς νῦν, διορχησόμενῳ ὀλίγον ὑγερων.

* Athen. i. p. 22. Οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ποιηταί

† Arist. Poët. iv.

‡ Arist. Vesp. p. 364.

§ Schol. ibid. Ὁ κωμικὸς, ὃ γὰρ δὴ ὁ τραγικὸς. So Suidas in Θέσπιδι.

|| Arist. Nub. p. 107.

"All night long," says he, "he dances those old Dances that Thespis used in his Choruses; and he says he will dance here upon the Stage by and by, and shew the Tragedians of these times to be a parcel of fools, he will out-dance them so much." And who can doubt now, that considers what I have newly quoted from Athenæus, but that Thespis (ὁ ἀρχαῖος) the old Tragic Poet (who lived cxi years before the date of this Play) ὁ ὀρχηστὴς, the common Dancing-master at Athens, is meant here by Aristophanes? so that the Scholiast and Suidas may take their Harper again for their own diversion; for it was a common practice among those Grammarians, when they happened to be at a loss, to invent a story for the purpose. But, to go on with Aristophanes: the old fellow begins to dance; and as he dances, he says

Κλῆθρα χαλάσθω τάδε· καὶ δὲ
Σχήματ' ἀρχή
(Οἱ· Μᾶλλον δὲ γ' ἴσως μαρίας ἀρχή)
Πλευρὰν λυγίσαντ' ὑπαὶ ῥώμης.

So the interlocution is to be placed here; which is faulty in all the Editions. "Make room there," says he; "for I am beginning a Dance that is enough to strain a man's side with the violent motion." After a line or two, he adds

[266]

Πτήσσει Φρύνιχος, ὥσπερ ἀλέκτωρ,
(Οἱ· Τάχα βαλλήσιν)
Σκέλ' ἑρᾶνόν γ' ἐκλατίζων.

Thus the words are to be pointed; — which have hitherto been falsely distinguished. But there is an error here of a worse sort, which has possessed the copies of this Play ever since Adrian's time, and perhaps before. Πτήσσει signifies "to crouch, and sneak away for fear," as poultry do at the sight of the kite; or a cock when he is beaten at fighting. The Scholiast* and Ælian† tell us That (Πτήσσει Φρύνιχος, ὥσπερ ἀλέκτωρ) — "Phrynichus sneaks like a Cock," became a Proverb upon those "that came off badly in any affair;" because Phrynichus the Tragedian came off sneakingly, when he was fined 1000 drachms for his Play, Μιλίτε ἄλωσις. Now, with due reverence to Antiquity, I crave leave to suspect that this is a Proverb coined on purpose, because the Commentators were puzzled here. For, in the first place, "to sneak away like a cock," seems to be a very improper similitude; for a cock

* Schol. *ibid.*

† Ælian, Var. Hist. xiii, 17. Ἐπὶ τὸν καλὸν τι πασχόντων.

is one of the most bold and martial of birds. I know there is an expression like this of some nameless Poet *,

"Ἐλκῆς ἀλίκτωρ δέλον ὡς κλέας πλίρον·"

* He sneaked like a cock, that hangs down his wings when he is beaten."

[267] But this case is widely different; for the comparison here is very elegant and natural, because the circumstance of *being beaten* is added to it; but to say it in general of a cock, as if the whole species were naturally timid, is unwarrantable and absurd. As in another instance; — "He stares like a man frightened out of his wits," is an expression proper enough; but we cannot say in general "He stares like a man." I shall hardly believe, therefore, that Aristophanes, the most ingenious man of an age that was fertile of great Wits, would let such an expression pass him, "He sneaks like a cock." But, in the next place, the absurdity of it is doubled and tripled by the sentence that it is joined with: "Phrynichus," says he, "kicking his legs up to the very heavens in dances, crouches and sneaks like a cock." This is no better than downright nonsense; though, to say something in excuse for the Interpreters, they did not join ἐκλακτίζων with Φρύνιχος, as I do, but with the word that follows in the next verse. But, if the Reader pleases to consult the passage in the Poet, he will be convinced that the construction can be no other than what I have made it. — Ἐκλακτισμός, says Hesychius, σχῆμα χορικόν, ὀρχήσεως σύντονον (correct it σχῆμα χορικῆς ὀρχήσεως, σύντονον†) "was a sort of "dance, lofty and vehement, used by the Choruses." And Julius Pollux, Τὰ ἐκλακτίσματα, γυναικῶν ἦν ὀρχήματα. ἔδει γὰρ ὑπὲρ τὸν ὄμων ἐκλακτίσαι "The ἐκλακτίσματα," says he, "were "dances of women; for they were to kick their heels higher than their shoulders‡." But, I conceive, here is a palpable fault in this passage of Pollux; for certainly this kind of dance would be very unseemly and immodest in Women. And the participle γάρ, *for*, does farther shew the reading to be faulty; for how can the throwing-up the heels as high as the head in dancing, be assigned as a *reason* why the dance must belong to Women? It would rather prove it belonged to Men, because it required great strength and agility. But the error will be removed, if, instead of γυναικῶν, we correct it γυμνικῶν. The dance,

[268]

* Plut. in Alcib.

† So Pollux, iv. 14. Τὸ σχῆμα ἔλκειν, σχῆμα ὀρχήσεως χορικῆς.

‡ Pollux, *ibid*.

says he, was proper to the γυμνικοί, Exercisers; for the legs were to be thrown up very high, and consequently it required *teaching* and *practice*. Well, it is evident now how every way absurd and improper the present passage of Aristophanes is. — If I may have leave to offer the emendation of so inveterate an error, I would read the place thus: —

ΠΑΗΣΕΙ Φρύνιχος, ὥσπερ ἀλέκτωρ

(Οἱ. Τάχα βαλλήσεις)

Σαίῳ ἀράκον γ' ἐλακτίζον.

i. e. "Phrynichus STRIKES like a cock, throwing his heels very "lofty." This is spoken by the old fellow while he is cutting his capers; and in one of his frisks he offers to *strike* the servant that stood by with his foot as it was aloft. Upon which the servant says Τάχα βαλλήσεις, — "You will hit me by and by, "with your capering and kicking." Πλήσσω is the proper term for a cock when he strikes as he is fighting, as Πληκτρον is his *spur* that he strikes with. The meaning of the passage is this: — That in his dances he leaped up, and vaulted, like Phrynichus, who was celebrated for those performances: as it farther appears from what follows a little after: —

Καὶ τὸ Φρυνίχιον

Ἐλακτισάτω τις ὅπως

Ἀδόντις ἄνω σκέλῳ.

* Ὡζῶσιν οἱ Διαταί*.

[269]

Which ought to be thus corrected and distinguished: —

Καὶ, τὸ Φρυνίχιον,

Ἐλακτισάτω τις ὅπως

Ἰδόντις ἄνω σκέλῳ.

* Ὡζῶσιν οἱ Διαταί.

i. e. "And, in Phrynichus' way, frisk and caper, so as the spectators, seeing your legs aloft, may cry out with admiration." Now to draw our inference from these several passages, it appears, I suppose, sufficiently that the Phrynichus here spoken of by Aristophanes was, as well as the Thespis, famous for his dancing; and consequently, by the authority of Athenæus quoted above, he must be ὁ ἀρχαῖος Φρύνιχος, "the ancient Phrynichus," ὁ δρχητικὸς "the master of dancing†." Upon the whole

* Arist. p. 365.

† We have part of an Epigram made by Phrynichus himself*, in [Append. p. 544.] commendation of his dancing:

Σχήματα δ' ὀρχησις τόσα μοι πόρην, ὅσ' ἐνὶ πόρῳ

Κύματα ποιεῖται χρίματι νῆξ ὀλέη.

* Plut.

Sympos.

Qu. viii. 9.

matter

matter then, there was but one Tragedian Phrynichus, the Scholar of Thespis; and if so, we have fully proved already, from the dates of his Plays, that his master Thespis ought not to be placed earlier than about Olymp. LXXI.

But I have one short argument more, independent of all those before, which will evidently prove that Thespis was younger than Phalaris; for to take the earliest account of Thespis, which Mr. Boyle contends for, he was contemporary with Pisistratus. But Pisistratus' eldest son Hippias, was alive at Ol. LXXI, 2*; and after that, was at the battle at Marathon, Ol. LXXII, 2; where he was slain, according to Cicero †, Justin ‡, and Tertullian §; but, if Suidas say true (out of Ælian's book, *De Providentia*, as one may guess by the style and matter) he survived that fight ||, and died at Lemnos of a lingering distemper: and this latter account seems to be confirmed by Thucydides and Herodotus; for the one says "He was with the Medes at Marathon ¶," without saying he was killed there; and the other not obscurely intimates, that he was not killed; for he says "His tooth, that dropped out of his head upon the Attic ground, was the only part of his body that had a share in that soil **." There are only two generations then from Thespis's time to the battle of Marathon; but there are four from Phalaris's; for Theron, the Fourth from that Telemachus that deposed Phalaris ††, got the government of Agrigentum, Olymp. LXXIII, 1, but three years only after that battle; and he was then at least XL years old, as appears from the ages of his son and daughter. I will give a Table of both the lines of succession:—

| | |
|----------|--------------------------|
| | 1. Telemachus. Phalaris, |
| | 2. Emmenides. |
| Thespis. | 1. Pisistratus. |
| | 2. Hippias, Ol. LXXI, 2, |
| | 3. Ænesidamus. |
| | 4. Theron, Ol. xxii, 2. |

It is true Hippias was an old man at that time; though it appears, by the post and business Herodotus assigns him, that he was not so very old as some make him. But, however, let him be as old, if they please, as Theron's father, yet still the case is very apparent that Thespis is one whole generation younger than Phalaris.

* Marm. Arund.

† Just. ii, 9.

|| Suid. in *Ἰππίας*.

** Herod. vi, 106.

† Cic. ad Att. ix, 10.

§ Tert. adv. Gentes

¶ Thuc. vi, p. 452.

†† See above, p. 34, 35, 36.

It may now be a fit season to visit the learned Examiner, and to see with what vigour and address he repels all these arguments that have settled the time of Thespis about Olymp. LXI. His authorities are Diogenes Laërtius and Plutarch, who shall now be examined. The point which Mr. B. endeavours to prove, is this: That Thespis acted Plays in Solon's time, and consequently before the death of Phalaris. Now the words of Laërtius, which are all he says that any ways relate to this affair, are exactly these: — "Solon," says he, "hindered Thespis from acting of Tragedies; believing those false representations to be of no use*." Hence the Examiner infers that Thespis acted his Plays in the days of Solon; so that his argument lies thus: — "He was hindered from acting Tragedies; *ergo*, he acted Tragedies:" *i. e.* he acted them, because he did not act them. Is not this now a syllogism worthy of the acute Mr. B. and his new System of Logic? — And it is not a much better argument if you turn its face the quite contrary way; for if Solon, when Thespis, as we may suppose, made application to him for his leave to act Tragedies, would not suffer him to do it, is it not reasonable to infer that Thespis acted none till after Solon's death? — which is the very account that I have established by so many arguments.

P. 166.

[271]

But are not the words of Plutarch more clear and express in the Examiner's behalf? It is true; for this Author relates particularly "That Solon saw one of Thespis's Plays; and then, disliking the way of it, he forbade him to act any more†." But what then? how does it appear that this was done before Phalaris's death? If I should allow this story in Plutarch to be true, yet Mr. B. will find it a difficult thing to extort from it what he aims at. "Why, yes," he says, "Solon was Archon, Olymp. XLVI, 3; which is XLIV years before Phalaris was killed." Here Mr. B. supposes that this business with Thespis happened in the year of Solon's Archonship; which is directly to oppose his own Author Plutarch, who relates at large how Solon, after he was Archon, travelled abroad x years; and after his return (how long after we cannot tell) this thing passed between him and Thespis. "But Eusebius," says Mr. B. "places the rise of Tragedy Olymp. XLII, 2; a little after Solon's Archonship." Will Mr. B. here stand to this against the plain words of Plutarch? Mr. B. either does

P. 166.

[272]

P. 166.

* Laërt. Solone. Θίσπειν ἐκώλυσε τραγῳδίας ἀγειν τε καὶ διδάσκειν, ὡς ἀνωφελὴ τὴν ψευδολογίαν.

† Plut. Solone.

P. 167.

or may know, that Eusebius's Histories are so shuffled and interpolated, and so disjointed from his Tables,—that no wise Chronologer dares depend on them in a point of any niceness without concurrent authority. “But,” says he, “take the lowest account that can be that Solon saw Thespis's Plays at the end of his life; Solon died at the end of the LIII*, or the beginning of the LIVth Olympiad; i. e. XIV years before Phalaris died.” Now here is a double misrepresentation of the Author he pretends to quote; for there is nothing in Plutarch about Olymp. LIII, or LIV; he only tells us that one Phnias said Solon died when Hegestratus was Archon, who succeeded Comias; in whose year Pisistratus usurped the government. But we know the date of Pisistratus's usurpation is Olymp. LIV, 4, Comias being then Archon †; so that Solon, according to Phnias's doctrine, died at Olymp. LV, 1; which is 14 years later than Mr. B. makes him say. But to pardon him this fault, which in him shall pass for a small one, yet the next will bear harder upon him; for he brings in this date of Solon's death out of Phnias, as if it was a point uncontroverted, and allowed by Plutarch himself; whereas Plutarch barely mentions it, without the least token of approbation; and places before it a quite different account from Heraclides (an Author as old as Phnias, and much more considerable) “That Solon lived, ΣΤΥΧΝΟΝ ΧΡΟΝΟΝ, a LONG TIME after Pisistratus's usurpation.” Nay, there is some ground for conjecture that Plutarch disbelieved Phnias; for he espouses that common story about Solon's conversation with Cræsus ‡, who came not to the Crown till Ol. LV, 3, which is two years after Solon's death, according to Phnias; and yet Solon did not see Cræsus at his first accession to the Throne, but after he had conquered XIV nations in Asia, as Herodotus tells it; so that, for any thing that Mr. B. has proved, Solon might possibly have this controversy with Thespis after the death of the Sicilian Prince. But what if it was before his death? must the fame of this new diversion, called Tragedy, which was then a dishonourable thing, and quashed by the Magistrate, needs fly as far as Sicily, to the Prince's Court?—as if a new show could not be produced at a Bartholomew Fair but the Foreign Princes must all hear of it!

But I must frankly observe on Mr. B.'s side (what he forgot

* Plut. Solone.

Marm. Arund. K. . . . ΟΥ ΑΡΧΟΝΤΟΣ.

† Plut. Solone.

to do for himself) that, as Plutarch tells this story of Thespis, it must have happened a little before Pisistratus's Tyranny; for he presently subjoins, That when Pisistratus had wounded himself, and, pretending that he was set upon by enemies, desired to have a guard, — "You do not act," says Solon to him, "the part of Ulysses well; for he wounded himself to deceive his enemies; but you, to deceive your own country-men!" Laërtius tells it a little plainer: That when Pisistratus had wounded himself, Solon said, "Ay, this comes of Thespis's acting and personating in his Tragedies*." Take both these passages together, and it must be allowed that, as far as Plutarch's credit goes, it appears that Thespis did act some of his Plays before Olymp. LIV, 4. But we have seen above, that the Arundel Marble and Suidas set the date of his first essay about Olymp. LXI; and the age of Phrynichus his Scholar strongly favours their side; for, by their reckoning, he began his Plays about xxv years after his Master; but by Plutarch's, above L. And whose authority now shall we follow? Though there is odds enough against Plutarch, from the antiquity of the Author of the Marble, who was above 300 years older than he, and from his particular diligence and exactness about the History of the Stage, yet I will make bold to add another reason or two why I cannot here follow him; for he himself tells me, in another place, "That the first that brought *Μῶες καὶ Πάθη*, the stories and the calamities of "Heroes upon the Stage, were Phrynichus and Æschylus†;" so that before them all Tragedy was satirical; and the subject of it was nothing else but Bacchus and his Satyrs. But if this affair about Thespis, and Solon, and Pisistratus, be true, then Thespis must have represented Ulysses and other Heroes in his Plays; for it is intimated that Thespis's acting gave the hint to Pisistratus to wound himself, as Ulysses did. So that this latter passage of Plutarch is a refutation of his former. The case seems to me to be this: — Somebody had invented and published this about Solon, as a thing very agreeable to the character of a wise Lawgiver; and Plutarch, who would never baulk a good story, though it did not exactly hit with Chronology, thought it a fault to omit it in his History of Solon's Life. We have another instance of this in the very same Treatise; for he tells at large the conversation that Solon had with Cræsus‡, though he prefaces it with this, "That some would

[274]

* Laërt. Solone, Ἐκείνῳ ταῦτα Φύσαι.

† Plut. Symp. Quæst. l. i.

‡ Plut. in Solone.

"shaw,

[275] “ shew, by chronological arguments, that it must needs be
 “ a fiction.” Nay, he is so far transported in behalf of his
 story, that he accuses the whole system of Chronology as a
 labyrinth of endless uncertainty*! and yet he himself upon
 other occasions can make use of Chronological arguments,
 when he thinks they conduce to his design. As in the Life of
 Themistocles, he falls foul upon Stesimbrotus (an Author,
 as he himself owns†, contemporary with Pericles and Cimon;
 who, as Athenæus says‡, had seen Pericles, and might possibly
 see Themistocles too) for affirming that Themistocles conversed
 with Anaxagoras and Melissus, the Philosophers; “ where-
 “ in he did not consider Chronology,” says Plutarch; “ for
 “ Anaxagoras was an acquaintance of Pericles, who was much
 “ younger than Themistocles; and Melissus was General
 “ against Pericles in the Samian war§.” Here, we see, this
 great man could believe that an argument drawn from Time
 is of considerable force; and yet, with humble submission,
 Chronology seems to be revenged on him in this place, for
 the slight he put upon it in the other; for Pericles was not
 so remote from Themistocles’s time, but that one and the same
 person might be acquainted with them both,—and even they
 themselves be acquainted with one another; the one being made
 General within xvi years after the other’s banishment||. And
 first for Anaxagoras: he might very well be personally known
 to Themistocles; for he was born at Olymp. Lxx, 1, as
 Apollodorus and Demetrius Phalereus, two excellent Writers,
 testify¶; and began to teach Philosophy in Athens at xx years
 of age, Olymp. Lxxv, 1, when Callias was Archon; the very
 year of Xerxes’s expedition, when Themistocles acquired such
 [276] glory; and ix years before he was banished. The same Au-
 thors inform us that Anaxagoras continued xxx years teach-
 ing at Athens; so that he had ix entire years to cultivate a
 friendship with Themistocles. And in the second place, what
 hinders but that Melissus too might be Themistocles’s friend,
 and yet be the Samian General in the war against Pericles,
 which was, at Olymp. Lxxxiv, 4**? for suppose him to have

* Id. Χρονικοῦ τισι λεγομένοις κατέστιν, &c.

† Plat. in Cimone.

‡ Athen. p. 589.

§ Plut. in Themist. Οὐκ εἰ τῶν χρόνων ἀπρίμνι.

|| Diod. p. 41, & 47.

¶ Laërt. in Anaxag.

** Thucyd. Diod. Suid. v. Μέλιτ, who confounds Melissus with
 Melitus the Orator.

been of the same age with Anaxagoras, he might then, as we have seen already, have been acquainted with Themistocles; nay, suppose him, if you please, x years older, and yet he would be but LXX years old when he was General to the Samians. And what is there extraordinary in that? Anaxagoras himself survived that war XIII years*; — and we have had in our own time more Generals than one that were LXXX years of age.

But Mr. B. will prove "that I myself allow Plutarch's account of Thespis; and am obliged to defend it as much as he is," because I owned, in another place, that he was "contemporary with Solon†." The Reader shall judge between us when I have told him the case. Johannes Malalas and another Writer relate that, soon after the siege of Troy, in Orestes's time, one Themis or Theomis (i. e. as I corrected it, *Thespi*s) first invented Tragedies; in opposition to which, I affirmed that "the true Thespi lived in Solon's time," — long enough after the taking of Troy. Now certainly there was no need of exactness here, where the distance of the two ages spoken of was so many whole centuries. I had no need to determine Thespi's age to a particular year, but to say he lived in the time of Solon (as without question he did); and may be supposed about xx years old before Solon died, if he made Tragedies at Olymp. LXI. Mr. B. is pleased to call that dissertation my *soft* Epistle to Dr. Mill; which is ironically said for *hard*; and indeed, to confess the truth, it is too *hard* for him to bite at, as appears by his most miserable stuff about Anapæstic Verses‡.

And so much for the age of Thespi. I shall now consider the opinion of those that make Tragedy to be older than Him. And what has the learned Examiner produced to maintain this assertion? — nothing but two common and obvious passages§ of Plato and Laërtius, which every second-hand Writer quotes that speaks but of the Age of Tragedy; one of which passages tells us "That Tragedy did not commence with Thespi nor Phrynichus, but was very old at Athens||:" the other, "That of old, in Tragedy, the Chorus alone performed the whole Drama; afterwards Thespi introduced one Actor¶." This is all he brings, except a hint out of Aristotle; who, affirming

P. 166,
170.

[277]
P. 166.

P. 173.

* Laërt. *ibid*.

† Dissert. ad Mal. p. 46. "Soloni æqualis fuit."

‡ See above, p. 133, &c.

§ P. 170, 171, 172.

|| Plato in *Min. πάντων ἀρχαίων*.

¶ Laërt. in *Plat.*

that Æschylus invented the second Actor, *implies*, he says, that Thespis found out the first. Now for two of his authorities, Laërtius and Aristotle; these words of theirs do not prove that Tragedy is older than Thespis; for Thespis might be the first introducer of one Actor, and yet be the inventor too of that sort of Tragedy that was performed by the Chorus alone. At first, his Plays might be but rude and imperfect; some Songs only and Dances by the Chorus and the Hemichoria; i. e. the two halves of the Chorus answering to each other; afterwards, by long use and experience, perhaps of xx, or xxx, or xl years, he might improve upon his own invention, and introduce one Actor, to discourse while the Chorus took breath. [278] What inconsistency is there in this? Æschylus, we see, is generally reported as the inventor of the second Actor; and yet several believed that afterwards he invented too the third Actor*; for, in the making of Lxxv Plays he had time enough to improve farther upon his first model. Where then is Mr. B.'s consequence that he would draw from Laërtius and Aristotle? But he has Plato yet in reserve; who affirms "That Tragedy was in use at Athens long before Thespis's time." I have already observed, in answer to this†, That Plato himself relates it as a paradox; and nobody that came after him would second him in it. He might be excused indeed by this distinction, that he meant *Ἀποσχεδιάσματα*, the extemporal Songs in praise of Bacchus, which were really older than Thespis, and gave the first rise to Tragedy, were it not that he affirms there That Minos, the King of Crete, was introduced in those old Tragedies before Thespis's time‡; which by no means may be allowed; for the old Tragedy was all (*Σατυρικὴ καὶ Ὀρχηστικὴ*) dancing and singing, and had no serious and doleful argument, as Minos must be, but all jollity and mirth.

P. 171.

Mr. B. here takes his usual freedom of giving my character: "He believes," he says, "Laërtius's works are better known to me than Plato's." What Authors, *he believes*, I am best acquainted with, is to me wholly indifferent; but, since he seems curious about my acquaintance with Books, I will tell him privately in his ear, that the last acquaintance I made of this sort was with the worst Author I ever yet met with. But, surely, one would think now that the Examiner himself was very well versed in Plato, since he is so pert upon me,

* Vita Æsch. Τὸν τρίτον ὑποκρίτην αὐτὸς ἐξεῦρε.

† See here, p. 235.

‡ Plat. in Minoë.

and

and *believes* that I am not. Now the Reader shall see presently, and by this very passage of Plato, whether Mr. B. *knows* that Author, or rather “casts his eye upon him,” as he did on Seneca and the Greek Tragedians. The Interlocutors in this Dialogue are Socrates and one Minos an Athenian, his acquaintance; and the subject of half their discourse is, to vindicate Minos, the ancient king of Crete, from the character of cruelty and injustice, which the Tragic Poets by their Plays had fastened upon him. Now our Examiner, with his wonderful diligence and sense, believes the person that talks there with Socrates, to be Minos the old King of Crete, who lived about DCCC years before him*: “Minos,” says he, “asks Socrates how ‘men come to have such an opinion of HIS severity;’ i. e. of Minos’s own that speaks; as plainly appears there from Mr. B.’s context. Is not this Gentleman now very well qualified to pass censures upon Writers, that can make Plato’s discourses to be like Lucian’s Dialogues of the Dead? nay, that can put the Dead and the Alive together in Dialogue, and be almost like Mezentius (the Phalaris of his age, and therefore worthy of Mr. B.’s respect) who

[279]

P. 160.

“Mortua quinetiam jungebat corpora vivis!

If he had read that short Treatise of Plato’s without being *fast asleep*, he might see some of those numerous places, which will tell him that Minos, the Interlocutor there, was not Minos of Crete. “Dost thou know,” says Socrates to him, “which ‘of the Cretan kings were good men,—as Minos and Rhadamanthys, the Sons of Jove and Europa?’ ‘Rhadamanthys,’ replies the other, ‘was a good man, they say; but Minos was ‘cruel, severe, and unjust.’ ‘Have a care,’ says Socrates again to him, ‘this borders upon blasphemy and impiety; but ‘I will set you right in your opinion of Minos, lest you, who ‘are a Man, the son of a Man, shouldst offend against a Hero, ‘the son of Jove.’ If these places be not sufficient to make the Examiner sensible of his blunder, I will give him several others ‘when he and I next talk together.’ And I will tell him this farther, before-hand, that in my opinion, Plato himself published this Dialogue without naming the Interlocutor; it was only (Σωκράτης καὶ ὁ δῖνος) ‘Socrates and Somebody.’ Afterwards Minos was made the name of that unknown person, from *Minos*, the title of the Dialogue; but I hardly think that he

P. 137.

[280]

* Edit. 3, last leaf.

S 2

that

that first did it, ever imagined such an ingenious Author as Mr. B. could have been caught in so sorry a trap.

P. 176. To convince us that Tragedy was older than Thespis, Mr. B. assures us "That Plutarch, in the Life of Theseus, expressly tells us that the acting of Tragedies was one part of the Funeral Solemnities, which the Athenians performed at the tomb of Theseus." But he has been told already by another, that there is "no such thing in Plutarch's Life of Theseus; or, if there was, yet Tragedy would not on that account be older than Thespis; for Theseus had no tomb at Athens before the days of Thespis*." Mr. B. has pleaded guilty to this †; and confessed that he took it at second-hand from Jul. Scaliger, who says, "Tragœdiam esse rem antiquam constat ex historia, ad Thesei namque sepulchrum certasse Tragicos legimus‡." I will tell him too of another that took it at the same hand; the learned Ger. Vossius: "Aiunt quidam," says he, "Thesei ad sepulchrum certasse Tragicos; atque eam fuisse Tragœdiarum vetustissimam §." Well, I will not impute this to Mr. B. as a fault, since Scaliger and Vossius have erred before him; — I will only observe the difference between those great men and the greater Mr. B. They cite no authority for what they say, because they said it only at second-hand. Mr. B. who took it at trust from them, believing that they had it out of Plutarch's Life of Theseus, cites Him for it at a venture in his Margin; and, in the text, says he expressly tells us so. What poor and cowardly spirits were They, in comparison of Mr. B. — they wanted the manly and generous courage to quote Authors they had never read, with an air of assurance. It is a great blot upon their memories; but, however, we will let it pass, and examine a little into the story of Theseus's tomb, because such great men have been mistaken in it; for, were it true that Tragedies had been acted at Theseus's tomb (which is not so) yet those Tragedies would be so far from being the first, that they came LX years after Thespis had exhibited his. Theseus died in banishment; being murdered and privately buried in the Isle of Scyros; and, about DCCC years afterwards, the oracle enjoined the Athenians to take up his bones, and carry them to Athens; which was accordingly done by Cimon, Olymp. LXXVII, 4. Μετὰ τὰ Μνημόνα, says Plutarch, ΦαίδωνⓄ ἈρχοντⓄ, "After the Medes's invasion,

* View of Dissert. p. 72.

† P. ult. 3d Edit.

‡ Scal. de Poët. i, 5.

§ Voss. Poët. ii, 12.

"when

" when Phædon was Archon, the oracle bid the Athenians fetch home the bones of Theseus; and it was done by Cimon*." If the reading be not corrupted, this oracle was given Olymp. LXXVI, 1, for then Phædon was Archon; and at this rate it will be seven years before the oracle was obeyed. But I rather believe that, for Μηδικὰ Φαίδωνος, we ought to correct it Μηδικὰ Ἀφεψίων⊖, " when Aphepsion was Archon." A was lost in Ἀφεψίων⊖, because Μηδικὰ ends with that letter, and αἰ and ε are commonly put one for the other; being accidentally pronounced both alike. Now Ἀφεψίων was Archon, Olymp. LXXVII, 4† which was the very year that Cimon fetched Theseus's bones, as Plutarch relates it; who adds too, that Ἀφεψίων was the Archont‡. Diodorus, in the annal of that year, says Phædon was Archon; for so the old reading is Ἀρχοντ⊖ Ἀθήνησι Φαίων⊖. The late Editions substitute Φαίδων⊖ but the true lection is Ἀφεψίων⊖, as appears from Laërtius and Plutarch; and this depravation in Diodorus confirms my suspicion about the first passage in Plutarch; for as here Ἀφεψίων⊖ was changed into Φαίων⊖, so there it might be into Φαίδων⊖. The Arundelian Marble calls him Apsephion, placing Ἀρχοντος Ἀψηφίονος at this very year. Meursius§, from these faulty places in Plutarch and Laërtius, makes Phædon to have been thrice Archon, about Olymp. LXXIII, 3, at Olymp. LXXVI, 1, and LXXVII, 4; whereas really he was but once Archon, at Olymp. LXXVI, 1. But there is another mistake committed by Jos. Scaliger, that has had very odd consequences. Scaliger, in his Ὀλυμπιάδων ἀναγραφῇ, which he collected from all the notes of time that he could meet with in any Authors, makes Ἀφεψίων to be Archon at Ol. LXXIV, 4. This, I am persuaded, he did not do out of design, but pure forgetfulness||; for he intended to have set it at Olymp. LXXVII, 4; but, in the Interval between reading his Author and committing this note to writing, his memory deceived him, and he put it at Olymp. LXXIV, 4. This suspicion of mine will be made out from Scaliger's own words there: Ὀλυμπ. οδ. δ'. Ἀφεψίων. Σωκράτης ἐγεννήθη, κατὰ τινὰς compared with Laërtius, from whence they are taken: Σωκράτης ἐγεννήθη ἐπὶ Ἀφεψίωνος ἐν τῷ δ'. ἔτει τῆς ος'. Ὀλυμπιάδος ¶. After this comes Meursius; who mistakes that Ὀλυμπιάδων ἀναγραφῇ for an ancient piece first published out of MS, by Scaliger; and, seeing Aphepsion

* Plut. in Theseo.

† Laërt. in Socrat.

‡ Plut. Cim.

§ Meurs. Archont. ii, 6, 7.

|| See here, p. 158 and 215.

¶ Laërt. in Socr.

named there as Archon, Ol. LXXIV, 4, he interpolates Laërtius, to make him agree with it *; by which means he makes two falsehoods in Laërtius's text, which was right before he meddled with it; for he sets Aphepsion at Olymp. LXXIV, 4, instead of LXXVII, 4; and at Ol. LXXVII, 4, he puts Phædon, instead of Aphepsion: and besides this, he dates Cimon's taking of Scyros, and the fetching of Theseus's bones, at Ol. LXXIV, 4 †, because Plutarch says Aphepsion was Archon at the time of that action ‡; which is a mistake of a dozen years; for this was done Ol. LXXVII, 3, and 4, as is plain from Diodorus §, and intimated even by Plutarch himself. Nay, to see how error is propagated, even Petavius too was caught here; for, at Ol. LXXVII, 4, he takes notice of Laërtius's inconsistency, as he thought it: "He makes Socrates to be born," says he, "at this Olympiad; but he names Aphepsion for the Archon; who was not in this year, but Olymp. LXXIV, 4 ||." And again, at Olymp. LXXIV, 4, Petavius makes Aphepsion to be Archon ¶, and cites Laërtius for it in the Life of Socrates; and he adds, "That in this year Cimon fetched Theseus's bones from Scyros to Athens." Here, we see, are the very same mistakes that Meursius fell into; and the sole occasion of them all was the heedlessness of

[284] Jos. Scaliger. But Petavius has yet another mischance; for he adds **. That "upon the bringing of Theseus's bones, the prizes for Tragedians were instituted; which is part of the error of Jul. Scaliger and Ger. Vossius, that we have noted above; the original of which seems to have been this mistaken passage of Plutarch; who, after he has related how the bones of Theseus were brought in pomp to Athens by Cimon,—*ἔθεντο δὲ, καὶ εἰς μνήμην ἈΤΤΟΤ καὶ τὴν τῶν τραγῳδιῶν κρίσιν ὀνομασθῆναι γενομένην* ††. Now it seems that some believe ΑΤΤΟΤ to be spoken of Theseus; and from thence they coined the story of Tragedies being acted at his tomb. But it plainly relates to Cimon; who, with the rest of the Generals, sat judge of the Plays of Sophocles and Æschylus at that Olymp. LXXVII, 4; and gave the victory to the former ‡‡. Upon the whole then, first, It appears against Mr. B. that Tragedies were not acted

* Meurs. Arch. ii, 7.

† Ibid.

‡ Plut. Cimon.

§ Diod. p. 45.

|| Petav. Doctr. Temp. II. p. 570.

¶ Ibid. p. 567.

** "Inde Tragœdorum institutus est Agon."

†† Plut. Cim.

‡‡ Plut. ibid. See Marm. Arund. epoch. 57.

among

among the solemnities at Theseus's tomb; and, secondly, That Theseus's tomb was not built till Olymp. LXXVII, 4, in Æschylus's and Sophocles's time, long after Thespis; so that, were it true that Tragedies had been one of those funeral solemnities, yet it would be no argument for that antiquity that Mr. B. assigns to Tragedy. But these are mistakes of his, only for want of reading: the next that I am going to mention, let others judge from what want it proceeds. The case is this:—A certain Writer has accused Mr. B. of a false citation of Plutarch's Life of Theseus; "for there is no such thing as he quotes in that Life. in the life of Cimon, indeed, there is something that "an ignorant person might construe to such a sense*." To this Mr. B. replies, That he owns he was misled by Jul. Scalliger; who affirms the thing, but quotes nobody for it: "and "perhaps," says Mr. B. farther †, "I was too hasty in not fully [285] "considering the whole passage of Plutarch in the Life of Cimon, relating to this matter." Now this excuse implies an affirmation that he had his eye on that passage in the Life of Cimon, when he wrote that about Tragedies at Theseus's tomb. But the contrary of this is manifest from his own Book; for he quotes not the life of Cimon, but the Life of Theseus, where there is not one syllable of Tragedies; so that he quoted Plutarch *at a venture*,—without looking into him at all. Where is the truth then of his "not FULLY considering?" If Mr. B.'s very excuses stand in need of excuse, how inexcusable must the rest be!

It was the Examiner's purpose to shew some footsteps of Tragedy before the time of Thespis; but he has not observed a passage of Herodotus (because his second-hand writers did not furnish him with it) which, of all others, had been fittest for his turn. The Sicyonians," says that Historian, "in every "respect honoured the memory of Adrastus; and particularly "they celebrated the story of his Life with Tragical Choruses; "not making Bacchus the subject of them, but Adrastus. "But Clisthenes assigned the Choruses to Bacchus; and the "rest of the festival to Melanippus ‡." This Clisthenes, here spoken of, was grandfather to Clisthenes, the Athenian; who was the main agent in driving out the sons of Pisistratus, at Olymp. LXVII; and, since Tragical Choruses were used in Sicyon before that Clisthenes's time, it appears they must be

* View of Dissert. p. 72.

† P. ult. 3d Edit.

‡ Herod. v. c. 67. Τὰ πάθια αὐτῷ τραγικοῖσι χοροῖσι ἐγίγαντο.

- long in use before the time of Thespis, who was one generation younger than Clisthenes himself. — and, agreeably to this, Themistius tells us “ That the Sicyonians were the inventors of
- [286] “ Tragedy, and the Athenians the finishers *.” And when Aristotle says “ That some of the Peloponnesians pretend to the invention of it †,” I understand him of these Sicyonians. Now, if Mr. B. had but met with this place of Herodotus, with what triumphing and insulting would he have produced it! — what plenty of scurrility and grimace would he have poured out on this occasion! But I have so little apprehensions either of the force of this argument or of Mr. B.’s address in managing it, that I here give him notice of it, for the improvement of his next Edition: the truth is, there is no more to be inferred from these passages, than that, before the time of Thespis, the first grounds and rudiments of Tragedy were laid: — there were Choruses and extemporal Songs (*αὐτοσχεδιαστικά*) but nothing *written* or published as a Dramatic Poem; — so that Phalaris is still to be indicted for a Sophist, for saying his two Fairy Poets *wrote* Tragedies against him ‡. Nay, the very word *Tragedy* was not heard of then at Sicyon, though, Herodotus names (*Τραγικὴς χορὴς*) the Tragical Choruses; which by and by shall be considered.
- P. 172. Mr. B. is so very obliging, “ that, if I will suffer myself to be “ taught by him, he will set me right” in my notion of Tragedy. I am willing to be *taught* by any body, much more by the great
- P. 59. Mr. B. though, as to this particular of Tragedy, I dare not honour myself as Mr. B. honours his Teacher, by telling him “ That the foundation of all the little knowledge I have in this “ matter was laid by Him;” for there is nothing true in the long lecture that he reads to me here about Tragedy, but what I might have learned out of Aristotle, Julius Scaliger, Gerard Vossius, Marmora Oxoniensia, and other common Books: and as for
- [287] the singularities in it, which I could not have learned in other places (if I, who am here to be *taught*, may use such freedom with my Master) they are such lessons as I hope I am now too old to learn. I will not sift into them too minutely; for I will observe the respect and distance that is due to him from his Scholar; but there is one particular that I must not omit, when he tells me, as out of Aristotle, that the subject of primitive Tragedy was Satirical Reproofs of vicious men and

* Them. Orat. xix. Τραγωδίας εὐρεταὶ μὲν Σικυῶνιοι, τελειωργοὶ δὲ Ἀττικοὶ ποιηταί.

† Arist. Poët. 3.

‡ Epist. 63, 97.

manners

manners of the times ; so that he explains very dexterously, as he thinks, the expression of Phalaris, " That the Poets wrote Tragedies AGAINST him ;" for the meaning, he says, is this : " That they wrote Lampoons, and abusive Satirical Copies of " Verses upon him." But it were well if this would be a warning to him, when he next pretends to *teach* others, to consider first how lately he himself came from School. The words of Aristotle that he refers to are, " That Tragedy at first was *Σατυρικὴ** " which Mr. B. in his deep judgment and reading interprets *Satyr* and *Lampoon*, confounding the Satirical Plays of the Greeks with the Satire of the Romans ; though it is now above a hundred years since Casaubon† wrote a whole Book, on purpose to shew they had no similitude or affinity with one another. The Greek Satyrica was only a jocose sort of Tragedy, consisting of a Chorus of Satyrs (from which it had its name) that talked lasciviously, befitting their character ; but they never gave " Reproofs to the vicious men of the times," their whole Discourse being directed to the action and story of the Play, which was Bacchus, or some ancient Hero, turned a little to ridicule. There is an entire Play of this kind yet extant, the *Cyclops* of Euripides ; but it no more concerns the *vicious men* at Athens in the Poet's time, than his *Orestes* or his *Hecuba* does. As for the abusive Poem or Satire of the Romans, it was an invention of their own. *Satira toto nostra est*, says Quintilian‡, " Satire is entirely ours ;" and if the Greeks had anything like it, it was not the Satirical Plays of the Tragic Poets, but the old Comedy, and the Silli made by Xenophanes, Timon, and others. " Satire," says Diomedes, " among the ROMANS, is NOW an abusive Poem, made to " reprove the vices of men§." Here we see it was a Poem of the Romans, not of the Greeks ; and it was *now*, that is, after Lucilius's time, that it became abusive ; for the Satire of Ennius and Pacuvius was quite of another nature. And now which of my Masters must I be *taught* by ? by Quintilian and Diomedes ? or by the young Orbilius, that has lashed Scaliger and Salmasius at that insolent rate ? But Mr. B. offers to prove that the old Tragedy had a mixture of Lampoon, from Theopis's Cart that he carried his Plays in ; " From which Cart," says he, " Scurrility and Buffoonery were so usually uttered, that " *Ἐξαμάξιν*, and *Ἐξ ἀμάξης λέγειν*, became proverbial expres-

P. 173.

P. 180,

181.

[238]

P. 213.

P. 180.

* Arist. Poët. 4.

† Is. Casaub. de Satyrica et Satira. Par. 1595.

‡ Quint. x, 1.

§ Diomed. p. 482.

" sions

“sions for Satire and Jeering.” What an odious word is here, Ἐξαμάζειν! Sure, all the Buffoonery of that Cart he talks of, could not be so nauseous as this one Barbarism. I desire to know, in what Original Author (for his second-hand Gentlemen he must excuse me) this wonderful word may be found? the Original of which seems a mistake of ἐξ ἀμαξῶν, for a participle Ἐξαμάζων. But to leave this to keep company with Ἀντιγονίδαι and Σελευκίδαι*, I will crave leave to tell him, that they were other Carts, and not Thespis’s, that this Proverb [289] (Τὰ ἐξ ἀμαξῶν) was taken from; for they generally used Carts in their pomps and processions, not only in the Festivals of Bacchus, but of other Gods too; and particularly in the Eleusinian Feast, the women were carried in the procession in Carts, out of which they abused and jeered one another. Aristophanes in Plutus:—

Μυστηρίοις δὲ τοῖς μεγάλοις ὀχνημένην
Ἐπὶ τῆς ἀμάξης —

Upon which passage the old Scholiast† and Suidas‡ have this note:—“That in those Carts the women (ἐλοιθόρην ἀλλήλαις) “made abusive jests one upon another;” and especially at a bridge over the river Cephissus, where the procession used to stop a little; from whence, to *abuse* and *jeer* was called γεφυρίζειν§. These Eleusinian Carts are mentioned by Virgil, in the first of his Georgics:—

“Tardaquee Eleusinæ matris volventia plaustra||;”

which most of the Interpreters have been mistaken in; for the Poet means not that Ceres invented them, but that they were used at her Feasts. But besides the Eleusinian, there was the same custom in many other festival pomps; whence it was that Πομπεύειν and Πομπεία came at last to signify *scoffing* and *railing*. So Demosthenes takes the word; and his Scholiast says¶, “That in those *pomps* they used to put on vizards,” “and riding in the carts abuse the people; from whence,” says he, “comes the Proverb, ἐξ ἀμάξης με ὕβρισε,” which Demosthenes uses in the same Oration**; so that the very passage of this Orator, which Mr. B. cites in his margin, is not meant of the Carts of Tragedians. It is true, Harpo-

* See here, p. 128.

† Schol. Arist. p. 48.

§ Hesych. Γφ.

¶ Demost. de Corona. p. 134, edit. Par.

‡ Suid. in Τὰ ἐξ ἀμαξῶν.

|| Georg. i, 163.

** P. 159.

cration* and Suidas† understand it of the *pomp* in the Feasts of Bacchus; but even there too they were not the Tragic, but the Comic Poets who were so abusive; for they also had their Carts to carry their Plays in. “The Comic Poets,” says the Scholiast on Aristophanes‡, “rubbing their faces with lees of wine, that they might not be known, were carried about in Carts, and sung their Poems in the Highways; from whence came the Proverb (Ὡς ἐξ ἀμάξης λαλεῖ) “To rail as impudently as out of a Cart.” Mr. B. concludes this paragraph with a kind hint, “That the Doctor may perhaps, before he dies, have a convincing proof that a man may be the subject of such Tragedies (*i. e.* such Lampoons and abuses from Carts) while he is living.” I heartily thank him for telling the world what worthy Adversaries I am like to have, and what honourable weapons they will use; and, to requite his kindness, I assure him that I shall no more value, nor be concerned at, those *lampooning* Tragedies, than if they were really spoken out of Carts, which perhaps may still be the fittest Stage for such kind of Tragedians. P. 180.

There are two passages of Horace and Plutarch that concern the rise and origin of Tragedy: —

“Ignotum Tragicæ genus invenisse Camœnæ
“Dicitur, et plaustris vexisse poëmata Thespis §.”

And Ἀρχομένων τῶν περὶ Θεσπιν ἤδη τὴν Τραγῳδίαν κινεῖν ||.

Now the first of these, as Mr. B. glosses upon it, means it was “an unknown kind of Tragic Poetry which Thespis found out;” and implies “there was another known kind in use before him.” The latter, he says, may import that Thespis did not invent, “but only gave life and motion to “Tragedy, by making it Dramatic.” Now Mr. B. either seriously believes these interpretations, or not. If he *does*, the best advice his Friends can give him is, to trouble his head no more with Critic, for it will never do him credit. If he *does not* believe them, where is that modesty “becoming a Young Writer,” or that sincerity becoming a Gentleman, or that prudence becoming a Man? It is a dangerous thing to trifle with the world, and to put those things upon others which he believes not himself. No man ever despised his Readers that did not suffer for it at the last. However, whether Mr. B. P. 175. P. 176. [291] Pref.

* Harp. in Πομπία. Διονυσιακαῖς ἑορταῖς.

† Suid in Ἐξ ἀμάξης. Ἐν Ἀναίοις.

‡ Schol. Arist. p. 76.

§ Hor. in Arte Poët.

|| Plut. in Solonc.

believes

believes these interpretations or not, I am resolved not to refute them; for though I have often had already, and shall have still, a very ignoble employment in answering some of his little cavils, yet I have spirit enough to think that there may be *some* drudgery so very mean, as to be really below me.

We are come now to the last point about Tragedy; and that is the *origin* of the *name*. I had observed "That the name of Tragedy was no older than the thing, as sometimes it happens, when an old word is borrowed and applied to a new notion." So that the very word *τραγωδία*, which the false Phalaris uses in his Epistles, was not so much as heard of in the days of the true one. Mr. B. commences his answer to this with an acuteness familiar to him. "What does he mean?" says he; "*Names*, I thought, were invented to signify *Things*; and that the *things* themselves must be before the *names* by which they are called." Now I leave it to the sagacious Reader to discover, what I cannot do, the pertinency and the drift of this passage of Mr. B.'s. However, let it belong to anything or nothing, it is a proposition false in itself, "That things themselves must be before the names by which they are called;" for we have many new tunes in Music, made every day, which never existed before, yet several of them are called by *names* that were formerly in use; and perhaps the tune of *Chevy Chase*, though it be of famous antiquity, is a little younger than the name of the Chase itself; and I humbly conceive that Mr. Hobbes's Book, which he called the *Leviathan*, is not quite so ancient as its name is in Hebrew. So very fortunate is Mr. B. when he endeavours at subtlety and niceness. It is true, where *Things* are eternal, or as old as the world, which we call the works of Nature, they *must* be older than the *Names* that are given them; but in things of art or potion, that have their existence from man's intellect or manual operation, *the things themselves* may be many years younger *than the names by which they are called*; and so the thing Tragedy may possibly be younger than the name that it is called by.

The reason, therefore, why I affirmed "That the name of Tragedy was no older than the thing," was, — because good Authors assured me that the word Tragedy* was first coined from the Goat, that was the prize of it; which prize was first constituted in Thespis's time. So the Arundel Marble, in the epoch of Thespis: *Καὶ ἄθλον ἐτίθη ὁ Τράγῳ* — "and the Goat

* *Τραγωδία*. *Τράγῳ*.

" was

" was appointed for the prize." So Dioscorides, in his Epigram upon Thespis : —

— Ω τραγῳδῶ δῶλον.

And Horace, speaking of the same person,

" Carmine qui Tragico vilem certavit ob Hircum."

And because I was fully persuaded by them that this was the true etymology of the word, and that the guesses of some Grammarians (Τραγωδία quasi τρυγωδία, or Τραγωδία quasi τραχεῖα ᾠδή) and other such like, were absurd and ridiculous, I thought, as I do still, that the very name of Tragedy was no older than Thespis; and consequently could not have been found in the Epistles of the true Phalaris. [293]

But I have not forgotten, what I myself lately quoted out of Herodotus, that the Sicyonians before Thespis's time honoured the memory of Adrastus (τραγικοῖσι χοροῖσι) "with Tragical Choruses*." If this be so, here appears an ample testimony that the word *Tragedy* was older than Thespis. But for a man that meddles with this kind of learning, the first stock to set up and prosper with is sound *judgment*, which gives the very name and being to Critic; and without which he will never be able to steer his course successfully among many seeming contradictions. As in this passage of Herodotus, which is contrary to what others assure us, what course is to be taken? — must we stand dubious and neuters between both, and cry out upon "the uncertainty of Heathen Chronology?" — or must we not rather say That Herodotus, who himself lived many years after Thespis, when Tragedy was frequent and improved to its highest pitch, made use of a Prolepsis, when he called them τραγικὰς χοροὺς, — meaning such Choruses as gave the first rise to that which in his time was called Tragedy? So we have seen before, that Porphyry, and Jamblichus, and Conou speak of Taurrominium at a time when that name was not yet heard of; but they meant the city of Naxos, that was afterwards called so. Such an anticipation is common and familiar in all sorts of writers. And if Herodotus, in another place, where he says "That the Epidaurians (long before Susarion lived in Attica) honoured the Goddesses Damia and Auxesia (χοροῖσι γυναικῆσι κερτόμοις) with Choruses of women, that used to abuse and burlesque the women of the Country†," had called them χοροῖσι κωμικοῖσι (Comical Choruses) he had said nothing un-

P.180.

[294]

* Herod. v. c. 67,

† Herod. v. c. 83.

worthy

worthy of a great Historian, because those Choruses of women were much of the same sort that were afterwards called Comical, though perhaps at that time the word Comical was not yet minted.

- P. 178. But let us see what Mr. B. advances to shew that the name of Tragedy is older than Thespis. "It cannot reasonably be questioned," says he, "but that those Bacchic Hymns they sung in Chorus round their altars (from whence the regular Tragedy came) were called by this name Tragedy, from *Τράγος*, the Goat, (the sacrifice) at the offering of which these Odes were sung." But he presently subjoins, "That
- P. 179. "as to this we are in the dark, and have only probabilities to guide us." If we are in the dark, I dare affirm that the Examiner will leave us so still; for it is not his talent to give light to any thing, but rather to make it darker than it was before. "It cannot reasonably," he says, "be questioned." Why not, I pray? Because it would be a question that He could not answer. I know no other *unreasonableness* in questioning it; for he has not one authority for what he supposes here, That the name of Tragedy was as old as the institution of sacrificing a Goat to Bacchus; but, on the contrary, we have express testimonies that it was no ancients than when the Goat was made the prize to be contended for by the Poets. As, besides the passages cited before, Eusebius says in his Chronicle, "Certantibus in Agone Tragos, *i. e.* Hircus, in præmio dabatur; unde aiunt Tragædos nuncupatos." So Diomedes the Grammatician, "Tragœdia à *τράγω* & *ὠδή* dicta; quoniam olim actoribus Tragicis, *τράγω*, id est, Hircus, præmium cantus proponebatur." Etymol. Mag. *Κέκληται τραγωδία, ὅτι τράγω τῇ ὠδῇ ἄθλον ἐτίθετο*. Philargyrius on Virgil's Georgics, — "Dabatur Hircus, præmii nomine; unde hoc genus poëmatis Tragœdiam volunt dictam*." All the other derivations of the word Tragedy are to be slighted and exploded. But if this be the true one, as it certainly is, the word cannot possibly be ancients than Thespis's days; who was the first that contended for this prize. Besides this, we have very good authority that "those Bacchic Hymns, from whence the regular Tragedy came," were originally called by another name; — not Tragedy, but Dithyramb. So Aristotle expressly teaches: — "Tragedy," says he, "had its first rise from those that sung the Dithyramb †." *Διθύραμβος*, says Suidas, *ὅθεν εἰς Διόνυσον*

* Georg. ii, 183.

† Arist. Poet. iv. *Ἀπὸ τῶν ἱεραρχόντων τὸν Διθύραμβον.*

i. e. "Dithyramb means the Bacchic Hymn." The first author of the Dithyramb, as some relate*, was Iasus Hermionensis, in the first Darius's time; or, as others †, Arion Methymnæus, in the time of Periauder. But, as it appears from Pindar, and his Scholiast ‡, the antiquity of it was so great, that the inventor could not be known; and Archilochus, who was much older than both Lasus and Arion, has the very word Dithyramb in these wonderful and truly Dithyrambic verses§: —

Ὡς Διώνισοι ἄνακτ' καλὸν ἐξάρξαι μέλ' —
 Οἶδα Διθύραμβον, οἶνῳ συγκεραυνωθείς φρένας·

So the verses are to be corrected and distinguished, being a pair of Trochaics; and Mr. B. may please to observe, that Archilochus too, as well as Suidas, defines a Dithyramb to be a Bacchic Hymn; which Mr. B. erroneously makes to be peculiar to Tragedy. I will tell him also anon, that the Chorus belonging to the Dithyramb was not called a Tragic, but Cylician Chorus.

[296]

Mr. B. has failed in his first attempt about the date of the word Tragedy; but he has still another stratagem to bring about his design; for he will prove that *τραγωδία* "comprehended originally both Tragedy and Comedy;" and since Comedy was as ancient as Susarion, who was near forty years older than Thespis, it follows that the word *τραγωδία*, which Comedy was then called by, must be older than Thespis. This being the point he promised to prove, he presently shifts hands, and changes the question; for he has quoted five passages, one out of Athenæus, three out of the Scholiast on Aristophanes, and one out of Hesychius, to shew that *τραγωδία* signifies Comedy; which is a thing so known and common, and confessed by all, that he might as well take pains to prove *κωμωδία* signifies Comedy. But what is all this to *τραγωδία*? Must *τραγωδία* signify Comedy, because *τραγωδία* does? An admirable argument, and one of Mr. B.'s beloved sort! He may prove too, whensoever he pleases, *lacerna* means a Lamp, because *lucerna* does; and a great many other feats may be performed by this argument. But, in his other citations, with which his margin is plentifully stuffed out, there is one to shew that *τραγωδία* signifies

P. 179.

P. 179.

* Suid. *Δάσος*. Arist. Schol. p. 362, 421.

† Suid. *Ἀρίων*. Arist. Schol. 421. Dion. Chrysost. p. 455.

‡ Pind. Olymp. xiii.

§ Athen. p. 628.

Tragedy;

[207] Tragedy; and two, that *Τραγωδία* signifies Comedy. Now, the first of these is beside the question again; for though *τραγωδία* should stand both for *τραγωδία* and *κωμωδία*, yet it does not at all follow that *τραγωδία* may stand for *κωμωδία*. If Mr. B. had studied his new Logic more, and his Phalaris less, he had made better work in the way of reasoning. It is as if some School-boy should thus argue with his Master:—*Pomum* may signify *malum*, an Apple; and *pomum* too may signify *cerasum*, a Cherry; therefore *malum*, an Apple, may signify *cerasum*, a Cherry. But, besides the failure in the consequence, the proposition itself is false; for *τραγωδία* does not signify Tragedy: nay, to see the strange felicity of Mr. B.'s Critic, even his other assertion is false too; for *τραγωδία* never signifies Comedy. — Let us examine his instances: —

P. 179. “*Τραγωδία*,” says Mr. B. “signifies Tragedy, properly so called, in this passage of Aristophanes* : —

“ — Αὐτὸς δ' ἔνδον ἀναβάνην ποιεῖ
“ *Τραγωδίαν* —

[208] “For this is spoken of Euripides.” But what then? “Why, Euripides being a Tragic Poet, *τραγωδία*, when applied to him, must needs signify Tragedy.” I am unwilling to discourage a Gentleman; and yet I cannot but take notice of his unlucky hand, whenever he meddles with Authors. Here he interprets *τραγωδία*, Tragedy; and yet the very jest and wit of this passage consists in this, that the Poet calls Euripides's Plays *Comedies*; and so the Scholiast interprets it: — *τραγωδίαν δὲ εἶπεν, ἀντὶ τῆς κωμωδίας*. Euripides was accused by Aristophanes, and several of the Antients, for debasing the majesty and grandeur of Tragedy, by introducing low and despicable characters instead of heroic ones; and by making his persons discourse in a mean and popular style, but one degree above common talk in Comedy; contrary to the practice of Æschylus and Sôphocles, who aspired after the sublime character; and by metaphors, and epithets, and compound words, made all their lines strong and lofty; and particularly in Aristophanes's *Ranæ* †, where Æschylus and Euripides are compared together, the latter is pleasantly burlesqued and rallied, on this very account. What could Aristophanes then say smarter in this passage about him, than, in derision of his style and characters, to call his Tragedies *Comedies*?

* Arist. Acharn. p. 278.

† Arist. Ran. p. 167, &c.

Well,

Well, let us see if, in his next point, Mr. B. is more fortunate, — “that τραγωδία may signify Comedy. There is a fragment,” he says, “of Aristophanes’s ΓΗΡΥΤΑΔΗΣ preserved, “where τραγωδός signifies a Comedian* :”

Καὶ τίνας ἂν εἶεν; πρῶτα μὲν Σαντυρίων
Ἄπὸ τῶν τραγωδῶν, ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν τραγικῶν χορῶν
Μίλητος, ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν κυκλικῶν Κινησίας.

Now Sannyrion being a Comic Poet, as it is very well known, it is a clear case, as Mr. B. thinks, that ἀπὸ τῶν τραγωδῶν means “one of the Comedians.” No doubt, the Poet meant to say that Sannyrion was sent Ambassador from the Comic Poets, Meletus from the Tragic, and Cinesias from the Dithyrambic. This was Aristophanes’s thought; and therefore I affirm that his words could not be ἀπὸ τῶν τραγωδῶν, as now they are read: so far from that, that if τραγωδῶν *could* signify Comedians, yet he would not have used the word in this place, where τραγικῶν χορῶν immediately follows; for what a wretched ambiguity would be here, and wholly unworthy of so elegant a Poet! since τραγωδῶν and τραγικῶν χορῶν are words of the same import; and if the former may signify Comedy, the latter may do so too. So that, if the persons Sannyrion and Meletus had not been well known, the passage might appear a mere tautology; Tragedians and Tragedians, or Comedians and Comedians; or, if the signification was varied, the one word meaning Comedians, and the other Tragedians, yet it had been uncertain whether of the two was the Comedian, and whether the Tragedian, because both the words, according to Mr. B. may be interpreted in either signification. These, I conceive, are such just exceptions against the vulgar reading of this passage, that a person who esteems Aristophanes as he deserves, may safely say he never wrote it so. If Critic had ever once smiled upon Mr. B. or if there was not a kind of fatality in his errors, he could scarce have missed this most certain correction: —

[309]

— Πρῶτα μὲν Σαντυρίων
Ἄπὸ τῶν τραγωδῶν —

by which all the ambiguity or tautology vanishes; for τραγωδός never signified any thing but a Comedian. And how easy and natural was the depravation of τραγωδῶν into τραγωδός! Τρυγωδός being the much rarer word, and, as I believe, not to be met with in Prose or serious Writings; for it was a kind of jeering

* Athen. p. 551.

name, and not so honourable as *Κωμῳδός*. However, the corruption of this passage is very ancient; for the Author of the Epitome of Athenæus, who lived before Eustathius's time, i. e. above 11 years ago, read it *τραγωδῶν* for here he calls Sannyrion a Tragedian*. But in Ælian's days, the true reading (*τρυγωδῶν*) was still extant in Athenæus; for that Author transcribes this very passage into his Various History; and from it he calls Sannyrion a Comedian†, and Melitus a Tragedian.

But that Mr. B. may not wonder at the change of *τρυγωδῶν* into *τραγωδῶν*, I will tell him of one or two other corruptions in the very same passage: —

[300]

— Ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν τραγικῶν χορῶν
Μέλῃτῳ, ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν κυκλικῶν Κινησίας.

for the learned Casaubon, instead of *Μέλῃτῳ*, reads it *Μέλῃτῳ*; "because," says he, "neither this verse here, nor any other wherein he is mentioned, will allow the second syllable of his name to be long‡." But, with humble submission, — Whether his name be written *Μέλῃτῳ* or *Μέλῃτῳ*, I affirm that those very verses both allow and require that the second syllable of it should be long; — as first in this of Aristophanes, if the first syllable of *Κυκλικῶν* be short, the second of *Μέλῃτῳ* must be long. Casaubon, it is true, as his observation shews, believed the first of *Κυκλικῶν* to be of necessity long; but, as it is plain that it *may* be short, so that it actually is so in several passages (I might say all) of the same Poet, will be seen by and by. The other verse that Casaubon produces, is out of Ranæ: —

Σκολιῶν Μελίτῃ, καὶ Καρικῶν αὐλημάτων.

But even here too the second syllable of *Μελίτῃ* is long; for KAI ought to be struck out, as will be plain from the whole passage §: —

Οὐτῷ δ' ἀπὸ πάντων μὲν φίρει ποριδίῳ,
Σκολίῳ Μελίτῃ, Καρικῶν αὐλημάτων,
Θρήνῳ, Χορίῳ τάχα δὲ δηλωθήσεται.

Who does not see now that, if KAI be inserted in the second verse, a great part of the elegance is lost? for the whole sentence runs on without any particle of conjunction. But to

* Epit. Athen. MS. Σανυρίωνα τὸν τραγωδῶν.

† Æl. Var. Hist. x, 6. Σανυρίων ὁ Κωμῳδίας ποιητής.

‡ Casaub. ad Athen. p. 857.

§ Arist. Ran. p. 180.

put the matter quite out of doubt, this very verse is cited in Suidas*, and KAI does not appear there; but it easily crept into the text, because the next word begins with the same letters KA. Upon the whole, therefore, the fault that Casaubon found in the passage of Athenæus is really none: but there is one which he did not find, and that is κυκλιῶν instead of κυκλίων for the verse should be corrected thus:—

Μέλπτε, ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν κυκλίων Κινησίας.

So Ælian† cites it from this very place, Κινησίας Κυκλίων χορῶν ποιητής and Aristophanes‡ speaks so in other places:—

Κυκλίων τε χορῶν ἀσματοκάμπτιας, ἄνδρας μετιωροφίτακας.

And again, speaking of the same Cinesias:—

Ταυτί πιπτοίηκας τὸν κυκλιοδιδάσκαλον

and so all manner of Writers call them Κύκλιοι χοροί, and never Κυκλικοί Suidas, Scholiasts on Pindar and Aristophanes, Hesychius, Plato, Plutarch, and others. This Cyclian Chorus was the same with the Dithyramb, as some of these Authors expressly say; and there were three Choruses belonging to Bacchus; the Κωμικός, the Τραγικός, and the Κύκλιος the last of which had its prize and its judges at the Dionysia§, as the other two had. The famous Simonides won LVI of these victories, as Tzetzes informs us from an Epitaph upon that Poet's Tomb||:—

Ἐξ ἐπὶ πεντήκοντα, Σιμωνίδη, ἦραό νίκας
Καὶ τρίποδας, θήσκεις δ' ἐν Σικελῷ πεδίῳ.
Κεῖν δὲ μνήμην λείπεις, Ἕλλησι δ' ἱπαισιν
Εὐχόμεντε ψυχῆς τοῖς ἐπιγινόμενοις.

So this Epigram is to be corrected; for it is faulty in Tzetzes. Indeed, it is not expressed here what sort of victories they were; so that possibly there might be some of them obtained by his Tragedies, if that be true which Suidas tells us, that Simonides made Tragedies. But I rather believe that he won them all by his Dithyrambs with the Cyclian Choruses; and I am confirmed in it by his own Epigram, not published before¶:—

* Suid. in Μέλπτε.

† Æl. x, 6.

‡ Arist. Nub. p. 79.

§ Æsch. contra Ctesiph. p. 87. Καὶ τὰς μὲν κριτὰς τὰς ἐκ Διονυσίων, ἵαν μὴ δικαίως τὰς Κυκλίας χορὰς κρίνωσι, ζημιῶτε.

|| Tzetz. Chil. i, 24.

¶ Anthol. Epigr. MS.

[302]

Ἐξ ἐπὶ πινυτήκοιτα, Σιμωνίδη, ἦρας ταύρας
 Καὶ τρίποδας, πρὶν τὸνδ' ἀνθέμιναι πίνακα.
 Τοσσάκι δ' ἱμερόντα (διδασκόμενοι) χορὸν ἀνδρῶν,
 Εὐδόξε νίκας ἀγλαὴν ἄρμ' ἐπέτης.

I have supplied the third verse with διδασκόμενοι, which is wanting in the MS. But it is observable that, instead of νίκας, as it is in Tzetzes, the MS. Epigram has ταύρας, which I take to be the Author's own word; but being not understood, it was changed into νίκας for Ταῦρ, a Bull, was the Prize of Dithyramb, as a Goat was of Tragedy; which was the reason why Pindar gives to Dithyramb the epithet of βοηλάτης* —

Ταὶ Διωνύσου πόθιν ἐξίφανα
 Σὺν βοηλάτῃ χάριτες
 Διθυράμῳ ———.

"He calls the Dithyramb βοηλάτης," says the Scholiast, "because the Bull was the prize to the winner; that animal being sacred to Bacchus." And as the Dithyrambic Poets contended for a Bull, so the Harpers (Κιθαροῦδοι) contended for a Calf. Aristophanes†: —

Ἄλλ' ἔτιρον ἥσθην, ἥνικ' ἐπὶ μόσχῳ ποτὶ
 Διξίθιος εἰσῆλθ' ἀσόμενος Βοιώτιον.

"Some," says the Scholiast, "interpret it ἐπὶ μόσχῳ, for a Calf; because he that got the victory with his Harp, had a Calf for his premium." He seems indeed to give preference to the other exposition, that makes Μόσχος the name of a Harper, and the modern Translators follow him in it; but the former is the true meaning of the passage, as both the language and the sense sufficiently shew. I will crave leave to add two things more relating to this matter: — First, That this triple Chorus, the Comic, Tragic, and Cyclian, may perhaps be meant in that Epigram of Dioscorides, which I have produced above: —

[303]

Βάχχος ὅτι τρίτῳ κατὰγοι χορὸν ———.

Neither shall I contend the point if any one will embrace this exposition; but, for my own part, I prefer the other, which makes it relate to Trina Liberaria, the three Festivals of Bacchus. And, Secondly, That these prizes, the Bull and the Calf, appointed for the Dithyramb and playing on the Harp (if they really were continued till Simonides's death, and

* Pind. Olymp. xv.

† Acharn. p. 61.

Aristo-

Aristophanes's time; and if those passages of theirs related to the present custom, and not the first institution only) may induce some to believe that the old prizes for Tragedy and Comedy might be continued too, though they be not taken notice of. However, be this as it will, the arguments used above * are not weakened at all by it; for it is plain from the epochs of Æschylus, &c. in the Arundel Marble (where those prizes are not mentioned) that the epochs of Sannyrion and Thespis (where they are mentioned) were proposed to us by that Author as the first rise of Comedy and Tragedy.

Mr. B. has one passage more, which is his last anchor, to prove his notable point, "That the word Tragedy may signify Comedy." It is in the Greek Prolegomena to Aristophanes, gathered out of some nameless Authors; the words are, "Ἐν δὲ ταύτῃ (Κωμῳδίᾳ) εἰπεῖν καὶ τραγῳδίαν, οἷονεὶ τραγῳδίαν τινα ἔσαν, ὅτι τραγῳδία χριόμενοι ἐκωμῶμεν" i. e. "Comedy may be called Tragedy, *quasi* Trygœdia; because the Actors besmeared their faces with lees of wine†." Here, we see, the testimony is positive and full that Comedy may be called Tragedy; which is the thing that Mr. B. undertook to prove; and what is there now remaining but to congratulate and applaud him? But I think one could hardly pitch upon a better instance, to shew that he that meddles with these matters must have *brains*, as Mr. B.'s phrase is, as well as eyes, *in his head*. A man that has that furniture in his upper story, will discover by the very next words in that nameless old Author, that the passage is corrupted; for it immediately follows, Καὶ τῆς μὲν Τραγῳδίας τὸ εἰς ἔλεον κινῆσαι τὰς ἀκροατάς, τῆς δὲ Κωμῳδίας τὸ εἰς γέλωτα. So that the whole sentence, as the common reading, and Mr. B. has it, is thus: — "Comedy may be also called Tragedy; and "it is the design of Tragedy to excite compassion in the auditory; but of Comedy, to excite laughter." Is not this now a most admirable period? and all one as if he had said "Comedy may be called Tragedy, for they are quite different things!" Without all doubt, if he had really meant Comedy may be called Tragedy, in those following words he would have said τῆς τραγῳδίας τῆς κυρίως λεγομένης "it is the design of Tragedy, properly so called;" and not have left them, as they now are, a piece of flat nonsense. But the fault, one may say, is now conspicuous enough; but what shall be done for an

[304]

* See here, p. 210. 252.

† Proleg. Arist. p. ix.

emendation of it? even That too is very easy and certain; for with the smallest alteration, the whole passage may be read thus: *Ἐρί δε ταύτην εἰπεῖν καὶ τραγωδίαν, οἷονεῖ τραγωδίαν τινὰ ἔσαν, ὅτι τραγία χριόμενοι ἐκωμῶδον.* And so we have it, in almost the very same words, in another Writer among the same Prolegomena; *Τὴν αὐτὴν δὲ (Κωμωδίαν) καὶ τραγωδίαν φασίν, ὅτι τραγὶ διαχρίοντες τὰ πρόσωπα ὑπεκρίνοντο**. The import of both is, "That for *κωμωδία*, one may use the word *τραγωδία*" which is true and right; for the words are synonymous, as appears from several places in Aristophanes, and the old Lexicographers.

[305]

I have now dispatched all the Examiner's instances which he has brought to shew that *τραγωδία* may signify Tragedy, or *τραγωδία* signify Comedy; and it would seem a very strange thing in any other Writer but Mr. B. that he should bring half a dozen examples, that are either false or nothing to his purpose, and be ignorant of that single one that is plainly and positively for him. I crave his leave to produce it here, and to change my adversary for a while, if Mr. B. will not be affronted that I assign him a second so much inferior to him, — the great Isaac Casaubon. This Author, in his most excellent Book, "*De Satyrica Poësi*," as Mr. B. has done, teaches us †, "That at first both Comedy and Tragedy were called *τραγωδία*, or *τραγωδία*, as appears from Athenæus; where, he says ‡, both "Comedy and Tragedy were found out in the time of Vintage; (*τρύγης*) ἀφ' ἧ δὴ καὶ τραγωδία τὸ πρῶτον ἐκλήθη καὶ κωμωδία. "Which," says Casaubon, "I thus correct: — *ἐκλήθη καὶ ἡ τραγωδία καὶ ἡ κωμωδία* that is, From which word (*τρύγη*) Vintage, both "Comedy and Tragedy were at first called *τραγωδία*." This is Casaubon's first proof; and we see it solely depends upon his own emendation of Athenæus; which, with humble submission, I take to be a very wrong one; for it is not in the text, as he has cited it, *ἐκλήθη ΚΑΙ κωμωδία* (which would truly shew some defect in it) but *ἐκλήθη Ἡ κωμωδία*, both in his own and the other Editions. He was deceived, therefore, by trusting to his Adversaria, without consulting the original; for there is no other pretence of altering the text; but from the particle *ΚΑΙ*.

[306]

He goes on, and tells us §, "That both *τραγωδία* and *τραγωδία* "were at first a common name both for Tragedy and Comedy; "but afterwards it was divided, *διεσπάσθη*, as Aristotle says,

* Proleg. Arist. p. vii.

† Casaub. Satyr. p. 21.

‡ Athen. p. 40.

§ Casaub. p. 22.

and

and the ancient Critics witness." Now the passage in Aristotle which he refers to, has nothing at all either about Tragedy or Comedy; but it speaks of Poetry in general: *Δισπάσθη δὲ κατὰ τὰ οἰκεία ἢ δὴ ἢ ποίησις*, "That it was divided and branched into sorts according to the several humours of the Writers; some singing the stories of Heroes, others making Drolls and Lampoons, and a third sort Hymns and Encomiums, all as their several fancies lead them*." But Mr. Casaubon subjoins this quotation following:—*Τραγωδία τὸ παλαιὸν ἦν ὄνομα κοινὸν καὶ πρὸς τὴν κωμωδίαν ὑγερὸν δὲ τὸ μὲν κοινὸν ὄνομα ἔσχεν ἡ τραγωδία, ἡ δὲ κωμωδία ἴδιον* i. e. "Tragedy was of old a common name, both for itself and Comedy; but afterwards that common name became peculiar to Tragedy, and the other was called Comedy:"—which passage is taken out of the Etymologicon Magnum, though a little interpolated and depraved by Casaubon himself; for that Author, after he has given several etymologies of the word *τραγωδία* at last says † *Ἡ ἀπὸ τῆς τρυγῆς τρυγωδία ἦν δὲ τὸ ὄνομα τῆτο κοινὸν καὶ πρὸς τὴν κωμωδίαν ἐπεὶ ἔπει διενέκριτο τὰ τῆς ποιήσεως ἑκατέρως ἀλλ' εἰς αὐτὴν ἐν ἦν τὸ ἄθλον, ἡ τρύψ. ὑγερὸν δὲ τὸ μὲν κοινὸν ὄνομα ἔσχεν ἡ τραγωδία ἡ δὲ κωμωδία ὀνόμαται, &c.* where we must not refer the words *ὄνομα κοινόν* to *Τραγωδία*, as Casaubon does, but to *Τρυγωδία*, which immediately comes before; for the meaning of it is this: "That *Τραγωδία* might have its name by a little variation from *τρυγωδία* which word *τρυγωδία* signified of old, not Tragedy only, but Comedy too; for at that time these two sorts of Poetry were not distinguished, but had one and the same [307] prize (*τρύφα*) a vessel of wine: afterwards, Tragedy retained that old name (*υ* only being changed into *α*) and the other was called Comedy." It is an error therefore in Casaubon, when he tells us as from this Writer, that *Τραγωδία* once signified Comedy; for the thing that this Writer affirms is this: "That *Τρυγωδία* once signified both Tragedy and Comedy: which is a proposition very much different from that other of Casaubon's.

But, however, if this passage of the Etymologicon will not serve Casaubon's purpose, it may be useful to Mr. B's. It is true, it will not come up to his main point, which he undertook to make out, "That under the word Tragedy, both Tragedy and Comedy were at first comprehended" (which alone, and nothing less than it, will signify any thing to the Age of

P. 170.

* Arist. Poët. cap. iv.

† Etymol. Mag. v. *Τραγωδ.*

Tragedy); yet it plainly affirms what he, by two mistaken instances, in vain attempted to prove, "That τραγωδία once signified "Tragedy." It concerns me therefore to give answer to this passage, because I have already flatly denied that τραγωδία ever signified Tragedy; and, I think, I need not be at so much trouble for a reply, when the Author himself affords me one in this very place; for the grounds of his assertion he declares to be these two, —That τραγωδία is derived from τραγῳδία and that τρῦξ (Wine) was the common prize both to Comedy and Tragedy. Now both these are plain mistakes; for the true derivation of τραγωδία is from τράλῳ a Goat, as I have fully shewn above; and that the prize was not the same, but the Goat was [308] for Tragedy, and the Wine for Comedy, the Arundel Marble (to name no more) expressly affirms, in the epochs of Susarion and Thespis. If the grounds then that he walks upon fail him, his authority too must fall with him; for he is alone, without any other to support him; all the rest confining the signification of τραγωδία to Comedy alone. Τρῦξωδεῖν, κωμῳδεῖν, says Hesychius;—Τρῦγῳδία, ἡ κωμῳδία, says Aristophanes' Scholiast. In the present Editions of Suidas, we read Τρῦγοκωμῳδία, without any exposition; but the true reading, as the very order of the alphabet shews, is τρῦξωδία, κωμῳδία and so H. Stephanus affirms that he found it in his MS. All these three are older than the Author of the Etymologicon; and if ever any before their time had used τρῦξωδία for Tragedy, either all or some of them would have told us of it.

If I may have leave to talk without proof, as well as some others, I should rather suspect that κωμῳδία was the old and common name both for Tragedy and Comedy till they came to be distinguished by their peculiar appellations; for the etymology of the word κωμῳδία (ἐν κώμαις ὡδή, a Song in Villages) agrees equally to them both: both Tragedy and Comedy being first invented and used in the Villages, as all Writers unanimously say. And it is remarkable that Dioscorides, in his Epigrams, calls the Plays of Thespis κώμης*.

Θίσπιδο εὔριμα τῦτο, κάδ' ἀγροῖατιν ἂν ὕλαι
Παίηνα, καὶ ΚΩΜΟΥΣ τέσσατε τελειοτέρους.

And again he says Thespis's Plays were an entertainment to the κωμῆται

Θίσπικς ὅδε τραγικὴν ὡς ἀνέπλασε πρῶτος αἰοιδὴν,
ΚΩΜΗΤΑΙΣ παρὰς καινοτομῶν χάριτας.

* See above, p. 165, 6.

So that even Thespis's Plays might at first, and for a little while, be called Comedies, which was a word already in use from the time of Susarion; but when men understood the difference between the two sorts, and a distinct prize was appointed to Thespis, it was natural to give each sort a particular name, taken from the several prizes; and the one was called *τραγῳδία*, from the Goat*; the other *κωμῳδία*, from the Cask of Wine†. The very likeness that is between the two words is no small confirmation that this account of them may be true; but I only propose it as a guess, to set against the conjecture of the Author of the Etymologicon; and perhaps it might be accounted as probable as His, if it had not the disadvantage of coming so many centuries after it.

Mr. B. having at last made an end of his mistakes in this article about Tragedy, I am very glad too to make an end of my animadversions upon them; for I am sensible how long I have detained the Reader upon this subject, though I hope both the pleasure and the importance of it, and the vast number of faults that called upon me for correction, will excuse the prolixity, which I will not increase farther by a repetition of what has been said; for even a short account of each where the variety of things touched on is so great, would amount to a long story. I will only crave leave to say, That of the Three points which the learned Mr. B. undertook to make out, every one has been carried against him; and that the incident mistakes which he has run into have not failed to increase in number, proportionably as this article of his exceeded in length.

[309]

P. 165.

XII.

[310]

HAD all other ways failed us of detecting this Impostor, yet his very speech had betrayed him; for his Language is Attic, the beloved dialect of the Sophists, in which all their *Μελέται*, or exercises, were composed; in which they affected to excel each other, even to Pedantry and Solœcism; but he had forgotten that the scene of these Epistles was not Athens but

* Τράγος.

† Τρύψ.

Sicily,

Sicily, where the Doric tongue was generally spoken and written; as, besides the testimonies of others, the very thing speaks itself in the remains of Sicilian Authors, Sophron, Epicharmus, Stesichorus, Theocritus, Moschus, and others. How comes it to pass then that our Tyrant transacts every thing in Attic? not only foreign affairs of state, but domestic matters with Sicilian friends, and the very accounts of his household? Pray, how came that idiom to be the court language at Agrigentum? It is very strange that a Tyrant, and such a Tyrant as he, should so doat on the dialect of a Democracy, which was so eminently (*μισοτύραννος*) “the Hater of Tyrants;” which, in his very days, had driven out Pisistratus, though a generous and easy governor; especially, since, in those early times, before Stage-poetry, and Philosophy, and History had made it famous over Greece, that dialect was no more valued than any of the rest.

[311]

I would not be here mistaken, as if I affirmed that the Doric was absolutely universal, or original in Sicily. I know that the old Sicani, the natives of the isle, had a peculiar language of their own; and that the Greek tongue there, like the Punic, was only a foreigner, being introduced by those colonies that planted themselves there; most of which coming from Corinth, Crete, Rhodes, &c. where all spoke the Doric dialect, thence it was that the same idiom so commonly obtained almost all over Sicily, as it appears to have done, to omit other testimonies from the ancient medals of that island:—ΤΑΥΡΟΜΕΝΙΤΑΝ, ΜΕΣΣΑΝΙΩΝ, ΘΕΡΜΙΤΑΝ, ΠΑΝΟΡΜΙΤΑΝ, ΔΙΑΥΒΑΤΙΑΝ, ΣΕΛΑΙΝΩΝΤΙΩΝ, &c. all which words inscribed upon their money, demonstratē the Doric dialect to have been then the language of those cities. It is true there came some colonies to Sicily, from Eubœa, and Samos, and other places, which, in those parts where they settled, might speak for a while the Ionic dialect; and afterwards,

[312]

being mixed with the Dorians, might make a new sort of

of dialect, a compound of both; as Thucydides observes* of Himera,—that the language of that city was at first a medley of Doric and Chalcidic. But that is no more than what happened even in Greece itself, where there were many *ὑποδιαίσεις τοπικαὶ* †, *local subdivisions* of every dialect; one country having always some singularity of speech not used by any other. But those little peculiarities do not hinder us from saying, in general, that the Sicilians spoke Doric; for the other dialects were swallowed up and extinguished by those two powerful cities of Dorian original, Syracuse, and Agrigentum, which shared the whole island between them. Syracuse was a Corinthian colony, and spoke the dialect of her mother city ‡. Agrigentum was first built by the Geloans of Sicily, who had been themselves a plantation of the Cretans and Rhodians, both of which were Dorian nations; so that, upon the whole, though in some other towns, and for a time, there might be a few footsteps of the Ionic dialect, yet our Sophist is inexcusable in making a Tyrant of Agrigentum, a city of Doric language and original, write Epistles in such a dialect as if he had gone to School at Athens.

But some apologies have been offered for his using the Attic dialect; as, first, “Because Phalaris was born [313]
“ at Astypalæa, an island of the Sporades, where was
“ an Athenian colony.” This is thought to be a good account of his speaking in that idiom. It were easy to overthrow this argument at once, by refuting our spurious Epistles, and by shewing, from much better authority, that Phalaris was a Sicilian born;—but I may speak perhaps of that by and by, and I will have every proof I bring stand by itself, without the support of another. Let us allow then that Phalaris came from Astypalæa, an island of the Sporades, mentioned by

* Lib. vi. p. 414.

† Vetus Auctor *περὶ Διαλέκτων*. Herod. i. 142.

‡ Theocrit. 1d. xv.

Strabo

Strabo* and Pliny†. It is true, some of the Editors of Phalaris have discovered a new place of his birth, Astypalæa, a city of Crete, never mentioned before by any Geographer, situate in the 370th degree of Longitude, bearing South and by North off of Utopia. And I am wholly of their opinion that he was born in that, or in none of them; but because Tradition is rather for the island, we will beg their good leave to suppose it to be so, and *there*, as it seems, was formerly a plantation of Athenians; and Phalaris being one of their posterity, must needs, for that reason, have a [314] twang of their dialect. Now what a pity it is that Phalaris himself, or his Secretary, did not know of this plantation when he wrote the cxxth Letter to the Athenians, ὦ σοφώτατοι γηγενεῖς Ἀθηναῖοι! What a fine compliment would he have made them upon that subject of their kindred! If any one know an express testimony that there was an Athenian colony at that Astypalæa, he can teach me more than I now remember. This I know in general from Thucydides‡ and others, that the Athenians sent colonies to most of the islands; and so *that* may come in among the rest. But what then?—must the language for ever afterwards be Attic wherever the Athenians once had footing? Thucydides says in the same passage that they planted Ionia. They had colonies at Miletus, at Ephesus, and most of the maritime towns of Asia Minor. Nay, the Ionians and the Attics were anciently one people, and the language the same; and when Homer says §

Ἐνθάδε Βοιωτοὶ καὶ Ἰάονες, —

by the latter he is known to mean the Athenians. And yet we see that, in process of time, the colonies had a different dialect from that of the mother nation. Why

* Lib. x. p. 488.

† Lib. iv. cap. 12,

‡ Thucyd. p. 10. Καὶ Ἴωνας μὲν Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ Νησιωτῶν τὰς πολλὰς ἥκισαν. Isocrat. Panathen. Plutarch. De exilio.

§ Strabo, p. 333, 392.

then

then must Astypalæa needs be Attic? and that so tenaciously, that twenty years living in Sicily could not alter it in one of her islanders? He was part of that time a Publican, or Collector of Taxes and Customs*: Could not that perpetual *negoce* and converse with Dorians bring his mouth, by degrees, to speak a little broader? Would not He that aimed at Monarchy†, and for that design studied to be popular, have quitted his old dialect for that of the place, and not, by every word he spoke, make the invidious discovery of his being a stranger? but what if, after all, even the Astypalæans themselves should be found to speak Doric? If we make a conjecture from their neighbourhood, and the company they are put in, we can scarce question but they were Dorians. Strabo says‡ the island lies between Cos, and Rhodes, and Crete (μεταξὺ τῆς Κῆς μάλιγα καὶ Ῥόδου καὶ Κρήτης); and that all these three used the Doric dialect, is too well known to need any proof. But to answer this in one word, we have direct evidence that this Astypalæa was a Dorian colony, and not an Athenian; for it was planted by the Megarians, as Scymnus Chius says expressly §: —

Ἐν τῇ πόρῳ δὲ κειμένη τῷ Κρητικῷ
Ἀποικὸς ἔστιν Ἀστυπάλαια Μεγαρίαν,
Νῆσος πελαγία. —

But let us hear the second apology for the Atticism of Phalaris. He is defended by the like practice of other Writers; who, being Dorians born, repudiated their vernacular idiom for that of the Athenians, as Diodorus of Agyrium, and Empedocles of Agrigentum; so that, though Phalaris be supposed to be a native of Sicily, yet here is an excuse for him for quitting the language. But I conceive, with submission, that this argument is built upon such instances as are quite different and alien from the case of our Epistles.

* Polyænus Stratag.

† Lib. x. p. 488.

‡ Ibid.

§ Scymn. Ch. ver. 550

The case of Empedocles and Diodorus, the one a Poet and the other an Historian, is widely remote from that of our Tyrant. The former, being to write an Epic Poem, shewed an excellent judgment in laying aside his country-dialect for that of the Ionians; which Homer and his followers had used before him, and had given it, as it were, the dominion of all Heroic Poetry; for the Doric idiom had not grace and majesty enough for the subject he was engaged in; being proper indeed for Mimes, Comedies, and Pastorals, where men of ordinary rank are represented; or for Epigrams, a Poem of a low vein; or for Lyrics and the Chorus of Tragedy, upon the account of the Doric Music; but not to be used in Heroic, without great disadvantage. And the Historian likewise, with the rest of that and other nations, Philistus, Timæus, Ephorus, Herodotus, Dionysius Halic, &c. had great reason to decline the use of their vernacular tongue, as improper for History; which, besides the affectation of eloquence, aims at easiness and perspicuity; and is designed for general use. But the Doric is coarse and rustic, and always clouded with an obscurity: — *ἔχουσι τι καὶ ἀσαφὲς τῆς Δωρίδος διαλέκτου*. says Porphyry*; who attributes the decay of the Pythagorean sect to their writing in that dialect. And what affinity is there between Phalaris's case, and that of Historians or Heroic Poets? What mighty motives can be here for assuming a foreign dialect? The Letters are dated in the middle of Sicily, mostly directed to the next towns, or to some of his own domestics, about private affairs, or even the expenses of his family, and never designed for the public view. If any will still excuse the Tyrant for Atticizing in those circumstances, it is hard to deny them the glory of being the faithfullest of his vassals.

[318] THE Examiner begins his Remarks upon this article with a point that he owns “is not very material:” he acknowledges

* Vita Pythag. p. 205.

there

there are "several Attic ways of speech in the Letters;" but for all that, they are not "properly Attic." Which cavil seems to be started here for no other design but to bring in that cutting jest, "That Dr. B. has abundance of pure Anglicisms in his Latin;" which, when he or any body for him shall shew by instances, I will then consider what to answer; but, in the mean time, it will pass for a calumny. He adds, "That Homer mixes Atticisms in his style; and yet nobody will say he wrote Attic:"—which is very crudely said, and shews Mr. B. had no true view of the progress of dialects; for if I should ask him what the Attic dialect was in Homer's time, I might stay long enough before he could tell me. It is well known that the Ionians were Athenian colonies*; and at first the Ionic and Attic were one and the same dialect. Now those colonies were carried into Asia by Neleus, but *CLXX* years before Homer was famous†; and even Homer himself calls the Athenians (Ἰάονες) Ionians. If I should say then, that in Homer's time there was little or no difference between the Attic and Ionic language, how could Mr. B. disprove it? for the difference we now see between Homer and the Attic Writers is no just measure in the case; because Homer lived near *ccc* years before the Athenians had any writer of their own‡. So that, as we may gather from the proportion of time, there was not so great a change made in the dialects between Neleus's and Homer's time, as between Homer's and Tyrtaeus's, or Solon's.

But he chastises me for saying "That the Sophists affected to excel one another in writing Attic, even to Pedantry and Solæcism;" for he declares "He is at a loss for the meaning of this; and to him it is an incomprehensible degree of affectation." What Mr. B. *is at a loss for*, or what he cannot comprehend, I know his reach too well to be very solicitous. He may say therefore, if he pleases, that Lucian too wrote nonsense, where he says "That one Socrates was wont to rally (τὸς σοφοῖσιζοντας Ἀττικῶς) those that affected ATTIC SOLOECISMS §." Here is the very same *incomprehensible* expression that I am reproved for by our great Master of sense and Language! But, for fear Lucian should have no better quarter from him in his next Book than I had in his last, I will endeavour to clear this point to the Examiner; so that, if possible, he may apprehend us both. It is known that Philostratus and Ælian have been ever thought the most Attic of all the tribe of

* See here, p. 226.

† Marm. Arund.

‡ Ibid.

§ Lucian Solœc. p. 98I.

the

the Sophists. Now, the great Photius, where he gives us a character of Philostratus's style;—"His Syntax," says he, "is so very odd, that no Writer's was ever like it; for it looks more like Solœcism than any thing of Syntax. Neither does he this out of ignorance; but, because some of the Antients might speak so now and then, he does it everywhere with affectation*." And Eustathius, after he has given some instances of Solœcism in Euripides and Sophocles, "But that some," says he, "of the old and good Orators made Solœcisms on purpose, to give a new turn and quaintness to their style, appears plainly in the writings of Philostratus†." This, we see, was the judgment of Photius and Eustathius; no despicable Authors: and, by Mr. B.'s permission, I will give an example or two, to justify their censure:—Οἱ δὲ Ωρεῖται, says Philostratus‡, χαλκαῖ μὲν αὐτοῖς πέτραι. Here is a plain Solœcism; a nominative case without any verb following it. Another Writer would have said Τοῖς δὲ Ωρεῖται, χαλκαῖ μὲν αἱ πέτραι. Again, says he, Καὶ πρὸς πυρρίχαις αὐτοὶ ὄντες, αὐλῶν μὲν μετὰ πάντα ἦν §. And again, Τὸν λυπόμενον μὲν, κοιμίζεσθαι αὐτῷ τὴν λύπην ὑπὸ τῷ αὐτῷ ||. And again, Δομῆτιανός ἐπιθελεύειν ἑαυτῷ φήσας, οὐ μὲν εἰς νήσους καθεύχθησάν ¶. All these are gross Solœcisms; "the last part of the sentence not agreeing, nor answering to the first;" which is the proper definition of a Solœcism**. Corinthus too observes it, as a peculiar way of the Attics, to put Nominatives instead of Oblique Cases; and he instances in Aristophanes and Philostratus††. I shall add to these a few passages out of Ælian; the other great pattern of the Attic style. Οἱ ἵπποι, says he, τὰς κάτω βλεφαρίδας ἡ φασιν αὐτὰς ἔχειν ‡. Οἱ γε ἄρρενες καὶ πολεμικοὶ κάμηλοι, καὶ ἐκλέμνυσιν αὐτὰς οἱ Βάκτριοι §§. Λακύνῃς δὲ καὶ Τίμων οἱ φιλόσοφοι, καὶ τέττις πιεῖν πάμπολύ φασι |||. If these examples be not sufficient to give Mr. B. some clearer apprehension what it is to solœcize in the Attic way, it is to no purpose to add more; but he must still continue "at a loss for the meaning of this deep reflection."

* Photius p. 540. Ἀσυνταξίαις μᾶλλον ἰοικέται ἢ συντάξεως ὅτι οὐκ ἐστὶν μετέχειν.

† Eustath. ad Iliad. p. 179. Σολοικοφανῆ καὶ ἄτω καινοπρεπεῆ.

‡ Philost. Apol. p. 155.

§ P. 159.

|| P. 227.

¶ P. 325.

** Sud v. Σολοικ.

†† Cor. Περὶ Διαλέκτων.

‡‡ Ælian. de Anim. iv, 50.

§§ Ibid. i7, 55.

||| Var. Hist. ii, 41.

Well;

Well, he recovers himself out of this deep puzzle, and now "he comes to my argument, which," says he, "I will make free to call a silly one, because it is my own, and mentioned by me in my Preface to Phalaris." Indeed, as this *argument* lies in his Preface*, being barely hinted there, and neither backed with any proof, nor guarded from any exceptions, and ushered in with a false proposition, "That the Sicilians ALWAYS use the Doric dialect," he shall have my consent to call it as *silly* as he pleases. But, with humble submission, as the Argument is managed in my Dissertation, Mr. B. will find it much easier to *call* it so than to prove it. [321]

I. His first *good reason* why his "Sicilian Prince was not obliged to speak Doric" is, because "he was no Native of Sicily; *which we are sure of*," says he, "if the credit of the Letters stand good; and though Dr. B. pretends that he can refute this from better authority, yet he has not throughout his Dissertation said one syllable to shake it;" nay, he says "the Doctor contends, without any manner of proof or reason, that Phalaris was a Sicilian born." Now though I have as little reason as any body to be concerned for this Gentleman's reputation, yet it really afflicts me to see him so pert and positive in a thing that is evidently false; for in the xvth Section of my Dissertation I had these very words:—"Lucian makes both Phalaris and his smith Perilaus to be born at Agrigentum; but the Letters bring one of them from Astypalæa, and the other from Athens." What can be more express than that Lucian is here produced against the Letters, to shew Phalaris was born in Sicily? Yet Mr. B. avers above once that I have not *one syllable*, not *any manner of proof or reason*, to shew he was a Sicilian. If I did not enter farther into that particular, it was because I then thought there was no need of it; and, by mentioning Lucian alone, I was as good as my promise, which was only this,—"That I might speak perhaps of that by and by." But since Mr. B. has come forth in such fury to fight Phalaris's battles for him, I shall now think it worth my while to produce other authorities; and to shew him, *to his comfort*, that neither all *threatened history*, nor all flattering applauses, *have the luck to live long*. [322]

That Phalaris was of Agrigentum, a Sicilian born, we have another positive testimony of Lucian, besides that cited before. P. 36.

* "Neque cum Siculis Scriptoribus placuerit semper Dialectus Dorica, Agrigentinorum Tyrannus aliâ uti debuit."

"The damned," says he, "broke out of Hell, and were headed
 "by Phalaris the AGRIGENTINE, and Busiris the Ægyptian,"
 "&c*. And so Polyænus calls him "Phalaris the AGRIGENTINE, a Publican†." And to these we may add Suidas, who says "Phalaris the AGRIGENTINE was Tyrant over all Sicily‡:" which Orosius thus expresses:—"Phalaris the SICILIAN was Tyrant," &c§. And Photius styles him "Phalaris the AGRIGENTINE Tyrant||." Are not all these witnesses pretty open and express? and we have others yet that make broad intimation of it. "When Scipio," says Tully, "restored Phalaris's Bull, which he found at Carthage, to the Agrigentines, he desired them to consider, whether it was better for the Sicilians to be slaves to their own countrymen (SUIS SERVIRE) or to be subjects to the Romans; when the same Bull was a monument both of their own cruelty (DOMESTICÆ CRUELITATIS) and of the Roman clemency¶." Now, if Phalaris had been a Foreigner, this speech of Scipio's had been very weak; and, like the arguments of Mr. B. might have been turned upon the Author. Heraclides tells us, "That when the Agrigentines got Phalaris into their power, they burnt his Mother also, and his Friends**;" which implies he was not an Alien, but had relations in the country, though the Letters pretend he was both a Stranger and an Orphan.

[323] This very Book, as it seems, of Heraclides, is quoted by Cicero†† for another story about Phalaris's mother; and if Heraclides had made Phalaris to be no native of Sicily, we may suppose that Cicero, who had read him, would never have put that speech into Scipio's mouth. And what says our Examiner now to his *threatened* History? I am afraid the threats are executed not only upon this piece of History, but upon the whole body of the Epistles; for since the Epistles give out Phalaris for an Astypalæan, whom all the Historians that speak of his lineage declare to be an Agrigentine, it is a shrewd token of an imposture; at least it evidently proves thus much, that either none of them ever heard of Phalaris's Epistles, or none of them believed them genuine; either of which is sufficient to

* Lucian. Ver. Hist. ii. p. 761. Φάλαρις τὸν Ἀκράγαρτινον.

† Polyæn. v. Φάλαρις Ἀκράγαρτινος.

‡ Suid. Φάλ. Ἀκράγαρτινος.

§ Oros. i, 20. "Phalaris Siculus."

|| Phot. Ep. 207. Τὸν Ἀκράγαρτινον τύραννον.

¶ Cic. iv. in Verrem.

** Heracl. in Polit. Τὴν μητέρα καὶ τοὺς φίλους.

†† Cicero Divin. i.

roust the mock Sicilian Prince, and all them that take up arms for him.

But Mr. B. is very angry because I was *merry* at a mistake of his, where he calls "Astypalæa, a city of Crete," which, I said, was "a discovery that no Geographer had made before." He would ask me, he says, *seriously*, "Do not the Epistles themselves PLAINLY suppose it? and do not you in the 58th page EXPRESSLY own that they do so?" Now I, in my turn, desire the favour of asking Mr. B. one of his own questions: "Was it worth his while to forge this little piece of History?" (the remainder of this question to me, "only in order to contradict his BETTERS," I leave for Mr. B.'s own use, and never will borrow it of him) "And is the pleasure of inventing a circumstance" (again I leave him the words that follow, "merely to be RUDE with") "an equivalent to the shame of being told of it?" for, in both these particulars, he has too well imitated that Sophist, whom he has so ill defended. First, the Epistles are so far from PLAINLY *supposing* that Astypalæa was in Crete, that they do not suppose it at all. All that is said there is no more than this: "That Phalaris was born at, and banished from, Astypalæa*;" and that, some time after, "He invited his wife to come to him from Crete to Agri-gentum†." Now, how does this *suppose*, or *imply*, that Astypalæa was in Crete? Might not his wife leave Astypalæa, where her husband's memory was odious, and retire into Crete? Is it necessary, because she was in Crete after her husband's banishment, that Astypalæa too must be in Crete? Themistocles was born, and lived and married at Athens; but after he was banished, his wife and children were in Epirus‡:—must Athens therefore be in Epirus too? A notable inference! and yet exactly the very same with Mr. B.'s, who, because Phalaris's wife was in Crete, would make Astypalæa in Crete too, though nobody ever heard of it there. In the second place, he wrongs me, or rather himself, when he says I EXPRESSLY own "that the Epistles suppose it;" for the very words he refers to are these: "Which SEEMS an intimation that the Sophist believed Astypalæa to be a city in Crete." Let the candid Reader judge now what an adversary I have to deal with. Is a SEEMING *intimation* an equivalent phrase, in his language, to EXPRESS *owning*? If so, I will have no farther controversy with him. I had reason to say it was *seemingly* intimated, be-

P. 36.

P. 30.

[324]

* Ep. 4, & 119.

† Ep. 69.

‡ Plut. Them.

cause I saw this was the only authority to make an Astypalæa in Crete: an error that nobody could possibly have fallen into, had there been nothing *seeming* here, nothing *like* such an imitation.

- [325] "But why," says Mr. B. "is not Astypalæa a city in Crete?"
 P. 37. "what has the Doctor to oppose to it? Has he then a list of
 "all the Hundred cities there? If he has, it is a mightier
 P. 38. "discovery in Geography than that of mine." And again he
 inculcates it, "No Geographer has mentioned this city in
 "Crete; no more have they several of the other Ninety-nine."
 Now whether shall we admire more, his learning or his reasoning? his learning, that he knew that great secret, that Crete was called *ἑκατόμυκτος*, because it had a hundred towns in it; or his reasoning, that Astypalæa is a city of Crete, because I cannot refute it with a list of all the Hundred? By the same way of arguing, he may affirm, when the humour takes him, that Oxford too was a city of Crete; and "what will the
 "Doctor have to oppose it?" But the misfortune is, that the old fatality of mistaking still pursues our Examiner; for what if I should give him "a list of all the Hundred cities of
 "Crete?" then his facetiousness and his assuming air will sit but awkwardly upon him. And yet such a list is so very easy to come at, that above xx years ago there was one printed to my hand, not only of a Hundred, but a Hundred and twenty Cretan cities, with an account of the several Authors that mention every one of them*; for there were a Hundred cities there even in Homer's time, and several were founded after. Is not the Examiner now a great judge of "discoveries in Geography?" Have Geographers never spoken of "several of the
 P. 37. "ninety-nine?" Methinks, as he says, he ought to have looked
 "about him before he resolved to be positive."

- However, Mr. B. urges for his own justification, that He
 p. 37. was not the first "that made this (false) discovery, but mis-
 [329] "took after great names, Goltzius and Fazellus." If he
 thinks it a more venial fault to make a mistake at second-hand after others, than to produce one out of his own store, he shall have the benefit of this plea; for I will be as easy to him as he can desire. It is enough for me that the error is evident, and that Mr. B. slipt into it; but whether he led or followed, it matters not at all. But he goes on again and expostulates, — Will the Doctor discard all places that occur
 P. 38. "but once in ancient Authors?" and so he flourishes for a whole

* See Meursius's CRETA.

page, out of Diodorus and Scylax. But I have answered him already, that Astypalæa of Crete does "NOT ONCE occur in "ancient Authors." It is true, in some new Geographers we meet with it; such as Naogeorgus, in his Preface to Phalaris; Boyle in his Preface and Index; who, by mistaking the Author that they published, have bantered the world with an enchanted city that nobody can see but they. I must speak *warily*, therefore, as Mr. B. tells me that it occurs in no *old* Geographers; and that, I think, I may safely say.

P. 38.

A very worthy person * having occasion to speak of Phalaris, had said "He was born at Astypala, an island of the Cyclades:" which, in the former Edition of these Dissertations I had gently corrected thus:—"Astypalæa, one of the Sporades." Upon this, Mr. B. resolves to "do right to that learned man, "whom I take upon me," he says, "to correct, without the least ground or colour of reason." But Mr. B. had been better advised to have staid till that learned man had asked his assistance. I am sure, when that person is on the side of truth, he needs no such defender as Mr. B.; and if he chances to be mistaken (as the most learned may sometimes be) he is too candid and just to accept of such a defender. As, in the present case, I dare say for him, he would be ashamed to make use of such poor shifts as Mr. B. supplies him with; for Mr. B. maintains Astypala to be a legitimate word, because we read it 'Αστυπάλη in the present copy of Scylax, one of the most corrupted Books in the world. But the very Adjectives formed from the name of this city, 'Αστυपालαιεύς, and 'Αστυपालαιάτης, shew plainly that the primitive name is 'Αστυπάλαια so 'Ιγιαλιεύς is from 'Ιγιαία, Λιλαιεύς from Λίλαια, Ποτιδαιεύς and Ποτιδαιάτης from Ποτίδαια but neither 'Αστυपालαιεύς nor 'Αστυपालαιάτης can by any analogy be formed from 'Αστυπάλη. We must correct Scylax then by other Authors, and not think to maintain and propagate one fault by another. Well, Mr. B. goes on to confute me, for saying "the Astypalæa in Phalaris seemed to be the "Island of the Sporades, rather than the Cyclades." My reason was, because Stephanus, besides that of the Cyclades, names another, "situate between Rhodes and Crete †;" which nearness to Crete, whither Phalaris's Wife and Son are supposed to have fled ‡, makes it probable that *that* was the Island mentioned in the Epistles. Now Mr. B. would overthrow this, two several

P. 39.

[327]

P. 40.

* Joshua Barnes.

† Steph. v. 'Αστυ.

‡ Ep. 69.

- P. 39. ways: first, the nearness, he says, to this Astypalæa to Crete is no argument at all, but rather the contrary; "for those that fly" are usually glad to get as *far* as they can out of the reach "of their pursuers." Wonderful aphorism! and taken from the justest view of human nature! I should have thought now, that they are usually glad to get as *soon* as they can out of reach. But, hereafter, if a Merchant-man be chased by a Privateer, she must not make to the *next* safe harbour; but, according to Mr. B.'s conduct, bear away for the *remotest*. — Mr. B. has been so kind as several times to study the holy Scripture; I crave leave, therefore, to propose one text to him; and desire his comment upon it:—God commanded the Israelites to build three cities of refuge beyond Jordan, and three in the land of Canaan*. Did not the persons, therefore, that fled for manslaughter, strive to reach the *next* city of refuge? or did they usually cross the river Jordan, and take their course to the city *farthest* from home, that the pursuer might have time and space to overtake them? If Mr. B. can make out this latter to be the true interpretation, he may then persuade us that it was very absurd in Phalaris's wife to steer towards Crete, the nearest place of safety; and that she ought to have "gotten as far off as she" could," towards Carthage or Hercules' Pillars; no matter whether the season was contrary, or the vessel old and leaky, or not victualled for so long a voyage. "But, secondly," says he, P. 39. "this flight of hers is a mere fiction; and there is no such thing" supposed, or in the least intimated in the Epistles." These are very hard expressions; but we are used to have such from Mr. B. when his arguments are soft enough. Phalaris fled from Astypalæa, and left his family behind him; this is plain from the Epistles; and the next news we hear of his wife is, that she was in Crete. Now, if Astypalæa was not in Crete, which I have clearly shewn already, then her flight from Astypalæa to Crete is both *supposed* and *intimated*. But indeed, if with some *new* Geographers one can spy out an Astypalæa in [329] Crete, invisible to all the Antients, then he is well qualified to believe, on Mr. B.'s side, that no flight is supposed. The Examiner closes this first part with a sorry, but yet a very spiteful, quibble about the word *gratuitously*; which is a privileged slander, and cannot with good manners be answered in the manner it deserves; —and, to speak freely, I can scarce resent it from Mr. B. because I cannot believe it is his own; I impute it rather to some under-jobbing Assistant, of a low sordid spirit,

* Numbers xxxv. 14.

which

which this calumny is a picture of, than to a Gentleman that challenges the title of Honourable.

Before we leave the Examiner's first argument, let us see a little what he drives at, in all this bustle about Phalaras's country. Why, to convince us that *his Prince* was not obliged to write Doric, he would shew that he was no native of Sicily. Grant this, and let him be born where the Examiner would have him, at Astypalæa in Crete. Now we are as sure that the island of Crete spoke Doric, as that Sicily itself did. And is not Mr. B. then a man of quick thought and foresight, to bring an argument which ends just where it first set out, without advancing one inch? Nay, if Phalaris was born in the island Astypalæa, I had shewn it to be highly probable that Doric was the mother-tongue there; and not a word has been yet said to disprove me. But he may now see a direct testimony of it, which I have added out of Scymnus Chius; so that, upon every supposition, his argument is vain and idle.

II. But we are come at last to the second point; for *supposing* that Phalaris was a Sicilian born, yet Mr. B. will give *good reasons* why he should not use the Doric dialect. If the Reader pleases to run over what I had said in my Dissertation upon this head, he will see that I myself had given several examples of Authors; who, being natives of Sicily or other Dorian countries, had written Books in another dialect: as Diodorus, Empedocles, Philistus, Timæus, Ephorus, Herodotus, Dionysius Hal. &c. But I had shewn the case of Phalaris to be quite different from theirs; and the difference turned upon these points, That Phalaris's writings are private Letters to his domestic Servants, about family affairs, never designed to be published, and written at a time when the Attic dialect was not yet in fashion. These therefore are the considerations that Mr. B. should have spoken to, if he designed to seek after truth, and not merely to raise a dust. But, instead of answering to the purpose, his main performance here is to fill up my &c. and to add more names of such Authors as departed from the dialect of their country. A very easy piece of work, but quite besides the question; and yet it is no little matter of comparison to see how sorrily he acquits himself, — even where to acquit himself well had been a vain and useless labour.

[330]

“Agathyrside,” says Mr. B. “the Historian of Samos; had he followed the dialect of his country, would have written in ‘Doric.’ Thus it is in his first Edition; for at that time, in

P. 41.

[331] his great learning, he thought the Samians spoke Doric. But in the next he corrected it *Ionic*; which I mention for his commendation, and as an instance of his improvement. But it is a pity he could go no farther; for, if I had the honour to have been in his Assistant's place, I could have told him that there was no such man as Agathyrside an Historian of Samos. Mr. B. will say he is quoted by Stobæus; "Agathyrside Samii, in *iv rerum Persicarum* *." So indeed it was in the copy that Gesner made use of; but the true reading is Agatharchides, as appears by Plutarch†; who relates the same story, word for word, from *Ἀγαθαρχίδης Σάμιος ἐν δευτέρᾳ τῶν Περσικῶν*. Neither can it be said that the error may lie in Plutarch's copies, and not in Stobæus; for the same Author is cited twice in Plutarch's book "about Rivers;" but Agathyrside is never once heard of but in this corrupted place of Stobæus.

P. 41. Another of Mr. B.'s Writers that departed from their Country-dialect, is "Andronicus Rhodius, in his Paraphrase of Aristotle's Ethics;" but he should have remembered that the old MS. itself has no name of any Author; for Dan. Heinsius, the first Editor of it, informs us that Andronicus's name was prefixed to it by a modern, and a very unlearned hand. Mr. B. adds, "That we may know Epimenides did not write in the Cretic dialect, from the short citation of him in St. Paul:—

"Κρήτες αἰὲ ψευταί, κακὰ θηρία, γαστέρες ἀργαί.

"For the Cretans are said to use *αἰὲς* instead of *αἰεί*." That this Poem of Epimenides was not in Cretic, I readily own; but the proof that Mr. B. brings of it does not seem to be good; for the Cretans might use both *αἰὲς* and *αἰεί* too; as in a Letter of this very Epimenides, written in the Cretic idiom, extant in Laërtius‡, we read *Εἶχε τὰν ἀρχὰν Αἰεί*. And in a Cretic Inscription among the Marmora Oxon. *Οἱ ΤΟΚ Αἰεί κοσμοντες*; that is, *οἱ τὸν αἰὲς*. Mr. B. therefore, had he known of it, should rather have cited this following Fragment of Epimenides ||:—

Καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ γένε' εἰμὶ Σελήνης ἡυκόμοιο,
'Ἢ δεινὸν φρίξας' ἀπιστίσαστο θῆρα λείονα,
'Ες Νιμφαιᾶν ἄγωσ' αὐτὸν διὰ πότνια' Ἥρα.

* Serm. vii.

† Plut. in Parall. p. 305.

‡ Laërt. Epimen.

§ Marm. Oxon. p. 116.

|| Ælian. H. An. xii, 7. *Ἐπιμηνίδης ἔφη.*

For this passage plainly proves what Mr. B. aims at, that Epimenides's Poems were not Cretic, but Ionic. 'Ες Νεμεαῖαν is a correction of the learned Gesner's; for the vulgar reading is 'Εννεμαῖαν. Perhaps it might be mended, without varying a letter, 'Εν Νεμέᾳ ἀνάγχο' —

P. 41.

Mr. B. goes on, and tells us "That Alcæus, Sappho, and " Simonides, were born in places where the Ionic was spoken, " and yet wrote their Lyric Poems in Æolic or Doric." It is true indeed that Simonides was born at Ceos, "whose Inhabitants were Ionians, being an Athenian colony*", as Herodotus tells us, for the Athenians themselves were anciently Ionians. Mr. B. therefore has the luck to be right in one of the three; but for the other two, Alcæus and Sappho, how scandalously is he mistaken! I protest I am ashamed even to refute such miserable trash, though Mr. B. was not ashamed to write it, nay to value himself upon it. What part is it that I must teach him? That Alcæus and Sappho were natives of Lesbos? But it is almost incredible he should be ignorant of that; or that the language of Lesbos was Æolic? Yes, there his wonderful learning was at a loss, and he believed it was Ionic. But his Scylax that he lately vapoured with (if, instead of a wrong word 'Αφυπάλη, he had learned any good out of him) might have taught him a better lesson. "Lesbos," says Scylax †, "an ÆOLIAN Island." "The inhabitants of Lesbos," says Stephanus ‡, "are called ÆOLIANS." "Five Æolian cities," says Herodotus §, "are in the Island of Lesbos." Nay, it was the Metropolis, as it were, of all the Æolian cities, as Strabo says expressly: — Σχεδὸν δὲ τι καὶ μητρόπολις ἡ Λέσβος ὑπάρχει τῶν Αἰολίδων πόλεων|| but there is a passage in Ælian¶ and Suidas**, that may seem to countenance our Examiner's mistake; for in reckoning up the Ionian cities, they have Πρίνη, ΛΕΣΒΟΣ, Τέως. Though the misfortune is, that for Λέσβος we must read it there ΛΕΒΕΔΟΣ· as it is plain from Herodotus, Strabo, and others. I had corrected this when I knew not that any other had done it; but it was well for me that, before I printed it, I lit on Meursius's "Fortuna Attica," where I found the same correction; for if Mr. B. had met with the same passage, when he next appears in print, I had been branded

[333]

* Herod. viii. c. 46. Χῆροι, ἔθνη· ἰὸν Ἰωνικὸν ἀπὸ Ἀθηναίων.

† Scylax, p. 34. Νῆσος Αἰολὶς Λέσβος.

‡ Steph. v. Αἰολ.

§ Herod. i. c. 151.

|| Strabo, p. 686.

¶ Æl. Var. Hist. viii, 5.

** Suid. v. Ἰωνία,

for

for a plagiarist. And yet I do not believe Meursius was a plagiarist, though I find that, long before his time, this very same emendation, and by the same proofs, was made by Brodæus*, in his Notes upon Anthol. Epigram; for a man would have very hard measure, if because another, whom he knew not of, had lit upon the same thought, he must be traduced as a plagiarist, though it appear from the rest of his performances (which are certainly new and his own) that he was very able to do that too without stealing from others. And this alone will be a sufficient answer to that calumny of Mr. B.'s, which, by and by, we shall come to.

- P. 44. The Examiner, in the depth of his reading, goes from Writers to Coins that have been struck in Dorian countries, "and yet the inscription of them not purely Doric." Among others, he tells us of *Ευσάρχης ἱερῶ ἀγῶν*†, "a Cretan money." This was borrowed from Monsieur Harduin's very excellent [334] *Book Of the Coins of Cities and People*; but I find other persons as well as myself have but ill usage from Mr. B. when he borrows any thing of them; for there is no such Cretan money, neither does Harduin give the least intimation of it. There is an inscription indeed, but no money, that has *Ευσάρχης ἱερῶ ἀγῶν*† and it is extant in Gruter, p. 1094, belonging to Lyttus, a city of Crete. And it is with equal faithfulness and diligence, what Mr. B. presently adds, "That in some other inscriptions it is *Ευσάρχας*." This is the reverse of the former blunder; for his Author Harduin here says money, and not inscription; and he says *Κεντάρχας*, not *Ευσάρχας* which last word, in the Doric termination, Mr. B. will not find either in inscription or money. I will leave the credit of this citation to be divided between Mr. B. and his Assistant; for it is a plain case that one or both of them have an excellent hand at transcribing of Authors. But, besides this, Mr. B. mentions "TEAH, the inscription of a coin belonging to Velia, a town in Magna Græcia;" which Velia, he supposes, in his great learning, to have been a Dorian colony; but Herodotus and Strabo will tell him that it was an Ionic; and the planters were the Phocæans, who were driven out of Asia by Harpagus.
- "But the most remarkable instance of all," says Mr. B. "is that of Zaleucus, king of the Locrians, a Doric colony; the Preface to whose Laws is preserved in Stobæus and Diodorus, and has plainly nothing of the Doric dialect in it."

* Lib. iv. cap. Εἰς Νάξος.

† Harduin, Num. Illustr. p. 261.

And again, a little after, "I will add," says he, "Zaleucus
 "too, who, we are sure, was a Pythagorean, from very good
 "authority." And I am *sure* too that this is a *remarkable in-*
stance, though not the *most of all* of Mr. B.'s great abilities in
 all parts of learning; for he has turned the Commonwealth of the
 Locrians into a Monarchy; and of a poor Shepherd and
 Slave, as Zaleucus is said to have been, he has made a KING.
 These are no ordinary performances; and they shew the Gentle-
 man has well improved himself in Phalaris's service. But
 why forsooth must Zaleucus be a King? Merely because Mr.
 B. had heard he was a Law-giver. And if it chance to lie in
 his way, he will make Draco and Solon Kings of Athens by
 the very same argument; though Aristotle* informs us that
 the *best* and *most* of the Law-makers were "men of the middle
 "rank." But to pass over this scandalous mistake, I have a
 matter of greater consequence to debate with him; for I am
 persuaded (notwithstanding Mr. B.'s "very good authority")
 that Zaleucus was no Pythagorean; and that the system of
 Laws ascribed to him, and produced by Diodorus and others,
 may be as mere an imposture as Phalaris's Epistles. [335]

The title of that Book, as Stobæus and others quote it, was
 "ZALEUCUS'S LAWS;" but we have good reason to suspect
 that there was no such person as Zaleucus, a Law-giver; and,
 if this be true, the cheat is apparent. Timæus, the Sicilian,
 a man of a virulent style, but an inquisitive and accurate
 Writer, expressly maintained, against the common tradition of
 his time, there was no such man as Zaleucus. Cicero, in a
 Letter to Atticus†, among other vulgar errors, takes notice of
 this: — "Who has not said," says he, "that Zaleucus was
 "Law-giver to the Locrians? Must Theophrastus therefore
 "be despised, if that story be refuted by Timæus, an Author
 "you are much versed in?" And again, in his Book of Laws,
 "Before I give you the Law itself," says he‡, "I will preface
 "something in its commendation; as I see Zaleucus and
 "Charondas have done." To which his brother Quintus re-
 plies, "That Timæus denied there was any such person as
 "Zaleucus; but Theophrastus," says Cicero again "an
 "Author, as I think, no worse than Timæus,—as many think, a
 "better) affirms there was such a man; and the Locrians, my

[336]

* Arist. Polit. iv. 11. τῶν μέσων πολιτῶν.

† Lib. vi. Ep. 1. "A Timæo tuo Familiari."

‡ De Legibus ii, 6.

"clients,

"clients, have still a tradition of it; but whether there was such a man or no, it is nothing to this matter." Here we see the Orator, in compliment as it seems to his Locrian clients, speaks in favour of the vulgar tradition; but, in his private Letter to Atticus, he gives it up as a fable, and joins it with that notorious error about Eupolis's being drowned Olymp. xci, 2. which, he says, Eratosthenes refuted, shewing several Comedies that Eupolis made and exhibited after that year. As for Cicero's Locrians, who, he says, still preserved the tradition about Zaleucus, we may oppose to them some Locrians in Timæus's time, who lived above cc years before Cicero; for Timæus, in that very place of his History*, where he reprehended Aristotle and Theophrastus for their narratives about the Locrians, said he conversed with one Echeocrates, a Locrian of note and quality; and had his informations from him about the affairs of that city. If Echeocrates, therefore, in that age did not believe there was any Zaleucus, he is certainly as credible as Cicero's Locrians, who come so many generations afterwards, after so many revolutions and changes in the constitution of their government. It is true, Polybius falls very foul upon Timæus for abusing Aristotle and Theophrastus; and charges him with some falsehoods relating to the Locrians; but there is nothing now extant implying that Polybius defended Theophrastus against him in this particular of Zaleucus. There is a passage indeed in the Excerpta of Polybius†, where a Law of Zaleucus is mentioned; but the word *Φησὶ* there intimates, that he gives it not as his own narrative, but repeats the words of somebody else; but, however, let that be as it will, "whether there was such a man or no," as Cicero says, I will not contend; but I think so much may be safely concluded from it, That either this Book of ZALEUCUS's Laws was not yet made in Timæus's time, or else he condemned it for an imposture; nay, not he only, but Echeocrates, a citizen of Locri; and therefore a very competent judge about a story of that country‡.

But

* See Excerpta ex Polyb. p. 45, &c.

† Polyb. xii. p. 660.

‡ Against this opinion, see Fabric. Biblioth. Gr. l. II. c. xiv. and Warburton, Div. Leg. of Moses, vol. I. book ii. § 3; where the learned Bishop seems to be quite right in preferring Vizzanius's interpretation of Jamblichus to the Doctor's; but quite wrong in all he says about Timæus; very disingenuously silent about the passage from Cicero's letter to Atticus; in which is a plain acknowledgement that Timæus had refuted Theophrastus; and very unfairly adding, in his pretended Translations,

1q

But I rather think the Book was made after the days of Timæus; for I observe that those that speak of Zaleucus before, and at that time, make him a poor Shepherd, and much older than Pythagoras; but, after that time, they commonly describe him as a man of quality, and a scholar of that Philosopher's*. Now this new account of him was in all probability gathered from passages in that system of Laws ascribed to him; for where else could they meet with it? So that, if I can shew from the oldest and best Writers that he was more ancient than Pythagoras, this new and false story in the latter Authors, being taken from that system, will convict it of a cheat†.

The account that Aristotle gave of him is this: — “That when the Locrians had consulted the Oracle how they might be rid of their seditions, they were bid to make themselves Laws. Upon this a certain Shepherd, named Zaleucus, told them he could furnish them with very good Laws. And being asked whence he could have them, — he said Minerva appeared to him in a dream, and would give him them: — whereupon they gave him his Freedom (for he was then a Slave); and so he became their Law-giver‡.” And agreeably to this, Suidas tells us, “That at first he was a Slave and a Shepherd§.” Either of which circumstances are sufficient proofs that he was no Pythagorean; for, if he was another man's Slave, and obliged to look after sheep at Locri, how could he have either time or leave to be at Crotona with Pythagoras, near a hundred miles from home? and especially to continue there the v years of silence, according to the discipline of the School? Besides, a slave would not have been admitted into that society, had he had ever such opportunities. [338]

And we have another argument from the same passage of Aristotle, that Zaleucus was no scholar of Pythagoras; “for he ascribed all his Laws to Minerva; from whom he pretended to receive them in dreams.” This Aristotle has told

to the railing accusations against Timæus, which he cites; no one of which calls him a calumniator, or impeaches his veracity in any respect; much less taxes him with inventing, aggravating, &c. the faults of others, from an innate malignity of heart. See the Excerpta ex Polybio, in this very Section, and compare them with the transactions in the text. S.

* Diod. Sic. p. 84. *Εὐγενής*.

† Bp. Warburton has employed a whole Section in the Examination of this and the other point here mentioned; which the Reader would do well to consult. — Vide ubi supra.

‡ Pind. Schol. ad x Olymp. *Φησὶν Ἀριστοτέλης, &c.*

§ Suid. v. *Ζάλ.* *Ἦν δὲ πρότερον δαλός τε καὶ ποιμήν.*

us,

us, as he is cited by the Scholiast on Pindar. And that *we* may not question the Scholiast's authority, the great Clemens Alex. assures us that both Aristotle and his Scholar Chamæleo say, "That Zaleucus gave it out that he had his Laws from "Minerva*." Plutarch too falls in with this account, where he tells us "That Zaleucus said Minerva used to appear to him, "and give him Laws, which were all entirely Hers, and no part "of them his own†." Now I humbly conceive that this project of Zaleucus's has nothing of a Pythagorean in it; for Pythagoras's Scholars ascribed every thing to their Master; it was always *Αὐτὸς ἔφα* with them, *HE SAID IT*: and the greatest Oath was to swear by Him —

Οὐ μὰ τὸν ἀμείντα ψυχῇ παραδόντα τετρακτὸν.

If Zaleucus, therefore, had been of that Society, he would certainly have honoured his Master, by imputing his Laws to his instructions; but, being a poor illiterate Shepherd, and of no authority with the people, he very craftily acquired it by taking nothing upon Himself, but laying all to Minerva.

Again, Strabo informs us ‡, "That the Locrians were generally believed to be the first that used WRITTEN Laws; and "that Zaleucus took them, as Ephorus the Historian says, "from the Cretic, and the Laconic, and the Areopagetic "customs§. And so Scymnus Chius, speaking of these Locrians, says They were the first that had WRITTEN Laws; which were supposed to be made by Zaleucus;"

*Τέττις δὲ πρῶτος φασὶ χρῆσασθαι νόμοις.
Γραφίῳσιν, ὃς Ζάλευκος ὑποβίβηται δοκεῖ||.*

Clemens Alexandrinus ¶ forgot himself perhaps, when he said "That Zaleucus the Locrian was the first that made Laws;" for he ought to have said "made WRITTEN Laws;" as Ephorus and Strabo said before him. But if Zaleucus's written Laws were the most ancient, it is most certain he could not be a Pythagorean; for Draco's Laws were *written* ones at Athens **; and he lived about Olymp. xxxix, as Tatian, Clemens, and Eusebius, expressly say; or, as Diodorus in one of his lost Books,

* Clem. Strom. i. p. 152.

† Plutarch. *Περὶ τῶ ἑαυτοῦ*, &c. *Idem* in Numa. Valer. Max. i. 2. Theodoret. ad Græc. Sermon. ix.

‡ Strabo p. 259. *Νόμοις ἐν Γραφίῳσιν.*

§ *Νομίμων, i. e. ἀγγράφων.*

|| Scymnus, ver. 313.

¶ Clem. Strom. i, p. 133.

** Joseph. c. Appion. i. p. 2. *Γραφίλλας νόμους.*

"He was XLVII years before Solon †:" which, being reckoned from Solon's Archonship, Olymp. XLVI, 3, will fall upon Olymp. XXXV, 1. If Zaleucus then was before Draco, he must be longer before Pythagoras; who, by the very earliest account, was not born till Olymp. XLIII, 4.

All this is farther confirmed by Eusebius; who places "Zaleucus, the celebrated Law-giver of the Locrians, at Olymp. XXIX;" which is XL years before Draco, and about LX before Pythagoras was born. Aristotle, indeed, reprehends their ignorance, "who would make Onomacritus to have been the first that was skilled in Law-making, and that Thales was his acquaintance; whose Scholars were Lycurgus and ZALEUCUS; and Zaleucus's Scholar was Charondas; for they talk," says he, "inconsistently with Chronology ‡." The Thales that is meant here was not the Milesian, but the ancient Cretan, who is generally assigned as a Master to Lycurgus §. So that Aristotle seems to find fault that they made Zaleucus too a Scholar of that Thales; for at that rate he must have lived CVIII years before the first Olympiad ||; i. e. CC years before Locri was built, Ol. XXIV ¶. How then could he be a Locrian and a Law-giver there? This is the "ignorance of Chronology," which the Philosopher censures here; but, however, it is no inconsiderable argument that Zaleucus was older than Pythagoras, who came above CCC years after Lycurgus.

And we have yet a farther discovery of it from the Orator Demosthenes; who, to persuade the Athenians not to change any Law upon small and frivolous pretences, gives the example of these Locrians; "with whom," says he, "it is a law, That a man who shall propose to make any new Law, shall do it with a rope about his neck, which he shall be strangled in if he do not carry his point; which has been such a guard and defence to the Laws, that there has been but one new one made in MORE THAN TWO HUNDRED YEARS*." Now that Demosthenes here speaks of Zaleucus's Laws, is plain enough from his naming the Locrians; but it appears farther from the Law itself; for Hierocles and Polybius's Au-

[340]

[341]

† Ulpian in Demosth. Timocr. p. 480. Ὁ δὲ Δράκων πρὸ Σόλωνος ἐπὶ καὶ τισσαράκοισι ἔτισιν, ὡς φησὶν ὁ Διόδωρος.

‡ Arist. Polit. ii, 58. Ἀσχεπλότερον τῷ χρόνῳ λέγοντες.

§ Strabo p. 482. Sextus Empir. p. 68, Laërt. in Thal.

|| Clemens, Plutarch, &c.

¶ Euseb. Strabo.

* Demost. in Timocr. p. 469. Ἐν πλείοσιν ἢ διακοσίοις ἔτισιν.

thor

thor say expressly "that this Law about the rope was ZALEUCUS's *;" and it is produced by Stobæus †, as out of Zaleucus's own Preface to his body of Laws. It is not very clear indeed what the Orator means here; whether it was "more than" cc years from the first date of Zaleucus's Laws to the introducing of that one new Law; or whether, from the first date of them to the Orator's own time, which he calls "more than cc years," there was but one new Law made. The first interpretation seems the more probable; but even the latter will be a sufficient proof that Zaleucus could not be Pythagoras's Scholar; for this Oration against Timocrates was spoken Olymp. cvi, 4, when Theodemus or Eudemus was Archon, as Dionysius Halic: ‡ says in express words; and Plutarch § says it implicitly, when he tells us Demosthenes made it at the xxvii or xxviii year of his age; for he was born at Olymp. xcix, 4||; and his xxviii year falls at Ol. cvi, 4. Now to compute only *two hundred* years backwards from this Olympiad, and it reaches to Olymp. lvi, 4, when Pythagoras, by the very earliest reckoning, had been but xiii years in Italy and vii of those were spent in his room under ground; and I suppose what Demosthenes calls MORE than cc years will amount above the remaining five; nay, I may moderately say above the whole xiii. But thus much, I am sure, may be safely concluded from it: That if Zaleucus was really Pythagoras's Disciple, the learned Mr. Dodwell's calculation must be wrong; which makes Pythagoras first set foot in Italy at Olymp. lxxvii, 2; for that Olympiad falls xlii years within Demosthenes's two hundred, without adding those years to the account which the Orator means by MORE. I make the reckoning from Pythagoras's going to Italy; because Zaleucus, one of the Locrians of Italy, could not be his Scholar till he came thither; for Theodoret was quite out when he thought the Locrians, whom Zaleucus gave Laws to, were those of Greece, near Acarnania and Phocis ¶.

[342] Take all these arguments together, and, I conceive, their united force will effectually refute Mr. B. who is "sure that" Zaleucus was a Pythagorean." But, besides that, they will go a considerable way to refute the Book itself too, which passed abroad in the world under the name of Zaleucus; for

P. 53.

* Hieroc. apud Stobæum, Sermon. 37. Polyb. xii. p. 661.

† Stob. Sermon. 42.

‡ Dion. Hal. de Demosth.

§ Plut. Vita Demosth.

|| Dionys. ibid.

¶ Theod. c. Græc. Sermon. ix.

if any intimation was given in that Book that the Author was a Pythagorean, the imposture of it is very evident. And yet it is hard to give any other reason that should induce the later Writers to call him a Pythagorean, as Diodorus does expressly (*Μαθητὴς Πυθαγόρα τῷ Φιλοσόφῳ*) "The Scholar of Pythagoras the Philosopher*;" and so Laërtius, Porphyry, and Jamblichus; and Seneca thus flourishes upon it, "That Zaleucus and Charondas learnt their Laws in the silent and sacred recess of Pythagoras†." Thus, we see the more recent Authors, with one voice, made him a Pythagorean; and yet every one of the old that speak of him make him earlier than that Philosopher; as Ephorus, Demosthenes, Aristotle, Chamæleo, Theophrastus, Timæus, the youngest of whom was about ccl years before the eldest of the others. What can be the cause of this difference, but that, in the interval between these old and those later Writers in the times of the Ptolemæes, when the forging of Books came to be a fashion and a trade, some impostor made a System of Laws under the name of Zaleucus, and in it gave a broad hint that he was a Scholar of Pythagoras?

[343]

The Impostor had taken care to insert those Laws of Zaleucus which he had met with in Ancient Writers into his counterfeit System; as that Law which Demosthenes mentions, "That he that proposed a new Law, should do it with a halter about his neck," appears in the very Preface of the counterfeit Book which Stobæus has given us‡. And his forgery met with good entertainment, because the old constitution of the city Locri was then altered, and was no longer in being to discover the cheat; which imposed therefore upon Diodorus and others, and prevailed upon Cicero himself so far, that he seems to stand neuter, and pronounces on no side; for it appears there that Cicero meant this very Preface that Stobæus afterwards met with:—"Before I give you the Law itself," says he, "I will preface something in commendation of it, as I see Zaleucus and Charondas have done§;" and he gives a *proæmium*, as he calls it, much to the same sense with those of Zaleucus and Charondas in Stobæus. But, however, this Impostor has not done every thing so artificially, but that even from the Fragments that are still left of his Book, it may seem very questionable, if it was not supposititious,

* Diod. Sic. p. 84.

† Sen Ep. 90.

‡ Stob. Sermon. 42.

§ Cic. de Leg. ii, 6.

I. Demosthenes has informed us "That the new Law, which alone was made at Locri in the compass of above cc years, was, That he that blinded a man with one eye, should lose both his own;" for the old Law of Zaleucus was *lex talionis*, "an eye for an eye." But Diodorus makes this [344] be one of the Laws of Charondas; and tells the same story about "a man with one eye" at Thurii; and that the Laws there, which had continued the same a long time, were never changed but upon this and two other occasions. They are both very good Authors; and it is a very tender point to say whether of them we should follow: but with submission to better judgments, I will lay down some reasons why I think Demosthenes is in the right here. He calls the city, where he says this Law was so long in force (Πόλις ΕΥΝΟΜΟΤΜΕΝΗ) "a well-governed city*;" and this is the very character that is generally given of Locri: "The Locrians," says Strabo, "were (πλείστον χρόνον ΕΥΝΟΜΗΘΕΝΤΕΣ) for a long time under good government†." And Pindar puts this compliment upon them:—

Νίμει γὰρ ἀτρίκτια πόλιν Λοκρῶν Ζαφυρίων ‡—

where he means, says the Scholiast (ὅτι ΕΥΝΟΜΕΙΤΑΙ) "That they have a good government." And Plato tells us "That the Locrians seem to have been (εὐνομάτατοι) the best governed people in all that country§." And again he says, "That Timæus was of Locri (εὐνομάτης πόλεως) the best regulated city in Italy||;" which Proclus thus explains: "That the Locrians (εὐνομήνιο) were well governed is evident, for their Law-maker was Zaleucus¶." But, on the contrary, the Thurians, where Diodorus lays the scene of this story, were so far from being celebrated on this account, that they are censured for their misgovernment. So Ephorus complains of them, in Strabo**; and Aristotle, in his Politics, brings them in twice as examples of ill management††. Demosthenes's story, therefore, is more agreeable to this matter of fact than [345] that of Diodorus is. And again, Demosthenes says here, that the Locrians were under a happy government "above cc years;" as Strabo also says (πλείστον χρόνον) "a very long

* Demosth. c. Timocr. p. 468.

† Strabo, p. 259.

‡ Pind. Olymp. x.

§ Plato Leg. i. p. 17.

|| Idem, Timæo.

¶ Proclus ad Tim. p. 22.

** Strabo, p. 260.

†† Arist. Pol. ver. 7.

"time;"

“time*,” which is really true in fact, as appears by a computation from the date of Zaleucus's Laws to the time that Dionysius the Younger tyrannized there, and ruined all at Olymp. cvi, 1. Now Diodorus too would magnify the continuance of Charondas's Laws at Thurii, when he says (*ἐν παντί τῷ μετὰ ταῦτα χρόνῳ*) “in ALL the time after Charondas, there” were but three changes made in them†. But this account of a long continuance is not warranted by History; for it is certain, from Himself and others‡, that the city Thurii was but first built Olymp. lxxxiv, 1, or a little before; and the government was quite subverted within liv years, at Olymp. xcvi, 3, three parts in four of the people being slain, and the rest sold for slaves, by their neighbours the Lucanians§. Upon the whole, then, Demosthenes's account seems more agreeable to truth. But how happened it that Diodorus should be so mistaken, and ascribe a Law to Charondas, which we see was Zaleucus's? Is there not just ground of suspicion that Diodorus was imposed on by that spurious Book of Zaleucus's Laws, where this Law was forgotten by the Impostor? If so, it will open a discovery of another counterfeit; for we see the Law was omitted where it ought to have been entered; and it was put among Charondas's, where it ought not to have been. That copy, therefore, of Charondas's Laws must, by this account, be a cheat too, and by the very same hand; for, as it seems, the Impostor had read something about the Law, but was mistaken in fathering it upon a wrong person. But of Charondas's Laws I shall say more anon. This must needs seem the most probable account of Diodorus's error, if we believe he has truly told us what he found in those Books of Laws, and did not forget himself: but there is some reason to suspect that he trusted to his memory, and so might possibly mistake one Lawgiver for the other; for he tells us too, that the Law concerning “the halter” was one of Charondas's||, which Stobæus¶ attributes to Zaleucus, and pretends to cite it, in Zaleucus's own words, out of his Preface. Hierocles too, and Polybius's Author, ascribe it to Zaleucus**; but they might have it at second-hand; so that all this matter must lie

[346]

* Strab. *ibid.*

† Diod. p. 82.

‡ Diod. p. 75. Plutarch. Vit. Lysiae; &c.

§ Diod. p. 313. Strabo, p. 263.

|| Diod. p. 82.

¶ Stob. Serm. 42.

** Hierocl. apud Stob. 37. Polyb. p. 661.

between Diodorus and Stobæus. If Diodorus has quoted faithfully, Zaleucus's Book of Laws was a cheat; if Stobæus was a faithful Transcriber, then this argument fails against Zaleucus's Book, and falls upon Diodorus himself.

II. We have two words of those Laws of Zaleucus preserved in Hesychius: ΛΕΠΤΑΣ ΚΑΙ ΠΑΧΕΙΑΣ, says he, λεῦκον ἐν Νόμοις, τὰς δραχμάς· λεπτὰς μὲν τὰς ἐξωκόλως, παχείας δὲ τὰς πλείον ἐχέσας· that is, "The words (Λεπτὰς καὶ παχείας) *thin* and *thick*, " in the Laws of Zaleucus, are spoken of *Drachms*; the *thin* " *Drachms* weighing six *Oboli*, and the *thick* above six." In the printed Hesychius it is Λεῦκον but Salmasius, Gronovius, and other learned men, have observed, and the thing itself speaks, that the true reading is Ζάλευκον for the preceding word ending in ΑΣ, the following ΖΑ was swallowed up, as it frequently happens when syllables are alike. Now I say, if (Λεπτὰς καὶ παχείας) "*thin* and *thick* drachms" were in the Laws of Zaleucus, as Hesychius assures us, that pretended Book of Laws must appear a mere cheat; for Julius Pollux informs us who they were that called those *Drachms* (παχείας) *thick* ones, and upon what occasion: Τὴν Αἰγιναιῶν δραχμὴν, says he, μείζω τῆς Ἀττικῆς ἔσαν (δέκα γὰρ ὀβολὸς Ἀττικὸς ἴσχυεν) οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ΠΑΧΕΙΑΝ δραχμὴν ἐκάλουν, μίσει τῶν Αἰγινητῶν Αἰγιναιῶν ὀνομάσαι μὴ θέλοντες· i. e. "The Ægeian Drachm, which was " bigger than the Attic (for it weighed x Attic Oboli) was " called by the Athenians (ΠΑΧΕΙΑ) the *thick* Drachm; for " they would not call it the Ægeian, out of hatred to that " people*." The case is this:—The Attic Drachm weighed six Attic Oboli; and so the Ægeian Drachm weighed six Ægeian Oboli; but the Ægeian Obolus was bigger than the Attic, in the proportion of x to vi; and so consequently the Ægeian Drachm, and the sums made up of it, the Mine and Talent, exceeded the Attic Drachm, Mine, and Talent, in the same proportion. Now the Ægeian Drachm being often current at Athens (for Ægina is close by it) and in other places of trade, the Athenians, who mortally hated the Ægeians, would not call that money Ægeian, as the rest of the world did, but *thick*, because it was thicker than their own, weighing almost twice as much. The whole history of this enmity between the Athenians and Ægeians is given largely by Herodotus†. If ΠΑΧΕΙΑ then, for an Ægeian Drachm, was a word peculiar to the Attics, and proceeded purely from the

* Pollux, ix, 6.

† Herod. lib. v. & vi.

hatred

hatred between the two nations, how comes the word in that sense to be found in Zaleucus's Laws? What! had the Ægeians offended him, who lived at Locri in Italy, remote enough from them and their quarrels? Why did not he call it Ægeian, as all the world did, except the Athenians? Nay, even among the Athenians themselves, they seem to have been the tradesmen and rabble only that called them *Παχίαις*, and not the men of quality, as appears plainly from Thucydides, where we have ΑΙΓΙΝΑΙΟΣ *ἑσολός*, ΑΙΓΙΝΑΙΑ *δραχμή*, ΑΙΓΙΝΑΙΟΝ *τάλαντον* but never ΠΑΧΥΣ *ἑσολός*, nor ΠΑΧΕΙΑ *δραχμή*. And would Zaleucus put a word in his Laws which a grave Writer would not use in his History? But why must the Ægeian money be at all taken notice of by Zaleucus? What was the Locrian commonwealth concerned with the Ægeians? They were very far asunder; and the latter were poor and inconsiderable in the time of that Lawgiver, and consequently could have very little or no traffick with his citizens. Thucydides tells us* that, before Themistocles's time, neither the Ægeians nor Athenians were considerable at sea; and Herodotus says†, that the beginning of the wealth and power of Ægina was the plunder that was carried thither and sold, after Xerxes's army was routed at Platææ. There was no reason then nor occasion to bring the Ægeian money into the body of his laws, much less to speak of it under the nick-name of *Παχίαις*, which the Locrians could not know the meaning of, till it were explained to them out of Greece. Nay, there is reason to suspect that Zaleucus's true Laws were made before the hatred began between the Athenians and Ægeians; and consequently before *Παχέα δραχμή* was ever used in that sense. Herodotus relates the first original of that hatred, which was about a couple of statues; and the occasion of his mentioning it is this: — About Olymp. LXIX the Thebans desired the assistance of the Ægeians in a war against Athens; and the Ægeians, says he, "remembering the quarrel about the statues‡," were ready enough to enter into an alliance against the Athenians. Now, from Olymp. LXIX to the time of Zaleucus, Olymp. XXIX, there are no fewer than CLX years; and if the business of the statues were as long ago as that, it was a very stale and cold pretence to begin a new war upon. Surely, if they had been at enmity for eightscore years, in all that tract of time some skirmishes or bickerings would have happened between them,

* Thucyd. p. 11.

† Herod. ix. 79.

‡ Ibid. v. 89.

that might serve for a fresher complaint, and a greater incentive to war, than an old scuffle six generations ago. It is very probable, therefore, that Zaleucus had made his Laws before the quarrel began which gave rise to the expression *Παχία δραχμή*: add to all this, that among the Dorian Greeks of Sicily and Italy, and consequently among the Locrians, there was no such sort of money as *δραχμή* or *δωλός*: but their species were quite different both in value and name (*ἐξία, νύμμη, λίτρα*) as I will shew further in Section XIV. And if this be made out, who will question but these pretended laws must be spurious? for if the name and species of *δραχμή* was quite foreign to the Locrians, what had *ἀετλὺς καὶ παχείας* to do there? One might as well expect to find them in the XII Tables at Rome as in the Laws at Locri. It is most probable then that some Sophist drew them up; and having been bred among the Athenians, he was senseless enough to put such words into the mouth of Zaleucus as he heard spoken at Athens; just as the Forger of Phalaris's Letters has made the Tyrant talk Attic, as if he had quite forgotten he was a Sicilian.

- [350] III. Diodorus tells us "one of Zaleucus's Laws was, That "nobody should wear cloths as fine as Milesian cloths, if he "was not a Catamite*" (*μὴδὲ ἱματίον ἸΣΟΜΙΑΗΣΙΟΝ φορεῖν, εἰὼν μὴ ἑταιρεύηται*). Now methinks it is very oddly worded in a Locrian Law, to characterize the cloths for men's habits, by comparing them with the manufacture of Miletus in Asia, at so vast a distance from Italy; for, considering the remoteness of the places, and the smallness of trade in those early times, it may justly be questioned whether the Milesian cloths, though in Greece they were celebrated for their fineness, were at all heard of at Locri, much less were so famous there as to deserve to come into their Laws. And besides this, the word *ισομλήσιον*, i. e. "EQUAL to Milesian cloths," never found that I know of but here, seems a very unfit expression for a Law; for how many doubts and questions would arise about that *equality*! and what a wide door was opened to delators and sycophants! If he had absolutely forbidden the wearing of Milesian cloths, the Law had been clear, and had amounted to a prohibition of importing that commodity: but as it is *ισομλήσιον*, and not *Μιλήσιον*, it seems to be contrived on purpose for the encouragement of barretors. Nay, though he had forbidden Milesian cloths, even that too had been very

* Diod. p. 85.

improper;

improper; for to what purpose should he declare by Law such goods to be contraband, which even before that prohibition were never imported? for the Locrians might have as fine or finer cloths, and at a much lower rate, from their next neighbours, the Apulians and Calabrians, — and particularly from Tarentum, than the Milesians could bring them. To be sure then the Milesians would never carry cloths, with the charge and hazard of so long a voyage, to a market where others could both outdo them and undersell them. Such a trade would have been as unprofitable as to carry Silphium to Cyrene, or Frankincense to Arabia. “The best wool,” says Pliny*, “is the Apulian, and what in Italy is called the wool of the Greek cattle; but abroad is called Italic. In the third place comes the Milesian.” By the Greek cattle, Pliny means the Tarentine, as Columella explains it, — “Græcum pecus, quod plerique Tarentinum vocant†.” “The finest sheep,” says the same Columella, “are the Milesian, the Calabrian, and Apulian; and among these the Tarentine are the best‡.” And the Tarentines were as famous for the effeminateness of their habit as the Milesians themselves. “All the Tarentines,” says Clearchus, “wore fine and transparent clothes, such as women wear now-a-days§;” insomuch, that a sort of thin woman’s garment had its name from them, *Ταραντινία*, as we read in Athenæus||; but in that place a MS. Athenæus, and the MS. Epitome, both of them in His Majesty’s Library, have it *Ταραντίον*, which may seem the better reading; though Eustathius¶ seems to have found neither of them in his copy but *Ταραντινίδιον*. In all probability then, had the true Zaleucus designed to restrain the luxury of apparel, he would rather take notice of his next neighbours, the Tarentines, whom all the Locrians knew, than of the Milesians, whom few of them had so much as heard of; and instead of *Ἰσομύησιον*, he would say *Ἰσοταραντίον*. But the counterfeit Zaleucus being a Græcian Sophist, and knowing that the Milesian cloths had the greatest vogue in the Greek markets, was so discreet as to forbid them by name, in a body of Laws which he cut out for Italy.

[361]

IV. The pretended Preface of Zaleucus, which Stobæus [352] has described, word for word, begins with this sentence:—

* Plin. viii, 48.

† Columella, vii, 4.

‡ Ib. vii, 2.

§ Athen. p. 522.

¶ Id. p. 622.

¶ Eustath. ad Dionys. ver. 376.

“ Every member of a commonwealth, in the first place, ought to believe there are Gods, Ἀναβλέποντας εἰς οὐρανὸν καὶ τὸν ΚΟΣΜΟΝ, καὶ τὴν ἐν αὐτοῖς διακόσμησιν καὶ ΤΑΞΙΝ, which they will know, by looking up to heaven and the world, and considering the beauty and order there.” Now, I presume, I have proved already, beyond all reasonable exception, that Zaleucus lived some generations before Pythagoras’s time; and if so, this Preface cannot possibly be his, because Pythagoras was the first that used the word ΚΟΣΜΟΣ to signify the WORLD or the HEAVENS. Phavorinus* says (they are the words of Laërtius) “ That Pythagoras first named the Heavens ΚΟΣΜΟΣ.” So Plutarch too, De Plac. Philos. “ Pythagoras first called the whole compass of the Universe ΚΟΣΜΟΝ, from the order (τῆς ΤΑΞΕΩΣ) he observed there†.” And the very same words are in the Philosophical History ascribed to Galen‡. Add to these the Scholiast on Homer, who says “ Ἡ τῷ κόσμῳ ΤΑΞΙΣ, the order of the Universe was named ΚΟΣΜΟΣ by Pythagoras§;” and the Anonymous Author of that Philosopher’s Life, Πρῶτος, says he, Πυθαγόρας τὸν οὐρανὸν ΚΟΣΜΟΝ προσηγόρευσε. Is it not plain now that the Writer of Zaleucus’s Laws was younger than Pythagoras? since he not only cites ΚΟΣΜΟΣ in the very same signification that Pythagoras first put upon it, — but subjoins too the word ΤΑΞΙΣ, which we see here was the very reason why Pythagoras called the world ΚΟΣΜΟΣ. It is true, in those passages of Plutarch and Galen, there immediately follows Θαλῆς καὶ οἱ ἀφ’ αὐτῶ ἵνα τὸν κόσμον. From whence, perhaps, a man of Mr. B.’s sagacity and learning may infer, that Thales too, who was a generation before Pythagoras, and, as many say, was his Master, called the universe ΚΟΣΜΟΣ. But surely we must not think Plutarch and the other Author so very stupid as to contradict themselves in one and the same line. We must understand them that Thales spoke of the thing signified by Κοσμός, but not that he used the word: he might say ἐν τῷ πᾶν, or ἐν τῷ σύστημα τῶν ὄλων, or some other expression of the same import. And, besides, we are informed by very good hands, Laërtius and Themistius, That Thales wrote nothing himself; so that if Κοσμός had really occurred in any Treatise ascribed to him, it had been a good argument that the Treatise was spurious, but none at all that Pythagoras did not first call the universe ΚΟΣΜΟΣ.

* Laërt. Pythag. Τὸν οὐρανὸν πρῶτον ὀνομάσαι Κόσμον.

† Plin. Pl. Phil. ii, 1.

‡ Gal. p. 429.

§ Schol. ad Iliad. i, 1.

V. In the same Preface it presently follows, Ὡς ἔ τιμᾶται θεὸς ὑπ' ἀνθρώπου φαίλας, ἐδὲ θεραπεύεται δαπάναις ἐδὲ ΤΡΑΓΩΔΙΑΙΣ τῶν ἀλισκομένων, καθάπερ μοχθηρὸς ἄνθρωπος. where, instead of ἀλισκομένων, which in this place makes no tolerable sense, the true reading seems to be ἀλισγεμένων and then the meaning will be, "That God is not honoured by a wicked man, nor pleased with the costly and pompous sacrifices of polluted persons, as if he was a vile mortal." Now this paragraph alone is sufficient to detect the imposture of these pretended Laws; for, as I have shewn above, the true Zaleucus lived before Draco, who made Laws for the Athenians at or before Olymp. xxxix; but the word ΤΡΑΓΩΔΙΑ was not coined, nor the thing expressed by it invented, till Thespis won the Goat, the prize of his Play, about Olymp. lx, above lxxx years after Draco. How then came the word Τραγωδία into the Laws of Zaleucus, which were written above cxx years before Thespis? I do not wonder now that Zaleucus was so generally believed to have all his Laws from Minerva; for nothing less than a Deity could have foreknown the word Τραγωδία, a whole century and more before it came into being. But besides that the very word was not at all heard of in Zaleucus's time, we must observe too that it is used by him metaphorically "for sumptuousness and pomp," which is a sense that could not be put upon it till a long time after Thespis; for in the infancy of Tragedy there was nothing pompous nor sumptuous upon the Stage; no Scenes, nor Pictures, nor Machines, nor rich Habits for the Actors; which, after they were introduced there, gave the sole occasion to the metaphor. For the first Scene was made by Agatharchus for one of Æschylus's Plays, as Vitruvius tells us,—*"Prium Agatharchus Athenis, Æschylo docente Tragœdiani, scenam fecit, et de ea commentarium reliquit*."* This Agatharchus was a Painter, who learned the Art by himself, without any Master; as Olympiodorus says in his MS. Commentary on Plato's Phædo, Γεγονασί τινες καὶ αὐτοδίδακτοι Ἡράκλειτος ὁ Αἰγυπτιῶτης γεωργός Φήμιος, Ἀγάθαρχος ὁ γραφεύς. For it is most probable he means the same Agatharchus that made Æschylus's Scene for him; and that all the other ornaments were first brought in by Æschylus, we have the unanimous testimony of all Antiquity. Now the first Play that Æschylus made was at Olymp. lxx, and the last at Olymp. lxxx; and in what part of this xl years interval he invented those ornaments for pomp and

[354]

[356]

* Vitruv. Pr. f. Lib. vii.

show,

show, we cannot now tell*. But suppose, if you please, that he invented them at the very first Play; and that the metaphor that makes *Τραγῳδία* signify pomp, came into use upon the sight of them,—neither of which are at all probable; yet even still it will be above *CLX* years after the time of the true *Zaleucus*.

VI. The last argument that I shall offer against the *Laws* of *Zaleucus* is this, That the Preface of them, which *Stobæus* has produced, is written in the *common* dialect, as the old *Grammarians* have called it, whereas it ought to be in *Doric*; for that was the language of the *Locri Epizephyrii*, as it appears from the *Treatise* of *Timæus*, the *Locrian*, extant in *Plato*; and from the *Epigrams* of *Nossis*. I do not know that it has yet been observed that this *Nossis* was a *Locrian*; and therefore I shall make bold to give an *Epigram* or two of hers, which will shew at once both her country and her dialect.

ὦ ξέν', εἰ τὺ γ' ἔπεις ποτὶ καλλίχορον Μιτυλήναν,
 Τὰν Σαπφῶς χάριται ἄνθ'· ἰναυσόμεθα,
 Εἰπὼν ὡς Μάσαισι φίλα, τίηατι Λόκρισσα
 Τίττειν ἴσαις ἐπὶ θ' οἱ τένομα Νόσσις· ἴθι.

So this *Epigram* is to be read, which is faulty in *Holstenius* and *Berkelius's* Notes upon *Stephanus*; and the meaning of it is, that *Nossis* addresses herself to a Traveller, and desires him, if ever he go to *Mitylene*, where *Sappho* was born, to say, That

- [Addend. p. 544.] * But we may make a near guess at it from the accounts we have of *Agatharchus* the Painter, who first made a Scene, according to *Vitruvius*, whom I cited above. *Αγάθαρχος*, says *Harpocration*, *τέττα μνημονεύει Δημοσθένης· ὃν δὲ ζωγράφον ἐπιφανῆς, Εὐδήμου υἱός, τὸ δὲ γένος Σάμιος*. The very same words are to be found in *Suidas*. Now the passage where *Demosthenes* speaks of him, is in his Oration against *Midias*, p. 360: but there is a larger account of him in *Plutarch's* Life of *Alcibiades*, and the largest of all in *Andocides's* Oration against *Alcibiades*. The substance of all their story is, That *Alcibiades* forcibly detained *Agatharchus* in his house, and would not let him stir out till he had painted it. Now *Alcibiades* died, *Olymp. xciv, 1**, when he was about *XL* years old†; and we can hardly suppose him less than *XX* when he had this frolic upon *Agatharchus*, especially if what *Demosthenes's* Scholiast says be true, that the reason of it was because *Agatharchus* was taken in bed with *Alcibiades's* Miss. *Agatharchus* then was by this account alive still about *Olymp. lxxxix, 1*, which is *xxxvi* years after *Olymp. lxxx*, when *Æschylus's* last Play was acted. It is plain then he was but a young man, even at *Olymp. lxxx*; and if we consider he was (*αὐτοδίδακτος*) his own master in Painting, and took it up of himself, we can scarce suppose he could invent the painting of Scenes till very near that *Olympiad*.

* Diodor.
 † Corn.
 Nepos.

a Locrian

a Locrian Woman wrote Poems like hers, and that her name was Nossis. *Ἰσαις* is the accusative Doric and Æolic for *ἴσας*, i. e. *χαρίτας* and that this is the true sense of it, will be further evident from another Epigram of hers, not published before, [356] where she celebrates the Locrians, her countrymen: —

Ἔντεα Βρέντιοι ἄνδρες ἅφ' αἰνομόρων βάλοι ἄμυν,
 Θειόμεινοι Λοκρῶν χερσὶν ὑπ' ἀκυμάχων·
 Ὡν ἀρετὰν ὑμνεῦντα, θεῶν ὑπ' ἀνάκτορα κεύνται·
 Οὐδὲ ποθεῖντι κακῶν πάχιας, ἧς ἱλίπον.

The import of which is, That the Locrians had obtained a victory over the Brutians, their neighbours; and had hung up in the temples of the Gods those shields they had taken, which now did not desire to return to those cowards that wore them before. And by this we may have some discovery of Nossis's age, which hitherto has been thought uncertain; for the *Βρέντιοι* or *Βρέντιοι*, whom she speaks of there, were not formed into a body, nor called by that name, till Olymp. cvi, 1, in Dionysius the Younger's time*. She cannot therefore be more ancient than Olymp. cvi; but that she was a little younger, is plain from her Epigram† upon the Tomb of Rhintho, the Tarentine, or, as she calls him, the Syracusian, her contemporary, who lived in the time of the first Ptolemee, about Ol. cxiv‡. Her mother's name was Theuphilis the daughter of Cleorcha; as another Epigram of hers taught me, yet unpublished: —

Ἦρα τιμήσσω, Λακείνιοι ἂν τὸ θυῶδες
 Πολλάκις ἐρατόθεν νισσομένα καθορῆς,
 Δίξαι βύσσινοι εἴμα, τό τοι μετὰ παιδὸς ἀγαυᾶς
 Νοσσίδος ὕφανεν Θεούφιλις ἡ Κλειόχας.

In the MS. it is *Θευφίλης* and we may observe, that even this too confirms it, that she was a Locrian, because she speaks of *Λακείνιον* for the famous temple of Juno Lacinia was not far from Locri, in the neighbourhood of Crotona. She had a daughter called Melinna, as another MS. Epigram seems to shew, though it is possible she may mean there another's daughter, and not her own; however, it deserves to be put here for its singular elegance: — [357]

Αὐτομέλινα τίτνυται· ἴδ' ὡς ἀγατὸν τὸ πρόσωπον
 Ἀμὲ ποτοπλάζειν μελιχίως δοκεῖ.
 Ὡς ἐτύμως θυγάτηρ τᾶς μητέρι πάντα ποτίζει·
 Ἥ καλὸν, ὅκκα πέλοι τέκνα γοιῦσιν ἴσα.

* Diod. p. 418. Strabo, p. 255. Justin. xxiii, 1.

† Anthol. iii, 6.

‡ Snid. P. 60.

Αὐτομέλιννα, that is, Melinna herself, not her picture, it is so exactly like her; so *αὐτοζωνή, αὐτοαλήθεια*. In the MS. it is *ἃ μὲ*, but the true reading is *ἁμὲ*, Doric, for *ἐμὲ* for *πατάκει*, the MS. has it *προσάκει*; but I have changed *πρὸς* into the Doric preposition *ποτὶ*. From the preterperfect tense of verbs the Dorians form a present, as from *δίδοικα* they make *διδόικω* from *δεδυκα, διδύκω* so that from *προσ-έοικε*, “to be like,” as a picture is like the original, our Female Poet forms *ποτ-εοίκα*, and then contracts it *ποτάκω*. So much was necessary to be said to make this Epigram intelligible. I return now to the Locrian dialect, which a Locrian Song, *Λοκρικὸν ᾄσμα*, in Athenæus*, sufficiently proves to be the Doric: —

Μὴ προδῶς ἅμ' ἱκετεύω· πρὶν καὶ μολὼν κείνον, αἰῶσω·
Μὴ κακὸν μέγα ποιήσης καὶ με τὴν διδύκην.
Ἀμέρα καὶ ἤδη τὸ φῶς, διὰ τὰς θυρίδας ἐκ ἰσορῆς;

So this passage ought to be read, and the version should be thus: —

“Ne prodas me, obsecro: prius quam ille veniat, surge.” &c. Sunt verba mulieris ad mœchum suum, ut surgere velit, priusquam vir domum redeat et ipsum deprendat. And it is now apparent what good reason Athenæus had to call the Locrian Songs *μοιχικοί* and we cannot doubt but he means the Locrians of Italy, if we consider what account he gives of the women of that place†. And now, to bring this argument to a conclusion, since it evidently appears that the Locrian language was Doric, without all question the Laws of that city were written in that dialect, as certainly as Solon's Laws, at Athens, were written in Attic. These of Zaleucus therefore are commentitious, because they are not in Doric, unless Mr. B. will be as zealous for “his King Zaleucus,” as he is for “his Prince Phalaris,” and contend that the King's Laws were *transdialectal* as well as the Prince's Epistles.

I. This metaphor of *Τραγωδία* for solemnity and pomp, invites me to step out of my way a little, and to consider the Laws ascribed to Charondas; for we have there too the very same metaphor. Diodorus speaks prolixly of these Laws‡, and the proœmia of them are reckoned in Stobæus; where, among others, we have this, “That a man who is a slave to “riches, ought to be despised as one of a mean spirit, καὶ

* Athen. p. 697.

† Ibid. p. 516.

‡ Diod. p. 79 to 84.

“κατὰ

“ καταπληθύνει^Θ ὑπὸ πτημάτων πολυτελῶν καὶ βίᾳ ΤΡΑΓΩΙ-
 “ ΔΟΤΜΕΝΟΥ, since he is smitten so much with wealth, and
 “ a sumptuous and ponipous life *” This, as I observed al-
 ready, is the very same figure of speech with that in Zaleucus,
 and is borrowed from the costly and gaudy ornaments of the
 Stage. Now the Laws of the Thurians were made at Olymp.
 LXXXIV; which was the time when that colony was planted;
 but I hardly think that this metaphor of τραγωδία for magnifi-
 cence and pomp was so early in use as at Olymp. LXXXIV. At
 that time Æschylus was newly dead, Sophocles was in his
 prime at LIV years of age, and Euripides had just entered upon
 the province of Tragedy. Now the last of these Poets was so
 far from giving occasion to this metaphor, by the rich orna-
 ments of his Scenes and Actors, that he was noted for the quite
 contrary way, as introducing his Heroes in mere rags. So Æs-
 chylus accuses him in Aristophanes’s Ranæ † : —

[359]†

ὦ πτωχοποιὲ καὶ βακισυρρίπιδι.

And the Comedian himself, in another of his Plays, most pleas-
 antly rallies him upon the same account ‡; and reckons up
 five of his shabby Heroes that gave names to as many of his
 Tragedies; Ceneus, Phoenix, Philoctetes, Bellerophontes, Te-
 lephus. It is true, it appears from this very ridiculing of Euri-
 pides that the other Tragedians were not guilty of the same fault
 of bringing beggars upon the stage; but, however, even the
 persons that they introduced were not clad so very gorgeously
 as to make Tragedy become a metaphor for *sumptuousness*;
 for money was at that time a scarce commodity in Greece,
 especially at Athens §, and the people were frugal; so that they
 had not much to lay out upon ornaments for the stage; nor
 much inclination, had they had it. Nay, we are sure, that for
 a hundred years after the beginning of the Thurian government,
 the expence and furniture of Tragedy was very moderate; for
 Demosthenes, in his action against Midias ||, which was made
 Olymp. CVII. 4, has informed us that the charge of a Tragic
 Chorus was MUCH LESS than that of the Chorus of Musicians,
 which usually performed too at the same Festivals of Bacchus.
 τραγωδοῖς, says he, κερχορήγηκε ποτε ἔτ^Θ ἐγὼ δὲ Αὐληταῖς ἀνδράσι.
 Καὶ ὅτι τῆτο τὸ ἀνάλωμα ἐκείνης τῆς δαπάνης πολλῶν πλείον ἐστιν,
 ἑδεῖς ἀγνοεῖ δῆπρ· i. e. “ Midias was once the Furnisher of Tra-

* Stob. Serm. 42.

† Arist. Ran. p. 164.

‡ Id. Acharn. p. 279, 280.

§ Cic. Tuscul. v, 32.

|| Dionys. Halic. de Demosth.

“ gic

- [360] "gic Chorus; but I, of a Chorus of Musicians; and there is nobody but knows that the expence of this is MUCH GREATER than the charge of that*." And yet the cost even of a Music Chorus was no very great matter, as we gather from this, that Demosthenes alone bore it all, and voluntarily too. It is true, he magnifies it as much as he can; and questions whether he should call it *generosity* or *madness* in himself, to undertake an expense above his estate and condition†; but we ought to receive this as a cast of his rhetoric; for, to be sure, he would never undo himself by taking an office which nobody forced upon him. But another Orator, Lysias, a little ancierter than he, has given us a punctual account of the several expences of the Stage. "When Theopompus," says he, "was Archon (Olymp. xcii. 2.) I was furnisher to a Tragic Chorus; and I laid out xxx Minæ. Afterwards I got the victory with the Chorus of men, and it cost me xx Minæ. When Glaucippus was Archon (Ol. xcii. 3.) I laid out vii Minæ upon the Pyrrichists. Again I won the victory with the Chorus of men; and with that and the charge of the Tripus, I expended l Minæ. And when Diocles was Archon (Olymp. xcii. 4.) I laid out upon the Cyclian Chorus iii Minæ. Afterwards, when Alexias was Archon (Olymp. xciii. 4.) I furnished a Chorus of Boys, and it cost me above xv Minæ. And when Euclides was Archon (Olymp. xciv. 2.) I was at the charge of xv Minæ upon the Comedians, and of v i upon the young Pyrrichists‡." Now an Attic Mina being equivalent to three pounds of English Money, it is plain, from this passage of Lysias, that the whole charge of a Tragic Chorus did but then amount to xc pounds Sterling. By the way, I shall correct a fault in the Orator Isæus§: Οὗτ' ἄν γὰρ τῇ μὲν φυλῇ εἰς Διονύσια χορηγήσας, τέταρτ' ἐγένετο, τραγῳδοῖς δὲ καὶ πυρρίχισταῖς ὕστατος. — Correct it τέταρτ' ἐγένετο τραγῳδοῖς καὶ πυρρίχισταῖς ὕστατ' ||. "This man," says he, "being to furnish out Choruses at the Festivals of Bacchus, did it so meanly, that in the Tragic Chorus he came but the fourth; and in the Pyrrichists he was last of all." And now I refer it to the Reader, whether considering this true account of the small charge of a Tragic Chorus even in Lysias and Demosthenes's time, he can think it probable that at the Lxxxivth Olympiad the
- [361] "gic Chorus; but I, of a Chorus of Musicians; and there is nobody but knows that the expence of this is MUCH GREATER than the charge of that*." And yet the cost even of a Music Chorus was no very great matter, as we gather from this, that Demosthenes alone bore it all, and voluntarily too. It is true, he magnifies it as much as he can; and questions whether he should call it *generosity* or *madness* in himself, to undertake an expense above his estate and condition†; but we ought to receive this as a cast of his rhetoric; for, to be sure, he would never undo himself by taking an office which nobody forced upon him. But another Orator, Lysias, a little ancierter than he, has given us a punctual account of the several expences of the Stage. "When Theopompus," says he, "was Archon (Olymp. xcii. 2.) I was furnisher to a Tragic Chorus; and I laid out xxx Minæ. Afterwards I got the victory with the Chorus of men, and it cost me xx Minæ. When Glaucippus was Archon (Ol. xcii. 3.) I laid out vii Minæ upon the Pyrrichists. Again I won the victory with the Chorus of men; and with that and the charge of the Tripus, I expended l Minæ. And when Diocles was Archon (Olymp. xcii. 4.) I laid out upon the Cyclian Chorus iii Minæ. Afterwards, when Alexias was Archon (Olymp. xciii. 4.) I furnished a Chorus of Boys, and it cost me above xv Minæ. And when Euclides was Archon (Olymp. xciv. 2.) I was at the charge of xv Minæ upon the Comedians, and of v i upon the young Pyrrichists‡." Now an Attic Mina being equivalent to three pounds of English Money, it is plain, from this passage of Lysias, that the whole charge of a Tragic Chorus did but then amount to xc pounds Sterling. By the way, I shall correct a fault in the Orator Isæus§: Οὗτ' ἄν γὰρ τῇ μὲν φυλῇ εἰς Διονύσια χορηγήσας, τέταρτ' ἐγένετο, τραγῳδοῖς δὲ καὶ πυρρίχισταῖς ὕστατος. — Correct it τέταρτ' ἐγένετο τραγῳδοῖς καὶ πυρρίχισταῖς ὕστατ' ||. "This man," says he, "being to furnish out Choruses at the Festivals of Bacchus, did it so meanly, that in the Tragic Chorus he came but the fourth; and in the Pyrrichists he was last of all." And now I refer it to the Reader, whether considering this true account of the small charge of a Tragic Chorus even in Lysias and Demosthenes's time, he can think it probable that at the Lxxxivth Olympiad the

* Demosth. c. Midiam, p. 362.

† Ibid. p. 336.

‡ Lysias, in Ἀπολ. Δωροδοκίας.

§ P. 54.

[Addend.
p. 545.]

|| One may correct it also Πυρρίχαις, which comes to the same thing.

Tragic

Tragic ornaments were so famous for their richness, as to give rise to the metaphor of *Τραγῳδία* for sumptuousness, especially in Italy, where perhaps at that time no Tragedy had ever been acted. I must own, it seems to me a very unlikely thing that this metaphor should so quickly obtain, even in common conversation, much less be admitted into a body of Laws, where the language ought to be plain and proper,—and where any metaphor at all makes but a very bad figure, especially a new one, as this must needs be then, which perhaps could not be understood, at first hearing, by one half of the citizens. It is true, when Tragedy was propagated from Athens into the courts of Princes, the splendor of the Tragic Chorus was exceedingly magnificent; as at Alexandria and Rome, &c. which gave occasion to that complaint of Horace's, that the show of Plays was so very gaudy, that few minded the words of them * :—

“ Tanto cum strepitu ludi spectantur, & artes
 “ Diviitiæque peregrinæ: quibus oblitus Actor
 “ Cum stetit in scena, concurrat dextera lævæ.
 “ Dixit adhuc aliquid? nil sane. quid placet ergo?
 “ Læna Tarentino violas imitata veneno.”

And in another place, he says † the Tragic Actor was

“ Regali conspectus in auro nuper & ostro.”

[362]

It is no wonder, therefore, that in those ages *Τραγῳδία* might be used metaphorically, to signify riches and splendor; and so Philo, and Lucian, and some others, use it; but I do not find any example of it within a whole century of the date of Charondas's Laws.

II. 1. But this objection will be much more considerable if Charondas really lived before the original of the Thurian government, and even before Æschylus himself, the first inventor of Tragic ornaments; for it will then be of equal force against Charondas's Laws as against those of Zaleucus. Theodoret tells us ‡ “that Charondas is said to have been the first Law-maker of Italy and Sicily.” And if this be true, he must be senior to Zaleucus himself, and before the very name of Tragedy, much more before the use of this metaphor taken from it; or, if we allow of their reckoning §, that make Charondas

* Hor. Ep. ii, 1.

† Id. in Arte Poët.

‡ Theodoret. c. Græc. Serm. 9.

§ In Aristot. Pol. ii, 12.

the

[363]

the Scholar of Zaleucus, it is more than enough to our present purpose; for they supposed his Master Zaleucus to have been contemporary with Lycurgus the Spartan; by which account they must place Charondas ccc years before Thespis. Nay, even according to Eusebius, Zaleucus's Laws bear date above cc years before the founding of Thurii, and above c before the original of Tragedy. But we have a better authority than these; I mean Heraclides, in his Book of Governments; who informs us * "That the Rhegians of Italy were governed by an aristocracy; for a thousand men, chosen out according to their estates, managed every thing; and their Laws were those of Charondas the Catanian; but Anaxilas the Messanian made himself Tyrant there." Which account is confirmed in the main by Aristotle, when he says "The oligarchy of Rhegium was changed into a tyranny by Anaxilas†." Here, I conceive, Heraclides has very plainly asserted that Charondas's Laws were made before the time of Anaxilas; but we are sure this Anaxilas died at Olymp. LXXVI, 1‡, after he had reigned at Rhegium and Messana XVIII years at the least, which commence from Olymp. LXXI, 8. Now the first victory that Æschylus won at the Stage, was at Ol. LXXIII, 3§; and we may fairly suppose, because he never got the prize till then, that he had not invented Scenes and Machines, and the other ornaments before. If Charondas's Laws, therefore, were made but the very year that Anaxilas usurped the government, yet they are older by VIII years than the original of Tragical Scenes. But, without question, Charondas's form of government had been a good while in Rhegium before Anaxilas subverted it; for the city had been built then cc years; and the very account in Heraclides clearly implies that the aristocracy was of some continuance.

II. 2. And, if this be allowed, we may safely infer that Charondas was no THURIAN, as some of the later Authors call him; Valerius Maximus|| and Themistius¶, and particularly Diodorus; where, speaking of the founding of the city Thurii, he says, "The Thuriens chose Charondas, τῶν

* Heraclid. de Polit. Νόμος ἐκτῶν τοῖς Χαρόνδῳ τῷ Καταναίῳ.

† Arist. Pol. v, 12.

‡ See here, sect. iv.

§ Marm. Arund.

|| Val. Max. vi, 5.

¶ Themist. Orat. xiv. Καὶ τῷ Θουρίῳ Χαρόνδῳ,

" ἀρίστον

“ἀριστον τῶν πολιτῶν, the best and wisest of the Citizens*,” to draw up a body of laws for them; for since he made Laws a considerable time before Anaxilas's tyranny, Olymp. LXXI, he could hardly be alive still at Thurii, Ol. LXXXV, which was 1 years after; and, indeed, there is not one of the old Writers, that I know of, who either says he was a Thurian. or that he made Laws for the Thuriens. Plato tells us “That Italy and Sicily profited by the Laws of Charondas†;” but the cities he does not name. We must learn those of his Scholar Aristotle, who expresses himself more particularly, “That Charondas the Catanian gave Laws to his own city, and the other Chalcidic cities in Italy and Sicily. Now the Chalcidic towns in Sicily were‡ Zancle, Naxos, Leontini, Catana, Eubœa, Mylæ, Himera, Callipolis; in Italy there was Rhegium, and if any other, I know not; but that neither Thurii, nor Sybaris before it, was a Chalcidic colony, is most certain. Heraclides therefore agrees with his Master Aristotle, where he tells us, as we have cited before, “That Charondas was a Catanian, and “Law-giver to the Rhegians.” Now, what could be the reason of this difference between all the old and some of the later Writers, but that, in the interval of time between them, which was about ccc years, these pretended Laws of Charondas came abroad as directed to the Thuriens, and calling him a Thurian? But, we see, the true Laws of Charondas, which Aristotle and Heraclides had, were made for the Chalcidic towns, not for Thurii. How could these be the same then? — unless perhaps some may suppose that the Thuriens agreed to take the Laws of Charondas, which were ready made to their hands, as those of Mazaca in Cilicia did§; so that Charondas's Laws might be given at Catana and Rhegium a good while before Olympiad LXXI; and yet given too at Thurii, at Olymp. LXXXIV, 1. This supposition indeed may serve to shew how Charondas's Laws might possibly be Thurian; but it cannot excuse Diodorus and the rest, who call Charondas himself a Thurian, since by this account he was dead before Thurii was ever heard of. But, in the next place, what if I prove that neither himself nor his Laws were received by the Thuriens? Then, I humbly conceive, that copy of them which Diodorus used, will be allowed to have been a cheat||.

[364]

[365]

III. If

* Diod. p. 79.

† Plato Polit. x. Ἰταλία καὶ Σικελία

‡ See Scymnus Chius, and others.

§ Strabo, p. 529.

|| After this was committed to the press, I recollected a passage of [Addend. Laertius, which at that time was quite out of my mind. This Author P. 545. tells

III. If we will take Athenæus's word, "ZALEUCUS was Law-giver to the Thurians †;" though, a little before, he had quoted a Law of his to the Locrians ‡; which is a sign that he did not out of ignorance mistake the one city for the other. By the Thurians here, he seems to understand the Sybarites, who were afterwards called Thurians; and we may suppose that at their settlement, Olymp. LXXXIV, they continued their old constitution of government, made at first by Zaleucus; for that the ancient Sybarites once used his Laws, appears from Scymnus Chius; who assigns this for one of the causes of their ruin that they did not adhere to them §.

Λέγεται γὰρ αὐτὸς μέτε τοῖς νόμοις ἔτι
τοῖς τῷ Ζαλευκῷ τακόμεθα συντελεῖν.

And that the Thurians at their first plantation received them again, though they refined and multiplied them even to excess, we may gather from Ephorus ||, who, speaking of Zaleucus's Laws, which he made for the Locrians, and commended them for their simplicity,—“But the Thurians,” says he, “afterwards aiming at exactness in every thing, grew more famous by it, but were worse governed;” for the fairest exposition of this passage seems to be this, that the Thurians had once the Laws of Zaleucus, which afterwards they refined upon: and, if we consider those passages of Athenæus and Scymnus, it may pass too for the truest.

[365] IV. But, however, whether Zaleucus's Laws were received or not by the Thurians, those of Charondas we may justly believe were not, by the accounts we have of both His and Theirs. There is a large fragment ¶ of Theophrastus's (I suppose, out of his Tracts about Laws) which gives us some notices about the Thurian Laws concerning buying and selling.

tells us, from Heraclides Ponticus, “That Protagoras the Sophist was Law-giver to the Thurians.” *Ἡρακλείδης, says he, ὁ Ποντικός, Θουρίους νόμους γράψαι φησὶ Πρωταγόραν τὸν Ἀθηναῖον* *. The same Author tells us “that Protagoras flourished, κατὰ τὴν τετάρτην καὶ ὀγδοηκοστὴν Ὀλυμπιάδα, at Ol. LXXXIV;” the very time that the Athenian colony went to Thuri. It is very probable he was then at Athens, for he was twice there; his second coming was between Olymp. LXXXIX, 1. and LXXXIX, 3; as Athenæus proves, p. 219. This, as I take it, is a great confirmation of what I have said about the spurious Charondas.

† Athen p. 508.

§ Scymnus Chius, v. 346.

¶ Stob. Serm. 48.

‡ Id. p. 429.

|| Strabo, p. 260.

“ The

"The buyer was to give earnest to the seller presently, and a piece of money to three of the next neighbours, that they might remember and bear witness of the bargain *; and then the same day he was to pay the whole price †; and, if he failed to pay it, he lost his earnest ‡; and if the seller did not stand to his bargain, he lost as much money as the thing was sold for §:" which, says Theophrastus, "was a very unequal penalty, that the buyer should forfeit the earnest only, and the seller the whole price, the one being so much more than the other."

But "Charondas and Plato," says he, "went another way to work; for they enact, — That all buying and selling shall be with ready payment; and, if any man trust, it shall be at his own peril, the Law shall give him no remedy if he is cheated; for by trusting he brought the cheat upon himself. ||" Now that Theophrastus reports this truly of Plato, it appears from Plato himself, in the xi Book of his Laws; where this very order about buying and selling is still extant. We may fairly suppose, therefore, that Theophrastus is as exact in what he says of Charondas; — and I conceive it is as plain here that Charondas's Laws were different from the Thurians, as that ready payment is different from giving earnest and being trusted. The passage of Theophrastus is both faulty in the original, and mistaken by the interpreter; but the Reader may easily see how it ought to be corrected and translated by the places I have cited in the Notes.

[367]

V. We have very good evidence that the form of government which Charondas's Laws were adapted to, was an Aristocracy, or Oligarchy. "Many of those Law-givers," says Aristotle, "that design to establish Aristocracies, mistake themselves ¶." Then he reckons up five artifices, by which they impose upon the people; and to one of them he adds *ὥσπερ ἐν τοῖς Χαρόνδα νόμοις*, "as it is in the Laws of Charondas;" and he concludes "the whole with this: — *Ταῦτα μὲν ὀλιγαρχικὰ σοφίσματα τῆς νομοθεσίας*." "These are oligarchical artifices in making of "Laws." This passage is a most plain intimation of what I

* Οἱ δὲ Θεραιοὶ, &c.

† Ἐν τοῖς Θερίῳ τὸν μὲν ἀρράβωντα παραχρῆμα, τὴν δὲ τιμὴν αὐθιμέρον.

‡ Στίρσις τῷ ἀρράβωντι ἔστω γὰρ οἱ Θεραιοί.

§ Ἐκλίσς ὅση ἀν ἀποδῶται καὶ γὰρ τὸτο ἐν τοῖς Θερίῳ ἡ ἀνιστοζήμια.

|| Χαρόνδας καὶ Πλάτων παραχρῆμα κελύουσι δίδουσι καὶ λαμβάνουσιν ἰάν δι τὴν πίσυνον, μὴ εἶναι δίκην αὐτὸν γὰρ αἴτιον εἶναι τῆς ἀδικίας,

¶ Aristot. Pol. iv, 12, 13.

asserted above; but Heraclides says it downright, in his account of the Rhegians, "who formed themselves," says he, "into an Aristocracy, being governed by χίλιοι, a thousand of the wealthiest citizens, and using the Laws of Charondas*." Add the other places of Aristotle, where he says "The Rhegian government was changed from an Oligarchy to a Tyranny by Anaxilas †;" nay, "and that the Thurian government was (ὀλιγαρχικώτερον) a sort of oligarchy ‡;" and then, I suppose, this point will be sufficiently proved. But Diodorus, from the copy of Charondas which he used, represents the constitution to be a Democracy, as when he says "A man that [368] "proposed a new Law must have a rope round his neck till (ὁ ΔΗΜΟΣ) the PEOPLE determined for or against it §;" and again, "That a woman without any fortune (κατέφυγεν εἰς τὸν ΔΗΜΟΝ) appealed to the PEOPLE ||; and the PEOPLE (τῷ δὲ ΔΗΜΟΨΥΧῳ) voted to make a new Law for her ¶;" and "lastly, that a blind man advised (τοῖς ΠΛΗΘΕΣΙ) the MULTITUDE to alter a Law **. Add to these his express declaration that the Thuriens formed (πολίτευμα ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΚΟΝ) a democratical government ††;" and then I suppose, it will appear very probable that Diodorus's copy of Charondas's Laws was not the same with that of Aristotle and Heraclides.

VI. Charondas, says Aristotle, "had (ἑδὲν ἰδίον) nothing peculiar in his Laws, except one ‡‡." On the contrary, Diodorus tells us, from his copy §§, "That he had (πολλὰ ἴδια) many things "peculiar," and reckons half a score of them; and yet that single thing observed by Aristotle does not appear among them. Does not this look as if the Laws they speak of were quite different? This is one shrewd suspicion that Diodorus's copy was not genuine. But let us consider the Philosopher's words: — Χαράνδρῳ ἰδίον μὲν ἑδὲν ἔστιν, πλὴν αἱ δίκαι τῶν ΨΕΥΔΟΜΑΡΤΥΡΩΝ· πρῶτον γὰρ ἐποίησε τὴν ΕΠΙΣΚΕΨΙΝ. So the passage is read in the common editions; and the interpreter translates it "Primus his de rebus accuratè consideravit;" which is quite beside the sense of the Author. There are two faults in the Greek that must first be corrected, before we can come at the right meaning. First, for ψευδομαρτύρων, we must read ψευδομαρτυρίων because δίκη is joined with the name of the

* Heraclid. de Polit.

† Aristot. Pol. v, 12.

‡ Ibid. v, 7.

§ Diod. p. 82.

|| P. 83.

¶ P. 84.

** P. 83.

†† P. 78.

‡‡ Aristot. Pol. ii, 12.

§§ Diod. p. 79.

things,

things, and not of the persons; as *δίκη ἀσεβείας, ἀγαμίας, ὀφθαλμίας*, &c.—not *δίκη ἀσεβῶν, ἀγαμῶν, ὀφθαλμῶν*. “ Demosthenes contra [369] “ *Euergum*; *Ταῖς δίκαις τῶν ψευδομαρτυριῶν**. *Isæus*, *Τὴν τῶν ψευδομαρτυριῶν δίκην ἡγωνίζετο*† and again, *Ἡ τῶν ψευδομαρτυριῶν δίκη εἰσῆει*‡. It is a fault, therefore, in the same Orator, where we read *Τὴν τῶν ψευδομαρτύρων δίκην εἴλομεν*§ and in Pollux, *Κατὰ τῶν ψευδῆ μαρτυρέντων δίκη, ὃ καὶ ἐπισκῆψασθαι καταμαρτύριον ἔλέγετο*||. we must correct it *ἐπισκῆψασθαι ψευδομαρτυριῶν*, as the excellent MS. of the late learned Isaac Vossius has it. The other fault in Aristotle is *Ἐπίσκεψις*, the true emendation of which is *Ἐπίσκηψις*, which signifies an action at law against false witnesses; for if a man was cast in a trial by false testimony, he might enter his plea to have another trial, to prove the witnesses perjured. Charondas, therefore, according to Aristotle, first ordained this *Ἐπίσκηψις* and, if we could know the first date of it, we might then arrive at the true age of Charondas. The Athenian Orators often mention this *Ἐπίσκηψις* as a Law in force at Athens; so Demosthenes, Isæus, Lysias¶, and out of them the Lexicographers, Pollux, Harpocration, Suidas, Etymolog. But whether it was one of Solon's Laws, or at what time made after his death, I am not able to tell. But there is a probability that it was made before the founding of Thurii, rather than after; for Lysias, who in his youth was one of that colony that founded Thurii, speaks, we see, of this *Ἐπίσκηψις*, and without any hint that it was a new Law; and he returned from Thurii to Athens at Olymp. xci, 1. Take the middle, therefore, between the institution of Solon's Laws, Ol. xlv, 3, and the pleadings of Lysias, and it will fall upon Olymp. lxi, 2, which is lxi years before the foundation of Thurii. So much odds are there that the *Ἐπίσκηψις* was enacted at Athens before Thurii was founded, and consequently [370] that Charondas, the first Author of the *Ἐπίσκηψις*, was more ancient than that Colony; and, by consequence, that the copy of his Laws which Diodorus used was supposititious.

VII. The case of Charondas in Stobæus is the very reverse of Zaleucus's; for he has made Zaleucus write his Laws in the common dialect; who, as a Locrian, ought to have used the Doric; and he has introduced Charondas in the Doric dialect, who, either as a Catanian or a Thurian, would more probably

* P. 638.

† P. 38.

‡ P. 52.

§ P. 38.

|| Pollux, viii, 6.

¶ Lysias c. Panceleonem.

have used another ; for Catana and the other cities that Aristotle says he gave Laws to were Chalcidic, that is, Ionic colonies; and the Thuriens, whose Law-giver he was, according to Diodorus, were a mixture indeed of several nations, but principally Attic. Diodorus says that Lampon and Xenocritus, both of Athens, were *Κριταί*, the *founders* of Thuri^{*}; and that, when the Sybarites sent to Sparta and Athens to desire a colony, the Spartans refused them ; but the Athenians undertook it, giving leave to any of the Peloponnesians to share with them if they pleased. Plutarch also ascribes the colony to the Athenians †, and names one Hiero an Athenian for their founder ‡. Dionysius Halicarn. attributes it “ to the Athenians, “ and the rest of Greece §;” making the Athenians to be the principal. It is true, indeed, Scymnus Chius makes Thuri a colony of the Achæans || ; but this can hardly be true, unless we understand it of Sybaris, which was afterwards called Thuri; [371] for that indeed was an Achæan colony. Diodorus adds, that at Olymp. 1xxxvi, 3, ten years after the first settlement, the Thuriens debated whose colony they were, and who should be called their founder ¶. The Athenians claimed it, because the *greatest* number of inhabitants came from Athens ** ; but those of Peloponnesus opposed it, because *many* came from thence too. At last they agreed to send to Delphi, that the oracle might determine the point ; and they were answered, that Apollo himself was to be counted their founder; and so the matter ended, no nation pretending to that honour. But, however, that the Athenians had the greatest party, and strongest interest there, appears doubly, both because, in the Athenian invasion of Sicily, the Thuriens adhered to the Athenians against the Sicilians and Spartans †† ; and because the Thurian money had a Pallas’s head with a helmet, exactly like the Attic ‡‡. I am not ignorant that, after the defeat of the Athenians in Sicily, Ol. xci, 4, the Thuriens too, among the rest of their confederates, deserted them ; and ccc Athenians were banished from the colony §§. But the Laws of Charondas, as Diodorus relates, were made upon the first establishment there, above xxx years before that overthrow ; and I leave it to the Reader’s judgment, if at that

* Diod. p. 77, 78.

† Plut. v. Lysiae & v. Periclis.

‡ Idem, v. Nicias.

§ Dionys. v. Lysiae.

|| Scymnus, ver, 325,

¶ Diod. p. 93,

** Πλείεσθς οἰκήτας.

†† Thucyd. Diodor.

‡‡ Goltzius.

§§ Dionys. & Plutarch. v. Lysiae.

time the great number and power of the Athenians at Thurii do not make it more probable that their Laws, if then made, would have been in the Attic dialect rather than the Doric.

VIII. There is a very odd passage in Stephanus Byzantius :
 'Απὸ τῆς Κατάνης Χαρόνδας, ὁ δῖος μὲν τῆς ἐν Ἀθήνῃσι νομοθετῶν,
 " Of Catana was Charondas, that celebrated Law-giver at
 " Athens*," and another in Suidas, more odd than that : Νομοθέται
 παρ' Ἀθηναίοις πρῶτον ἐγένετο Δράκων, καὶ μετὰ τῶτον Σόλων, καὶ
 μετὰ τῶτον Θαλῆς, καὶ μετὰ τῶτον Αἰσχύλος. " The Law-givers
 " to the Athenians were first Draco, then Solon, then Thales, [372]
 " and then Æschylus." What shall we say to these passages ?
 We must own there were many (Νομοθέται) Makers of Laws at
 Athens after Solon's time ; but yet I can hardly believe that
 Charondas, and Thales, and Æschylus, are to be reckoned of
 that number. As for Suidas, I am persuaded, that for Αἰσχύλος,
 the true reading is Ζάλευκος so that, putting a full stop after
 Νομοθέται, as it is in the paragraph just before, the meaning of
 Suidas will be thus : — " LAWGIVERS. The first was Draco
 " at Athens, after him Solon, after him Thales and Zaleucus :"
 where he does not assert that Thales and Zaleucus were
 Athenian Law-givers, but only that their Laws were more
 recent than Draco's and Solon's. We have seen already from
 Aristotle, how some maintained that Zaleucus was Thales's
 Scholar ; meaning Thales the Cretan, who was almost 300 years
 before Solon's time ; but Suidas, or his Author, confounding
 Thales the Cretan with the Philosopher (Thales the Milesian)
 has by consequence put him after Solon. This perhaps may
 be no unlikely account of the passage of Suidas ; but the other
 of Stephanus is very hard to make out ; for even Plato and
 Aristotle forbid us to allow of the vulgar reading, ἐν Ἀθήνῃσι
 for, speaking of this Charondas, they make him Law-giver in
 some towns of Sicily and Italy ; but say not one word of his
 Laws at Athens. Add to this, that ἐν Ἀθήνῃσι, which all the
 Editions and MS. seem to agree in, is not Greek ; for they ever
 say Ἀθήνῃσι, without the preposition, as they will find who
 please to examine it. These things seem to warrant a conjecture
 that Hermolaus, the Epitomizer of Stephanus, or some of his
 Copiers, mistook, and put ἐν Ἀθήνῃσι for ἐν Σικελίᾳ. And yet,
 on the other side, that Charondas's Laws were famous at least,
 if not in force at Athens, we have a good authority ; — Hermip-
 pus, in his Treatise " of Law-givers ;" who informs us " That [373]

* Steph. v. Κατ.

"Charondas's Laws used to be sung at Athens over a glass of wine;" *Ἡδόντο Ἀθηναῖοι οἱ Χαρώνδα νόμοι παρ' οἶνον* *: for the very title of the Book shews that *NOMOI* here do not signify "Songs and Tunes," as *Ὀλύμπιο νόμοι*, *Μαρσύης νόμοι*, but really "Laws." Now Aristotle puts a problem, "Why are tunes called *Νόμοι* †?" and he answers, "Is it because, before the use of Letters, men *SUNG* their Laws that they might not forget them, as the custom continues yet among the *Agathyrsi*?"—which passage, I think, will go a great way towards putting an end to our debate about Charondas; for, if Laws were *sung* before the knowledge of Letters, as Aristotle says; and if Charondas's Laws were sung at Athens, as Hermippus says, then the consequence seems fair and natural that they were first sung at Athens, before the date of Solon's or Draco's Laws, which were *written* upon wooden tables, and fixed up for public view. And by this account Charondas's Laws must be sung cc years before the very naming of *Thurii*. Besides this, we may justly infer that his Laws were written in some sort of verse, or tuneable measure; for otherwise how they should be sung over wine, I do not understand. And to confirm us in this suspicion, there is a passage in Strabo, of which his learned Commentator has said nothing; but from this view it will be plain and easy:— "The *Mazacenes* of *Cappadocia*," says he, "use the Laws of Charondas (*αἰρέμενοι καὶ Νομαδόν*) and appoint some person to be their *LAW-SINGER*; who is among them the declarer of the Laws, as the *Lawyers* are among the *Romans* ‡." Now how came it to pass that Charondas's Laws required a *Law-singer*, *NOMΩΔΟΣ*: a word and office never heard of but in this passage of Strabo, unless there were something peculiar in them? that whereas other Laws were in *Prose*, they were in *Verse*; and to be *sung* by the people! To give an instance how they might be sung at Athens,— One of the Laws of Charondas, as Diodorus says, was *Περὶ τῆς Κακομιλίας* "About avoiding ill Company §." Now the *Athenians* had a *Scolion*, or *Catch*, which they used to sing (*παρ' οἶνον*) over a glass of wine ||:—

[374]

Ἀδμήτη λόγον, ὃ ταῖρε, μαθὼν τὰς ἀγαθὰς φίλει
 τῶν δειλῶν δ' ἀπέχου, γινέσθι δειλῶν ὀλίγη χάρις.

* Athen. p. 619. *Ἐρμινπιπ* ἐν ἔκτῳ περὶ Νομοθετῶν.

† Arist. Prob. XIX, 28.

‡ Strabo, p. 539.

§ Diod. p. 79.

|| Arist. & Schol. p. 356. Athen. p. 695.

The measure of it is neglected in the vulgar Athenæus ; but it is like that in Alcæus and Horace,

" Nullam, Vare, sacra vite prius severis arborem."

Μηδὲν ἄλλο φυτεύσης πρότερον δένδρεον ἀμπέλων.

Now, if instead of Ἀδμήτης λόγον, one should say thus:—

Χαρώνδα νόμον, ὃ ῥ' αἵρε, μαθὼν τὰς ἀγαθὰς φίλῃ,

he would have the very Law that Diodorus speaks of " about " evil Conversation." But we have one of his Laws really extant in verse, though not of Charondas's own making ; but of one of the Comic Poets * :—

Τὸν νομοθέτην φασὶ Χαρώνδαν εἶναι
 Νομοθεσίᾳ τὰτ' ἄλλα καὶ ταυτὶ λέγειν
 Ὅ παῖσιν αὐτὴ μητρὶαν ἐπεισάγων,
 Μήτ' εὐδοκίμεισθω, μήτε μετιχίτω λόγῳ
 Παρὰ τοῖς πολίταις ὥς ἐπείσασκον κακὸν
 Κατὰ τῶν ἑαυτὴ πραγμάτων πιπορισμένος.
 Εἴτ' ἐπίτυχς γάρ, φησι, γήμας τὸ πρότερον,
 Εὐήμερων κατάπαυσον εἴτ' ἔκ ἐπίτυχς,
 Μανικὸν τὸ πῆραν δευτέρας λαβεῖν πάλιν.

[375]

So these Iambics are to be read in Diodorus. In the common editions, the two first verses are taken for Prose, and supposed to be Diodorus's words, not the Poet's. But it is now evident that they belong to the rest ; and I have only changed ταῦτα into ταυτὶ, for the sake of the measure. Even the great Grotius † was in the common mistake, and believed them to be prose ; and upon that account he altered the viiith verse thus :—

Εἴτ' ἐπίτυχς γὰρ τὸ πρότερον γήμας φίλῃ

because, I suppose, he could not apprehend what φησί belonged to ; but now it is plain that it refers to Charondas. In the last verse, both the Editors of Diodorus and Grotius too, admit of the vulgar reading, πείρας δευτέρας, " the second " experiment : " but, at that rate, it is not true Greek ; for λαβεῖν here will not bear a genitive case. I have corrected it, therefore, πῆραν δευτέρας, " the experiment of a second wife." Well, if it appear probable from these several particulars that Charondas's Laws were drawn up in some kind of verse, or measure, fit to be sung, we need no other proof to detect the imposture of Stobæus's Writer ; for all the Fragments that

* Diod. p. 80.

† Grotii Excerpta ex Trag. & Com. p. 919.

are produced there are flat and downright prose, without the least footsteps of poetical measure. For example, this very Law which we have now cited from the Comic Poet is thus expressed in Stobæus:—*Ὁ μητρὶαν ἐπιγαμῶν μὴ εὐδοξίτω· ἀλλ' ὀνειδίζεσθω, ὥσπερ αἰτιῶν ὦν οἰκείας διατάξεις.* “He that marries a second wife, to be stepmother to his children, let him be disgraced, as being the Author of his own disquiet.” This Law the Writer might meet with in the Poet cited above, or some other Author now lost; and therefore he inserted it into his collection, to make the cheat pass the more easily. But I appeal to those that are skilled in the ancient Poety, if there be any musical measure of any sort whatsoever in the words that he has given us. He seems to have heard too, that Charondas’s Laws were used to be sung, as we have shewn from Hermippus and Strabo: he concludes therefore from this, *Προτάσσει δὲ ὁ νόμος, ἐπίσασθαι τὰ προύιμα τῶν πολιτῶν ἅπαντας, καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἑορταῖς μετὰ τῶν παιᾶνας λέγειν ὃ ἂν προτάσσει ὁ ἐργάτωρ, ἵνα ἐμφυσιῇται, ἐκάστῳ τὰ παραγγέλματα.* “The Law enjoins, that all the citizens shall learn these Proœmia; and at their feasts, some person appointed by the Master of the feast shall say them, after the Hymns are sung, that the Laws may become familiar to every body.” He is so far in the right indeed, that these Laws that he has put upon us are to be *said*, and not *sung*; for there is nothing of harmony in them; nor do they need a Law-singer, *Νομῳδός*, as the true laws of Charondas did; nor would the Athenians have *sung* these (*παρ’ οἶνον*) at their merri-ments; for the very Laws of Solon have as much of tune and verse in them. But the sagacious Reader may observe too a very odd and peculiar usage of the word *Ἐμφυσιῇται* which this Writer puts here to signify “being natural, as it were, and familiar.” And that we may not think it a fault of the Copier, there is the same word in the page before; *Ἐμφυσιῇται ἐκάστῳ τὸ κάλλιστον καὶ σπερματωδέστατον τῆς ἀρετῆς.* “That the best and the most seminal virtue may become natural to them;” though, in both places, even common Syntax requires that we should read it *ἐμφυσιῶται*. Now, in all the Authors that I can think of, it has quite another meaning:—“to be puffed up, and be proud;” from *φυσᾶω*, “to blow;” but this mock Charondas believed it came from *φύσις*, *nature*, which is a mere barbarism; for the first syllable of *φύσις* is short, and the first of *φυσίῳ* long. This, with some other words, both in Charondas and Zaleucus, and the matter too of each of them, makes me suspect the Author was

* Stob. Serm. xlii.

no native of Greece; but I do not pretend to determine that; neither do I assert any thing positively on either side of this whole debate about the two Law-givers; I rather desire to stand a Neuter, till the matter shall be decided by some abler hand; and, if I might have the nomination, it should be he whom the whole learned world will allow to be the best able, his Excellency Mr. EZEKIEL SPANHEMIUS.

I return now to our learned Examiner, and I find him still at his old work of cavilling and mistaking. He has spent two miserable pages in ridiculing me, as he thinks, for saying Empedocles wrote an Epic Poem:—a name which, He thinks, belongs to no Poems but such as the *Ilias* and *Aeneis*. What will he say then to Athenæus, who calls Archestratus's *Gastronomia* (a small poem about Fish and Cookery) an EPIC POEM? Ἐπικὸν δὲ, says he, τὸ ποίημα*. What to Quintilian, who, among (EPICOS) the Epics, reckons Aratus, Theocritus, Nicander†? Is not Empedocles as much an Epic as these are? What will he say to Laërtius, Plutarch, and others, who usually say Parmenides's Ἐπη, and Xenophanes's Ἐποποιίαν, and the Pythagorean's Χρυσᾷ Ἐπη? What to Suidas, who says Orpheus wrote Ὠδυτικὰ Ἐπικῶς? and Timotheus, about Quadrupeds, Birds, Fishes, &c. Ἐπικῶς? and Tribonianus, upon Ptolemee's Canon, Ἐπικῶς? Are not these Poems Philosophical as well as Empedocles's? But what will he say to Aristotle‡, Plutarch§, and Simplicius||, who expressly call Empedocles's Poems ΕΠΗ? for pray, what difference between Ἐπη or Ἐποποιία, and Ποίημα Ἐπικόν? Athenæus plainly shews us that they have all the same importance; for the same Poem of Archestratus, which in one place he calls Ἐπικὸν ποίημα, in another ¶ he calls Εποποιίαν, and in a third he calls the Author Ἐποποιός**. But let us see Mr. B.'s happy address in managing this cavil:—"If the Doctor," says he, "has met with an account of Empedocles's writing an Epic Poem, he knows more of his Works than Laërtius did, who was so absurd as to pass it over in silence." A noble paragraph indeed to come from such a master of sense and style! If Laërtius *did* not know of that Epic Poem, how was he *absurd* in not speak-

[378]

* Athen. p. 4.

† Quint. x, 1.

‡ Arist. Nicom. vii, 3.

§ Plut. de Aud. Poët.

|| Simplic. ad Phys. Arist. p. 7, & 258.

¶ P. 104.

** P. 335.

ing

ing of it? Mr. B. may please to explain this, who at least is answerable for the language of his Book: but his Assistant, perhaps, "that consulted Books for him," is to blame here for the matter; and the next time that Mr. B. sees him, he may justly call him to account for deceiving him about Laërtius; for that Author reckons up, among other Poems of Empedocles's (ΞΕΡΞΟΥ ΔΙΑΒΑΣΙΣ) "The Expedition of Xerxes*," which he afterwards calls ΠΕΡΣΙΚΑ. And I dare appeal to Mr. B. himself, if that was not an Epic Poem in his sense of the word.

[378] It is true, Laërtius adds, that Empedocles's sister is reported to have burnt that Poem: but that is nothing to the present point; for Mr. B. challenges me to produce any voucher for Empedocles *writing* an Epic Poem; and that I have now done. Nay, if Aristotle's Copies do not deceive us, that Epic Poem was extant in his time†, for he quotes a fragment of it:—

* ΑΛΦΙΤΟΥ ὕδατι κολλήσας —

But I own, that for Περσικοῖς, I would there read Φυσικοῖς, as others have done before me, because the very same fragment is quoted by him, in another place, out of Ἐμπεδοκλῆς ἐν τοῖς Φυσικοῖς‡ and the very sense of it, "A paste made of meal and water," shews it rather belongs to Physics than to the Expedition of Xerxes.

P. 45. "But can the Doctor be so wretchedly ignorant," says Mr. B. "as to think every large copy of Hexametres is an "Epic Poem?" On whose side "the wretched ignorance" lies, the present age and posterity will judge. But it is plain, Mr. B. supposes, that Empedocles's Physics were but "a large "copy of verses;" and yet Laërtius would have taught him that those Physics consisted of 5000 verses; which are above twice as many as are in all Virgil's Georgics. Nay, they were divided into several Books; and Simplicius cites the FIRST and SECOND of them§. Ἐμπεδοκλῆς ἐν πρώτῳ τῶν Φυσικῶν Ἐμπεδοκλῆς ἐν δευτέρῳ τῶν Φυσικῶν. Mr. B. seems to have as false a notion of Empedocles's (ΚΑΘΑΡΜΟΙ) Treatise of Expiations; for he compares it with Theocritus's Pharmaceutria, as if they resembled one another, both in bigness and in subject||. Now the one has but 166 verses in it, and the other, as

P. 46,
47.

* Laërt. Emped.

† Arist. Probl. xxi, 22. Ἐμπεδοκλῆς ἐν τοῖς Περσικοῖς.

‡ Meteor. IV, 4. § Simplic. Phys. Arist. p. 34.

|| P. 86.

Laërtius

Laërtius says, had 5000. Is not Mr. B. then very exact in this first way of comparison? As for the subject of them, the Pharmaceutria of Theocritus is nothing but the charms and philtres of a woman to make a man in love with her; and what is that to (Καθαρμοὶ) "the Expiations" of Empedocles? which were either the lustrations of cities and countries from plagues, earthquakes, prodigies, or of private persons from diseases, dreams, murders; or rather (if Mr. B. say true, "That [380] the subject of that Treatise was in great measure drawn from "the Pythagoreans") the Καθαρμοὶ must signify the purification of the mind in the Pythagorean way, which Hierocles, Jamblichus, and others speak so much of. Mr. B. goes on, "That "we have a large fragment of his directed to the people of "Agrigent, his townsmen; so that the subject was no higher "than an account of himself to his own countrymen; and "may not Doric then be proper for little Poems, where men "of ordinary rank are addressed to?" Here he supposes this fragment to be a different piece from the Καθαρμοὶ, being "a "little Poem," says he, to the Agrigentines; whereas Laërtius twice tells us, that the fragment is out of the Καθαρμοὶ, the beginning of which work was thus: —

ὦ φίλοι, ὃ μέγα ἄστυ κατὰ ξανθὴ Ἀκράγαντι
Ναίετ' —

so that a Book of 5000 verses is again dwindled into "a little "Poem." And then to infer from the first verses of it, "that "the subject of the whole was nothing but an account of him- "self to his countrymen," is just as if he should argue from the first verses of the Georgics, that the subject of them is nothing but Virgil's account of himself to Mæcenas.

To shew that Phalaris's Epistles might be written in Doric at first, but afterwards be *translated*, he instances in "the [381] "pieces of Perictyone, and Aristoxenus, and Zaleucus, three P. 53. "Pythagoreans, who in all probability wrote in Doric; and "yet in Stobæus's time, some part of the writings of the one "were in Ionic, and those of the others in the common dialect." Now, as for his King Zaleucus, I have endeavoured to shew above, that he was no Pythagorean, and that the writings ascribed to him are a cheat; and the second Writer, Aristoxenus, was at first indeed a Scholar to Xenophilus, a Pythagorean, and wrote the Lives of Pythagoras and his followers; but he was afterwards Aristotle's Scholar; neither did he reckon himself among the Pythagoreans, as appears from Laërtius and Diodorus: — "The last of the Pythagoreans," says Laërtius,

tius*, "were Xenophilus and five others, whom Aristoxenus "saw." And Diodorus places (τῶν Πυθαγορικῶν φιλοσόφων τὰς τελευταίας) "the last of the Pythagorean sect" at Olymp. ciii, 3, which was XLIV years before Aristotle's death, whom Aristoxenus expected to have succeeded; but Theophrastus was preferred before him. Why should Aristoxenus then write in Doric, who both lived at Athens, and was no Pythagorean? Mr. B.'s third Writer is Perictyone, "who, though a Pythagorean, wrote in Ionic." Mr. B. declares, more than once, that he despises the mean employment of Index-hunting; but his Assistant and He, as we have seen in several instances, are not always of the same opinion; for the hint of this Ionic Fragment of Perictyone was taken out of Stobæus's Index: but if he had read the Author, and not dipped into the Index only, he would have found in the very first Chapter two Fragments of Perictyone's Book (Περὶ Σοφίας) and both of them in the Doric. The Ionic Fragment is spurious therefore; for why should she write Philosophy in two dialects? Nay, to deal freely and openly, I believe all her Fragments are spurious, as most of those of Pythagoric Treatises are justly suspected to be; for they appeared but late in the world, and long after the times of their pretended Authors. Porphyry, in his MS. Commentary upon Ptolemee's Harmonics (which I am glad to hear the very excellent Dr. WALLIS is now publishing at Oxford) cites a passage of Archytas the Pythagorean (Οὐ μάλιστα, says he, καὶ γνήσια εἶναι λέγεται τὰ συγγράμματα) "whose Writings "in particular are supposed to be genuine." Few of the rest will be thought so in the judgment of knowing persons, and particularly this Perictyone will be exploded for a mere forgery; for who ever heard before of this Pythagorean lady? Jamblichus has given us a list of all the women of the Sect that he ever heard of, and there is no such among them. Stobæus is the only man that mentions her or her writings; and I am persuaded that the forger of them designed to have them pass in the name of Perictyone, who was Plato's mother; for they thought it a point of decorum, to make even the female kindred of philosophers copy after the men. So, in the counterfeit Socratic Epistles, we have Socrates's wife, Myrto, setting up an academy for the Ladies. And among the Pythagoric Writings we have a Book "about Human Nature† (Περὶ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου Δευκάνης) which the learned Canterus translates "Aresu

* Laërt. in Pyth.

† Diod. p. 386.

† Stob. Eclog. Phys. p. 105.

"Pythag."

"Pythag." He seems to take it for Aresas, one of the Successors of Pythagoras; but the true version is thus: — *Æsara* Pythagoræ F. Lucanæ, "By *Æsara*, Pythagoras's daughter, [383] "the Lucanian." And yet neither Jamblichus, nor Porphyry, nor Laërtius, when they give us an account of that Philosopher's daughters, take any notice of *Æsara*; but there is a late Author in Photius that mentions her, though the passage is so corrupted that the lady is lost in it: — "The sons of Pythagoras," says he, "were Mnesarchus and Telauges (*καὶ Σάρα καὶ Μυία αἱ θυγατέρες*) and *Sara* and *Myia* his daughters." Correct it *καὶ Αἰσάρα* the Syllable *Αἰ* was lost here, because the same in *KAI* preceded it; so that henceforward they may register this *Æsara* in the list of the Pythagorean women, and blot out *Sara*, whom nobody ever heard of.

I must now consider half a dozen of Mr. B.'s pages by the lump. A very learned person, in excuse for the Attic Dialect of Phalaris, had objected to me, "That Ocellus the Lucanian, P. 54, 55, 56, 67, 58, 59, 60. "though a Dorian by his country, had not written in Doric, "as appeared by his Book, yet extant, *De Natura Universi**." Now, when I was drawing up the former Edition of this Dissertation, I observed Stobæus quoted some passages of Ocellus in Doric, which are extant, word for word, in the present Book, the dialect only altered; whereby I knew the whole Treatise was written originally in the Doric dialect†. I can truly say I observed this myself, without knowing that any other had done it before me; and I was induced to think that nobody had done it, from this very objection about Ocellus Lucanus, which was made by a man of very great reading, and yet plainly implies that he had nowhere met with the observation. And I was confirmed farther in the belief of it from the Cambridge Edition of Ocellus, which was the only one I had then by me; for the first annotation printed there is a question, "Why, since [384] "Archytas, and Timæus Locrus, and Theocritus, wrote in "the Doric idiom, Ocellus should write in Attic?" to which no answer at all is given. Were not these things enough to persuade one that the observation had not been made before? I must confess I was not ignorant that one Vizzanius had set out an edition of Ocellus; but being an Editor of no great esteem (the Editor of Phalaris must pardon this freedom) I had not purchased the Book, nor knew at all that he had said this thing before me; neither did I think it worth the while to

* Euripid. ed. Cantab. tom. II. p. 523.

† Stob. Phys. c. 24.

let the press stand still while I sought for it, because I knew the Cambridge Edition was later than Vizzanius's, and would probably have had the observation in it, if Vizzanius had lit upon it. Besides that, I was prone enough to believe that the learned Greek Professor, the author of the objection, could not be a stranger to Vizzanius's Edition; so that I concluded, from his not knowing it, that Vizzanius had not said it. This is a true account of this matter about Ocellus Lucanus; and I hope it is so fair a one, that all ingenuous persons, not tinged with envy and malice, will be satisfied with it. I shall now make some remarks on the Examiner's harangue, wherein he has laboured to make the world believe that I stole the observation, which I gave out for my own, out of Vizzanius's Preface; which being about matter of fact, and within the reach of my own knowledge, I do aver to be a calumny; and that the account I have here given is true in every part of it. But let us see how he makes out his indictment: — "He finds
 [385] "the same places in Stobæus named by Vizzanius and Me; "therefore I stole the observation from him." Wonderfully argued! But are not those passages in Stobæus the only ground that the observation is bottomed on? If two persons, therefore, without concerting together, might hit upon the observation, which I presume Mr. B. will not deny, is it not necessary that they must both hit upon those proofs which the observation solely depends on. If I had concurred with Vizzanius in some incidental matters not at all necessary to the main point, it might then look a little more probable that I had pillaged them from him; but since the observation in general might be found out without Vizzanius's help, the citing of such places as it is entirely founded on, is no farther proof that I made use of his help. But Mr. B. argues farther, "That the
 P. 55; "Doctor says it was agreed and covenanted among the Scholars of that Italian Sect* (*φωνῇ χρῆσθαι τῇ παλαιᾷ*) to use "their own MOTHER TONGUE; which," says he, "he found "in Vizzanius, who says the SAME thing, and quotes the same "authority for it: *tum quia Pythagoræos quoslibet Doricæ "Dialecto studuisse comperio; tum quia id Pythagoræ suadeant "instituta, qui semper Idiomatum Græcorum Doricum maxime "voluit sectari; i. e. all the Pythagoreans used the DORIC, "according to Pythagoras's institution; who preferred that "dialect before all the rest, as Jamblichus says."* Now to see the acuteness of our Examiner; he has brought here such

* Jamblich. Vit. Pyth. p. 202.

an argument to shew me a Plagiary, as is a manifest proof that I am none; for how could I *find that* in Vizzanius which is not in him? and how does he say the *same* thing, who says the very contrary? The thing, as I said it, is thus:—The Pythagoreans enjoined all the Greeks that entered the society, to use every man his mother-tongue*; Ocellus, therefore, being a Dorian of Lucania, must have written in the Doric. This I took to be Jamblichus's meaning; but Vizzanius has represented it thus:—That they enjoined all that came to them to use the mother-tongue of Crotona, which was the Doric. Now this is quite contrary to what I make it; for if an Athenian or an Ionian had listed himself among them, they must both have spoken Doric, according to Vizzanius; but in my interpretation, they must each have retained his own country dialect. Whether Vizzanius or I have hit upon the true meaning of Jamblichus, perhaps all competent readers will not be of a mind†; but I dare say they will unanimously agree in this, That Mr. B. though he would prove me a Plagiary, has taken such effectual care, that nobody will ever be a Plagiary from Him.

[386]

But I had said, "If a man had published a Book not in his mother-tongue, he had been banished the Society; which is an inference," says Mr. B. "that Vizzanius did not make." How then "have I taken all, word for word, out of his Preface?" But Mr. B. gives four reasons why Vizzanius did not make the inference. First, "Because this injunction was not observed by Empedocles." Have I not justly observed once before, that there is a sort of fatality in Mr. B.'s errors? Could he possibly have brought an instance more directly against himself? for Empedocles was really turned out of the Society for writing that Book that Mr. B. refers to; and a Law was made upon it‡, that no Epic Poet, from that time, should be admitted into the company. Secondly, he says, "The Author of the Golden Verses wrote not in Doric," and yet was not expelled the Society. But can Mr. B. prove that

P. 55.

P. 54.

[387]

* Jamb. Φωνὴ χρῆσθαι τῇ πάτρῃ ἰατρῶν παρήγγειλλον, ὅσοι τῶν Ἑλλήνων προσῆλθοιεν πρὸς τὴν κοινωσίαν ταύτην· τὸ γὰρ ξυγγινεῖν ἐκ ἰδοκίμαζον.

† That the interpretation of Vizzanius is the true one, is proved by Bishop Warburton, Div. Leg. p. 120. Vol. I. Ed. 2. Jamblichus, in the same place, says that Pythagoras valued the Doric above the other Greek Dialects. In another place he assigns this for one of the causes of the decay of the Pythagoric Philosophy; viz. διὰ τὸ καὶ τὰ γεγραμμένα Δωριδί γυγῆσθαι, p. 49. ed. Kust.

‡ Laërt. Emped.

the Society was in being when those verses were first made? We are sure Pythagoras was not the Author of them, but we know not who was; and, I believe, no mention is made of them till above c years after the extinction of that Society. Much weaker, therefore, is Mr. B.'s third reason, "That Jamblichus, even while he is writing this account of the Pythagoreans, did not observe the injunction;" for Jamblichus was a Platonic, and not a Pythagorean; and the Society had been dissolved above dc years before his time. The fourth is, "That Pythagoras himself did not observe this injunction;" for an Epistle of his is in Ionic. True, indeed, Pythagoras did not observe it, as Vizzanius explains the injunction; but as I have done it, he did observe it, for his (*φωνὴ μάτρῳ*) *mother-tongue* was Ionic, he being a native of Samos. Besides this, I might tell Mr. B. that the Epistle is spurious; so that every way this last instance is worthy of his wit and learning.

- P. 138 There are yet one or two cavils about this business of Vizzanius, which I cannot let pass without an answer. He says "The scarcity of Vizzanius's Book, and the probability of not being traced, encouraged the Doctor to pillage from him;" which is spoken with so much sense and truth, that the very contrary may be fairly concluded from it; for how is his Edition so scarce, that has been twice printed within fifty years, and may be purchased at a small value? And where could I expect to be more easily traced than here, if I had really stolen from him? The discovery that I thought I was the first Author of, was about Ocellus Lucanus; and would not any person that was minded to sift it, first of all look into the Editions of Ocellus? Certainly, if I was disposed to be a plagiarist, I would steal with a little more discretion, and not pretend to tell news of Ocellus out of the common Editions of him; and without question there was no improbability of my *being traced*, since it appears that the Examiner was able to trace me. But I had said "If I may expect thanks for the discovery, I dare engage to make out that Ocellus wrote in Doric." This, by a just and candid Reader, would be thought to imply that I believed the discovery scarce worthy of thanks; but Mr. B. would not slip the opportunity of shewing his good-nature and his ability a farce and banter; so that he discovers in the expression "*an extraordinary air of satisfaction.*" And yet this air is not quite so discernible as that of Mr. B.'s a little before; when, having offered at a slight correction of Strabo, *Ἀκράγας Γελῶν ἄποικος*, for the vulgar reading *Ἀκράγας Ἰώνων* which Casaubon and Cluverius, who knew
- [308]
- P. 54.

knew well enough that Agrigentum was a colony of the Geloans, had let pass as an error of the Author, not of the Copyers; because, in some other accounts of the Sicilian Colonies, as well as in this, that Author differs from all the rest; the Examiner, I say, admiring and pluming himself for that glorious emendation,—“I wonder,” says he, “how this escaped the most learned and acute Casaubon’s observation.” Now here is an *air* of suspicion, that these fine epithets were sprinkled here upon Casaubon to elevate somebody higher, and to hint to us that he was “as learned and more acute than He?” But, for my own part, I am so far from valuing myself upon a discovery of Ocellus’s Doric, that I have expunged it out of this second Edition; though it was as really my own discovery as if nobody had hit on it before me. Such a discovery is but a business of chance, or, at the best, of bare industry; neither is there any sagacity or judgment required to it; and it has so little difficulty, that not only Vizzanius, but even the Editor of Phalaris, might easily have stumbled on it.

P. 51.

[389]

I have run through the Examiner’s authorities, which he has produced on this head; let us now take a short view of his reasonings. The result of what he has said about Poets that changed their country dialect is this: — “That they chose such a dialect as was then in fashion when they wrote; for there was a fashion in dialects, and the chief of them had severally their course and period in which they flourished.” Now, I must frankly acknowledge that, let Phalaris, or Æsop, or whoever you will be spurious, this reasoning is a genuine piece, and the Examiner’s own; for it carries his peculiar mark and signature upon it, in that it proves directly against himself; for it is so far from being an account why Phalaris should use the Attic dialect, that it is almost a demonstration that he would not have used it; because, in the time of the true Phalaris the Attic dialect was not yet in fashion; there was no Attic prose then besides Draco’s and Solon’s Laws, and but one piece or two in verse. I had expressly urged this against the Epistles, “That Phalaris would not write Attic; especially since in those early times before Stage-poetry, and Philosophy, and History had made it famous over Greece, that dialect was no more valued than any of the rest*,”—where it is not only intimated that there was a *fashion* of dialects; but the very causes are assigned that brought the Attic into fashion. Phalaris, therefore, would never forsake his own native tongue for the

P. 42.

[390]

* See here, p. 311.

Attic, at a time when neither Stage-poet, nor Philosopher, nor Historian had written in it.

P. 43. But the Examiner has come off worse, if possible, in his account of Prose Writers that exchanged their native dialect for some other; for Dionysius Halicarnassensis, though he was born in a Doric country, yet lived in another; and in the age of Augustus, when the Attic idiom had been famous for cccc years. What is this then to Phalaris's case, who never stirred that we know of, out of Sicily, and lived at a time when the Attics were as unlearned as their neighbours. We may apply the same, with a little allowance, to his other Prose Authors. But he should have instanced in familiar Epistles, never intended for public view, such as Phalaris's are; and shewed that, even in those cases, men have deserted their own dialect; and this had been something to the purpose. But he will tell us he has not been wanting here; for, "to come closer to the point," says he, "we have a Letter of Dion of Syracuse to Dionysius the Tyrant, and a piece of Dionysius's, both preserved among Plato's Epistles, and written in such a dialect as if both Prince and Philosopher (to use the Doctor's phrase) had gone to school at Athens." Here he fancied he was very smart upon me; but, as it generally happens with him, he lashes himself; for, to use the Examiner's phrase, the Philosopher did really go to School at Athens, and lived with Plato and Speusippus; and though the Prince did not go to Athens, yet Athens, as I may say, went to him; for not Plato only, but several other Philosophers were entertained by him at his Court in Syracuse.

{391}

But to shew Mr. B. what a difference there is between Poems, or Philosophical or Historical Tracts designed for the Public, and private Letters about Family Affairs never intended to be sent abroad, and that an argument about the dialect must not be drawn from the one to the other, I will give him an instance in one of his own list, Epimenides the Cretan. Mr. B. would prove (out of St. Paul) that this Cretan's Poems were not in Doric; but, though his argument failed him, I supplied him with a better, which plainly shews they were in Ionic. Neither will I, upon account of this Ionicism, impeach those Poems as supposititious, because in those days it was the fashionable dialect for all Epic Poetry; for, as Hermogenes observes, "The Ionic is sweet and naturally poetical, ποιητικὴ φύσει καὶ ἡδέια*." But if Mr. B. should produce a private Letter of this Epime-

* Hermog. p. 315.

nides, not written in the Cretan language, the case would be quite altered; for the Letter I should tax as a cheat, though I did not the Poem; and I have a great example to warrant me in it. "There is an Epistle goes abroad," says Laërtius, "of Epimenides to Solon, about the form and government that Minos gave to the Cretans; but Demetrius the Magnesian, endeavours to prove it spurious, because it is not written in the Cretan dialect, but in the Attic.*" Mr. B. may see by this instance that the inference will not hold from Poems to Epistles; for I hope he will allow this Demetrius to be a competent judge here. He was Cicero's Præceptor in Rhetoric, an acquaintance of Pomponius Atticus, and an excellent Critic and Historian. And if he thought it an absurdity for a Cretan to write Attic Letters, though directed to an Athenian, how much more absurd may We think it in Phalaris, a Sicilian, to write Attic Epistles to other Sicilians! There is another Letter of Epimenides to Solon†, which is truly in the Cretan or Doric idiom; but, for all that, I shall not believe it genuine; for one Forger may be more skilful than another; and one of the most ignorant of them all is the Mock Sicilian Prince.

[392]

XIII.

BUT, since Tyrants will not be confined by Laws, let us suppose, if you will, that our Phalaris might make use of the Attic, for no reason at all but his own arbitrary humour and pleasure; yet we have still another indictment against the credit of the Epistles; for even the Attic of the true Phalaris's age is not there represented; but a more recent idiom and style, that by the whole thread and colour of it betrays itself to be many centuries younger than he. Every living language, like the perspiring bodies of living creatures, is in perpetual motion and alteration; some words go off, and become obsolete; others are taken in, and by degrees grow into common use; or the same word is inverted to a new sense and notion, which in tract of

[393]

* Laërt. in Epimen.

† Laërt.

time makes as observable a change in the air and features of a language, as age makes in the lines and mien of a face. All are sensible of this in their own native tongue, where continual use makes every man a critic; for what Englishman does not think himself able, from the very turn and fashion of the style, to distinguish a fresh English composition from another a hundred years old? Now there are as real and sensible differences in the several ages of Greek, were there as many that could discern them; but very few are so versed and practised in that language as ever to arrive at that subtilty of taste. And yet as few will be content to relish or dislike a thing, not by their own sense, but by another man's palate;—so that, should I affirm that I know the novelty of these Epistles from the whole body and form of the work, none, perhaps, would be convinced by it, but those that, without my indication, could discover it by themselves. I shall let that alone then, and point only at a few particular marks and moles in the Letters, which every one that pleases may know them by. In the very first Epistle [394] (ὦν ἐμοὶ προσιρέπεις) “which you accuse me of,” is an innovation in language; for which the Antients used *προφέρεις*. In the cXLII, among other presents to a bride, he sends *θυγατέρας τέτλαρας ὁμήλικας* which would anciently have signified *daughters*; but he here means it of *virgins* or *maidens*, as *fille* and *figlia* signify in French and Italian; which is the most manifest token of a later Greek. Even Tzetzes*, when he tells the story out of this Epistle, interprets it *maids* (*θεραπαίνας*.) In the LXXVII (*πολλοὶ παῖδαν ὄντες ἐρξαί*) “many that are fond of their children;” for that is his sense of the words; which, of old, would have been taken for “a flagitious love of boys;” as if he had said *πολλοὶ ὄντες παιδερασαί*. They that will make the search, may find more of this sort; but I suppose these are sufficient

* Chiliad. p. 196.

to unmask the recent Sophist under the person of the old Tyrant.

WHAT the Examiner has been pleased to animadvert upon this article, is comprehended under two heads; his general reflections upon the purity and stability of the Greek tongue, and his particular exceptions to the words that I had marked out as tokens of a recent Writer.

In his general harangue, he first spends a whole page, to inform us of a great piece of news, that our English tongue has undergone very considerable changes. Then he asks me these pertinent questions:—“Do you take the Greek of Lucian to be as different from that of Plato as our English now is from that which was spoken soon after the Conquest? Are not Homer and Oppian much nearer one another in their language than Chaucer and Cowley,—though in time they are far more distant?” As if I had supposed that the gradual alteration of the Greek language was as great in every century while it lasted, as that of our English tongue this last hundred years? whereas it is as plain as words can make it, that I compared the changes of the Greek during the whole interval between the true Phalaris and the Sophist, which I called in a round number “a thousand years,” with the changes of our English “in the last hundred.” Then he commences a formal and sophistical declamation about “the reasons that made the Greek language so fixed and unalterable?” where he gives us some shining metaphors, and a polished period or two; but for the matter of it, it is either some common and obvious thought, dressed and coloured in the beauish way; or some new mistake, which now at last has its happy birth from the fertile genius of our Examiner. The Reader shall judge between us, whether I pay him in his own coin; that is, misrepresent him, when he has considered what I shall now say.

The accusation that I brought against the Epistles, was this:—“That the Author has written them in the new and recent Attic, not that which was in use in the age of the true Phalaris,” whom the Examiner himself owns to have been contemporary with Solon; so that, if we can make any discovery what the Attic language was in Solon’s time, we may be sure that the true Phalaris would have spoken in the same way, had he a mind to have used that dialect. There is an Oration ascribed to Lysias, “against Theomnestus*,” which

* Lysias, Κατὰ Θεομνήστου.

P. 60.

[395]
P. 70,

P. 70.

[396]

Harpocration once or twice questions if it be genuine: but whether it be Lysias's or not, it is all one to our present purpose; for we know the time that it was made, and by that account it may well enough be Lysias's. That Orator died at Olymp. c, 2, or c, 3; and this Oration appears to be made three or four years before, at Olymp. xcix, 4. for the person who speaks it, tells us *Ἐμοὶ μὲν ἔτη εἰςὶ τριάκοντα* *ἔξ ὅτε ὑμεῖς κατεληλύθατε, εἰκοτὸν τετὶ φαίνομαι ἔν τρισκαιδέκτῃς ὧν, ὅτε ὁ πατὴρ ὑπὸ τῶν Τριάκοντα ἀπὲθνεκεν.* "I am now," says he, xxx years old; and this is the xxth year since you Athenians returned "hither; so that I was xiii years of age when my father was "killed by the Thirty Tyrants†." This is the common reading of that passage; but, if we examine it, it will be found to be a manifest depravation; for the Thirty Tyrants began Olymp. xciv, 1‡; and, in fear of them, half of the Athenians forsook their country; then, at Olymp. xciv, 4, the thirty were deposed; and those that had left Athens (*κατεληλύθασι*) "returned" again. If the person, then, that spoke this Oration was xxx years old in the xxth year after the return of the Athenians, he could not possibly be xiii years old, nor above x, when the Thirty Tyrants murdered his father. But the true correction of this place may be had from the next Oration, which is called "The second "against Theomnestus§;" but is really nothing else but the rough draught of the other; where the person's age is thus set forth:—*Ἐτη ἔτι μοι δύο καὶ τριάκοντα* *ἔξ ἧ δ' ὑμεῖς κατήλθετε, εἰκοτὸν τετὶ φαίνομαι ἔν δεδεκαέτῃς ὧν, ὅτε ὁ πατὴρ ὑπὸ τῶν τριάκοντα ἀπὲθνεκεν.* "I am now," says he, "xxxii years of age; and "this is the xxth year since your return; so that I was xii years "old when my father was killed by the Thirty." Now this account is agreeable to history and truth; for, if the xxxiith year of this person's age was coincident with the xxth after the return of the Athenians, then his xiiiith falls upon the last year of the Thirty Tyrants, and in that we must suppose his father was killed. So that, in the other Oration, for *ἔτη λ*, we must read, *ἔτη ρ* and *ιγέτης* for *ιγέτης*; for the numbers being thus written in numeral letters, were very liable to be mistaken. Upon the whole, therefore, as I said before, this Oration must have been written at Olymp. xcix, 4, which is ccxiii years after the Archonship of Solon, when he made his body of Laws. Now, by the Laws of Athens, if a man called another (*Ἀνδροφόνον*)

* Dionys. Halic. in Lysia.

† Lys. p. 116.

‡ Diod. and others.

§ Lys. p. 119.

"a mur-

"a murderer," it was penal; so that the person who speaks this Oration, brings an action against Theomnestus, for saying "he had killed his father;" τὸν πατέρα ἀπεκτονέναι. The defendant makes his exception to the indictment, because he did not call him Ἀνδροφόνον, which was the word penal by Law. But the other replies, That the sense and meaning of the Laws was to be regarded, as well as the words; "for though things," says he, "continue the same, yet we do not use some of the same words that our ancestors did*." Let the Crier read some of the old Laws of Solon. ΔΕΔΕΞΘΑΙ ΕΝ ΤΗΠΟΔΟΚΑΚΗ. Here what was (Ποδοκάκη) the stocks, in Solon's time, is now called τὸ ξύλον. ΕΠΕΓΓΤΑΙΝ ΕΠΙΟΡΚΗΣΑΝΤΑ ΤΟΝ ΑΠΟΛΛΩ. ΔΕΔΟΤΑ ΔΕ ΔΙΚΗΣ ΕΝΕΚΑ ΔΡΑΣΚΑΖΕΙΝ. Here is ἑπιρκεῖν, to swear, which we now call ὀμῶσαι and Δρασκάζειν, to run away; which is now Ἀποδιδράσκειν ΟΣΤΙΣ ΑΠΙΛΛΗΘΙ ΤΗ ΘΥΡΑΙ. Here is Ἀπίλλειν, to exclude; for which we now say Ἀποκλείειν. ΤΟ ΑΡΓΥΡΙΟΝ ΣΤΑΣΙΜΟΝ ΕΙΝΑΙ. Here Στάσιμον does not signify to weigh money in scales, as we now use the word, but to let out at use. ΟΣΑΙ ΠΡΕΦΑΣΜΕΝΩΣ ΠΩΛΟΥΝΤΑΙ ΚΑΙ ΟΙΚΗΟΣ. Here Πρεφασμένως signifies openly, which we now call Φανερώς and Πωλεῖσθαι is to walk, now Βαδίζειν and Οικῆ is a servant, now Θεράπειτ and there are many such as these†." The ingenious Reader may please to observe the last words of Lysias: — "That there are many more such as these‡;" and then he will have a just apprehension of the great change of the Attic tongue, between Solon and Lysias's time. Some of those words of Solon, that our Orator has produced here, are mentioned too by others; as Ποδοκάκη is quoted from Solon, by Demosthenes§; and Πρεφασμένως πωλῶνται, by Plutarch||; which he interprets, as Lysias does, Ἐμφανῶς φοιτῶσιν. And if a proportionable number of such antiquated words do not occur in the other Fragments of Solon's Laws, the reason is, because the Writers do not cite the very words, but only express the sense of them. As when Plutarch relates the Law, "That whoever (βιάσθαι) ravished a free woman should pay a hundred drachms¶;" we know from Hesychius, that the original

* Lysias, p. 118.

† P. 117.

‡ Πολλὰ δὲ τοιαῦτα καὶ ἄλλα ἐξ' αὐτοῦ.

§ Demosth. c. Timoc.

|| Plut. Solon.

¶ Plut. Sol.

word of Solon was not βιάσασθαι, but βινεῖν*. But, in another place†, where he declares that he cites the Law αὐτοῖς ὀνόμασι, “word for word,” ΕΠΙ ΦΟΝΩΙ Η ΣΦΑΓΑΙΣΙΝ, we do not fail to meet with the old obsolete idiom; as Σφαγαῖσιν here, for σφαγαῖς.

[399]

Now, I suppose, it is sufficiently plain from these specimens, that the Attic dialect was not so very stable and immutable as the Examiner imagines. There were only two centuries betwixt Solon and Lysias; and the alteration seems to be almost as great as what has happened in our own language within the same space; for, as to the changes of entire words, the instances here alleged are a plain proof of it; and for the orthography, or way of spelling, which is the principal variation of the modern English from the old, we should find as considerable a difference between Solon’s and Lysias’s spelling, if we had a sight of the original (Κύρσεις) Tables of his Laws; for in Solon’s time there were but XVIII Greek Letters in all, the rest being invented afterwards by Epicharmus and Simonides‡; and we are sure that the whole XXIV were not in public use at Athens till the Archonship of Euclides, Olymp. xciv, 2§; so that some of the words cited above, by Lysias and Plutarch, were by Solon spelled thus:—ΔΕΔΕΣΘΑΙ ΤΕΙ ΤΗΥΠΑΙ ΠΗΟΝΟΙ Ε ΣΠΗΑΓΑΙΣΙΝ. Upon all accounts, therefore, the Attic was no more privileged from change than the other languages of the world are. Nay, we may suppose there was a greater change in it betwixt Theseus and Solon, than between Solon and Lysias, the former interval being three times as long as the latter; for we know that the Attic and Ionic were originally the very same language||; and yet afterwards we find them to differ exceedingly. I make no question but the Ionians, who were Attic colonies, had a gradual change in their dialect, as well as Athens, their common mother, had; for Herodotus informs us “That the Ionians had four quite different idoms of “language ¶; so that it is evident that they too had varied from the ancient Attic; but yet, it is pretty observable that several of those antiquated words of Solon’s are what we now call Ionic, as Πωλεῖμαι for βαδίζω is very frequent in Homer:—

[400]

* Hesych. in Βινεῖν.

† Plut. Sol.

‡ See here, p. 241, 242.

§ See Meursius, Fort. Attic. p. 63. Vales. Harpocrat. p. 101.

|| See here, p. 226.

¶ Herod. i, 142. Χαρακτῆρες γλώσσης χίσσαται.

Οὐτί ποτ' εἰς ἀγορὴν πωλείσκετο κυδιάνευσαν.

And so οἰκῆ for θεράπων is doubly Ionic, both as to the whole word, and as to the termination of it, ῆ for εως and this too is several times in Homer: —

Ἐξ ὕπνου γούωσα φίλος οἰκῆς ἐγείροι.

And this illustrates, and is itself illustrated by Dionysius Halicarn. who asserts clearly and fully to our purpose, "That the ancient Attic dialect had but some small variations from the Ionic *." Now to apply this to the Epistles of Phalaris, I would crave leave to ask the admirers of them if the Attic dialect there be after Solon's example? as it would certainly be if the Tyrant had written them. Is the formation of nouns after Solon's model, αἰσι for αἰς, and η for εως? are there any antiquated words there, as πωλεῖσθαι, δρασκάζειν, πεφασμένως? &c. And yet the sense of them occurs there, but expressed in a more recent way; though, if we consider what Lysias says, "That there were (πολλὰ τοιαῦτα) MANY such in Solon's "Laws," it must be owned that the true Epistles of Phalaris had been full of such words, as perhaps would have puzzled a better Scholar (if there can be one) than the late Editor of the false ones.

The Examiner seems to take pains to persuade us that the Attic dialect was of such a fixed and durable nature, that it is in vain to pretend to distinguish any different ages of it; but the Greeks themselves were of another opinion, if they may be allowed in their own language to be as knowing as Mr. B. Some of them were so nice as to distinguish a middle age of that dialect between the times of Solon and Lysias. Dionysius Halicarn. tells us "That Lysias was the best pattern of the Attic tongue; not of that ancient one that Plato and Thucydides used; but of the fashionable one in his own time †," so that here are three sorts of Attic specified within the compass of two centuries; for I suppose it is plain that Thucydides's language is as different from that of Solon's Laws, as from that of Lysias's Orations. Demetrius Magnes, in the passage above cited, calls a pretended Letter of Epimenides to Solon an imposture, "because it was written in the Attic tongue, and even in the new Attic ‡." Do but

[401]

* Dionys. de Thucyd. p. 147. Μικράς τινος διαφοράς.

† Dionys. v. Lys.

‡ Laërt. in Epim. Γεγραμμένον Ἀτθίδι φωνῇ, καὶ ταύτῃ ἰδίᾳ.

substitute

substitute the name of Phalaris instead of Epimenides, and it is exactly the same indictment that I have made to the Epistles. All the three, Epimenides, Solon, and Phalaris, were contemporaries; and if Epimenides's Letter was detected to be a cheat because it was the new Attic, by the same rule we must discard Phalaris's; for Demetrius could know of no newer Attic than that of Phalaris's Epistles; nay, there is nothing more common in the Greek Writers than this distinction of the old and new Attic*, as may be seen in Etymologicon M. Eustathius, Prolegom. ad Aristoph. Synesius de Insuperbiis, &c. "The Attic language," says Lucian, "has, in tract of time, undergone many changes; but the word Ἀποφράς has had the luck to continue all along†;" so far was he from believing it so fixed and enduring" as the Examiner dreams it was.

[402] The causes of the changes in the Attic language are not so secret and abstruse, but that a man of less sagacity than Mr. B. might easily have found them out; for if we consider the great conflux of strangers to that city, — the vast number of slaves from all nations, and of foreigners that settled there, — the frequent wars that they had abroad, and the hired troops that they often maintained at home, and their mighty trade both in their own port and all over Greece, — we shall rather admire that the alterations in their dialect were so few, than affirm with Mr. B. that there were none at all. In Demetrius Phalæreus's time, at Olymp. cx, the inhabitants of Attica were 21,000 citizens, 10,000 foreigners, naturalized, and 400,000 slaves‡. Now if there were above XIX slaves and strangers to one citizen, as by this account it plainly appears, this cause alone is more than sufficient to introduce a great change in their dialect.

P. 71. But the ingenious Mr. B. tells us "That the empire of the Greeks did not a little contribute to the stability of their language; that is, as he afterwards expresses it, to the keeping it entire and unmixed." Now I am of opinion that, if another man had been to name some of the causes of "the change and mixture" of the Greek, or indeed of any other tongue, he would have pitched upon *empire* in the first place; for even common sense will tell one, that if a nation extends its conquests over other countries of a different speech,

* Ἀρχαία καὶ Νέα Ἀττικῆ.

† Lucian de Apoph. Πολλὰ ἐνέφρανον.

‡ Athen. p. 272.

and retain them in subjection by standing armies and garrisons, and by keeping all the civil power and public offices in its own hands, it may extinguish indeed, by this means, the ancient language of the conquered, but its own too must needs have a little mixture, and imbibe something from the tongue that it destroys; as by pouring a great quantity of water to a little wine

[403]

(Ἀπόλυσας τὸν οἶνον, ἐπιχίας ὕδαρ)

you may quite destroy the wine; but yet the water will taste of the mixture. It is evident, from the Laws of Numa, and the XII Tables, and the inscription on the Columna Duiliana, compared with the Plays of Terence, that the Roman language had a greater change in the last c years between Duilius and Terence, than in the cccc between Numa and Duilius. And the true reason of this was *empire*; for before Duilius's time, in the first Punic war, the Romans had gotten nothing beyond Italy, but in the following century they carried their eagles almost all over Europe; so that the vast confluence of people from all the provinces, the introducing of foreign artificers and captive slaves from every quarter, and the natives that returned home from the expeditions, made an innovation of language at Rome itself. And if Alexander's conquests in Asia had not altogether as great an effect upon the Greek tongue, the reason was, because the empire was soon divided into so many branches; but if Alexander had returned out of Asia, and placed the seat of his empire in some city of Greece, and transmitted it entire to posterity, the vast crowds of those that would have come to court from the farthest parts of the monarchy, would have made the same alteration of the language there as afterwards happened at Rome.

But Mr. B. is in great admiration at the stability of the Greek tongue. "It was incomparably," he says, "the most fixed and enduring of any that we are generally acquainted with." What Languages *We*, that is, the Examiner and his Assistant, *are acquainted with*, I know not, and therefore I have nothing to say against this proposition: but when he goes on, and tells us "That no other language that has been of known and familiar use in the world," has been so durable as the Greek, and that it was absolutely "the most holding tongue in the world," the Examiner had better have *holden his tongue*, than have talked so crudely and erroneously; for we are sure, from the names of persons and places mentioned in Scripture before the Deluge, not to insist upon other arguments, that the Hebrew was the primitive language of mankind,

[404]
P. 70.

P. 71.

P. 73.

kind, and it continued pure, for above 3000 years, till the captivity into Babylon. Even from the date of the Mosaic Law to the Prophecy of Ezekiel, there is a distance of 900 years, yet the language of the two Writers is the very same. What can the Examiner shew like this, either for continuance or purity, in the Greek tongue? I will mention one language more, and that is the Syriac. The holy Scripture informs us, that Laban the Syrian, when he made a league with his son-in-law Jacob, called the heap of stones that, after the custom of those times, was erected for a memorial of it, *גֵּר שְׂהָדוּתָא* (*Igar Sahdutha* *) "The heap of witness;" which we are sure, from the Syriac versions of the Old and New Testament, continued to be pure and vulgar Syriac for 2000 years: nay, the very same language is said to be preserved and spoken to this day by the Maronites of Mount Libanus in Syria; so that the Syriac has lasted for above 3400 years, with little or no variation.

[405]
P. 70.

The Examiner makes a mighty flourish about "the sweetness, and smoothness, and the music of the Greek tongue," and assigns that as the reason of its lasting so long; but at that rate he must make another speech about "the sweetness and smoothness" of the Eastern tongues, since they lasted much longer. But the true reason of that long continuance, both of Hebrew and Syriac, was, because the nations continued unmixed and separate from strangers; and the preservation of the Greek language, though not in the same degree of purity and duration with the two other, is wholly owing to the same cause; for, till the time of Alexander, the wars and the business of the Greeks were for the most part among one another, and not with foreign nations; so that, though the particular dialects were perpetually changed and diversified by their mutual conquests and commerce, yet the same language for the main continued still. But when the Roman government was established among them, immediately the Latin names of offices, and terms of Law, &c. over-ran the old Greek language; so that we have Dictionaries of barbarous words of Greece, almost as voluminous as those of the true ones.

P. 71. Mr. B. avers "That we have Greek Books, written by Authors at almost 2000 years distance, which disagree less in phrase and manner of speech than any two English ones

* Genes. xxxi. 47. This is not according to the English version, though agreeable to the Hebrew letters.

" at

"at 200 years distance." But Mr. B. is not aware that the reason of this was, not because the same phrases and manner of speech continued all that while in civil and popular use, but purely because the later Writers would *imitate* the old ones, as the Moderns now imitate Cicero and Virgil. This is evident from the innumerable Greek Lexicons and Scholiasts, some yet preserved, but most of them lost; the design of which was to explain the obsolete words in the old Writers of verse and prose, by such other Greek words as were then in use; for Homer and Archilochus, Thucydides and Herodotus, were not thoroughly understood by the vulgar Greeks in Oppian's time, but only by the learned; nay, even Oppian himself, who took the allowed privilege of using antiquated words (as, among us, Spencer and Milton did, though a little more sparingly) could not be understood in his own town except by the Learned. And to shew farther that it was imitation only that makes the Greek Books of different ages so alike, that general manner of speech, called (Κοινὴ Διάλεκτος) "the common dialect," which the Writers after Alexander's time commonly used, was never at any time, or in any place, the popular idiom, but perfectly a language of the Learned, almost as the Latin is now: I say *almost*, because they did not tie themselves up so strictly to imitation, but that still their style had some leaven from the age that each of them lived in. It is the felicity, therefore, of the Latin tongue that it is no longer in popular use; and it is more fitted, upon that very account, to be the universal language of Learning, because it is no longer liable to those changes to which living languages are naturally obnoxious; but, by being dead, it is become immortal. The Greek, indeed, would have done as well for that purpose; but there ought to be but one such language, and the Latin has already got the possession. As for our English tongue, the great alterations it has undergone in the last two centuries, are principally owing to that vast stock of Latin words which we have transplanted into our own soil; which being now in a manner exhausted, one may easily presage that it will not have such changes in the two next centuries: nay, it were no difficult contrivance, if the public had any regard to it, to make the English tongue immutable, unless hereafter some Foreign nation shall invade and over-run us.

I have now examined Mr. B.'s general reflections upon the stability of the Greek tongue, which he has made so sinistrously, and with so very little judgment, as if he aspired after the character of Homer's Margites —

(O;

(Ὅς μὲν εἰπίετο πολλὰ, καὶ ὧς δ' ἠπίετο πάντα)

P. 208, " who knew a great many things, but all of them wrong."
 209, 210, But let us see what exceptions he has made to my particular
 211: instances of Phalaris's recent language.

P. 54. I. The first that I had produced is out of the first Epistle (προτρέπειν) " to accuse," which Mr. B. perhaps believes he has answered in an harangue of four pages; but, if I may be allowed to speak freely, it is such miserable chicanery, it is so much below even himself (" I compliment him when I say so," to return him his own civility) that I cannot abuse my reader's patience in winnowing and sifting it, since the whole is nothing but chaff. He had translated προτρέπειν, " to exhort;" but I observed that, in this place, neither sense nor syntax would allow of that signification. As for the Syntax, he has not so much as offered any example, either Greek or Latin, where προτρέπω, in the sense of *exhortation*, admits a dative case after it, as it has here; yet, however, he still contends that the
 [406] sense of the passage will admit that meaning of the word. And to give him his just commendation, he has taken the right way to put an end to any dispute; for a man that talks at that rate resolves not to be confuted. If I say that grass is green, or snow is white, I am still at the courtesy of my antagonist; for if he should rub his forehead and deny it, I do not see by what syllogism I could refute him. So, if the learned Examiner shall still insist upon it, that the *sense* of the place is " to exhort," I have nothing farther to urge, but must leave him either to be laughed at, or pitied, or admired, as his Readers are disposed towards him.

I had observed that the Latin *version* of Phalaris, which is " falsely ascribed to Cujacius" (for both original and translation of this Book have the luck to be fathered upon wrong Authors) " interprets προτρέπειν, to accuse, so that Mr. B. might " have learned from thence the true meaning of this passage; " but it so happened, that that Edition, though in the public " Library at Oxon. lay all the while concealed from our late " Editor, that then lived there." Upon this Mr. B. commences a very heavy charge against me: — " It is a greater
 P. 212. " blemish to me," he says, " than want of judgment. I am a " man of extraordinary confidence, that can so boldly assert " what it is impossible I should know; that would face him " down that he never saw what he knows himself to have often " seen and used" (that is, before he finished his Edition of Phalaris);

Phalaris); and at last he avers, "That indeed the Edition of Cujacius was one of those printed copies he meant in his "preface." Now this is a very tender controversy; and I am afraid the very softest handling of it will touch somebody to the quick. Honour and reputation are nice things; and, if [409] once they happen to receive a flaw, they are not easily repaired. I will not make myself an arbitrator here; but the reader shall judge between Mr. B. and Me. The words of his Preface are these:—"There are two versions of Phalaris that I had before me; the one by Naogeorgus, published in the year 1557; the other, as it seems, by a certain Jesuit, for the use of their Schools, in the year 1614. The Jesuit is pretty elegant in his language, but he is too loose and diffuse; so that he always differs from the style of the Author, and often from the sense. There is a third version too by Francis Aretine*." Now I must own, that at that time, when I first published my Dissertation, I had not seen this edition of the Jesuit that Mr. B. here speaks of, and I believed it had a translation peculiar to it; for I trusted to Mr. B.'s account, "that the Jesuit had made it;" and, consequently, that it could not be the same with Cujacius. I concluded, therefore, he had never seen Cujacius's version, because he expressly says he made use of three only; that of Naogeorgus, and the Jesuit's, and Aretine's. And where now was my "extraordinary confidence," in saying he had not seen the Edition of Cujacius? and how was it "impossible that I should know it?" I believed my inference to be true and logical; and I will put it into the form of a syllogism, that Mr. B. may examine whether it agree with his System of Logic.

Mr. B. made use of three versions only; one made by Naogeorgus, another by a Jesuit, and a third by Aretine.

But Cujacius's version was neither made by Naogeorgus, [410] nor by a Jesuit, nor by Aretine.

Therefore Mr. B. made no use of Cujacius's version.

If it be such a *blemish* to me, and such *extraordinary confidence* to pretend, by virtue of this syllogism, that Cujacius's edition was then unknown to Mr. B. I shall have the worse opinion of all Books of Logic for it, not excepting Mr. B.'s own System. I had a small suspicion too, besides, that the Editor had not seen the Edition in that Public Library, be-

* "Versiones duæ, altera à Naorgeorgo edita an. 1557. Altera à quodam, ut videtur, Jesuita in usum Schol. Soc. Jes. 1614. Jesuita in dictione non inornatus est, sed lusus," &c.

cause it is not entered in the Catalogue under the title of Phalaris, but of Epistolæ and Cujacius; so that a person that does not otherwise know of that edition, cannot find it in that Catalogue, unless by a great chance, or by reading it all over. I believed, likewise, "that Mr. B. had not seen the edition of "Aldus," because Aldus's text is sometimes better than that which Mr. B. has followed. I had that opinion then of his judgment, that I supposed he had not seen those things, because he did not give them the preference; as indeed it was a third argument to me that he had not seen Cujacius's, because he did not follow him in the true translation of the word *προρρίπη*. Thus I reasoned at that time; but I am now sensible that I argued weakly enough; for I have found, by tedious experience, that he can stumble upon things without seeing them, and see and handle things without understanding them.

[411]
P. 212. The Reader has now a fair and ingenuous account on my part; let us see if Mr. B.'s have the same characters of candour and veracity. He affirms, with great warmth and vehemence, that he had (*præ manibus*) "before him, and in his hands," both the edition of the Jesuit and that of Cujacius; and he adds too, "that the version ascribed to Cujacius is exactly the same with that put out by the Jesuit;" which is very true, for the Jesuit only reprinted it. Give me leave now, without calling Mr. B.'s honour in question, to argue a little for dispute's sake, that, notwithstanding this repeated asseveration, yet he had not Cujacius by him. Cujacius was printed at Geneva in the year 1606; and the Jesuit's edition, that Mr. B. used, was printed at Ingolstadt, 1614. Now Mr. B. tells the world in his Preface, "That the JESUIT made that version; and the "JESUIT," he says, "is elegant in his Latin, but differs from "the style of the original." But how could Mr. B. suppose that the Jesuit made it at Ingolstadt, 1614, if he then knew that "exactly the same version was printed VIII years before at "Geneva?" If he had both the Books "before his hands," he could not possibly make such a horrible blunder. Those that have a just esteem of his wit and sagacity, will never believe, no, not upon his own word, that he could be guilty of such wretched stupidity. There must needs be some other way then for solving this difficulty, though I confess it is too hard for me. I refer it, therefore, to the Reader's consideration; and if he find it graven him too, it may call a certain verse to his memory:—

"Accipe nunc Danaûm insidias, et crimine ab uno
"Disce omnes"—

II. Another

II. Another word of recent stamp was *θυγάτηρ*, which in Phalaris signifies "a maiden;" and I took that to be a manifest token of a later Greek; and, that it might not be suspected that I put a wrong meaning upon the word, I observed that even Tzetzes took it in the same sense that I do. But Mr. B. with the assistance of two Concordances, which shewed him the word *θυγάτηρ* in the Old and New Testament, has found out an answer; for he says that, in Prov. xxxi, 29, (Πολλὰι θυγατέρες ἐκτίσαντο πλάστον) "Many daughters have got riches:" *θυγατέρες* must mean *women* or *maidens*. Now the original here is (בנות) *daughters*; and it is well known to any one that ever perused the Septuagint, that they often translate word for word, though the phrase that results from it be against the genius of the Greek tongue. This has so filled that version with Hebraisms, that one may affirm Demosthenes himself could not have thoroughly understood it; and the Greek Fathers oftentimes mistook the sense of it, for want of skill in the Hebrew. What does Mr. B. mean then by this instance out of Proverbs? for if his *Sicilian Prince* have Hebraisms in his style, here is a new argument to shew him a cheat; and we must impeach him, not only for Atticizing, but for Hebraizing too. But I will leave Mr. B. to manage this new topic, and go on to his instances from the New Testament, where our Saviour says to the woman (Θάρσει θυγάτηρ, ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέ σε) "Daughter, be of good comfort, thy faith hath made thee whole*;" where Mr. B. supposes *θυγάτηρ* means not properly *Daughter*, but *Woman*. Now, if we view this argument on every side, we shall find it in all respects worthy of its Author; for, were it true here that *θυγάτηρ* means *woman*, it would be another Hebraism or Syriasm, which, instead of supporting Phalaris's credit, is enough to overthrow it. Nay, were it a genuine Greek phrase, this would still come very short of being a good answer; for I accuse this Sophist of a recent style, much later than the language of the true Phalaris's time; and Mr. B. in justification of him, brings a passage of the Evangelists, that come 90 years after Phalaris. But if it will give him any satisfaction, I will allow that the Sophist himself was as ancient as the Evangelists; no wonder then if the same use of the word *θυγάτηρ* should be found both in Him and Them: but yet, I humbly conceive, it would not follow that the old Phalaris would use it so. But the worst of all is still behind; that *θυγάτηρ*, in the Gospels, does not sig-

[412]

P. 67.

P. 67.

[413]

* Mat. ix. 22. Mark v. 34. Luke viii. 48.

nify *woman*, but properly and strictly *daughter*; for it was the common way in conversation, not only in the Eastern countries, but everywhere else, when persons of age and authority spoke kindly to their juniors, to say *Son*, or *Daughter*; and others again used to say *Father*, or *Mother*, though there was no kindred at all between them. So *Heleua*, in *Homer*, calls *Telemachus Son*: —

Δῶρόν τοι καὶ ἐγὼ, τέκνον φίλε, τῆτο δίδωμι·

and her husband *Menelaus* too accosts him in the same language: —

Αἴμαλος εἰς ἀγαθοῖο, φίλον τέκον, οἱ ἀγορεύεις.

On the contrary, *Euryalus* greets *Ulysses* with the title of *Father*: —

Δεῦρ' ἄγε καὶ σὺ, ξεῖνε πάτερ, πείρησαι ἀέθλων·

and so *Bacchis* says to *Chremes*, in *Terence*: —

“ — Asperum,

“ *Pater*, hoc est; aliud lenius sodes vide.”

[414] There are other instances innumerable of this custom in conversation. Our Saviour, therefore, called the woman *Daughter*, as *Eli* said to *Samuel*, *my Son*. But must we infer from thence that the words *son* and *daughter* may signify absolutely *man* and *woman*, as *θυγάτηρ* does in *Phalaris*? It is an inference that may become *Mr. B.*; but if other Authors should follow his fashion, it would sit but scurvily upon them. But he has another invention yet in reserve; and it is best to make way for him, for he seems to be in a rapture with it. “It is “probable,” he says, “that in the more ancient MSS. of “*Phalaris* it was written contractedly *Σερας*, which may be “read either *θυγατέρας* or *θεραπαίνας*.” And being full blown with the opinion of his wonderful acuteness in discovering this rare expedient, “He will ask,” he says, “an INSULT-“ING question: — If our great Dealer in MSS. did not ob-“serve this, where is his sagacity? If he observed it, with-“out owning it, where is his sincerity?” Why, they are just *where* they were before this question was put; and I dare warrant that neither of them are in danger of being hurt by it; for I deny that there is any such abbreviation used in any Greek MSS. as *Σερας* for *θεραπαίνας*. This the Examiner should have first proved, before he pretended to argue from it. But he will never be able to do that; nor to produce one single instance,

instance, no not out of all the MSS of the Bodley; for abbreviations were never made use of but in words that come frequently; so that both labour and room were saved by their repeated contractions: as $\overline{\pi\rho}$ was written for $\overline{\pi\alpha\lambda\eta\rho}$, $\overline{\alpha\nu\omicron\varsigma}$ for $\overline{\alpha\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron}$, and in the old Copies of the Bible, $\overline{\delta\varsigma}$, $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$, $\overline{\chi\varsigma}$ for $\overline{\delta\epsilon\delta\varsigma}$, $\overline{\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron}$, $\overline{\chi\rho\iota\varsigma\omicron\varsigma}$ because those words come in almost in every verse. But if a Writer should abbreviate such words as $\overline{\delta\epsilon\rho\alpha\pi\alpha\iota\nu\alpha\varsigma}$, which scarcely comes once in a whole Book, he would save himself but one moment's labour, and make his copy unintelligible. It is a mere dream then of our Examiner, to think $\overline{\delta\epsilon\rho\alpha\varsigma}$ may stand for $\overline{\delta\epsilon\rho\alpha\pi\alpha\iota\nu\alpha\varsigma}$ and it is just as if he should say that $\overline{\pi\epsilon}$ may stand for $\overline{\pi\rho\eta\varsigma\eta\rho}$, or $\overline{\alpha\nu\omicron\varsigma}$ for $\overline{\alpha\nu\theta\epsilon\rho\omega\pi\omicron}$. So seasonably has he put his *insulting* question, at a time when he may think he comes very well off, if himself be not insulted on. [415]

III. Another instance of language, which the true Phalaris would not have used, was $\overline{\pi\alpha\iota\delta\omega\nu\ \epsilon\rho\alpha\varsigma\alpha\iota}$ for the Sophist speaks of "parents who love their own children;" but in the old time those words had a lewd signification. But to this the Gentleman replies, "That to him the argument seems to lie quite the other way; for in later times the words were scandalous; so that a Sophist would not have put them in Phalaris's mouth; but in Phalaris's time the expression might be innocent." True, a Sophist of learning and good sense would have put proper words in the Tyrant's mouth; but this sorry Declaimer, as he has committed many worse blunders, so he might be guilty of this. We may know his character from that wretched ignorance of History and Antiquity which he so often discovers; and it is a just punishment upon him to have such Translators, and such Defenders. But let us see how Mr. B. proves that in the true Phalaris's time the words had an innocent meaning. "When Phalaris," he says, "would express the scandalous love of Boys, he does not use this word, as later Authors do; for he calls Lycinus $\overline{\pi\acute{o\rho}\nu\ \epsilon\nu\ \pi\alpha\iota\varsigma\iota}$, but not $\overline{\pi\alpha\iota\delta\epsilon\rho\alpha\varsigma\eta\nu}$." Here our learned Examiner takes $\overline{\pi\acute{o\rho}\nu\ \epsilon\nu\ \pi\alpha\iota\varsigma\iota}$ to be equivalent to $\overline{\pi\alpha\iota\delta\epsilon\rho\alpha\varsigma\eta\varsigma}$ and so indeed his translation expresses it:—"Cum pueris scortatorem esse." But his Assistant, methinks, might have taught him better;—that $\overline{\pi\acute{o\rho}\nu\ \epsilon\nu\ \pi\alpha\iota\varsigma\iota}$ is not *scortator*, but *scortum*, *cinædus*. Had he ever read Æschines's Oration against Timarchus, he would have met with a dozen instances; and indeed it is never taken in any other sense. The true version therefore of $\overline{\pi\acute{o\rho}\nu\ \epsilon\nu\ \pi\alpha\iota\varsigma\iota}$ is *inter pueros cinædum*,—"A Catamite, when you was a boy." So that this argument, instead of shewing that the Sophist would "put proper words

P. 63.

P. 65.

Ep. iv.

[416]

A a 3

" in

“ in Phalaris’s mouth,” has only shewn that a late Editor puts improper words in the Sophist’s mouth.

To convince Mr. B. that παιδεραστής had no innocent meaning, even so early as Phalaris’s time, Solon, a contemporary of the Tyrant, forbade it by law to all servants. “ He made a “ Law,” says Plutarch *, “ Δούλον μὴ ξηραλοφιῖν, μηδὲ παιδερασεῖν, that servants should not love boys;” and that the vile practice of it was in Sicily then, as well as in Athens. Mr. B. who believes the Epistles genuine, may be satisfied from the iv, which we have newly cited; for, if Lycinus was πόρνος, there was somebody else παιδεραστής. And they that have a lower opinion of those Epistles, may be convinced of it by another token; because Chariton and Melanippus, two Agrigentines and conspirators against Phalaris, are infamous for παιδερασία: though the Devil’s Oracle celebrated them for it†.

Εὐδαίμων Χαρίτων καὶ Μελάνιππος ἔφην,
Θείας ἡγητῆρις ἡφemeriois φιλότῃτος.

But Mr. B. farther objects, “ That Παιδων ἑρασται and Παιδεραι sound very differently.” Musically argued indeed! there is a very *sounding* syllable, *ων*, that makes them differ extremely. But we will allow Mr. B. to be a good judge of *sounds*, if he will allow others to be tolerable judges of *sense*: [417] and in that the words are so exactly alike, that the nicest Writers never thought of distinguishing them. Æschines, therefore, when he speaks of the same Law of Solon, does not use παιδερασεῖν, as Plutarch does; but παιδὸς ἑρᾶν† and even Plutarch himself, in another place expresses it so: — Δούλοις ἑρᾶν ἀρρένων παιδων ἀπέπε §. Let them sound then ever so differently, they are equivalent we see in signification.

Mr. B. concludes this point with what he thinks to be his strongest defence,—“ That παιδεραστής is used in Plato in a “ virtuous sense.” True, perhaps; but let us see how he proves it. Why, he brings a passage out of Plato’s Symposium: — Πάντως ὁ τοιοῦτος παιδεραστής τε καὶ φιλεραστής γίγνεται. But Mr. B. has once shewn us already || how very skilfull he is in Plato’s Writings; and his second essay upon them does not degenerate from his first. The matter lies thus: — The object

* Plut. Solone.

† See Athenæus, Ælian, Euseb. Præp. Evang.

‡ Æschin. c. Timarchum, Ἀλλος ἰλευθίγος παιδὸς μὴ ἑρᾶν,

§ Plut. in Ἐρωτικῷ.

|| See here, p. 279.

of that Dialogue of Plato's is an encomium of Love; and each of the guests makes a set speech in its commendation. But we must not suppose that all the speeches are philosophical, and becoming the mouth of Socrates, or Plato himself; but they are suited to the characters of the several persons that speak them. Some of them therefore are lewd enough, according to the company; for even Agatho himself, the master of the feast, was a Catamite, as appears by the Dialogue itself, and by the old Comedians and others. Among the rest then, Aristophanes the Comic Poet is introduced, making an Oration about Love; and he tells a long Fable, that at first mankind were all made double, with two heads, four arms, four legs, &c. and there were three sorts of them; some were double men, some double women, and some hermaphrodites. Afterwards, upon some offence they had committed, Jupiter split them all into two's; from whence arises now in mankind that natural desire of some companion as his other half, to perfect his being; and even all the varieties of that desire proceed from the same cause; for of those that in the former state were hermaphrodites, the male half still desires the woman; and all such are now lovers of women, and adulterers; and the female half desires the man; and such are lovers of men and adulteresses. But of those that in the original state were double men, both the halves now are lovers of males; so that when young, they are Catamites; and when grown up, they are *παιδερασαί*, lovers of boys; and of those that were double women, both are now *ἑταιρίσσαι*, women-lovers of women. This is the substance of Aristophanes's speech; and as it is observed by some of the antients, that Plato, in his Symposium, makes Aristophanes have a drunken hiccough, taking that revenge upon the Poet for abusing his master Socrates, so I am persuaded that, from the same motive he has put such a speech in that Poet's mouth, as shews him to be, what he really was, a very debauched fellow.—And is not Mr. B. now a man of wonderful judgment, to produce a passage out of this speech of Aristophanes, as an instance that *παιδερασαί* has a *virtuous sense*? What sort of *sense* was in himself then, I leave others to judge; for if the *παιδερασαί* there has an innocent meaning,—by the same rule the *μοιχοί*, and *μοιχεύτριαι*, and *ἑταιρίσσαι*, must be harmless names too; which perhaps Mr. B. will not be willing to affirm. But he says “That the speaker himself professes afterwards, that he “meaned not those words of a lascivious love;” which is just after his usual way, to defend one error by another; for the very words that he cites there, prove the contrary to what he

A a 4

draws

[418]

[419]
P. 66.

draws from them. Aristophanes, to make the Fable he had told look probable, describes some instances of such vehement lovers, that the one cannot live at ease one moment out of the other's company : in which cases, says he, the pleasure of vengery does not seem a competent cause of it ; but the true reason is, that every such couple were the numerical halves that made up one complete person in the former state ; whereby they have such a natural propensity to one another, that, if it were possible, they would be one body again. Is it not evident here now that *a lascivious love* is supposed, only it is not allowed as an adequate cause ? Read but Aristophanes's own Plays, and the character that is given of him in this very Symposium *, and then say if his meaning can be so chaste here.

P. 66. We have seen now what a rare Commentator upon Plato our Learned Examiner is ; and “ I shall leave him to be scourged,” not only by the Platonists, as he did Me, but by every one that understands good sense and decorum. But yet, after all, I am far from asserting that παιδεραστὴς and παιδικὰ are never innocently meant in Plato, and other Socratical Writers ; for the word was used metaphorically ; and though it had better been let alone, and no scandal been given by it, yet in itself the metaphor was proper and just ; for a Philosopher may be said to be the true Παιδων ἐραστὴς, in opposition to the others, since what they admire in beauty, out of impure lust, he loves and reverences as an image of divine beauty. But even this is a certain argument that Παιδων ἐραστὰι could not in those ages signify “ Lovers of their own children ” (as it does in Phalaris's Epistles) no not metaphorically †, because there was nothing to take such a metaphor from ; for though Sodomy was an epidemical vice in those unhappy ages of the world, yet the abomination of a father with his own son, such a horrid mixture of Sodomy and Incest, was never spoken of even then, nor had any name. Nay, though we should suppose that such a complicate wickedness had been practised among them, yet the name would have been even then accounted too foul and abominable to be employed for a modest metaphor.

IV. Mr. B. has had the privilege of committing a great number of mistakes ; and, upon a review, I do not find he has

* Ἀριστοφάνης, ὃ περὶ Διόνυσον καὶ Ἀφροδίτην πᾶσα διατριβή.

† After all, the use of this word in an innocent sense is proved from Eurip. Supplic. ver. 1088. Παιδων τ' ἐραστὴς ἦν, i. e. a lover or desirer of children : παιδων being there used for τέκνων.—Markland, in loc.

yet

yet made out that I have written one single word amiss, except where, by a small slip of the memory, Buda was put for Belgrade. Four hundred pages then have been all spent in refuting his abuses and errors: — a very great exercise both of patience and good-nature; for a recompence of all which tedious labour, I desire but one small favour of him, “That he will give me leave to make the next mistake.” I will promise him it shall be no shameful one; and it shall be the only time I will trouble him in this way in all the controversy that I have with him. Among the words that I believed had an innovated sense in the Epistles of Phalaris, there were Προδίδουμι, “to give before-hand;” and Διόκω, “to follow as a friend, not as a pursuer.” I could not call to mind at that time any old writer that had used them so; and the press staying for more copy (for the whole Dissertation was carried thither, leaf by leaf, while the ink was scarcely dry on them) I had no leisure to make any search. I will freely own therefore to Mr. B that my memory, which is none of the best, deceived me here; for I had formerly read those very passages that he produces; and, when I read them, I understood them in the same meaning that he does, though at that time they were quite out of my mind. [421]

But though I was mistaken by a deceitful memory, yet the glory that Mr. B. acquires by correcting the error, is too light to be put in the balance against his faults, though I shall not go about to make it less; but give him and his admirers leave to magnify it as much as they can. He has told me “That I expose myself to be corrected by every one that can turn an Index or a Lexicon;” and, to explain himself, he adds in his margin this passage of Quintilian*, which serves for no other purpose there but to shew he understood it not; for Quintilian does not speak of such Indexes as Books have now-a-days; but, after he had named several of the Greek Poets; Homer, Antimachus, Euphorion, &c. “I pass over the names of the rest,” says he, “for there is nobody so destitute of the means of knowing them, but he may copy the catalogue of them out of a Library.” This shews us that in those days too the Libraries had Catalogues of the Books belonging to them; but what relation has that to Lexicons and our modern Indexes? Mr. B. presently excuses himself for “the multitude of quotations” that fill the margin of “that odd work of his;”—

P. 68.

* Quint. x, 1. “Nec sane quisquam est tam procul à cognitione eorum remotus, ut non Indicem certe ex Bibliothecâ sumptum transferre in Libros suos possit.”

and

[422] and indeed, after such a citation from Quintilian, it was very seasonable to beg that pardon, though upon another account than he was aware of. But, to forgive our Examiner this blunder, it is very true what he says, That “a man that can turn an “Index or a Lexicon,” might easily correct those mistakes of mine; for those significations of *δίωκω* and *πρὸδιδωμι*, which I had then forgotten, are taken notice of in the Greek Concordances and Constantine’s Lexicon. Mr. B. then has taught the world nothing, nor improved learning in any sort; for the things were known, we see, a hundred years ago; — and it is pretty remarkable, that, after all the clamour of the Examiner, and some inferior tools that have seconded him, “that I know “nothing but out of Indexes and Lexicons*,” yet the only mistake that their united learning could convict me of had been avoided, if I really were such a turner of Indexes and Lexicons.

A mistake through mere forgetfulness, and but once or very seldom committed, has been always esteemed one of the best sort, and to leave the least blemish upon the Author; for, if that were enough to disgrace a Writer, nobody could escape the infamy, except those that were inspired. If I do not make false judgments of things, and if I reason truly from premises, for a bare error of the memory I shall not be solicitous; but fairly trust my reputation to the present age and posterity. Whatever the world shall think of my performances, I shall acquiesce in the censure. As I do not write Books for fame, so I am not concerned about the reception they shall meet with:—

[423]

— “Valeat res ludicra, si me
“Palma negata macrum, donata reducit opimum.”

However, when I consider what the things are that, among the best judges, raise or depress the character of a man of letters, I had much rather be found guilty of forgetting those unusual significations of *πρὸδιδωμι* and *δίωκω*, than of managing the matter as Mr. B. has done; for of eight examples that he has brought of the latter of those words, six are nothing to the purpose. The thing that I had said was this, That *δίωκω* then only signified *to pursue*, “when that which fled feared “and shunned the pursuer;” as where Achilles pursues Hector, in Homer: —

* “Virum in volvendis Lexicis satis diligentem.” A. ALSOP.

T

Τῇ ῥα παρὰδραμέτην, φεύγων, ὃ δ' ἔπιθε δῶκον·
Πρόθε μὲν ἰσθλὸς ἔφηνε, δῶκε δὲ μὴ μίγ' ἀμείνων.

And Mr. B. in refutation of this has produced six instances, where δῶκω does not at all mean to *pursue*, but, in a metaphorical sense, to *desire*, to *court*, to *seek*. And what are all these to the point? I spoke of that sense of δῶκω when it signifies to *pursue*; it was the very supposition that it had the meaning of *pursuing*; which notion, when it belonged to it, was accompanied, as I then thought, with another of *being shunned*. As for the figurative sense of *desiring* and *seeking*, that I had not forgotten; for it is the most common acceptance of it. The only true way to answer me was to bring an instance where it means a *pursuit*, but yet without being *shunned*; as when one friend *pursues* or *follows after* another: and I own that two of his instances plainly prove this; but the other six that are all metaphor, among which are those out of Scripture, are not at all pertinent to the business; and they are a greater evidence of his bad judgment, than mine are of my bad memory.

[424]

Mr. B. makes a mighty outcry, as if my forgetting a Greek word in the Septuagint, or the New Testament, was to subvert the authority of them; “and he has an enquiry to make of me, “Whether I think my Philosophical Lectures serve more to “the establishment of Religion, than my Criticisms do to “overthrow it?” The Gentleman has told us what disposition he is of, for he thinks “ridicule the most diverting thing in the “world.” But I humbly conceive that he had better employ his talent at *grimace* and *banter* upon other occasions, than where the Scripture is concerned; for it shews no great reverence to those Sacred Writings to bring them, though it be but as accessaries, into farce and ridicule. And perhaps it is no great discretion in him to cast such an oblique slur upon my “Lectures against Atheism*.” They were preached upon an

P. 62, 63.

P. 67, 68.

P. 285.

* It was a current report in my time, at *Oxford*, that during this controversy, the *Christ Church* men, whenever they published any thing themselves, had always a sting at Bentley (see ALSOP, above); and, at the same time, desired their friends of other Colleges to second their strokes. And hence, I was told, sprang that sarcastical reflection made on part of our Author's Lectures by (another wise good-natured man) Dr. KEIL, of *Baliol College*. “I am not surprised to find an error of this “nature asserted by one who, as it appears, is not very well skilled in “Astronomy. But it were to be wished that great Critics would confine their labours to their Lexicons, and not venture to *guess* in those “parts of Learning which are capable of demonstration; for this is our “present case.” *Examination of Dr. BURNET's Theory of the Earth*, p. 58, 2d edition. If you compare KEIL's and ALSOP's together, the reflections will appear to have been derived from the same source. O.

establishment

establishment of the great and good Mr. Boyle, to whom this Gentleman has the honour to be related ; and though they are much below what I could wish them, and what the subject of them deserves, yet the world has received them favourably, and they are translated into more languages than one. He had better, therefore, have omitted this little affront upon those Sermons, lest the Readers, calling to mind the Founder of that Lecture, should be invited to make a comparison between him and another of his name.

- [425] The most excellent Bishop Pearson had designed a new Edition of Ignatius's Epistles, with an ample Commentary : a specimen of which posthumous work has been published by the learned Dr. Smith, and the whole is earnestly expected from him ; for though it has not passed the last hand of the Author, yet it is every way worthy of him ; and the very dust of his writings is gold. In that published specimen there is this annotation upon the words of Ignatius : — “ ΤΟΝ ΤΜΑΣ ΣΟΦΙΣΑΝΤΑ. Vox Paulina, ex 2 Tim. iii. 15. Τὰ δὲ νῦν σε σοφίσαι εἰς σωτηρίαν. *Quæ te possunt sapientem reddere.* “ Neque ante eum vox activa eo sensu reperitur cum “ accusativo personæ ;” where the Bishop positively affirms “ That Σοφίζειν, in the acceptation of *making wise*, is a word of “ St. Paul's framing ; for, before him, nobody used it in that sense.” But in this his memory deceived him ; for, as Dr. Smith observed to me, there is the very same use of the word in Psalm xviii, 8. Ἡ μαρτυρία κυρίου πῖση, σοφίξασα νῆπιον and Psalm civ, 22. Καὶ τὰς πρεσβυτέρους αὐτῶ σοφίσαι. What shall we say now to this ? for the Bishop's case is exactly mine. His Lordship had forgotten one word in the Bible, and I had forgotten another. Will the Examiner insult upon that great man as he has done upon me ? I will only change the persons, and we shall see how his *insulting* and *grimace* becomes him.
- P. 60. “ The Bishop avers, that St. Paul is the first that uses Σοφίζειν “ for *making wise*. What shall we do then for the Septuagint ? At this rate, that Translation must come after St. Paul ; so that the writings that carry their names must be “ 300 years younger than we Christians suppose them ; and “ that version ascribed to the LXX cannot be an ancient work, “ but was penned by some recent Sophist. What shall we say “ to this ? Shall we allow Bishop Pearson to be a scurvy Critic ; or shall we, in tenderness to his honour, give up our “ Greek Bibles ? Perhaps the Bishop may for this once be “ mistaken ; but I have one enquiry more to make of him on “ this occasion, and that is this, Whether he thinks his Expositi- “ tion

"tion of the Creed serves more to the establishment of Religion, than his Criticisms do to overthrow it? For is he not positive that *Σοφίαν*, in that sense, was first used by St. Paul? And is not the very same word in the same sense to be met with twice in the Septuagint? Should not so profound a Grecian and Divine as he is, have looked a little into the Old Testament before he had pronounced such rash and groundless assertions? Could men imagine one who writes at this rate to have any meaning, they would think he had a very ill one; but the whole management of his controversies clears him from all suspicions of meaning and design." These are the very words of Mr. B. (only the Bishop and his Writings are substituted for Me and Mine) not that I make any comparison of my poor papers with that great man's incomparable works; but I would shew that Mr. B.'s argument holds alike against us Both. And Mr. B. must needs acknowledge now, that "I have one good page" in this Edition of my Dissertation, as well as I had in the former; for, being his own, I think I know his humour so well, that he cannot but be pleased with it.

Præf.

But to put an end to this article, the only thing that Mr. B. has said well upon this head, is about the meaning of two words, which may prove, indeed, that I was mistaken; but it does not at all defend his Phalaris; for of the five words that I instanced in, the greater part do still keep their ground; and if two strings be broken, here are three yet left that will hold as strongly as all the five. If the Sicilian Prince, therefore, has no better a champion than Mr. B. is, his case will still appear to be desperate; for the wild question that the Examiner puts to me, "How do you know but those words might be in use in Phalaris's time, and be dropped afterwards when the learned age came on, and be revived again as that declined?" Though it deserve no answer, yet it has one; for we know from the Laws of Solon, who was Phalaris's contemporary, that the language of the Epistles was not the language of that time; nay, though we had not those remains of Solon's to shew, Mr. B.'s suppositions would still be very infirm ones; for here are three revolutions of the same words (*used, dropped, revived*) that are all precariously supposed without any manner of proof. A way of argumentation that some *young Writers* may make a dust with; but then their works will hardly live to be old ones.

[427]

P. 61.

Præf.

BUT

XIV.

BUT should we connive at his using the Attic dialect, and say not a word of those flaws and innovations in his style, yet there is one thing still that I fear will more difficultly be forgiven him; that is, a very slippery way in telling of money. This is a tender point, and will make every body shy and cautious of entertaining him. In the LXXXV Epistle he talks of a Hundred Talents (*τάλαντα ἑκατόν*); of Fifteen more in the CXVIII; Eight in the CXXXVII; Seven in the CIV; Five in the CXLIII; and Three in the xcv. [428] These affairs being transacted in the middle of Sicily, and all the persons concerned being natives and inhabitants there, who would not be ready to conclude that he meant the Talent of the country? since he gives not the least hint of his meaning a foreign sum. If a bargain were made in England to pay so many Pounds, or Marks, and the party should pretend at last that he meant Scots Marks, or French Livres, few, I suppose, would care to have dealings with him. Now this is the very case in so many of these Letters. In the LXXth, indeed, he is more punctual with Polyclitus, his Physician; for he speaks expressly of Attic money (*Μυριάδας Ἀττικὰς πέντε*) 50,000 Attic drachms. But this is so far from excusing him, that it is a plain condemnation out of his own mouth; for if it was necessary to tell Polyclitus that he meant the Attic Money, and not the Sicilian, why had he not the same caution and ingenuity towards all the rest? We are to know, that in Sicily, as in most other countries, the name and value of their coins, and the way of reckoning by sums, were peculiar. The sum Talent, in the Sicilian account, contained no more in specie than Three Attic drachms, or Roman denares, as plainly appears [429] from Aristotle *, in his now lost Treatise of the Sicilian

* Pollux, lib. ix. c. 6.

lian Governments. And the words of Festus are most express, "There are several sorts of Talents; the Attic contains 6000 Denares, the Syracusan 3 Denares*." What an immense difference! One Attic Talent had the real value of Two Thousand Sicilian Talents! Now, in all these Epistles, the very circumstance assures us, that by the word Talent, simply named, the Attic Talent is understood. But should not our wise Sophist have known that a Talent, in that country where he had laid the scene of his Letters, was quite another thing? Without question, if the true Phalaris had penned them, he would have reckoned these sums by the Sicilian Talents, increasing only the number; or, should he have made use of the Attic account, he would always have given express notice of it, never saying *τάλαντον* alone without the addition of *Ἀττικόν*.

THE Examiner enters upon this article with such an Air of satisfaction, as carries in it an assurance of victory. "If the Doctor," says he, "can make this out, I promise to renounce the whole set of Epistles." Now here is fair encouragement for me to take pains, since, if I can carry this single point, I shall have the honour of making by it so illustrious a proselyte. But if we consider that extraordinary zeal that he shews all along for his Sicilian Prince, we may look upon this as a *defiance* rather than a *promise*; nay, I am informed that this part in particular is by some others, as well as by himself, believed to be unanswerable†; nay, that some have proceeded

P 73.

[430]

so

* "Talentorum non unum genus: Atticum est sex millium denarium, Syracusanum trium denarium."

† What Mr. Boyle is here said to have thought of this part of his book, many, and those too friends to Dr. B. (as he told me himself) thought of the whole, when it first came out; nor could be convinced of the contrary, till he, first asking them where it was so impregnable, and confuting one article after another upon the spot as fast as they instanced; assured them it was all of the same kind, and proved it so in this answer; for his contempt of them was very real and unaffected, though he had no malignity against them, and became much connected afterwards, as Master of Trinity College, with Atterbury, as Dean of Christ Church and Westminster. Mr. Boyle also made him a visit at Cambridge.

so far in its commendation, as to suspect that it was not written by the same hand that made the rest of the Book. But I shall do the Examiner that piece of service to clear him of that hard censure upon account of this admired Chapter; for I will prove it is no better than the rest of the performance; but every paragraph in it either mistake or false reasoning, from beginning to end.

P. 74. Before he comes to the *buis'ness* itself, he will shew us how captious he can be, and how expert at chicanery. He would ridicule my comparison of the Sicilian Talent in Phalaris to the Scots Marks and French Livres; "for the case," he says, "is just contrary." Now the ground of my comparison was this: — By the spurious Phalaris, the Reader is made at first to believe that great sums of money are expended; Ten Talents and a Hundred Talents; but when he comes to look narrowly into the matter, he finds he is deceived; for the Sicilian Talent must be intended, if he be the true Phalaris, and by that means the account will fall and dwindle from a Hundred Pounds Sterling to a single Shilling. Let the Reader be judge now if the comparison was not just. But he asks me "What cloudy Author had I been conversing with, that could give this perverse turn to my imagination?" If conversation "with a cloudy Author" would necessarily *confound* a man's head, Mr. B. might be secure, for his Book could never be answered; but I hope that, notwithstanding that dangerous *conversation* that I have had with it for some time, I can yet be able to *clear up* all the puzzling and perplexed stuff that he has brought, or can bring against me.

[431]

But first it may not be improper, for the satisfaction of such as read not Phalaris's Epistles, to shew the Attic Talent must be meant there (value 180*l.* English) not the Sicilian Talent, which is no more than Five Groats*. I suppose here, as I did above, that the Attic Pound weight of XII Ounces is equal to an English one; so that a Mina, weighing XII Ounces of Silver, may be reckoned equal to three Pounds Sterling.

Cambridge. The two Dr. Freinds, Tony Alsop, W. King, &c. and even Aldrich and Smallridge, were not considerable enough to deserve his notice, though John Freind wrote the Examination of his Dissertation upon Æsop; Smallridge wrote the Burlesque Parody, proving that Dr. B. could not write the Dissertation, by the same arguments he made use of to prove Phalaris could not write the Epistles; Alsop speaks of him with rudeness and contempt in the Preface to his edition of the Æsopæan Fables; and King continued ridiculing him in Dialogues of the Dead, &c. *Solstitialis herba, paulisper fuere.* S.

† See here, p. 260.

There

There is no need of greater exactness in our present calculations. Now the Tyrant is introduced, complaining that the Catanians, by an incursion into his territories, had plundered him of VII Talents; which, if they be supposed Attic Talents, make 1260*l.* Sterling; but if Sicilian, but 12*s.* 7*d.*: too small a sum for a Prince to be concerned at. In another place, out of great liberality, he gives V Talents for a lady's portion, which, in Attic, is 900*l.* Sterling; but in Sicilian, 9*s.*: — too small a fortune for a lady of her quality. There are more instances of this sort; and in several places too he names (δραχμαὶ) Drachms, which were no Sicilian money.

Mr. B. begins with an attack against the credit of my witnesses, Pollux, Festus, and Aristotle. And first he cavils at my calling Aristotle's book a treatise of the Sicilian governments. He owns that Aristotle wrote "an Account of the Governments of the Sicilian Cities (as the Πολίτεια Συρακυσίων, Ιμεραίων, Ακραγαντίνων, Γελώνων, &c.); but it does not appear that the Book bore such a title." But if that do not appear, something else plainly does, that Mr. B. was in great want of arguments when he descended to such trifling exceptions; among which I must reckon what he says against the authority of Pollux, "That one of Seberus's MSS. wanted those pages whence this passage is cited, so that there is room to doubt whether it be genuine;" but it was extant in the MS. from which Aldus first printed the Book, and in a MS. of the late Is. Vossius, a transcript of which I have by me; and in the Palatine MS. used by Salmasius*. The same Seberus informs us that one of his MSS. wanted all the IV last Books, and two of them wanted eight; will Mr. B. therefore discard all those, and leave us two only of the ten? And is it not something like a riddle, that so small a hole will make room for him to doubt if Pollux's passage be genuine; and yet no room is wide enough to let him doubt if his Phalaris be genuine?

But allowing the passage to be Pollux's own, yet "we are told there," he says, "that a Sicilian Talent is equal to XII Νύμμοι, and a Νύμμος equal to three Ὀμόλια which Ὀμόλια is a corrupted word, and must be helped out by a correction; so that all that we can talk from Pollux about the Nummus and the Talent, is bottomed upon a mere Conjecture." But this objection of the Examiner is bottomed upon a mistake of his own, for the MS. of Vossius has it plainly Ἡμισόλια nay, though all the copies were corrupted here, they would do the Examiner no service, because our ac-

* Salmas. de Modo Usur. p. 257.

counts with Phalaris about his Talents are not so nice as to depend upon (ὀμόλια or ἡμιὀμόλια) “a penny, or three half-pence;” for we know, from another passage which is not [433] corrupted, that the Νῆμμος was a single piece of Silver*. Let the piece then be as big as the Examiner dares suppose it; yet, if the Sicilian Talent contained but xii of them, it is still vastly too low to be meant in the Epistles.

P. 78. The next page is spent in telling us “That those who would settle the value of the Sicilian Talent from its adjustment to xii Νῆμμοι, SEEM to take it for granted that Νῆμμος there means the Roman Nummus or Sestertius; but it cannot be so, because the words are not Pollux’s, but Aristotle’s; who lived before the Roman Sestertius was coined. So that the ground upon which the computation of the Talent SEEMS to be made, plainly fails.” What may seem to Mr. B.’s imagination, is too wide to be measured and comprehended by Mine. But, I am persuaded, there is not one Writer extant that has given the least hint that he believed the Nummus here was compared by Aristotle to the Roman Sestertius. This is P. 203. a dream therefore of the Examiner’s; for he tells us, “It is no wonder if he should not be awake sometimes;” and he seems now to have been in one of his sleepy fits. The value of the Sicilian Talent may be gathered from this passage thus:—a Talent was xii Νῆμμοι, and every Νῆμμος was an Obolus and a half. Now six Oboli make a Drachm; so that four Νῆμμοι and a Drachm are equivalent. If a Talent therefore contain but xii Νῆμμοι, it must contain three Drachms. Thus we see the Sicilian Talent is adjusted in its value, as I had reckoned it before, without any consideration of the Roman Sestertius.

But, “after all,” says he, “I have imposed upon people in P. 79. my valuation; for Aristotle mentions two sorts of Sicilian Talents; the old one, consisting of xxiv Νῆμμοι the new [434] “one xii; which small one I have followed in my computations, though Phalaris must be supposed to reckon by the “most ancient.” This indeed is very material, and I know not how to come off; for I have sunk the Prince’s expences half in half. Let them be stated then, as Mr. B. will have them; and so the Catanians plundered Phalaris of 1l. 15s. 2d. and the lady’s fortune, that he paid out of his coffers, came to 18s. both which bills I had cut off in the middle. And is the matter now mended by this? or is my argument at all the weaker for it? Mr. B. shews himself to be a better steward of his Master Phalaris’s revenue than of his own reputation; for

* Pollux, p. 436.

he owns "the point is not worth contending for." But, however, it serves to fill a whole page, which is no inconsiderable service. The reason why, of the two accounts that were both equal to my main purpose, I chose to follow the latter, was because Festus reckons the Syracusian Talent by Aristotle's lower rate; so that two Authors concurring in it, I gave it the preference.

Mr. B. grows at last angry with Pollux himself; "and will give him no credit in this matter; for he cites such things here out of Aristotle as cannot be admitted; no, not upon Aristotle's own testimony;"—as where he tells us "That the Sicilians reckoned (δύο Χαλκῆς) two brass pieces to be equal to Ἐξάλιτρα, six Litrae; and six brass pieces to be equal to half a Litra. But how can two be x11 times as many as six? Again," says he, "to confound us the more, he tells us from the same Aristotle, that ἑξ τάλαντα, six Talents, are equal to three brass Pieces; and that τρία τάλαντα, three Talents, are equal to three brass Pieces. But how can three be more than six?" Now, if this argument have any force in it, it must prove that Aristotle, or Pollux at least, could not count three; nor knew the difference between two and six. Mr. B. I dare say, is the first man that disputed at this rate; and till such another Aristotle, as he describes here, comes into the world, perhaps he will be the last. The whole banter is only founded upon three false readings of Pollux:—Ἐξάλιτρα*, and Ἐξ Τάλαντα, and Τρία Τάλαντα†. The two first belonged to one and the same thing, and must both be corrected Ἐξάντα and the third Τριάντα. So slight an emendation makes the whole passage consistent; and I shall shew, by and by, that it is both necessary and certain. "The Examiner must give me leave now and then to ask him one of his own questions," though I will not give it as he does the epithet, INSULTING. "If our great dealer in *spurious Authors* did not observe this, where is his sagacity?—if he observed it without owning it, where is his sincerity?" One of the two will be very hard pressed; but for his sincerity I will be voucher in this particular, because it is plain, by his miserable offer at a correction (to be considered *anon*) that his sagacity "was not awake" here.

P. 80.

[435]

P. 67.

But he says, "Pollux in the same place informs us, that the Talent of every country was divided into LX Minæ, and each of those Minæ into c Drachms. If the Sicilian Talent then was but three Attic Drachms, the Sicilian Mina was

P. 81.

* Pollux p. 216.

* P. 436.

- [436] “no more than one English Farthing and a half, and the Drachm
 “not the LXVth part of a Farthing, and yet in Silver too: “a
 “species of money not to be counted without the help of micro-
 “scopes; so that when we have occasion hereafter to express the
 “value, or rather worthlessness, of any contemptible performance,
 “we shall say it is not worth a Sicilian Drachm.” I like the
 Gentleman’s motion well; and, since we can never have a
 better *occasion* of using this new *saying*, I must crave leave to
 tell him that his own *performance* in this very paragraph is
 “contemptible, and not worth one of his *imaginary* Sicilian
 Drachms;” for there is no such thing in Pollux as what the
 Examiner tells us from him, “That the Talent of each country
 “was divided into LX Minæ.” I will set down that Author’s
 words: “As the Mina,” says he, “at Athens contained c Attic
 “Drachms, so the Minæ of other Countries contained c
 “Drachms of each Country; which Drachms were in value
 “to the Attic Drachm in the same proportion as the Talent
 of each (abovementioned) was to the Attic Talent*.” Here
 it is evident from Pollux, that the Mina of every Country
 contained c Drachms, and the Drachm of every Country was
 the 6000th part of the Talent of that Country; but here is
 not the least hint that the Talent of every Country contained
 LX Minæ. These two, I humbly conceive, are very different
 propositions; though the Examiner, with his Logical System in
 his head, confounded them. Wherever there were such names
 of money as Minæ and Drachms, there was a Talent;
 Pollux therefore observed truly, that in every country these
 two bore the same proportion to Attic Minæ and Drachms,
 as Talent did to Talent. But then it is not true, in the re-
 verse, that wherever there was a Talent, there were Minæ
 and Drachms; for in Sicily and the Doric colonies of Italy,
 Tarentum, Rhegium, Neapolis, there was a Talent; but no
 such name, nor species, nor sum, as either Mina or Drachm.
 The Talent there was not divided into Minæ and Drachms,
 but into Νέμμης, Λίτρας, Οὐγκίας. Pollux therefore has
 quite separated his account of the Sicilian money from that
 of other nations†; but if the Sicilian Talent had been divisible
 into Minæ and Drachms, as the other Talents he there speaks
 of, he would certainly have included that too in his general
- [[437]

* Pollux, p. 437. Ἡ μὲν δὲ ὡς παρ’ Ἀθηναίους ἑκατὸν εἶχε δραχμὰς Ἀτ-
 τικὰς, ὅτε καὶ παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις τὰς ἐπιχωρίως δυναμένας πρὸς λόγον τῇ καθ’
 ἑκάστην τάλαντι κατὰ τὴν προσθήκην καὶ ὑφαίρεσιν.

† Pollux, p. 437.

estimation of Talents. Let the Reader now be judge if the Examiner's performances here do not deserve his own new invented expression, "not worth a Sicilian Drachm." Let him take it then to himself; for he tells us that his Sicilian Prince was celebrated for his justice, when he made Perillus handsel his own invention*. Mr. B. therefore, cannot complain if He gives the first handsel to His, though the phrase carries a lower *worthlessness* in it than he was aware of; for he computed the Sicilian Drachm to be the LXVth part of an English Farthing; whereas now it plainly appears to be nothing at all, and exactly of the same value with an Utopian Drachm.

Mr. B. in his margin, quotes two very learned men, Brerewood and Gronovius, who affirm, he says, "that every Talent contains 6000 Drachms." Now, if this had really been their opinion, yet it had signified nothing here; for we do not go by authorities, but by truth. If they believed so, they were certainly mistaken; neither do Pollux and Suidas, the Authors cited by Brerewood, say any such matter. But if Mr. B. had either been diligent or ingenuous here, he would have seen that it was only a loose expression of those two learned men, that dropped from them unawares; for Brerewood in the same page, and Gronovius in the same chapter, that Mr. B. has quoted, expressly affirm on my side, that the Sicilian Talent was anciently six, and afterwards three Denares. Mr. B. we see, has another *obligation* here "to excuse himself to the Reader for his multitude of quotations."

His next attempt is upon the passage of Festus, "Talentum Syracusanum trium Denarium;" which he ushers in with an harangue about Festus's Abridgment of Verrius Flaccus, and Paulus Diaconus's Abridgment of Festus: a story known to every body that have once looked into Festus. But what was this to his purpose? Let Paulus be as "mean a writer" as Mr. B. pleases, yet this passage is not cited from his Epitome, but from Festus himself. But Mr. B. will now tell us something "which is more to his purpose, That all the Editions of Festus take care to warn us, that for *Syracusanum trium Denarium*, we ought to read *Syracusanum trium Millium Denarium*;" and thereupon, to make a show and a noise with, he crams his poor margin with half a dozen citations. Now the thing is no more than this:—The first Editor of this passage of Festus, not understanding how a

* Præf. Phalar.

Talent could be so little a sum as three Denares, put that conjecture in the margin for an emendation, as he thought it; and so it has been continued since, and some of the Editors have espoused it; for all Editors, Mr. B. knows, are not infallible. But the MS. Copy of Festus, and the text of all the Editions, represent it as it is quoted by me; and all the best Writers about money have for this hundred years embraced it (Scaliger, Brerewood, Salmasius, Gronovius, &c.); and, before this Section is ended, it will be made out to be the true Reading.

P. 85, 86,
87, 88.

But he will prove now out of Sicilian Writers, and those that speak of Sicilian affairs, that the Talent of that country had not such a low value as I would assign to it out of Festus and Pollux; but of all his Authors there is but one that writes in the Sicilian dialect, and that is Theocritus; and he indeed mentions a Mina as the price of a woman's gown, and VII Drachms paid for v fleeces of wool, which cannot be of that low and small sort of Drachms, that Mr. B. has now discovered "by the help of his microscope." Now allowing what Mr. B. supposes, that Theocritus speaks here of Sicilian money, yet it ought to be considered that he lived near ccc years after Phalaris's time, in which interval the species of money might be altered in Sicily. That the money of Syracuse, where Theocritus was born, was recoinced in that time, is very certain. Aristotle informs us* that Dionysius the First got all the money and riches of Syracuse into his hands in five years time†; and that, having borrowed money of the citizens at interest, upon their demanding it, he ordered every man, upon the pain of death, to bring in all the money he had; and when the money was brought in he recoinced it, and made every piece of new money pass for double the former value, and so paid them out of their own silver. So the Romans, in the first Punic war, recoinced all their brass money; and made every ounce go for vi times as much as it did before‡. But Dionysius, perhaps, did not only recoin the money of Syracuse, but alter the species too and the names of it; for Aristotle there says he coined a Drachm, which he put off for a double Drachm§. Now we may gather from Aristotle himself, as Pollux has cited him, that, among the old Sicilian money, there was no such name as a Drachm. Dio-

* Arist. Polit. v. 11.

† Arist. Oecon. ii. 20.

‡ Pliny xxxiii. 3.

§ Δραχμὴν δύο δραχμῶν δραχμὰς.

nysius,

nysius, therefore, or somebody before him, had altered the money at Syracuse, and had introduced the Greek species there. But perhaps we ought not to take Aristotle's words so strictly and literally in this place. In his accounts of the Sicilian Governments, whence Pollux has his citations, he was obliged to use the words of the country; but in his *Œconomics* he might take the common liberty of Writers to reduce the Sicilian money to some equivalent of the Attic. By the Drachm, therefore, of Dionysius, he may mean perhaps the Sicilian *Δεκάλιτρον*, or Denare, and express it by the name of Drachma, as known among the Grecians, and about the same value. But let this be as every one pleases, I suppose it will be allowed, that in *ccc* years time the species of money might be altered in Sicily; as in England, by the late great restitution of our coin, the species called Ninepences and Fourpence-halfpennies are gone, and perhaps may never be reduced into use again. What Aristotle, therefore, tells us about the old Sicilian money, cannot be refuted from the species of Theocritus's time, or any that come after him.

Besides this, I have another answer to this instance from Theocritus; for the Poet does not speak of Sicilian money. The passages that Mr. B. cites are out of the xvth *Idyllium*: —

- ΓΟ. Πραξινοῖα, μάλα τοι τὸ καλαπτιυχὲς ἐμπερόναμα
 Τέτο ἀρίπει· λίγαι μοι, πόσσῳ κατέβα τοι ἂφ' ἰσῶ;
 Πς. Μὴ μνάσης, Γεργοί· πλείον ἀργυρίῳ καθαυρῶ μνᾶν
 Ἄν δὺο —

[441]

and again,

Χάμδς ταυλά γ' ἔχει, φθόρος ἀργυρίῳ, Διοκλείδας·
 Ἐπὶ δὲ δραχμῶν κυνάδας, γραῖαν ἀποδίλματα πηρῶν,
 Πίπτε πόνως ἔλαδ' ἰχθὺς, ἅπαν ῥύπον, ἔργον ἐκ' ἔργου

where it is owned that Minæ and Drachms are spoken of; but who are the persons that speak? Mr. B. tells us "They" are Syracusan Ladies. No wonder that he has made Ladies of two women of low rank; for he made a King Zaleucus from a Shepherd; and to go to the palace to see a sight there, like the King's fine coach, is, in Mr. B.'s language, "to appear" at Court." But, to let that pass, — Pray where are these Ladies when they say this? I must declare here my astonishment at the conduct of our Examiner; and it seems to me to be wholly unaccountable, unless I have recourse again to that fatality of mistaking that he seems to lie under. What, was he *not awake* here neither? that he could see the scene of this *Idyllium* was not at Syracuse in Sicily, but at Alexandria in

B b 4

Ægypt!

Ægypt! The Idyllium itself, had he ever read it, would have told him this over and over

(Βάμεις τῷ βασιλεῖ ἐπ' ἀφνειῷ Πτολεμαίῳ)

[442] “Let us go to King Ptolemee’s court,” says one woman to the other; and so away they foot it, and return home before dinner. Now, if they lived in the same city, this journey of theirs is feasible; but to go from Syracuse to Alexandria, and back again in a morning, and on foot too over the sea, is a stretch something extraordinary. To be short with the Examiner, they were natives indeed of Syracuse, but they had removed to Alexandria; and there they had husbands, and children, and servants, and dwelling-houses. All this appears from the very Poem; and that Mr. B. may not say that the Minæ and Drachms here were laid out upon clothes at Syracuse before their departure from thence, the very verse that he cites will teach him the contrary (Πέντε πόκις ἔλαβ' ΕΧΘΕΣ) “YESTER-DAY my Husband laid out VII Drachms upon wool.” But if Mr. B. shall pretend to have known that the scene of all this was at Alexandria, “where was his sagacity,” that he could not see the Alexandrian money must be meant, and not that of their old country Sicily? If a French Refugee drives a bargain here at London with Sixpences and Shillings, will Mr. B. infer from it that those species are the money of France too? Here is another of “his performances, not worth

P. 87. “a Sicilian Drachm;” and his facetious computation, “that the VII Drachms in Theocritus must be short of the eighth part of a Farthing, if they were paid in the Doctor’s money,” must, like the rest of his assertions, be interpreted backwards, and then it will be true; for, “in the Doctor’s account,” they were Alexandrian Drachms, and consequently not lower than the common Attic Drachms, but double their value.

P. 86. But Mr. B. will scatter his learning occasionally, besides what he bestows upon his main subject. He acquaints us that, in the first passage (Πλέον ἀργυρίῳ καθαρῷ μινᾶν ἢ δύο) “H. Ste-

P. 87. phanus, in the margin, reads it Μινᾶς,” and, accordingly, Mr. B. translates it, “It costs somewhat more than a Mina or two,” as if the original was Πλέον μινᾶς ἢ δύο and, to allow Mr. B. all the favour we can, the Latin versions have interpreted it so before him:—“Plus Mina una et altera; Plus

[443] “Mina una vel duabus.” Now a Mina was a Pound weight of Silver, and, consequently, equivalent to Three Pounds sterling. And I will crave leave to ask Mr. B. what sense there is in his or their version? “Pray what does your gown

“stand

"you in?" Answer: — "It is a very dear gown; it cost me "above THREE or six pounds." Pray, who ever talked at this rate? What! is there no medium between *three* and *six* Pounds? If I should ask a Friend what he rents his house at, and he should tell me "At above Forty or Fourscore "Pounds a year," it might pass perhaps for a banter, but an answer I should not take it for; and yet the woman in Theocritus is very serious, and does not seem to have been of those "that take ridicule and grimace for the most diverting thing in the world." If Theocritus had really written at this rate, I perceive it would pass upon Mr. B.; but I am afraid that King Ptolemee, a good judge of wit, whom Theocritus presented this Poem to, would have paid him for it in Sicilian Drachms. But the fault is not the Poet's, but theirs that translate him; and the true Reading is MNAN, the genitive Doric for *Mnōn* and the construction is (Πλέον ἢ δύο μνᾶν ἀργυρίῳ καθαρῷ) "It cost me above Six fair Pounds."

There is another fault too in the second passage that the Examiner cites: —

"Ἐπὶ δὲ δραχμῶν κυνάδας, γραιῶν ἀποτίλημα σπηρῶν"

for in the old Editions of Aldus and others, it is

"Ἐπιδράχμῳ κυνάδας" —

which, because it was not understood, was changed by the late Editors. But the ancient reading is the true, if we take it as it ought to be taken, *Ἐπιδράχμῳ*, the accusative Doric for *ἐπιδράχμῳ*, from the adjective *Ἐπιδράχμῳ*. The sense, indeed, will be the same still, but the composition will be more elegant. Mr. B. may say, and he has good reason, that the not correcting these passages cannot be imputed as a fault to Him, when such great men as Stephanus, Casaubon, Heinsius, &c. failed as well as he. We will allow this, therefore, and not lay these omissions to his charge; but then he ought not to abuse and calumniate others, who have honest endeavours to improve this part of learning, if Envy will let them be quiet.

[444]

The other Authors that Mr. B. has produced, to shew that Talents, Minæ, and Drachms, of an equal value with those of Greece, were current in Sicily, are Thucydides, Plato, Polybius, Diodorus, and Plutarch; but not one of them was a Sicilian, except Diodorus, and he too wrote his History in a foreign country, and uses the common dialect, and comes ccccc years after Phalaris. Now, to answer all these instances at once, for the thing is too vulgar to be insisted on particularly,

larly, I must acquaint him with what every body else knows, but to him is a secret, that all the Authors that write in the Attic or common dialect, do of course turn the sums of money of any country that they speak of into the Attic account; not meaning that the Attic coins were used in specie upon these occasions, but that the money of whatever sort it was, was equivalent in weight or value to so much Attic money : — and the end that they had in so doing is conspicuous enough ; for, designing their histories for general use, they thought the best way to be understood by all was, to reduce the money to some species universally known ; and if Mr. B. had ever compared the Greek and Latin Writers of the Roman History together, he must necessarily have observed it. I will give him one or two Examples of it, which may serve instead of all. Livy*, who, as a Roman, writes in the style of his own country, tells us Servius Tullius divided the Roman citizens into five classes; the first was of such as were rated *Centum millia æris*, that is 100,000 Asses, or brass Money ; the second at 75,000, and so on to the lowest. But Dionysius Halicarnassensis†, who wrote for the Greeks, turns these accounts into Attic silver, and makes the first class to be rated (*Ἐκατὸν Μνῶν, ἢ Μυρίων Δραχμῶν*) “ at 100 Minæ, or 10,000 Drachms ; ” — and the second (*Πέντε καὶ ἑβδομήκοντα Μνῶν, ἢ ἐπὶ ἑξακισχιλίων καὶ πεντακοσίων δραχμῶν*) “ at 75 Minæ, or 7,500 Drachms ; ” and so to the fifth. Now this account of the Greek Historian cannot be true, if we understand those Drachms to have been used in specie, for it is known that the Romans had no silver Money till 300 years after the time of this Servius ; but Livy and he agree in the value, though not in the species ; for x Asses of brass being equivalent to one Attic Drachm of silver, 100,000 of such Asses are worth 10,000 Drachms ; and 75,000 Asses worth 7,500 Drachms. The same Livy informs us, that Camillus was threatened to be fined “ *Quingentum millium æris mulcta*, ” 500,000 Asses of Brass, which Plutarch‡ represents in Silver Money, and calls it (*πέντε μυριάδων ἀργυρίᾳ ζημίῳσιν*) “ a fine of 50,000 Drachms ; ” and yet the Romans had no use of Silver coin till a hundred years after Camillus. If Plutarch, therefore, in his account of Camillus, has turned the Roman money to Attic, why may he not have turned the Sicilian so in his History of Timoleon ? — and if He did it, why not Polybius too ? and why not Plato and Thucydides much

* Lib. I.

† P. 22.

‡ Plut. in Camillo.

rather,

rather, being natives of Athens? Diodorus, it is true, was a Sicilian; but as he forsook the dialect of Sicily, so, in consequence, he ought to depart from it in the names and *species* of its money, and not fill his History with *νέμμοι*, and *ἐγκίαι*, and *ἑξάντες*, and *πεντάγχια*,—words that nobody would understand abroad but Grammarians and Antiquaries. Besides that, as I observed before, he is so many centuries junior to Phalaris, that the money of that island might possibly be altered to the Greek species in all that tract of time; but that the old names of money continued there till the time of Gelon, Tyrant of Syracuse, LXX years after Phalaris's death, Diodorus himself will teach us; for he says that, upon the defeat of the Carthaginians, Demareta, the wife of Gelon, coined a new piece of money, "of the value of ten Attic Drachms; but the "Sicilians called it, from its weight, Πεντηκοντάλιτρον*." This passage, even alone, will shew that there was no such money, nor name of Drachm, in those days in Sicily; for, if there had, they would have called this money *Δεκάδραχμον*, from the "value of ten Drachms," and not *Πεντηκοντάλιτρον*, "from the "weight of Fifty Litrae." From which compound word it plainly appears, that the Litra, one of those Sicilian coins that I and my Authors contend for, was yet in use in the time of Gelon. Without question, therefore, it was used there in Phalaris's time; and if you admit of the Litra for a Sicilian coin, you must take all the rest after it that are mentioned by Aristotle and Pollux, as the *Δεκάλιτρον*, the *Ἡμιλίτρον*, &c.; for these plainly refer to and suppose one another as a Half-crown English supposes a Crown. And what has the Examiner gotten now by his "approved Sicilian Writers?" To what purpose are his ridiculous computations, "a Talent is 1s. 10½d. P. 87, 88. "for a Month's pay of a Ship;—200 Minæ, 6s. 3d. for the "magnificent Funeral of a General!" I know not what they stand for there, but to be emblems of his own performance, which, at first view and to unskilful Readers, seems a business of great value and price, as the Greek Talents and Minæ were; but, when examined more narrowly, it dwindles into "Talents of Eighteen Pence, and Minæ of Three Farthings!"

But see what it is to be engaged with such a master of P. 88, 89. defence:—"He may freely admit," he says, "of the low "value of the Sicilian Talent, and yet think the Letters genu-

* Diodor. Sic. p. 21. Εἶχεν Ἀττικὰς Δραχμὰς δέκα· ἐκλήθη δὲ παρὰ τοῖς Σικελιώταις ἀπὸ τῶ γαβμῷ Πεντηκονταλίτρον.

"ine;

- "ine; for there are several suppositions that must all be shewn impossible, before any convincing argument can be drawn from hence to prove them spurious." To prove suppositions to be *impossible* is a very hard task indeed; and, if nothing less than that will serve, it is more difficult to *convince* Mr. B. than to convert a Jew. But let us see what his *suppositions* are:—
- I. There might be a low value of the Sicilian Talent in some other age, and yet the Talent of Phalaris's time might be higher." But I will presently shew him, that in Epicharmus's and Sophron's time, the very next generation to Phalaris, the Sicilian money was as I have stated it; and Aristotle* says that (τὸ ἀρχαῖον) "in OLD time," the Talent there was but xxiv νῆμμοι, about vii s. English.
- II. Or a low Talent might be in other parts of Sicily, but a higher "at Agrigentum." But Aristotle† tells us, in general (Σικελικὸν τάλαντον) "The SICILIAN Talent was xxiv νῆμμοι," which must include Agrigentum, unless Mr. B. will carry that too into Crete, as he did Astypalæa. Nay, the Philosopher expressly says ‡, that the Λίτρα was AGRIGENTINE money; and if the Litra come in there, the Talent and all the rest will follow it.
- III. Or there might be a low Talent of baser metal, suppose Brass, equal to a Litra; and yet Phalaris's "Silver Talents might be higher." Here are so many blunders in this supposition, that I scarcely know which to begin with. He believes a Talent in Sicily was a single piece of money, or a coin; but it was a Sum, as a Pound is in England. And upon this he fancies a Brass Talent was less than a Silver one, which is just as if he should say, that a Pound paid in Copper Farthings is less than a Pound paid in Sixpences. But from whence could he have that extravagant Stuff?—"a Brass Talent equal to a Litra!" I am afraid again that he was *not awake* here; but methinks he might have got out of his nap in his second or third Edition. A brass Litra of Sicily weighed a Pound; and lx of them made a Talent; and a small coin of Silver, of equal value to a Litra of Brass, had from thence the name too of Litra (as among the Romans the Silver Coin was called Denarius, because it was valued at x Asses of Brass) and lx of those of Silver Litrae made the ancient Talent of Silver; so that a Talent of Silver and a Talent of Brass were both equal in value, and both contained

* Poll. p. 437.

† Ibid.

‡ Pollux, p. 2, 6, 436. Ἐν Ἀκραγαντίνῳ Πολιτείῳ Φησὶν Ἀριστοτέλης ζῆμισθαι τινα λ. Λίτρας.

lx Litrae.

LX Litrae. But Mr. B. has a marginal note here: — “ That
 “ the Talents in Pollux are compared to Χαλλοῖ, and are lower
 “ in value than they.” Admirably observed indeed! this [449]
 same margin of his has in several places quite outdone the
 text. The text here says “ a Talent of Brass was equal to a
 “ Litra;” but the margin tells us “ it was less than a Χαλλῆς,”
 which was but the xiith part of a Litra; so that both text and
 margin together form a Proposition exactly like this: — “ A
 “ certain Book of a late Writer’s is worth four Shillings, and
 “ too dear at Three Pence.” But the shameful mistake of
 this marginal note is founded upon a corrupt reading in Pol-
 lux (Ἐξ τάλαντα, ὅπερ ἐστὶ δύο Χαλλοῖ); that is, “ Six Talents,
 “ which is two brass pieces,” which I have already observed,
 and shall presently prove, is to be corrected Ἐξᾶντα and I
 dare appeal to any English reader, though he understands not
 one word of Greek, if the passage as I have faithfully trans-
 lated it, does not betray itself to be corrupted; for the Author,
 being to make a general comparison of money, would have ex-
 pressed it, as all the world uses to do, in the lowest numbers of
 proportion, and would certainly have said “ Three Talents
 “ make One Brass Piece,” not “ Six make Two;” and yet
 Mr. B. with all his acuteness could argue from this reading as
 if it were genuine! “ IV. Or there might be a low value
 “ (Talent I suppose he would say) used by the Natives and
 “ ancient Inhabitants of Sicily; and yet the Talent used by
 “ the Greek Colonies that placed themselves there, might be
 “ higher.” But the very names of the money we speak of,
 shew they belonged not to the Sicanians, or Phœnicians in
 Sicily, but to the colonies of Greeks; as Οὐγκία from ὄγκῶ,
 Νυμμῶ from νόμῶ, Τετραῖς, Τριαῖς, Ἐξᾶς, Ἡμιλίτριον, Δεκάλιτρον
 these are certainly Greek words; and neither Phœnician nor
 barbarous Sicanian; and Diodorus says the Σικελῖᾶται, Sicilian
 Greeks (not the ancient inhabitants of the island) called the [450]
 money of Gelon’s time, Πεντηκοντάλιτρον. Pollux also, and
 Aristotle say expressly they were the monies (τῶν ἐν Σικελίᾳ
 Δωρίων) “ of the Dorian Colonies in Sicily;” and that Νυμμῶ
 was a coin of the Tarentines in Italy, who were a Dorian Co-
 lony too, and had no concern with the old Sicanians. “ V. Or,
 “ if these Letters might by a later hand be changed out of
 “ the Doric dialect into Attic, the same hand might make
 “ them speak Attic in the valuation of the monies.” This
 is his last supposition, and the pleasantest of them all; and
 though I doubt not but the very proposal of it will be received
 with laughter by all competent readers, yet I will give him an
 answer

IV.

V.

answer to it, when I consider the general way of his defence. We have now gotten, and I hope safely, over all his suppositions; and though I will not pretend to have shewn them *impossible*, yet I have shewn them so groundless and absurd, that a wise man will be ashamed of them. But to prove any thing of this nature *impossible*, is truly an impossible thing; for how can we bring demonstrations about matters of mere history? If nothing, therefore, but downright *impossibility* will convince the Examiner that his Phalaris is spurious, he may still, *to his comfort*, believe them genuine; but at that rate he is well prepared to believe all the stories of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, or Apuleius's *Ass*.

[P. 89.] But our misfortune is, that though we have stood the shock of so many *suppositions*, yet we are just where we were before; for, lastly, he says, "though none of his reasonings should hold, it is agreed by those who treat of these matters, and give us this low value of the Sicilian Talent, that, where-
[451] "ever the word Talent is used by Greek Writers (as it is in Phalaris's Epistles) without any addition, the Attic Talent must be understood:" and for this he quotes Gronovius, Bernard, and Brerewood. Now, allowing this to be true, what would our sagacious Critic infer from it? Do not I myself affirm too, that in Phalaris's Epistles the Attic Talent is understood? The very circumstances of every passage there, where Talent is mentioned, shew he meant the Attic; and it is the sole ground and foundation of all this article against him. Mr. B. therefore, may assure himself, that I shall never make Phalaris's Epistles an exception to that rule of Gronovius. That the Attic is meant in the Epistles, will be allowed on all sides; but whether the true Phalaris would have used the word so, there is the question. And do Mr. B.'s marginal citations prove any thing of that? Diodorus, though a Sicilian, had good reasons for his reckoning by Attic money, because he wrote in the common dialect, — because the Attic valuation was then universally known, — because other Historians had done so before him. But must Phalaris, therefore, be supposed to have used the Attic accounts, at a time when the Attic Talent was no better known than the Sicilian? must he do it in private Letters, that were never intended for the public? in stating the expences of his household, which, being laid out in Sicilian money, could not be expressed in Attic without puzzling fractions? If Mr. B. will obstinately maintain such absurdities as these, he will fully satisfy his readers
that

that whatever there was in Phalaris's accounts, in Mr. B.'s genius there is nothing of Attic.

Mr. B. declares " That he finds the Moderns go into the
 " opinion of a Sicilian Talent of low value, without any other P. 88.
 " authority, as he can find, but the obscure and interpolated [452]
 " passages of Pollux and Festus; but the notion ought to be
 " supported by good authorities, taken from aproved Sicilian P. 84.
 " Writers, or others that purposely treat of Sicilian affairs." I
 will give him an account therefore of the authorities we go upon ;
 and I believe it will presently appear that the " approved Sici-
 " lian Writers," such as Epicharmus and Sophrön, who were
 nearest the age of Phalaris; and " those that purposely treat of
 " Sicilian affairs," such as Aristotle in his account of the Sici-
 lian governments, do all countenance and support the notion,
 That the Sicilian money was different from the Attic, both in
 species and name. But, for the clearer illustration of what I
 shall say here, I will give a Table of the Sicilian coins, accord-
 ing to those Authors; and compare them with the Roman
 coins, which were all borrowed from them.

[453]

A TABLE OF THE SICILIAN MONEY.

| METAL. | SICILIAN. | ROMAN. | VALUE. |
|------------------|----------------|---|---|
| Brass or Silver. | Τάλαντον. | | { 60 Brass or Silver Litræ. |
| Silver. | Πενήκοιτάλιον. | | 50 Litræ. |
| Silver. | Δεκάλιτρον. | <i>Denarius.</i> | 10 Litræ. |
| Silver. | Νῆμμος. | { <i>Nummus.</i> <i>Sestertius.</i> } | 2 ½ Litræ. |
| Brass or Silver. | Λιτρα. | { <i>Libra, As,</i> <i>Libella.</i> } | { A Pound weight of Brass, or a piece of Silver equivalent. |
| Brass, Silver. | Ἡμιλίτριον. | { <i>Semissis,</i> <i>Sembella.</i> } | Half a Litra. |
| Brass. | Πεντέγκιον. | <i>Quincunx.</i> | 5 Ounces of Brass. |
| Brass. | Τριᾶς. | <i>Triens.</i> | { A third part of a Litra. |
| Brass. | Τετραᾶς. | { <i>Quadrans,</i> <i>Terancius.</i> } | A Fourth of a Litra. |
| Brass. | Εξᾶς. | <i>Sextans.</i> | A Sixth of a Litra. |
| Brass. | Οὐλκία. | <i>Uncia.</i> | 1 Ounce of Brass. |

This Table comprehends the names of all the Sicilian sums or coins, from the highest down to the lowest; and I shall now subjoin the passages of Authors, which establish and warrant every one of them.

[454]

TAAANTON.

“The Sicilian TALENT,” says Pollux*, “had the lowest value of all. Of old, as Aristotle teaches, it contained “xxiv Νῆμμοι” but afterwards only xii.” Now a Νῆμμος, *Nummus*, as I shall shew presently, was the 17th part of a Denare; so that the ancient Talent contained vi Denares, and the latter iii. And Suidas falls in exactly with Aristotle’s account; for he informs us “That, among the Sicilian Greeks,

* Pollux, p. 431.

"a Talent was anciently xxiv Nummi; but now xii*." In the vulgar editions it is *μνών* but the true reading is *Νέμμων*, as the passage of Aristotle clearly shews; and so it is corrected by Budæus, and every body since that have treated of these matters. The word *Νέμμων*, being not understood by the copier, was corrupted into *μνών*. To these authorities we may add Festus; who, giving the value of several sorts of Talents, says, "The Neapolitan contains vi Denares, the Syracusan 111, and that of Rhegium Half a Denare †." What Festus here calls the Neapolitan Talent, has the same value with the old Talent of Sicily; which is not to be wondered at, since Aristotle and Pollux affirm that the *Νέμμος*, one of the coins of Sicily, was common to the Tarentine and other Dorian colonies of Italy. And the Syracusan Talent of Festus is the very same with what Aristotle and Suidas call "The later Sicilian." Here are four authorities then; Aristotle, Pollux, Suidas, and Festus, for the low valuation of the Sicilian Talent; and the alteration that Mr. B. and some others would introduce into the text of Festus, now appears to be groundless. They would interpolate it thus:—*Syracusanum trium (Millium) Denarium*, the Syracusan Talent had "3000 Denares." But what authority have they for this Talent of 3000? None at all. Is it not a glorious correction then, and worthy to be embraced by Mr. B. to change the reading, that is warranted by three authors, and to substitute another that is supported by none? And what will they do with the following words, *Rheginum victoriati*? Will they insert *Millium* there too, and make it neither Latin nor sense? But, if the Talent of Rhegium was but equivalent to Five Pounds of Brass, why must that of Sicily be thought too low when it is made equal to Thirty or Sixty?

[455]

It is very certain that the Romans called the common Attic Talent *Talentum Magnum*, "The Great Talent:" an expression never used by any Greek Author; so that the reason and ground of it has been a great enquiry among the Antiquaries of the last age. But the ingenious and learned Gronovius ‡ has lit upon a conjecture that has all the characters of truth and certainty. The Romans had no such sum nor name as Talent in their way of accounts; but, by their dealings with the neighbouring Greeks, the Sicilians, Rhegians, Tarentines, Nea-

* Suid. in *Τάλασσιον*.

† Festus, "Tal. Neapolitanum Sex Denarium, Syracusanum trium Denarium, Rheginum victoriati."

‡ Gronov. de Pecun. Vet. iii., 3.

[456] politans, they knew a Talent among them stood for a small sum of Silver. Afterwards, when they extended their commerce, or their conquests, to other parts of Greece, they found a Talent there meant a vast sum of 6000 Denares; which was 1000, or 2000, or 12000 times as much as the Talent of their neighbours. This latter, therefore, was called the Greek Talent, and in process of time Talent alone; the other acceptance of the word falling into disuse. I do not question but all competent judges will receive this notion of Gronovius with approbation and applause; and as the expression *Talentum Magnum* is so fairly explained by the low Sicilian Talent, so reciprocally the low value of that Talent is plainly made out by the expression *Talentum magnum* *.

But there is one thing not yet accounted for; how it came about that in those Dorian colonies the word Talent was applied to such inconsiderable sums. I will crave leave to propose a conjecture of mine; and submit it to the censures of the

* Gronovius was under a mistake in supposing the Romans had no such sum as a Talent in their accounts, as Mr. Clarke has clearly shewn in his Connexion of Roman, Saxon, and English Coins, p. 395, n. t.—Every Talent bore the very *same* proportion to that pound which was the basis of the computation; *i. e.* all were Sixty Pounds of *their own* weight. A *Nummulary* Talent, from a Pound of XII ounces, was five times XII, or Sixty Pounds. By the same rule the *Commercial* retail Talent, from a Pound of XVI ounces, was five times XVI, or Eighty Pounds. That this was the *Talentum magnum*, is evident from Plautus, Mostell. Act. III. Sc. i. 102. 114. Tranio endeavours to persuade his master to engage for a debt which his son had indiscreetly contracted; and for which the creditor was then making very pressing demands. “Quater quater draginta illi debentur minæ. Dic te illi daturum, ut abeat.” This sum is afterwards computed in Great Talents:—

“— eas quanti destinat?

“Tr. *Talentis magnis* totidem, quot ego et tu sumus.”

Here two Talents are four times forty, or twice eighty Pounds, *viz.* from a Pound of XVI ounces. Priscian confirms this evidence:—“*Talentum parvum* Atheniense minæ Sexaginta; *magnum* octoginta et tres libræ, “et quatuor uncie.” Gram. Vet. vol. I. 134. Priscian was in this instance making a nice calculation how many Roman Pounds were equal to this great Talent. The Attic Pound, by the account of these later Writers, was a 24th part larger than the Roman. Divide 80 by 24, you have three and one-third for the quotient, or *octoginta tres libræ et quatuor uncie*, in round numbers Eighty Pounds.—The very character of the persons in Plautus destroys Gronovius’s reasonings on this subject. The scene is Athens, the Dramatis Personæ Greeks, well acquainted with their own Nummulary Talent, before they ever heard of those diminutive computations; and therefore, when the Athenians speak of the *Talentum magnum*, it was to distinguish either the *Commercial* Talent, or the Asiatic Nummulary Talent, from *their own* of Sixty Pounds.

Learned.

Learned. Talent* originally is a word of Statie, and means LX pounds weight of any thing. Now the Brass *Λίτρα* of Sicily being at first a Pound weight, as the *Libra* or *As* was among the Romans, LX such *Litræ* weighed in all LX Pounds, and consequently were called a Talent. Afterwards, when Silver-money came into use among them, the species of it had their denominations from the proportions they bore to the Brass *Litra*; so that a small Silver coin, equivalent in worth to a Brass Pound, was called *Λίτρα*; and another coin, containing Ten of them, *Δεκάλιτρον* just as the Romans called their Silver coin *Denarius*; because it was equal in value to *Deni Asses*, Ten Brass Pounds. By the same rule, therefore, a sum of Silver, containing LX Silver *Litræ*, or VI (*Δεκάλιτρα*) *Denares*, was called a Talent, because it was equivalent to LX Pounds weight of Brass. Here, I conceive, is a probable account how the old Sicilian Talent came to stand for VI *Denares*; or, as Aristotle expresses it, XXIV *Nummi*. But the same Author acquaints us, that afterwards the Talent sunk lower, to the value of XII *Nummi*, or III *Denares*. The occasion of which seems to have been this. As Solon diminished the Attic *Drachm* a fourth part in weight, making 100 of them go to a Pound, which LXXV made before,—and as the Romans, being straitened in the First Punic war, lowered their Brass money five parts in six, making their *As*, which till then was a full Pound weight, to be no more than two Ounces, so that the Sicilians seem to have lessened their Brass money half in half; and yet the old names (as among the Romans) continued still, notwithstanding the change in weight. A Talent of Brass, therefore, containing LX of those Half Pound *Litræ*, was no more than III *Denares*, or XII *Nummi* of Silver. But the Rhegians, according to Festus, seem to have sunk their Brass *Litræ* from a Pound weight to an Ounce; which is exactly what the Romans did in the Second Punic War; when they made their *As* to be *Uncialis* of a single Ounce weight. By which proportion, though the Talent even among the Rhegians might at first be LX *Litræ*, each of which weighed a Pound,—yet, after they were diminished to an Ounce apiece, a Talent of LX such *Litræ* would be worth no more than half a *Denare*, or the *Victoriat*us of Festus. [457]

ΠΕΝΤΗΚΟΝΤΑΛΙΤΡΟΝ.

We have an account of this coin from Diodorus Siculus†; that, after Gelon had vanquished the Carthaginians in Sicily,

* Suidas, Pollux, and others.

† Diodor. p. 21.

[458] Ol. LXXV, 1. Demareta, his wife, interceded in their behalf, and obtained for them an honourable peace; and upon that occasion she caused a new coin to be stamped, weighing 1 Litra; that is, Five *Δεκάλιτρα*, Denares; or, as Diodorus computes it, x Attic Drachms. This money was called *Δημαρέτιον*, from her name; and by the Sicilians *Πενήκοι τάλαντον*, from the weight and value of it. The same money is mentioned by Pollux*; but he tells us quite another story about the occasion of coining it: "That, when her husband wanted money in the war, against the Carthaginians, Demareta and the rest of the women brought all their silver utensils to the mint; and the coin was called *Νόμισμα Δημαρέτιον*." But the very bigness of the money, being five times the weight of their heaviest ordinary coin, shews Diodorus's narrative to be truer than Pollux's; for, if Gelon had been in any straits for money, he would certainly have stamped it in the smallest species; whereas this was a sort of medal, and by its magnitude declared the greatness of the victory and the booty. This Demareta was the daughter of Theron, Tyrant of Agrigentum; and, after Gelon's decease, was married to Polyzelus his brother, as we learn from the Scholiast of Pindar†; who adds too, that from her a Sicilian coin was called *Δημαρέτειον*. Diodorus acquaints us farther‡, That Gelon, out of part of the booty, made a golden Tripus of xvi Talents, and sent it to Delphi, a donary to Apollo. And there is an Epigram of Simonides upon the same Tripus, which I suppose is not yet published, and therefore I shall give it here out of the MS. Anthologia; —

Σιμωνίδα.

Φημί Γέλων', Ἰέρωνα, Πολύζηνον, Θρασύβουλον,
 Παῖδας Δεινομένους τὸν τρίποδ' ἀνθήμεναι,
 Ἐξ ἱερῶν λιτρῶν καὶ πενήκοις τάλαντων
 Δαρσίῳ χρυσῷ τᾷς δικάτας δικάταν.

[459] Where it is observable that Simonides, who perhaps was then in Sicily and saw the Tripus, says, it weighed above 1 Talents; but Diodorus says, xvi. If we believe the Scholiast of Pindar §, it was not one Tripus only, but several, that Gelon dedicated to Apollo; and this inscription was engraved on them: —

* Pollux, p. 437.

† Schol. Pind. Olymp. ii. 'Αφ' ἧς καὶ τὸ Δημαρέτειον νόμισμα ἐν Σικελίᾳ.

‡ Diød. ibid.

§ Schol. Pind. Pyth. i. 'Αναθῆναι τῇ Διῷ χρυσῷς τρίποδας ἐπιγράψαντα ταῦτα.

Φημί

Φημί Γίλαν', Ἰέρωνα, Πολύζηλον, Θρασύβελον,
 Παῖδας Δεινομένεως τῆς τρίποδας δέμεναι,
 Βάρβαρα νικήσαντας ἔθνη, πολλὴν δὲ ταρασχεῖν
 Σύμμαχοι Ἑλλήσιν χεῖρ' ἐς ἰλευθέρην.

Which appears to be the very same Epigram with that ascribed to Simonides; and the one perhaps is to be supplied out of the other; the latter distich of this being to be added to that. But what can be the meaning of *Δαρετίς χρυσῆ*? If we consider the passage already cited out of Diodorus, Pollux, and Pindar's Scholiast, which all belong to the subject of this Epigram, we can scarcely doubt but the true reading is, —

Δαμαρετίς χρυσῆ τᾶς δεκάτας δικάταν

where the Poet was constrained, of mere necessity, to use a *Pæon*, instead of a *Dactyl*, as another Poet did, without any necessity :—

Ἀλλὰ τὸν ἔπολε θυμὸν ἐν γήθεισιν ἔπειθε.

But the copiers, not considering this, and observing the verse to have a syllable too much, contracted the word into *Δαρετίς* which has been done above 1000 years ago, as it is evident from Suidas : — *Δαρετίς*, says he *, *τὸν τρίποδα δ' ἀνέμεναι ἐξ ἑκατὸν λιτρῶν καὶ πενήκοντα ταλάντων δαρετίς χρυσῆ τᾶς δεκάτας* where the word, we see, is set down; but there is no explication of it. He has only given part of our Epigram where he found that *Δαρετίς* and as that word both in Suidas and the Epigram is to be corrected from other Authors, so the rest of that Passage of Suidas is to be corrected from the Epigram †.

[460]

ΔΕΚΑΛΙΤΡΟΝ, ΛΙΤΡΑ, ΗΜΙΑΛΙΤΡΙΟΝ.

Aristotle, in his Treatise of the Agrigentine Government, informs us “ that a person was fined there (*τριάκοντα Λίτρας*) “ xxx Litraë; and that a Litra was equal in value to an Æginæan Obolus ‡.” The same he repeats, in his discourse about the Himeræan government: — “ That the Litra was “ equal to an Obolus, and the *Δεκάλιτρον* contained x Litraë, “ and was worth a Corinthian Stater.” These particulars are

* Suid. γ. *Δαρετίς*.

† After all, the true reading is, as the Copiers have it, *Δαρετίς* it being not unusual to drop the *μ* for sound's sake. As, *Ὀμόθοροι*, *ὄμβροροι*, and *ἄθροροι*. *Ὀμόζυγες*, *ὄμζυγες*, and *ὄζυγες*. *Ὀμότριχες*, *ὄμτριχες*, and *ὄτριχες*. Toup, Epist. ad Ep. Gloc. p. 90.

‡ Pollux, p. 216, 436.

told us twice by Pollux, in his 14th and 15th Book; so that there is no room for any suspicion that he mistook his Author. *Λίτρα*, says Hesychius, ὅσολος· οἱ δὲ νόμισμα παρὰ Σικελίης· οἱ δὲ ἐπὶ γαβμῶν· οἱ δὲ Ῥωμαῖοι διὰ τὸ β Λίτρα· Photius in his MS. Lexicon, *Λίτρα* ἦν μὲν νόμισμά τι, ὡς Δίφιλος· ἐπὶ τε γαβμῶν Ἐπίχαρμος τε καὶ Σῶφρων ἐχρήσαντο· Σοφοκλῆς δὲ λιτρόσκοπόν φησι τὸν ἀργυραμοιβόν, ἀπὸ τε νομίσματος. Hesychius again, *Λιτροσκόπος*, ἀργυραμοιβός· ἀπὸ τε Σικελικῆς νομίσματος, ὃ καλεῖται λίτρα. Here are two good Authors concurring with Pollux, besides the three others that one of them cites (Diphilus, Epicharmus, and Sophron); but we have not the names of them only, but the very passages too preserved to us in Pollux. “The Comic Poets,” says he*, “of Sicily use the word *Λίτρα*, sometimes “for a small piece of money, as when Sophron says, in his “Book called *Γυναικεῖοι Μῖμοι*, ‘Ὁ μισθὸς δεκάλιτρον (the true “reading here seems to be *δέκα λίτρῶν* or *λιτρῶν*); and again in “his *Ἀνδρεῖοι Μῖμοι*, *Σῶσαι δ’ ἐδὲ τὰς δύο λίτρας δύναμαι* and “sometimes for a Pound weight, as Demologus in his *Medea*,

[461]

“Τετρακονταλίτρος τινὶ πανίσκῳ πίδαας.”

In the vulgar Editions it is *παῖδας*, which Salmasius† has truly corrected (*πίδαας*) “chains of $\chi\lambda$ pound weight.” But there is another error still remaining, *Δημόλογος*, a Poet as unheard of as Phalaris’s two Tragedians, Aristolochus and Lysinus; instead of which Demologus, the MS. of Is. Vossius, had it *Δεινόλοχος*, which is certainly the true reading; for this Dinolochus was really a Sicilian Comic Poet (as Pollux here supposes him) “being a Syracusan, or an Agrigentine, “and the son, or, as others say, the Scholar of Epicharmus, “and the Author of $\chi\lambda\iota$ Doric Comedies‡.” He is cited again by Pollux§, *Δεινόλογος* ἐν Ἀμαζόσιν, and twice or thrice by Hesychius. But our Author proceeds, and tells us||, “That even some of the Athenian Comics mention the word “*Λίτρα*, as Philemon in his Play inscribed *Σικελικός*, and Posidippus in his *Γαλάτεια*.” In the Editions it is printed *Γαλάττι*, which learned men have corrected *Γαλάτεια* and the great Salmasius accurately observes, that it appears by the names of these two comedies, that the scene and subject of them were in Sicily; so that the Poets there used the word *Λίτρα*, not as Attic Money, but as Sicilian. In another place¶

* Pollux, p. 215.

† Suid. v. *Δεινολ.*

‡ Id. p. 217.

† De Modo Usur. p. 234.

§ Pollux, p. 500.

¶ Pollux, p. 436.

our Author ascribes the Play, not to Philemon, but to Diphilus, as Photius also seems to have done in the passage above cited; but Athenæus gives it to Philemon*; so that it was dubious, even in those days, whether of them was the Author of it. The words of Diphilus are these: —

Οἷον ἀγοράζειν πασὰ, μηδὲ ἐν δ' ἔχειν,
Εἰ μὴ κικίνηες ἀξίως λίτραιν δυοῖν.

In the Vossian MS. it is πάντα for πασὰ which may seem the truer lection; because of the elegant opposition there between πάντα and μηδὲ ἐν. But πασὰ too is a very tolerable lection, [462] being a dish made of cheese and other ingredients; and the cheese of Sicily, where the action of this Play lies, was famous, as the Poet tells us in this very Comedy†. “But Epicharmus,” continues Pollux‡, “mentions several names of “money in his Play called Ἀρπαγαί.” The passage there is thus represented in the Vossian MS. Ὡσπερ αἱ πονηραὶ μάντιες αἰθ' ὑπονέμονται γυναῖκας μωρὰς ἀμπετάκιον ἀργύριον, ἄλλαι δὲ λίτραι· αἱ δ' ἂν ἡμίλιτρον δεχόμεναι, καὶ πάντα γινώσκοντι. And I guess, from the emendation of Salmasius§, that the Palatine MS. had it exactly so too; and, perhaps, the MS. of Vossius is nothing but a copy of it. Salmasius has thus reduced the words into Trochaic verses: —

————— Ὡσπερ αἱ πονηραὶ μάντιες,
Αἰθ' ὑπονέμονται γυναῖκας μωρὰς, αἱ πιστέγκιον
Ἀργυρίου, ἄλλαι δὲ λίτραι, αἱ δ' ἂν ἡμίλιτρον δεχόμεναι
Πάντα γινώσκοντι —————

Where, in the third verse, the true measure is not observed, a Spondee being put there instead of a Trochee; but as for μωρὰς, in the second verse, the Dorians frequently made the accusative ας short, as we see in Theocritus. I would read the whole in this manner: —

————— Ὡσπερ αἱ πονηραὶ μάντιες,
Αἰθ' ὑπονέμονται γυναῖκας μωρὰς, αἱ πιστέγκιον
Ἀργυρίου, ἄλλαι δὲ λίτραι, αἱ δ' ἂν ἡμίλιτρον
Δεχόμεναι, καὶ πάντα γινώσκοντι τῷ τῆναι λόγῳ.

The three last words do not appear in the MS.; but the vulgar Editions have τῷ τι λόγῳ, which must be lengthened by a syllable, to close up the Trochaic. The meaning of the

* Athen. p. 658.

† Athen. ibid.

‡ Pollux, 436.

§ Pollux. p. 261.

[463] passage is this: — “ Like those roguish fortune-tellers that wheedle foolish Women; some of them exacting a Five-ounce piece of money, some a Litra, some half a Litra; and, as those silly Women believe, they know all things*.”

Αμ in the second verse is for ἀν for in ancient writing, when the N came before M or B, or Π or Φ, it was changed into M, as in the Chron. Arundelianum, ΕΜ ΠΑΡΩΙ for ἐν Πάρῳ and in the Marble of Smyrna, ΕΜ ΜΑΓΝΕΣΙΑ for ἐν Μαγνησίᾳ and the modern Greeks, though they write it N in those cases, yet they pronounce it as M. In the third verse I read ἡμιλίτριον instead of ἡμίλιτρον for I observe, that it is the form of the compounds with ημ, as ἡμαμφόριον, ἡμυθράκιον, ἡμιδιπλοίδιον, ἡμισφαίριον, ἡμυπόδιον, and many more. Another passage from Epicharmus is thus cited by the same Pollux †: — “Εγὼ γὰρ τὸ βαλάντιον λιτροδεκάληρον ἐξάγγιον τε καὶ πεντάγγιον, which is thus exhibited in the Vossian MS.: — “Εγὼ γὰρ τότε βαλάντιον λιτροδεκάληρος γατήρ ἐξάντιον τε πελάγγιον” and so in all probability the Palatine MS. reads it, as one may gather from Salmasius ‡, who thus corrects it by the help of it: —

———— “Εφ’ ᾧ γὰρ τὸ βαλάντιον, λίτρα,
Δεκάλιτρον γατήρ, ἐξάντιον τε καὶ πεντάγγιον.

But by this emendation both the verses have false measure; neither does the sense appear very elegant. It seems to me very probable that γατήρ in the MSS. is an interpolation; because in other places Pollux tells us that the δεκάλιτρον was worth a Corinthian γατήρ from whence the Interpolator borrowed it, and clapped it in here. But it cannot be Epicharmus’s own for two reasons; both because it is no Sicilian word, and because it makes a tautology. If I may have leave to propose an emendation, I would read the passage thus: —

[464]

———— “Εχω γὰρ τότε βαλάντιον λιτρῶν
Δεκαλιτρῶν τε πλῆρες ἐξάντων τε καὶ πενταγγίων.

“ I have my Purse,” says he, “ full of Litrae and Denares, and “ Two-ounce Pieces, and Five-ounce Pieces.”

* But the true reading is γινώσκειν ΚΩΤΙΑΩ, ΔΟΓΩ, *they know all things if you will believe their cant*; which word is particularly used to the idle talk of women, Hesiod. Op. 373, and Theocrit. in Syraeus. 64, 87, 89. Πάντα γυναῖκες ἴσασιν—Παύσασθ, ὦ δόσσανοι, ἀνάνυτα κωτίλλοισαι *Women know every thing.—Cease, gossips, your idle prating.* Τί δέ τι, τί κωτίλλαι εἰμὲς—*What is it to you if we do prate?* Toup, on Suidas, iii, voc. Τίερχεται.

† Pollux, *ibid.*

‡ Salmas. p. 260.

ΝΟΥΜΜΟΣ.

ΝΟΤΜΜΟΣ.

Julius Pollux, who wrote his Book at Rome, and dedicated it to the Emperor Commodus, tells him "that the word Νῆμμο appears indeed to be of Roman original; but it is "really Greek, belonging to the Dorians of Sicily and Italy*." So Varro also expressly teaches, "that the word Nummus "was borrowed from the Sicilians: — *In argento, Nummi; id "à Siculis* †." The same Pollux adds, "That Aristotle, in "his Treatise of the Tarentine Government, says a certain "coin there was called Νῆμμο, which, for its impress, had "Taras the son of Neptune astride upon a Dolphin." Half a score of these Tarentine Νῆμμοι, with that stamp upon them, are in Goltzius. Again, our Author acquaints us "That, "according to Aristotle, the old Talent of Sicily contained "xxiv Νῆμμοι, but the later xii only; and that a Νῆμμο was equivalent to an Obolus and a Half." And then he confirms the authority of the word Νῆμμο, by two passages of Epicharmus; the first of them, Κῆρυξ ἰὼν εὐθύς πρῶ μοι δέκα νέμμων μόνον καλὴν which is thus to be distinguished, and reduced to Iambics: —

— Κῆρυξ ἰὼν

Εὐθύς πρῶ μοι δέκα νέμμων μόνον καλὴν.

There seems to be no room for doubting but that the verses were thus written by the Poet; and yet the Reader may take notice, that there is a Spondee in the fourth place, instead of an Iamb.; but then it is softened by two short syllables that come immediately before it. The same measure seems to be used in the second fragment of Epicharmus, cited by Pollux, [465] 'Αλλ' ὅμως καλαὶ καὶ πῖτοι ἄρνες εὐρήσασσι δέμοι καὶ νέμμες, πωλατιάϊ γὰρ ἐντὶ τὰς ματρός which is thus reducible to Trochaics, though here the MS. does not assist us: —

'Αλλ' ὅμως καλαὶ τε πῖτοι τ' ἄρνες εὐρήσασσι μοι

Δέκα νέμμες, πωλατίαϊ γὰρ ἐντὶ μετὰ τὰς ματέρῃ †.

Πῖτο I take to be a true Doric word; from whence come πῖότερ, πῖοτάδι.

* Pollux, p. 436.

† Varro de L. L. p. 41.

† But in both places the reading is wrong: in the former we should correct it, Εὐθύς πρῶ μοι δέκα ΝΟΜΩΝ; in the latter, Δέκα ΝΟΜΩ. Tourp. in Suid. voce Νομισνομένων.

THE DIVISIONS OF THE ΑΙΤΡΑ.

ΠΕΝΤΟΤΤΙΚΙΟΝ, a coin of Five ounces Brass, or of Silver equivalent to them, is mentioned by Epicharmus, in that Fragment produced above: —

— Ἐξάτην τε καὶ πεντοττικίον.

The Latins called it Quincunx. And, perhaps, as the Latins had the Septunx too, so the Sicilians might have Ἐπὶ ἑπταγώνιον, though we have now no Author that mentions it. I will correct here a passage of Festus, which has created some trouble to the learned Antiquaries of this and the last age. Sextantarii Asses, &c. “The Asses,” says he, “of two Ounces weight, called Sextantarii, came into use in the second Punic War;” to which he adds, “Septuennio quoque (anno) usus est, ut priore numero; sed id non permansit in usu, nec amplius processit in maiorem*.” Here Festus is very much blamed by Budæus, Hottoman, Harduin, and others, for affirming that the Sextantarii Asses continued in use seven years only, since it plainly appears from Pliny that they lasted a good while longer: but the fault is not in Festus, but in those that transcribed him ill; for the true reading is thus: —

[466] “SEPTUNCIO quoque VARRO usus est, ut priore numero,” &c.; that is, “Varro used the word *Septuncium*, as he did the number before it (Sextans); but the word did not continue in use, nor did the compounds from *Uncia* go to a higher number than Seven.” He means, the Latins did not say “Octuncium, Nonuncium, Decuncium.” But let us hear Varro himself, who will be voucher for this emendation:—“Septunx, à septem et uncia conclusum. Reliqua obscuriora, quod à deminutione: et ea quæ deminuuntur, ita sunt ut extremas syllabas habeant: ut à duodecim una dempta uncia, Deunx: Dextans, dempto Sextante: Dodrans, dempto quadrante: Bes, ut olim Des, dempto triente†.” The meaning of which is, that they went no higher than Septunx, in the compounds from the number and Uncia; but they said Bes for VIII Ounces, Dodrans for IX, Dextans for X, Deunx for XI; so that, when Festus tells us in another place, “Nonuncium, quod vulgo magistri ludi appellant, significat novem uncias,” we are to understand him, that Nonuncium, though it was used by Schoolmasters when they taught Boys, was no legitimate word, nor of popular use.

* Festus, in Sextant.

† Varro de L. L. iv. p. 41.

ΤΡΙΑΣ. ΤΕΤΡΑΣ. ΕΞΑΣ. The account that Pollux gives of the divisions of the λίτρα, is exscribed from Aristotle's Book of the Himeræan Polity. The passages are very faulty; but, because they come twice over, they may easily be corrected, by comparing one with the other, and both with the Roman monies which were borrowed from Sicily. Ἀριστοτέλης. says he, ἐν τῇ Ἱμεραίων Πολιτείᾳ φησὶν, ὡς οἱ μὲν Σικελιωταὶ τὰς δύο χαλκὰς ἐξάλιτρα [p. 436, ἐξ τάλαντα] καλῶσι, τὸν δὲ ἓνα Οὐγκίαν* τὰς δὲ τρεῖς τριάκοντα [p. 436, τρία τάλαντα] τὰς δὲ ἐξ ἡμίλιτρον, τὸν δὲ ὄβολον λίτραν, τὸν δὲ Κορίνθιον σατῆρα δεκάλιτρον, ὅτι δέκα ὄβολος δύναται where the first error of the Copyers is ἐξάλιτρα in one place, — and ἐξ τάλαντα in the other. In the former place, the Vossian and Palatine MSS. have it δίξαντα in the latter, they vary not from the Editions. Now, from all the three words compared together, the true reading easily results: — Ἐξάλια so Hesychius, Ἐξᾶς, εἰδῶ (νομίσματι) παρὰ Συρακουσίοις and Arcadius the Grammarian, in his MS. Tract, Περὶ Τόνων, quoted by Salmasius, Ἐξᾶς ἐπὶ ποσότητι δὲ περισπᾶται† which is word for word too in Theodosius's MS. Epitome of Herodian's Book, called Καθόλου, in the public Library at Oxford. And we met with the word just now in the Fragment of Epicharmus: —

Δεκαλίτρων τι πλῆρες, ἐξάλια τε, καὶ πνιθυκίων

for the MS. there reads it ἐξάλιον and it is well known that ω are commonly mistaken by Copyers for α. I myself have had frequent experience of it in sheets from the press; as in my Notes on Callimachus, it is somewhere printed τῶν, instead of ῥιον. The second mistake of Pollux's Copyers is Τριάκοντα and Τρία Τάλαντα for Τριᾶντα. Hesychius, Τριᾶντα πόρνη, λαμβάνουσα Τριάκοντα, ὃ ἐστὶ Λεπτά εἴκοσι. Here again is the very same error that the Copyers of Pollux committed; Τριάκοντα instead of Τριᾶντα for this and Ἐξᾶς being foreign words, and not commonly understood in Greece, had the common fate of all words of that sort, to be corrupted by Transcribers.

ΟΥΓΚΙΑ. So the MS. has it, instead of Οὐγία and that is the true reading, though it is written both ways in the books of the Greek Physicians, in the time of the Roman Empire, when they speak of Weights and Doses. Photius in his MS. Lexicon: — Οὐγκίαν, τὸν σαθρόν, Σώφρων καὶ Ἐπίχαρμι. Suidas: — Οὐγκία, εἰδῶ μέτρα, ἢ σαθμός.

The ancient Writers were content to be moderately accurate in their comparisons of monies. They commonly reckoned

* Pollux, p. 216, 436.

† Salmas. de Modo Usur. p. 256.

the Roman Denare to be equivalent to an Attic Drachm; though in strict examination they are not so. But they thought it better to neglect those fractions, for the conveniency of expressing themselves in round sums; and they considered they were Historians, and not Masters of the Mint. We have an instance of this, in the very thing that now lies before us; where the Sicilian Money is thus adjusted by Aristotle, to the monies of Greece: — “an Οὐγκία,” says he, “is one Attic Chalcus; and the Ἡμιλίτριον is six Chalci; and the Litra is “an Æginæan Obolus*.” Now, if we examine this rigidly, the computation cannot be true; for the Litra, according to Aristotle, contained xii Attic Chalci, and yet was equal to an Æginæan Obolus; so that by this reckoning, the Æginæan Obolus was equal to xii Chalci. But the Æginæan Obolus was to the Attic, as x is to vi; and the Attic Obolus had the value of viii Chalci; therefore the Æginæan Obolus was not equal to xii Chalci; for the proportion of xii to viii is not the same with the proportion of x to vi. But, as I said before, such small differences were neglected by the old writers; and they were content if their calculations were tolerably exact. Diodorus Siculus says, “The Πενήκοιτάλιτρον of Demareta was equivalent to x Attic Drachms;” by which computation a Δεκά-
 [469] λίτρον was equal to 11 Attic Drachms: but Aristotle computes, that a Δεκάλιτρον was equivalent to xii Æginæan Oboli, which are more than 11 Attic Drachms. The same Aristotle assigns τρία ἡμισόλια, “an Obolus and a half” as an equivalent to the Sicilian Νῆμμο where he seems to mean the Æginæan Obolus; and at that rate the Νῆμμο was the fourth part of an Æginæan Drachm. But as the Nummus at Rome was the 17th of the Denarius, so the Νῆμμο in Sicily seems to have been the 17th of the Δεκάλιτρον the Δεκάλιτρον, therefore, by this reckoning, was equal to an Æginæan Drachm; or to one Attic Drachm and $\frac{2}{3}$. And it is no great wonder if Aristotle in different Books should make such different computations, since in one and the same paragraph his accounts, as we have seen, are not consistent. But the learned Salmasius and Gronovius, instead of τρία ἡμισόλια in Pollux, read it τρίτον ἡμισόλιον, “two Oboli and a “half;” and if this correction be admitted, the calculation will be the juster; for a Litra being equal to an Obolus, the Νῆμμο, two Oboli and a half, will be exactly the 17th part Δεκάλιτρον as the Nummus being two Asses and a half at Rome, and therefore called the Sestertius, was the 17th of a

* Pollux, p. 2. 6. 436.

Denare. And indeed, it must needs be owned, whether we read *τρία ἡμοδόλια* or *τρίτον ἡμοδόλιον*, that as *iv Nummi* made a Denarius, so *iv Nūmμοι* made a *Δεκάλληρον* as the passage of Festus compared with Pollux, and the Roman accounts compared with the Sicilian, make it plain beyond controversy.

The Roman TRIENS signified a third part of an As or of xii ounces, the QUADRANS a Fourth, and the SEXTANS a sixth. This is certain, and needs not now to be proved. But yet, among the Sicilians, from whom the Romans borrowed those words, a ΤΡΙΑΣ is said to mean three parts of the Λίτρα, [470] or three Ounces; not the third part of it, or four Ounces; and so ΤΕΤΡΑΣ to be four Ounces, and ΕΚΤΑΣ to be six Ounces; which makes a very wide difference between the accounts of the two Nations. Τρεῖς Χαλκοῖ, says Pollux*, ὅπερ τριᾶντα and again, Τριᾶντα ὅπερ τρεῖς χαλκοῖ, that is, “Α ΤΡΙΑΣ “means three Ounces.” Τετρας δηλοῖ τέσσαρας χαλκῆς, says Hesychius; “a ΤΕΤΡΑΣ stands for four Ounces.” And in another place, Τριᾶντα, ὅπερ Λεπτά εἴκοσι “a ΤΡΙΑΣ is xx Lepta; which is the same again with three Chalci, or Ounces; one Chalcus containing vii Lepta. What shall we say to this matter? must we disbelieve these Grammarians? or suppose their Copiers have done them wrong? or must we take it at their words, that the Sicilians reckoned so, though we do not know why? Jos. Scaliger supposes† that the Sicilians took those words in the same sense as the Romans did, and that the Grammarians were mistaking; “though,” says he, “it is “not so much a mistake as an Idiotism; for the vulgar used “to call a division into four parts Tetrantes; and into viii, “Octantes, as we may see in Vitruvius.” On the contrary, Salmasius maintains “That the Grammarians are in the right; and that the Sicilians took τριᾶς, and τετρας, and δεκάς for iii, “iv and x parts of xii Ounces or Litra; and that the Romans “were to blame for changing the meaning of those words; “and that Vitruvius’s sense of them is not an Idiotism, but “the true and proper notion.” If so mean a Writer as I am may have the liberty to interpose in the controversy of such a great man, I am persuaded the thing was thus. Both Sicilians and Romans had the same notion and use of the words Τριᾶς and Triens, Τετρας and Tetrans or Quadrans, Ἐξᾶς and

* Pollux, p. 2. 6. 436.

† Scalig. de Re Num. p. 5, 6.

‡ Salmas. De Modo Usur. p. 254, &c.

- [471] Sextans meant the iiid , ivth , and vth , part of any whole whatsoever was spoken of; so that, when they were applied to a Pound weight of xii Ounces, they must signify iv , iii , and ii Ounces. Thus far I agree with Scaliger; and I think Salmasius was quite out when he espoused the other opinion; for the words themselves refute him; all we have of them of this form in the division of the Litra being only these three, ἑξᾶς , τριᾶς , and τετραᾶς but, if ἑξᾶς meant six Ounces, and so the rest, then we should have had other such divisions of the Litra; πεντᾶς for vii Ounces, δωδεκάς for viii , ἐννεκάς for ix , δεκάς for x , ἐνδεκάς for xi . On the other side, if ἑξᾶς signify the vth part of the Pound, that is ii Ounces; and the other two words in like manner, then the reason is plain why we have no more divisions of it than those three; because they are the only divisions of xii that make even numbers; all the rest producing fractions; as πεντᾶς a vth of xii Ounces, would be ii Ounces and two-fifths of an Ounce*; πεντᾶς an viiith , would be one Ounce and five-sevenths; δωδεκάς an viiiith , would be one Ounce and one-half; ἐννεκάς a ixth would be one Ounce and one-third; δεκάς a xth , would be one Ounce and one-fifth; ἐνδεκάς a xiith , would be one Ounce and one-eleventh. These being all Fractions, the Sicilians would not coin any money of these several divisions; because, instead of being useful, they would puzzle and confound all reckoning. But, if Salmasius's opinion be true, we should certainly have had πεντᾶς for a coin of v Ounces; for we are sure that they had money of that weight; but then they did not call it πεντᾶς , but πεντέγκιον , as in the Fragment of Epicharmus: —

——— $\text{Ἐξάλλων γε καὶ πεντέγκιον}$.

[472]

This single word πεντέγκιον , is a demonstration against Salmasius; for as the Romans, taking Quadrans for a ivth part of xii Ounces, could not express the notion of a v Ounce piece by Quintans, but by Quincunx; so, by the way of reverse, the Sicilians expressing a v Ounce piece by πεντέγκιον , could not mean iv Ounces by τετραᾶς , but the ivth part of xii Ounces. Again, we are told by Pollux, that the Sicilians took ἑξᾶντα for ii Ounces: but according to Salmasius, ἑξᾶς must mean a vi Ounce piece, which is utterly impossible, upon another account; *viz.* because ἑξᾶς would then be the same with ἡμιλίτριον . But, as the Romans used Semissis to denote a piece

* Dr. Bentley had printed it ii Ounces and one-tenth: too hastily supposing two-fifths to have been equal to one-tenth.

of VI Ounces, and had therefore no such word as Sexunx, — so the Sicilians, having the word ἡμιλίτριον or VI Ounces, as appears from Epicharmus, Aristotle, and Pollux; had no need to say ἱξέγκιον or ἱξᾶς for the same weight. It is true, in some MSS. of Pollux it is not ἱξᾶνλα, but διξᾶνλα and Salmasius is pleased to prefer that reading as a Doricism, from διξός. But it is only in one place of Pollux that the MSS. have it διξ- in the other they all read it εἰξ. And, with submission, they were not the Dorians, but the Ionians, that used διξός for δισσός, as we see in xx places of Herodotus. And, if the Sicilians used διξᾶνλα in Salmasius's sense, why did they not say τριξᾶντα, but τριᾶντα? for Herodotus has τριξοὶ for τρισσοὶ, as well as διξοὶ for δισσοὶ. Upon all accounts then, I espouse the opinion of Scaliger against that of Salmasius; but in the remaining part of the dispute, I humbly conceive they are both mistaken; the one, while he excuses the use of τριᾶς and τετραῖς for III and IV parts of XII, as an Idiotism, which may be justified by Vitruvius; the other, while he thinks Vitruvius must be taken in that sense, which he esteems the true notion of the words. The passage of Vitruvius is thus: — “Dividuntur Circinationes tetrantibus in partes quatuor, vel octantibus in partes octo, ductis lineis *” Scaliger interprets these Tetrantes and Octantes to be a Square and an Octagon inscribed in a circle; which mistake is so palpable, that it needs no refutation. Salmasius says, Tetrans here means a thing with IV parts, and Octans a thing with VIII. On the contrary, to me it seems evident that Vitruvius takes Tetrans for a Quadrant, or the 1vth part of a Circle; and the Octans for the viiith part. “A Circle,” says he, “must be divided into IV parts, Tetrantibus.” If Tetrans had meant all the IV parts, he would not have said Tetrantibus, but Tetrante. But there is another place that plainly shews what he understands by Tetrans. “Ducatur rotunda Circinatio; et in ea catheto respondens diametros agatur: tunc ab summo sub abaco inceptum in singulis Tetrantonum actionibus dimidiatum oculi spatium minuatur, donecūm in eundem Tetrantem, qui est sub oculo veniat †.” Here he supposes a Circle to be divided by two diameters at right angles; that is, into IV equal parts; and these IV parts he calls Tetrantonum, and one 1vth he calls Tetrantem. So that Vitruvius's notion of Tetrans and Octans does not differ from the received notion of Quadrans among the Romans, as Scaliger and Salmasius thought. They were taken by Vi-

[473]

* Vitruvius, x, II.

† Vitruvius, iii, 3.

truvius,

[474] truvius, and every body else, for the ivth and viiith part of any whole whatsoever; and all the words of that form that could be applied to the divisions of the As or Libra, have the very same meaning: Sextans the vith part of the whole As, Triens the iiii, Quadrans the ivth; and so among the Sicilians, ἐξᾶς, τριᾶς, τετράς. Octans indeed was not used as a division of the Libra; because, as I observed before, it would have made a troublesome fraction; but it was used in the division of other things, whether magnitude or number; as here by Vitruvius for the viiith part of a Circle. So ΔΕΚΑΣ, a Sicilian word mentioned by Arcadius*, Τὸ Δεκᾶς περισπᾶται, ὅτε ἐπὶ ποσότητι τᾶσσεται though it was no species of money, for the reason above given, yet it was a name of measure and quantity, and denoted the xth part of any thing. It appears then, from the whole account, that the ancient Romans had all their names and species of money from the Dorians of Sicily and Italy; and continued every word in it's original sense. And because money was first coined at Rome by Servius Tullius, who began his reign Olymp. l. 4. and died Olymp. lxi 4. and consequently was contemporary with Phalaris, it is a plain case that in Phalaris's time, as well as afterwards, the Sicilians had those species of money.

P. 81. After I had prepared this defence of my account of the Sicilian Talent, I observed that Mr. B. in his second edition had made some few additions to his remarks upon this article. At first, he told us "It would not, perhaps, be difficult to offer some emendations of Pollux, that might set these things right;" but, it seems, for some secret reasons, he would not oblige us with them. But in his second edition, being in better humour, "Not to be too reserved," says he, with the "Doctor, I shall now offer what may set Pollux right; and "I wish the Doctor himself were as capable of Emendation."

[475] I thank the Gentleman for his good wish; but, if he can give me no better *emendation* than this that he has given Pollux, he would be no better a Director to Me than somebody has been to Him. His first conjecture is, "that ἐξ τάλαρα, ὅπερ ἐστὶ δύο χαλκοῖ, is an error of the Copyists, for ἐξάλιτρον†." A profound conjecture indeed! it is not borrowed from the other place of Pollux‡, where the text has it ἐξάλιτρα and I have proved above that both places are corrupted; and that the true reading is ἐξᾶντα. "Which ἐξάλιτρον," says Mr. B.

* Salmas. p. 256,

† Pollux, p. 436.

‡ Id. p. 215.

" signified

“ signified the viith part of a Litra; and so the rest of the “ Compounds of Λίτρα in the same manner.” Here our Emendator makes Ἐξάλιτρον mean “ the viith part of a Litra; which, by all analogy, and all examples of authors, must needs mean “ vi whole Litræ; so that he is out of his reckoning no less than *six times six*. What thinks he of ἐξάμηνϙ, ἐξαήμερϙ, ἐξαέτης, ἐξάπηχυς, ἐξαδάκτυλος, ἐξάδραχμϙ, ἐξάσιχος, and xx more? Must these signify the viith of a Month, Day, or Year, &c. or, as the all world has yet supposed, must they mean vi Months, vi Days, vi Years, and so on? According to Mr. B.’s wise computation, the Δεκάλιτρον must not be ten Litræ, but the tenth of a Litra, which is a hundred times less than Aristotle and Pollux dreamed of. The Πεντεκοντάλιτρον must not be 1 Litræ, but the 1th of a Litra, which is 2500 times less than poor Diodorus Siculus thought it, who values it at x Attic Drachms. The Prisoner’s Chain, that Diphilus calls Τετρακοντάλιτροι *, must not be xl pound weight, but the xlth part of a pound; which would not be quite so *heavy* as some of those in Newgate. But, of all men, Aristophanes † is in the most dangerous condition with his

[476]

Πόθεν ἂν λάβοιμι ῥῆμα μυριάμορον.

for he wished here for something “ that would hold the measure “ of 10,000 casks;” but Mr. B. can tell him that it means no more than “ the 10,000th part of a cask;” so that either the Poet or Mr. B. are mistaken a hundred millions in the reckoning. After so glorious a beginning, Mr. B. tells us in the next sentence “ that the Sicilian Talent was a piece of Silver that “ answered to LX Litræ of Brass.” It seems he cannot open his mouth without mistaking; for the Talent was no *piece of Silver*, nor a single coin, but a *sum*,—as a Pound Sterling is in English; and it was reckoned a Talent whether it was paid in Silver or in Brass; whether with vi Silver Δεκάλιτρα, or xxiv Νοῦμμοι, or LX Λίτραι, or cxx Ἡμιλίτρια, or all in Ἐξάντης or Οὐγκίαι of Brass; just as a Pound here is the same, whether it be paid in Crowns, or Shillings, or Half-pennies, or Farthings. His very next sentence acquaints us “ that this LX “ Pound weight of Brass was then divided into xxiv pieces, “ called Νοῦμμοι, each Νοῦμμϙ being equal to two Pounds and “ a half; which the Romans would have called Nummus Ses- “ tertius, as they would have called iv of them a Decussis.”

* Pollux, p. 215.

† Aristoph. in Pace.

[477] Here are *three* mistakes in the compass of *one* proposition : so very fruitful is Mr. B. in those happy productions. The Sicilian Νοῦμμο he makes to be “ a brass piece of 2 Pounds and a half , which was a small piece of Silver, about the weight of three Pence English. Aristotle says, the Tarentine Νοῦμμο had stamped upon it ΤΑΡΑΣ astride upon a Dolphin ; and there are several Silver ones of that sort yet preserved, but nothing like it in Brass. And indeed, the absurdity of the Examiner’s notion is visible at first view ; for who would stamp any species of 2 pounds and a half weight ? the heaviest coin was but one pound ; and higher than that they did not go. He mistakes again, when he teaches us that the Romans would have called that brass piece of 2 Pounds and a half, a Nummus Sestertius ; for the Roman Sestertius was like the Sicilian, of Silver : — “ In argento,” says Varro, “ Nummus : id à Siculis.” There was no such coin as Sestertius till the Second Punic War, when Silver Money came into use. Then, he says, they would have called four of those Brass pieces “ a Decussis.” Here he imagines that Decussis was a particular coin,—which was a sum of XII Asses, or of XII pounds weight of uncoined Brass ; so were Tressis, Quinquessis, Octussis, and so on to Centussis : all sums and not species ; though some learned men have maintained these to be coins, and the Sestertius to be Brass too, and so might lead Mr. B. out of the way. In the next place, he proceeds to give an account how the Sicilian Talent of XXIV Νοῦμμοι came to sink so low as XII Νοῦμμοι but his suppositions being bottomed upon those two mistakes, that the Talent was a single coin of Silver, and the Νοῦμμο a coin of Brass, they must needs be all mistakes too ; and the superstructure be like the foundation. If the Readers be not yet tired with his endless blunders, they may see what work he makes of this in page 81.

[478] But the strangest thing of all, if any thing besides being in the right can now be thought strange in our Examiner, is the flat contradiction between this new addition and what Mr. B. had said here before. The old part is to prove that the low Sicilian Talent is a mere figment ; — the new is to make it probable that there was a low Talent, and to shew how it came to be so : — the old decries the passage of Pollux, as “ so obscure and interpolated,” that nothing can be made of it ; — the new offers to clear it up, and “ to set the thing right ;” to make way for the low value of the Talent : — the old undervalues Festus, and corrects it 3000 Denares, instead of 3 : — the new espouses the present reading (3) and would reconcile it with

P. 88.

P. 83, 84.

with other Writers; in the old, the ἐξάλιτρον is interpreted vi Litræ; in the new it is but 11; in the old "he has good reason" not to admit that the Sicilian Νῆμμα was the same with the "Roman Sestertius;" in the new he readily admits and plainly supposes it: — in the old, "a Talent may be Brass, and equal" to a Litra;" in the new, "the Talent is a piece of Silver," and answers to LX Litræ." Now, if the old text had been cashiered and struck out, we might allow this new addition as the Examiner's second thoughts, and give him the common right of changing his former opinion upon better consideration. But, as if it were on purpose to amaze and astonish his Readers, the old text stands still as it did, and the new piece is clapped into it, as if they both consisted very well, and suited together. We have had one instance before*, where his Text and his Margin, like the two faces of Janus, look quite contrary ways; but in this place, not only the Margin is at war with the Text, but the very Text too, by another addition, has a Civil War within itself. Now the Reader perhaps may be inclined to suspect that some Assistant was over-officious here, and that Mr. B. himself would not blow hot and cold with the same breath; but I would advise them not to be too rash, but to learn by my example†, how feeble all such arguments from reason are, in things that concern the Examiner! However, if there was any such Assistant that put in a finger here, I must own myself obliged to him; for though he bungled grievously in his work, yet his design was wholly on my side, to account for the low Sicilian Talent, and to avoid all that Mr. B. had written about it before. And I am the more confirmed in my opinion that he was against Mr. B. because I find him playing mere booty with him: — "Suppose," says he, "there" was a Sicilian Talent of this low value; yet, when a Talent was simply mentioned, it must mean the common Talent, made up of 60 Minæ, and those divided each into 100 Drachmæ, and these into Oboli." This looks now like a salvo, to come off with Mr. B. and to reconcile the new piece and the old together; but it is perfectly a banter upon him, and seems designed for a piece of nonsense; for the meaning of it is exactly thus: — "Though a current Talent" in Sicily was but worth about Half a Crown, yet, when "a Talent was mentioned in Sicily, it must mean 180 Pounds Sterling." But we may expect to have this passage cleared "when Mr. B. and the Assistant next see one another;" and

P. 80.

P 79.

P. 89.

[479]

* See here, p. 120.

† P. 89.

then too he may please to resolve Whether he will still oppose my account of the Sicilian Money; or, if not, *renounce*, as he *promises*, not “some particular Epistles only, but the whole “Set of them.”

[480]

XV.

BUT, to let pass all farther arguments from words and language, to me the very matter and business of the Letters sufficiently discover them to be an imposture. What force of wit and spirit in the style, what lively painting of humour some fancy they discern there, I will not examine nor dispute. But, methinks, little sense and judgment is shewn in the ground-work and subject of them. What an improbable and absurd story is that of the LIV Epistle! Stesichorus was born at Himera; but he chanced to die at Catana, a hundred miles distance from home, quite across the Island. There he was buried; and a noble Monument made for him*. Thus far the Sophist had read in good Authors. Now, upon this, he introduces the Himerenses, so enraged at the others for having Stesichorus's ashes, that nothing less will serve them than “denouncing war, and sacking their “city.” And presently an embassy is sent to Phalaris, to desire his assistance; who, like a generous ally, promises them what arms, and men, and money they would: but, withal, sprinkles a little dust among the bees, advising them to milder counsels, and proposing
[481] this expedient, That Catana should have Stesichorus's tomb, and Himera should build a Temple to him. Now, was ever any declamator's theme so extravagantly

* Suidas Πάρτα ἐκτὸς. & Στοιχ.

put?

put? What! to go to war upon so slight an occasion! and to call in too the assistance of the Tyrant? Had they so soon forgotten Stesichorus' own counsel*, who, when upon another occasion they would have asked succour of Phalaris, dissuaded them by the Fable of the Horse and his Rider? Our Sophist had heard that Seven Cities *contended* about Homer; and so Two might go to blows about another Poet; but there is a difference between that contention and this fighting in earnest. He is as extravagant too in the honours he would raise to his Poet's memory; nothing less than a Temple and Deification. Cicero tells us, that in his days there was his statue still extant at Himera (then called Thermæ); which, one would think, was honour enough. But a Sophist can build Temples in the air as cheaply and easily as some others do Castles.

What an inconsistency is there between the LI and LXIX Epistles! In the former, he declares his immortal hatred to one Pethon; who, after Phalaris's flight from Astypalæa, would have persuaded his wife Erythia to a second marriage with himself; but seeing her resolved to follow her husband, he poisoned her. Now this could be no long time after his banishment, for then she could not have wanted opportunities of following him. But in the LXIX Epistle we have her alive again, long after that Phalaris had been Tyrant of Agrigentum; for he mentions his growing old there†. And we must not imagine but that several years had passed before he could seize the government of so populous a city that had 200,000 Souls‡ in it; or, as others say, 800,000§; for he came an indigent stranger thither, according to the Letters, and by degrees rising from one employment to another, at last had opportunity and power to effect that design. Besides,

[482]

* Aristot. Rhet. l. ii.

† Διὰ τὸ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆρας. Ep. 69.

‡ Diod. Sicul. p. 206.

§. Diog. Laërt. in Empedoc.

in the LXIX Letter, she is at Crete with her son; and in the LI she is poisoned (I suppose) at Astypalæa; for there her poisoner dwelt; and it is expressly said she designed, but could not follow her husband; which seems an intimation that the Sophist believed Astypalæa to be a City in Crete. It is certain that the Editors of Phalaris, by comparing these two passages together, made that discovery in Geography; for it could not be learned anywhere else; and it is an admirable token, both that the Epistles are old and genuine, and that the Commentators are not inferior to, nor unworthy of their Author.

[483]

What a scene of putid and senseless formality are the LXXIIX, LXXIX, and CXLIV Epistles! Nicocles a Syracusian, a man of the highest rank and quality, sends his own brother a hundred miles with a request to Phalaris, That he would send to Stesichorus, another hundred miles, and beg the favour of a copy of verses upon Clearista his wife, who was lately dead. Phalaris accordingly sends to Himera with mighty application and address, and soon after writes a second letter of thanks for so singular a kindness. Upon the fame of this, one Pelopidas entreats him, that he would procure the like favour for a friend of his*; but meets with a repulse. Now, whether there was any Poem upon Clearista among the Works of Stesichorus, whence our Sophist might take the plot and groundwork of this story; or whether it is entirely his own invention and manufacture, I will not pretend to guess. But let those believe that can, that such stuff as this busied the head of the Tyrant; at least they must confess then, though the Letters would represent him as a great admirer and judge too of Poetry, that he was a mere "Asinus ad Lyram;" for, in the LXXIX Epistle, he calls this Poem upon Clearista

[484]

μέλος and μελωδίαν, which must here (as it almost ever

* Ep. lxxv.

does)

does) signify a Lyric Ode, since it is spoken of Stesichorus, a Melic or Lyric Poet. But in the cXLIV he calls it an Elegy, ἐλεγείον which is as different from μέλος, as Theognis is from Pindar, or Tibullus from Horace. What? the same copy of verses both an Ode and an Elegy? Could not some years' acquaintance with Stesichorus teach him the very names? But to forgive Him, or rather the Sophist, such an egregious piece of dulness, why, forsooth, so much ado, why such a vast way about to obtain a few verses? Could not they have written directly to Stesichorus, and at the price of some present have met with easy success? Do not we know that all of that string, Bacchylides, Simonides, Pindar, got their livelihood by the Muses? So that, to use Phalaris's intercession, besides the delay and unnecessary trouble to both, was to defraud the Poet of his fee.

Nay, certainly, they might have employed any hand rather than Phalaris'; for, begging pardon of the Epistles, I suspect all to be a cheat about Stesichorus's friendship with him; for the Poet, out of common gratitude, must needs have celebrated it in some of his Works. But that he *did not*, the Letters themselves are, in this point, a sufficient witness; for, in the LXXIX, Phalaris is feigned to entreat him, not once to mention his name in his Books. This was a sly fetch of our Sophist, to prevent so shrewd an objection from Stesichorus's silence as to any friendship at all with him. But that cunning shall not serve his turn; for what if Phalaris had really wished him to decline mentioning his name? Stesichorus knew the world well enough, that those sort of requests are but a modest simulation; and a disobedience would have been easily pardoned. In the LXXIV Letter the Tyrant proclaims and glories to his enemy Orsilochnus, that Pythagoras had stayed five months with him; why should he then seek to conceal from posterity the twelve years familiarity with Stesichorus? Pindar,

[485]

D d 4

exhorting

exhorting Hiero the Tyrant of Syracuse to be kind to Poets and men of letters, tells him how Cræsus had immortal praise for his friendship and bounty to them; "but the memory of that cruel and inhospitable Phalaris was hated and cursed everywhere*." How could Pindar have said this, had he heard of his extraordinary dearness with Stesichorus? for their acquaintance, according to the Letters, was as memorable and as glorious as that of Cræsus with Æsop and Solon; so that Pindar, had he known it, for that sole kindness to his fellow-Poet, would have forborne so vile a character. Plato, in his second Epistle, recounts to Dionysius some celebrated friendships of learned men with Tyrants and Magistrates; Simonides's with Hiero and Pausanias, Thales's with Periander, Anaxagoras's with Pericles, Solon's and others with Cræsus. Now, how could he have missed, had he ever heard of it, this of Stesichorus with Phalaris? being transacted in Sicily, and so a most proper and domestic example. If you say the infamy of Phalaris made him decline that odious instance, in that very word you pronounce our Epistles to be spurious; for, if they had been known to Plato, even Phalaris would have appeared as moderate a Tyrant as Dionysius himself. Lucian †, that feigns an embassy from Phalaris to Delphi for the dedication of the Brazen Bull, makes an Oration in his praise, as Isocrates does of Busiris; where, without doubt, he has gathered all the stories he knew for topics of his commendation; but he has not one word of his friendship with Stesichorus;—nor, indeed, has any body else. And do not you yet begin to suspect the credit of the Letters?

[487] It would be endless to prosecute this part, and

* Pyth. i. Τὸν δὲ ταύρου χαλκίῳ καυτῆρα πηλῆα νόον ἔχθρὰ Φάλαρι κατίχοι παντὰ φάτις.

† In Phalar. prior.

shew all the silliness and impertinency in the matter of the Epistles ; for, take them in the whole bulk, they are a fardle of common places, without any life or spirit from action and circumstance. Do but cast your eye upon Cicero's Letters, or any Statesman's, as Phalaris was, what lively characters of men are there ! what descriptions of place ! what notifications of time ! what particularity of circumstances ! what multiplicity of designs and events ! When you return to these again, you feel, by the emptiness and deadness of them, that you converse with some dreaming Pedant with his elbow on his desk ; not with an active ambitious Tyrant, with his hand on his sword, commanding a million of subjects. All that takes or affects you, is a stiffness and stateliness and operoseness of style ; but, as that is improper and unbecoming in all Epistles, so especially it is quite alien from the character of Phalaris, a man of business and dispatch.

MR. B. begins the Examination of this article with a pedantic digression and common-place about Pedantry ; which I will not now meddle with, but reserve for a more proper place, that I may not, as he has done, interrupt the business of this Section with an impertinent excursion that has no manner of relation to it.

The first absurdity that I noted in the matter of the Epistles, was " the Himeræans going to WAR with the Catanæans " about Stesichorus's ashes, and calling in Phalaris to their " assistance against Stesichorus's own advice in a case exactly " like it." Now the Examiner pretends to answer this ; but with greater craft than ingenuity, he drops the principal part of it. " What is there," says he, " in this story, either absurd " or improbable, that the Himeræans should be so concerned " to get the ashes of Stesichorus, and the Catanæans to keep " them ?" What I, from the Epistles, called " a war and " sacking of a City *," and a dependence upon the most brutal of Tyrants, our Honourable Examiner styles " a Concern ;" and says not one word about the " going to War." But he tells us, " This very thing happened afterwards in the case

* Ep. 54. Ἐλῦσιν ὑμῖν πόλιν ἐν Σικελίᾳ.

“ of Euripides, whose bones the Athenians sent a solemn embassy to Macedonia to retrieve; but their request was “ denied.” And is this the “ very thing,” and the same case, with that in the Epistles? It is so far from being the “ very thing,” that one can hardly pick out a more proper instance to refute the Epistles! for, as the Athenians met with a denial when they demanded Euripides’s ashes, and yet declared no war upon that account, nor committed the least hostilities, so likewise the Himeræans would never go to war upon so slight an occasion, especially against a powerful city that had the same original with their own; both colonies being founded by the Chalcidians of Eubœa. After this, he informs us from Pausanias “ That the Athenians built a noble “ monument to Euripides :” but neither Pausanias nor Thomas Magister, who are the only authors, I suppose, that speak of it, say a word of its nobility; but the one calls it barely *Μνημα Εὐριπίδου κενόν* *, and the other, *κενотάφιον* †, without a word in its commendation. Then he tells us, out of Plutarch, “ That the Orchomenians endeavoured all they could to get Hesiod’s bones; but the Locrians that had them, would not be prevailed upon to part with them.” And here again he puts a force upon his author, and makes him say more than he really does; but though the case were so as he represents it, it would be, as the most of his are, a good argument against himself; for, as the Orchomenians did not go to war upon it, though the very Oracle advised them to fetch Hesiod’s bones, so the Himeræans would not have run that hazard for the sake of Stesichorus.

I had blamed the Epistles for raising “ a Temple ‡” to Stesichorus, which the Examiner justifies, from “ the several “ Temples erected to Homer at Smyrna, and in other places; “ which the Doctor,” says he, “ knew nothing of; though it “ be no’ secret even to the first beginners of learning.” It is a good proof indeed, that “ the first beginners” may know this thing, because our Examiner knows it. But there is another thing, that I perceive even He “ knows nothing of;” that Homer’s case and Stesichorus’s have no relation to one another; for, I pray, at what time were the Temples built to Homer? It was a long time before he was honoured with so much as an Epitaph. “ He was buried,” says Herodotus,

* Pausan. p. 2.

† Thom. Mag. vita Eurip. p. 100.

‡ Ep. 54. *Νῶς ἰς ἄσθον Στεσιχόρου.*

" in the Island Ios, — καὶ ὕστερον πολλῶν χρόνων, and a LONG
 " TIME after, when his Poems became famous, they made an
 " Epitaph upon him *." As for his Temple at Smyrna, which
 Strabo †, Cicero, and others mention, it must needs be as
 recent as the city itself; and that was built by Antigonos and
 Lysimachus, six or seven hundred years after the Poet's time,
 the old city having been ruined and desolate for 400 years
 together. And then the Temple at Alexandria that Ptolemee
 Philopater erected to his memory, was later than that at
 Smyrna ‡; and the marble of Homer's Apotheosis, which is
 published with an ample Commentary by the very learned
 Cuperus, may be reasonably supposed to be later than them
 both. What has the Examiner gotten, therefore, by his in-
 stances of Homer's Temples? They are all near ccc years
 younger than Phalaris and Stesichorus; and if a custom ob-
 tained in this latter age, will he infer that it was used too in the
 former? or will he compare the fame of Stesichorus with the
 glory of Homer? or will he suppose that Stesichorus could
 immediately obtain those honours which Homer did not, till
 his Books had lasted vi centuries, when he was numbered
 among the ancient heroes? This is so poor an excuse for the
 Sophist, that it is a further detection of him; for, since he
 lived after Ptolemee's time, and had heard of Homer's Temples
 at Alexandria and Smyrna, it might easily come into his head
 to build the like for Stesichorus; but the true Phalaris, in
 whose days even Homer himself had no Temple erected to him,
 would never have thought of it.

But what a morose piece of critic is that, where he will not
 give me leave to say, as others have done, " That Himera
 " was afterwards called Thermæ?" Because, forsooth, Dio-
 dorus and Cicero say they were not built upon the same spot
 of ground. And yet Diodorus himself expressly calls the
 inhabitants of Thermæ, Himeræans §; and Scipio, when he
 gave them the statues that formerly belonged to Himera; and
 Cicero, when he tells that story of Scipio, do both as good as
 declare that they looked upon them as the same city. Poly-
 bius, therefore, joins both words together, and calls them
 Θερμαῖν τῶν Ἱμεραίων || and so Ptolemee, Θερμαὶ Ἱμεραίων πόλις,
 which Cluverius corrects Ἱμεραῖαι and so an inscription in
 Gruter ¶, COL. AVG. HIMAERAEORVM. THERMIT. And if

* Herod. vita Homeri.

† Strabo, p. 646.

‡ Ælian. xiii, 22.

§ Diod. p. 280.

|| Polyb. p. 24.

¶ Gruter, p. 433.

I may

I may not say Himera was called Thermæ, because they were not upon the same spot, I must not say neither (what every body has said) that Naxos was called Taurominium; nor that Sybaris was called Thurii; no, nor that Smyrna was called Smyrna, nor Magnesia called Magnesia; for the new towns of those names were as remote from the old ones as Thermæ from Himera.

I had charged the Letters with *inconsistency*, because the L1st makes Phalaris's wife to have been poisoned at Astypalæa, soon after her husband's flight; but the LXIXth makes her alive in Crete many years after, when Phalaris was grown old in the Monarchy at Agrigentum. Mr. B. is pleased to reply, "That here I make an unreasonable supposition that the Letters must have been written in the same order that they now stand; for, if that do not take place, there is no manner of inconsistency between these two Epistles." Now, what name ought to be given to such a Writer as this is, who prevaricates so notoriously in a case as plain as the sun? Did I ever make such a supposition that the Letters were written in the order they are printed? had I not expressly supposed in the 1vth article that the LXXXvth Letter might be written before the LXXXIVth? nay, before the xxth? nay, before the very first of all*? And is it not visible and plain to any man of sense that I place the *inconsistency* here, not upon the Order of the Epistles, but upon the differences of place and time? I would ask him now, in his own language, "Was the pleasure of forging this imaginary *supposition*, which is worthy of himself, and none of mine, an equivalent to the shame of being told of it?"

P. 103. But he tells me "I make four other suppositions, which have not the least countenance from the Epistles, or any other History." What the Examiner will grant or deny, to me is indifferent; but I appeal to others if every particular that I said there may not be fairly gathered from the Letters themselves? "Phalaris fled from Astypalæa †;" "His wife, endeavouring to follow him, was poisoned by Python, who courted her to a second marriage ‡." Again, "His wife is alive in Crete, when Phalaris had long possessed the Government of Agrigentum §." All this is plainly affirmed in the Letters. Now, if Astypalæa was not a town of Crete,

* See here, p. 104.

† Ep. 4, 49.

‡ Ib. 51.

§ Ib. 69.

but

but an island of the Sporades, as I have proved already against Phalaris's Editors, then, if she was poisoned at Astypalæa, she could not afterwards be alive at Crete. And if she was poisoned for endeavouring to follow her husband, which cannot reasonably be supposed to be very long after his flight, she could not be yet alive when he was grown old in Sicily. I must confess that these two accounts are still in my opinion *inconsistencies*. But Mr. B. and I may have very different notions of what deserves to be called by that name; for his Examination flatly contradicts his own Index to Phalaris; and his Margin, in more places than one, is directly opposite to his Text, and yet he seems not to apprehend them to be *inconsistent* one with another; for he has made no retraction of his Index to Phalaris; and has made his Margin keep company with his Text, as if they were very good friends.

[493]

My other exception against the Epistles was the Sophist's absurd conduct about Nicocles's address to Phalaris, to obtain by his intercession a copy of verses from Stesichorus. But the Examiner "protests he can see no harm, nor any thing unnatural in it." Now, this being a matter of mere judgement, and no controversy of fact, I am not surprized to see Mr. B. and myself have such different opinions about it: and, when a thing is once brought to that issue, it is in vain to dispute farther about it; but we must refer the whole matter to the Readers that have taste and skill. I shall only take some short notice of the particulars that his argument is built on. He says "Phalaris was not successful in a second attempt upon Stesichorus, at the instance of a Sicilian gentleman." But it is plain from the Epistle itself *, that Phalaris refused to make a second attempt; so that the Gentleman was unsuccessful with Phalaris, not Phalaris with Stesichorus. Mr. B. it seems, does not know his own *favourite* Book; and yet, if I, that despise it, and believe it not worth the reading, had made such a mistake about it as this is, he would have given us two whole pages in aggravation of the fault, and have poured out his *grimace* and *banter* profusely upon so worthy a subject.

P. 104.

P. 104.

But, "he finds I have high thoughts of Phalaris," because I said Such stuff as Stesichorus's verses did not busy his head." They were not "high thoughts" of his great monarchy, but hard ones of his cruelty and barbarity, that made me suppose such matters did not busy his head. Mr. B. then might have

P. 104.

[494]

* Ep. 65.

saved that diminishing character that he gives here of Phalaris's power. One may guess it was much against his mind to depress his Sicilian Prince; but his anger against his Antagonist was stronger here than his sense of Loyalty. But let us see how he manages: "He was only a petty Prince," he says, "of one town in Sicily." I perceive he has not lost all his former respect for him; he will make him a prince still, though it be but a petty one. But why so ill-natured, as to allow him but one single town, Agrigentum; and in that single town too to take away half of his subjects? What will he do therefore with Suidas, who makes him "Tyrant of all Sicily*?" or with Diogenianus, who affirms "That he subdued the City and Country of Leontini†? or with Polyænus, who makes him "conquer the Sicilians, and take "Ouessa (or rather Inessa) their capital city‡?" or with Diodorus§, who informs us that he had two castles, "Ἐπνομος λόφος, and Φαλάριον, in the territories of Gela, a day's journey from Agrigentum? or, lastly, what will he do with the Epistles themselves, which pretend he vanquished the Leontini, and the Tauromenites and Zancleæans their allies||? If Mr. B. pleases to take all these into the account, he may allow his Prince to have been master of "a Million of subjects," though Agrigentum should not be so populous as Laërtius represents it. And why now would Mr. B. deal so unkindly with him, to make him "a petty prince of one city only," when such credible Authors assign him many more? Is there not, as I have often observed, a certain fatality in this Gentleman's errors, so that, whether he talks for Phalaris or against him, on both sides he is always mistaken?

[495] He goes on, and tells me "That there have been Tyrants,
P. 105. "with many millions of subjects, that have employed themselves about Poems. Has not the Doctor seen," says he, "the Fragments of Augustus's Letters to Horace, pressing "and obliging that Poet to write?" Never was a piece of history more aptly applied: I can heartily now forgive him all he has said about Me, when I see how judicious and exact he is in bestowing names and characters. Phalaris is a Sicilian Prince with him, and Augustus is a Tyrant. Methinks that Dionysius, Tyrant of Syracuse, had been a nearer and pro-

* Suid. Φάλ. τυραννήσας Σικελίας ὅλης.

† Diog. Παροιμιῶν ii, 50. Καταπολεμήσας τὰς Λεοντίνους.

‡ Polyænus, v, 1.

§ Diod. p. 741.

|| Epist. 85.

perer comparison; for he was so concerned with Poets and Poems, that he not only had several Poets in his court, but himself made several Tragedies:—though even this or any other such instance had been wholly impertinent; for, as I said, it was not Phalaris's greatness, but his barbarity and ignorance (being an illiterate Publican before he usurped the Tyranny) that makes his dealings with Stesichorus for copies of verses, to be so improbable and absurd.

But "a present," he says, "had been an improper means to obtain verses of Stesichorus; for he was one of the greatest men of Sicily." This is a new piece of history; and to be sure he takes care to make it out well:—yes, by two very good arguments:—First, "Because, as Suidas tells him, his brother Helianax was *Νομοθέτης*, a Lawgiver." Ay, no doubt of it, if he was a Lawgiver, he must consequently be a Member of Parliament. But it falls out, unfortunately, that the Legislative Power was not always in such great hands as it is now-a-days; "The best Law-makers," says Aristotle*, "were of the MIDDLE rank of citizens; for Solon was such a one, as appears by his Poems; and Lycurgus, for he was no king; and Charondas, and most of the rest." Even Aristotle himself, whose nobility was not extraordinary, made Laws for the Abderitans†; Zaleucus, as we have seen above, was but a Shepherd and a Slave; Eudoxus the Cnidian made Laws to his own citizens‡; and yet he was so poor§, that Theomedon a Physician bore his charges at Athens; and his friends made a purse for him when he was to travel to Ægypt: and Protagoras was Law-giver to the Thurians||, and yet at first he was no better than a Porter to carry burthens¶. Why then must Stesichorus be one of the greatest men in Sicily, because he had a brother a Lawgiver? The Examiner, we see, will still be true to his old way of reasoning; for one may fairly infer the very contrary from it, that he was but of *middle* and ordinary quality. Well, but he must needs be "one of the greatest men there, because he made an apologue to the Himeræans against Phalaris, about the Horse and his Rider, and the Stag**." And is that such a proof of his *wealth* and *greatness*, above the low temptations of money and presents? Menenius Agrippa made such another apologue to the Romans††;

P. 105,
106.

[496]

* Arist. Polit. iv, 11.

† Laërt. Plutarch. c. Colotem.

‡ Laërt. Plut. ibid.

§ Laërt.

|| Ibid.

¶ "Bajulus," *Φορμοφόρος*. Gellius, v. 3.

** Arist. Rhet. ii. 2.

†† Livy, ii.

and

and yet he was so very poor that he left not enough to bury him. There is another apologue too of Æsop's, mentioned by Aristotle in the very place where he tells Stesichorus's; and if Æsop, a poor Slave, could make apologues at Samos, relating to public affairs, why must Stesichorus's apologue at Himera prove him "one of the greatest men in Sicily?" The Arundel Marble gives us a date, when Stesichorus the Poet, Εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἀφικέτο, [497] "went into Greece." Now εἰς Ἑλλάδα ἀφικέσθαι, means to travel into Greece to get money, "as his brother Poets did, "who were to make their fortunes by their pen." When Homer was very poor, says Herodotus *, some persuaded him, εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἀπικέσθαι, "to go into Greece;" and he designed it; but died in Ios before he began the voyage. And the Readers will be apt to suspect, for all the greatness that Mr. B. dreams of, that Stesichorus had no other errand to Greece than Homer had before him,—and Simonides and others after him.

I had made another censure upon the Epistles, "for calling "the same copy of verses both Μῆλϙ and Ἑλεγείον." The P. 106, Examiner replies,— "That, by the different cast of His head, 107. "he should have reasoned just the other way; and have inferred something in favour of the Letters. First," he says, "a Sophist would not have confounded the words." True; a learned Sophist would not have written such sorry Epistles, as a judicious man would not have published them; but our mock Phalaris is a Sophist of that size, that no kind of blunder is below his character. But "a Prince," says Mr. B. "might "not think himself obliged to write with all the exactness of "a Scholar." This is just the second part of his compliment to Queen Elizabeth *: he is resolved, it seems, to stand up for Princes, and maintain for them a royal prerogative of speaking improperly. But let Mr. B. be as good a Courtier as he pleases, I am now to consider him only in his capacity of a Critic. I shall proceed therefore to his next remark, P. 107. "That Phalaris called it an Ἑλεγείον, when he asked it of "Stesichorus, and knew not what measure it would be in; "but when he had it, and saw it was Lyric, he then called it "Μῆλϙ." Who can deny now but this is sharply observed? [498] but there is one inconvenience in it, that, while he is careful of the Prince's reputation, he betrays the Poet's; for if an Elegy, in the proper sense of the word (as their excuse supposes) was bespoke of Stesichorus, why should he make a

* Herod. Vita Homeri.

† See here, p. 259.

Lyric

Lyric Poem instead of it? This had been just like the Sign-painter, that whatsoever was spoken of him, whether a Lion or a Dolphin, always painted a Rose. But Mr. B. will prove P. 107.
 “That Ἑλεγειῶν and Ἑλεγεῖον had a looser sense than what the
 “Grammarians put upon them, because Dion Chrysostom
 “calls Heroic Verses on Sardanapalus’s Tomb Ἑλεγεῖον. But
 there is a figure of Rhetoric here, called Self-contradiction,
 that is very frequent in our Examiner’s reasonings; for he had
 newly said, “A Sophist could not mistake Ἑλεγεῖον the distinct P. 106.
 “sense of which was so well settled before his time by the
 “Grammarians;” and now he produces Dion Chrysostom
 (who, as he tells us, was “as arrant a Sophist and Declaimer as
 “ever was) employing it in a looser meaning than what the
 “Grammarians put upon it.” But, to let this pass, what he
 teaches us here about “the distinct sense that the Grammarians
 “settled upon it, is but a cast of his “own loose and unsettled
 “sense;” for the Grammarians knew well enough that Ἑλεγεῖον
 was taken for Epitaph, even without a Pentametre in it. They
 could learn, that out of Herodotus, among others, when
 he tells them “That the People of Ios, τὸ Ἑλεγεῖον τὸδε ἐπι-
 “γραψαν, wrote this Elegy on Homer’s Tomb*: —

“Ἐθάδε τὴν ἱερὴν κεφαλὴν κατὰ γαῖα καλὴ πῦσι

“Ἀνδρῶν Ἡρώων κοσμήτορα δῖον Ὀμηρον.”

And Suidas †, one of those Grammarians, could not be ignorant of this; for he cites the very same Epitaph, and calls it Ἑλεγεῖον. The case is no more than this: — In the old times [499]
 they generally made their Epitaphs in a single distich, Hexametre and Pentametre; whence, in process of time an Epitaph at large came to be called Ἑλεγεῖον. “The Antients,” says the Scholiast upon Apollonius Rhodius ‡, “used Ἑλεγεῖα for inscriptions upon tombs.” τὰ Ἑλεγεῖα, says Lycurgus the Orator §, τὰ ἐπιγεγραμμένα ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις. But what advantage is this now to Mr. B. and his Phalaris? An Ἑλεγεῖον, of all Hexametres, is as remote from a Lyric Song as if it was mixed with Pentametres; so that Ἑλεγεῖον, and Μελῶν cannot yet be used for the same copy of verses, but by that privilege of making Solecisms that Mr. B. would vindicate to Princes,

* Herod. Vita Homeri.

† Suid. v. Ὀμηρος.

‡ Schol. Apollonii, ii. 784. Τοῖς Ἑλεγεῖοις ἐν τοῖς ἐπιγραφαῖς ἔχοντα αἰ παλαιοί.

§ Lycurg. p. 168.

But his next proof perhaps may be better; "for a nightingale," he says, "in Aristophanes's *AVES*, is said to sing "Ἑλεγχοί and by and by those very Ἑλεγχοί are called Μέλῃ. This, indeed, carries both surprise and demonstration along with it. What a strange reach of fancy has our Examiner! Who but he could ever have thought on this pretty argument from a Nightingale? Let us put it into a syllogism: — "A Nightingale sings Μέλῃ a Nightingale sings Ἑλεγχοί *ergo*, Μέλῃ and Ἑλεγχοί are the same." Very quaint indeed, and out of the common way! but it has one little fault, — that, if a Nightingale can sing more tunes than one, his syllogism must then be hushed. Mr. B. seems to bring this argument with a very serious air, as if, because the Poet metaphorically calls the singing of a bird by the several names of human music, we may infer that all those names may signify one and the same thing. But, in the very same page, Aristophanes says that the Upupa, which we call the Hoopoe, no very melodious bird, chanted a Μέλος —

[500]

Ὁ ὕποφ' μελωδῶν αὐτὸν παρασκευάζεται *.

Mr. B. therefore, by the very same reasoning, may give us another syllogism: — The Nightingale sings a Μέλῃ the Hoopoe sings a Μέλῃ *ergo*, the Hoopoe sings like the Nightingale. And, by the same argument, Black-birds will sing like them; for their notes too are Μέλῃ —

Κόσσυφοι ἀχιῦσιν ποικιλότραυλα μέλη †.

and so the Cicada too: —

Ξυθαῖν ἐκ πτερόγων ἁδὸν κρέκουσα μέλη ‡.

Nay the very Frogs will croak like Nightingales; —

Ταῖς Νύμφαισι δ' ἰδοξεν αἰετὸν τὸν Βάτραχον ἄδιν.

Τῷ δ' ἰγὼ ἔφθοιόμι, τὸ γὰρ Μέλῃ ἔκαλον ἄδιδι §.

But, what is still more extraordinary, the same Nightingale in Aristophanes, a little after, begins to chant a lesson of Anapaests: —

Ἔμινι σύντροφ' ἀηδοῖ,
Ἀρχῇ τῶν ἀναπαίστων ||.

So that by Mr. B.'s powerful argument, both Μέλῃ, and Ἑλεγχοί, and Ἀνάπαισι, may be all used in the same signification. And,

* Aristoph. p. 376.

† Anthol. i, 20.

‡ Ibid. iii. 24.

§ Moschus. id. iii.

|| Aristoph. p. 395.

if Mr. B. had to produce some Anapæsts of Nightingales, to confute my observation about the measures of that verse*, they might have done him perhaps much better service than those of Æschylus and Seneca.

I had declared, that I suspected all to be a cheat about the friendship between Phalaris and Stesichorus, because the Poet himself never mentioned it, nor any other Writer, — though several, had it been true, had fair occasion to speak of it. Now the Examiner accounts for Lucian's silence, because he had said enough in naming Pythagoras; and to have added Stesichorus's name, would have made the piece look stiff and unnatural. Wonderfully nice and exact! — he can tell you, to a single word, when a Treatise will be stiff; like the Gardener, that could determine to a minute when his Melons were ripe. “How many have I saved,” says Phalaris, in Lucian, “who plotted against me, and were convicted! as Acanthus that stands here, and Timocrates, and Leogaras his brother†.” Now, according to the Letters, Stesichorus too was taken plotting; and yet the Tyrant saved his life, and made him his friend. But, says Mr. B. if Lucian here had added Stesichorus to the other three, that single name would have made the discourse as stiff as any buckram; and yet, allowing that Lucian himself had as nice a sensation of stiffness as Mr. B. appears to have, and therefore would not put down four names, but three only, yet methinks he might have spared one of those three, and put Stesichorus in his room, unless Mr. B. will shew that Timocrates or Leogaras (whom nobody ever heard of) were as famous as Stesichorus, and their examples as memorable. But Mr. B. adds farther, “† that, if “Lucian's silence be an exception to Stesichorus's acquaintance with Phalaris, it is to Abaris's too; which yet our Critic has before, for the sake of Aristotle and Jamblichus, “been graciously pleased to allow.” Now, without the Examiner's telling us, we might guess “that he was not awake “sometimes in his work; for surely the man that wrote this, “must have been fast asleep, or else he could never have “talked so wildly.” There is not one word in that place that the Margin refers to, about Phalaris's friendship with Abaris; and how could “I allow it, for the sake of Aristotle,” who says not the least syllable of it! or, if I should allow it,

[501]
P. 109.

P. 203.

P. 157.

[502]

* See here, p. 96, &c.

† Lucian 1. Phal. p. 845.

‡ Dissert. p. 16. here, p. 20.

for the sake of Jamblichus, what would that be to Lucian? for, according to Jamblichus, the Tyrant was killed by Abaris's means upon their first acquaintance; how then could Phalaris in Lucian have magnified himself to the Delphians, upon the past friendship of that Hyperborean? If Lucian had believed the story, as Jamblichus tells it, that the Tyrant was deposed by Pythagoras and Abaris at their first visit, his mentioning Abaris or Pythagoras, in Phalaris's speech at Delphi, had been very absurd. But Stesichorus had been a proper instance, if the Letters be true; for he was XII years the Tyrant's friend, and died too before him; so that Lucian's not mentioning him shews he knew nothing of the Epistles; as, on the contrary, his mentioning Pythagoras, shews he knew nothing of that story of his deposing Phalaris.

P. 109. In the next place, Mr. B. accounts for Plato's silence about the friendship of Stesichorus and Phalaris, "because Plato mentions nothing there of the acquaintance between Pythagoras and Phalaris." An admirable account indeed! Plato, says Mr. B. might omit the mention of Stesichorus's friendship with Phalaris, and yet might believe it true; because he mentions not another friendship that in all probability is as mere a fiction as that; which is as just as if he reasoned thus:—The Antients in their accounts of Æsop, say nothing of his ugliness, and yet they might believe it; because they say nothing neither of Xanthus the Philosopher, with his company of Scholastics*. But says Mr. B. "the Pythagoreans all agree that their Master and Phalaris were acquainted; and Dr. B. grants it." I granted they were contemporaries; and, by a familiar slight of hand†, he turns the word into acquaintance, as he once did before. But how knows he that [503] "all the Pythagoreans agree," when the only men that speak a word of it are Lucian and Jamblichus, and they were neither of them Pythagoreans? Or, suppose the Pythagorean story true, as Jamblichus reports it‡, "That Phalaris blasphemed the Gods, despised Philosophy, and designed to murder Pythagoras,"—would this have been as proper and domestic an instance for Plato as the XII years friendship with Stesichorus? What "a Master of Decency" is Mr. B. and what "a relish" has he of "dexterous management," who goes about to excuse Plato for not numbering Phalaris' and Pythagoras' "enmity" (for so it is represented by those Pythagoreans he speaks of)

* Planud. v. Æsop.

† See here p. 30.

‡ Jambl. v. Pythag. p. 184.

among the "celebrated friendships" of Learned Men with Tyrants!

As for the argument from the silence of Pindar, "he will not attempt to answer it;" which is a better sign of discretion than he usually shews; however, "he will put me in mind of one false colour that I have given to my argument"; for I said "Pindar exhorts Hiero to be kind to Poets and Men of Letters"; but, says he, "there is not a word of that in the verses themselves, whatever guess the Scholiast may make at their remote meaning. So that the Doctor might as well prove his point from *Ἀριπτον μὲν ὕδωρ*." What shall we say now to such a hardy Writer as this is? who can deny with such an air of confidence, what every body's eyes can witness to be true? The very words of Pindar immediately preceding the passage I cited, are

Καὶ λογίοις καὶ δοιδοῖς,

which, by the nicest translation, means "Men of Letters, and Poets". And "to be kind to such," the Poet exhorts Hiero in the paragraph just before : — [504]

Εὐανθεῖ δ' ἐν ὄργᾳ παρμένων,
Εἴπερ τι φιλεῖς ἄκοῶν ἀδεῖαν ἄ-
εὶ κλύειν, μὴ κάμνε λίαν δαπάναις

that is, "Continue your generous temper; and if you desire immortal Fame, do not be weary of being bountiful".

After he has denied that to be in Pindar, which is evidently and expressly there, the next and last advance he makes is, to deny that to be in the Letters which he himself once knew to be there, if it was he that translated them. "The Letters," he says, "do not imply that there was any extraordinary dearness between Stesichorus and Phalaris; there is no proof from them that Stesichorus loved him; His friendship was desired, and he only, out of prudence, did not stand off". This is spoken with a good measure of assurance; let us see with what measure of truth. The Tyrant declares, "That, though he gave Stesichorus xii years of life, yet still he was in debt to him; for he alone of all mortals gave him courage, and taught him to despise death*"; and that, "for the sake of Stesichorus, he is ready to encounter certain destruction†". And the fame of Phalaris' kindness to him was so great, that the Tauromenites applied to Stesichorus, to intercede with the

P. 110.
111

P. 111.

* Ep. 103.

† Ib. 54.

Tyrant, that he would remit the price of their captives *. Stesichorus dies before he could do it for them ; but he leaves it in command to his daughters to ask that favour in his name. The Tyrant, upon the first notice of the request immediately returns the money, with this protestation, "That he would not only do
 [305] " that for his sake, ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ τι καὶ τῶν ἀδυνάτων ἔτι μείζον but
 " any thing else, though it were more than impossible." And yet it appears, from another Letter †, that the sum he remitted here was no less than a hundred Talents, or 18,000 Pounds Sterling: the greatest sum by much that appears in the whole set of Epistles; and six times as much as in another Letter he was forced to borrow for himself ‡. This, I presume, is a pretty good token of an "extraordinary dearness" on Phalaris' side; and this alone would be argument enough to prove Stesichorus was not insensible on his part; for Mr. B. surely will not make such a ninny of his Sicilian Prince, as to suppose him so prodigal of his highest favours, without suitable returns of his friendship. But, besides this, the very Letters are as express for Stesichorus' love as for Phalaris'; for, as the Tauromenites addressed to Stesichorus, to obtain favours of the Tyrant, so Pelopidas § and Nicocles || apply themselves to the Tyrant, to get favours of Stesichorus; which in his way were copies of verses; and the argument that Phalaris uses to persuade the Poet to do that favour is, "to confirm the received opinion that the world had of their friendship ¶". And he tells us, both there and once more **, that Stesichorus desired leave to celebrate him in his Poems; but the Tyrant begs he would not do it, Πρὸς ἱταί-
 [306] πης Διός, καὶ κοινῆς 'Ερίας by such obtestations as are used among the dearest friends and relations. "And it is sufficient," he says, "for him to be written ἐν αὐτῷ Στεσιχόρῳ, in Stesichorus' "own heart." Now if these do not imply a friendship on Stesichorus' part, as well as Phalaris', let the Reader be judge; and at the same time let him reflect what an odd-sighted Examiner I have to deal with; that at some times can see in Books what never was there; but at other times, cannot see the plainest things, not only in other men's books, but even in his own.

* Ep. 31.

† Ib. 85.

‡ Id. 118.

§ Ib. 65.

|| Ib. 78.

¶ Ib. 78.

** Ib. 146.

XVI.

IT must needs be a great wonder to those that think the Letters genuine, how or where they were concealed; in what secret cave, or unknown corner of the world, so that nobody ever heard of them for a thousand years together. Some trusty servant of the Tyrant must have buried them under ground; and it was well that he did so; for, if the Agrigentines had met with them, they had certainly gone to pot. They that burned alive both him and his relations, and his friends, would never have spared such monuments of him to survive them and their city. And without doubt it was immortal vellum, and stolen from "the parchments of Jove*," that could last for ten ages, though untouched and unstirred, in spite of all damp and moisture, that moulders other mortal skins; for had our Letters been used or transcribed during that thousand years, somebody would surely have spoken of them, especially, since so many of the Antients had occasion to do so; so that their silence is a direct argument that they never had heard of them. I have just now cited some passages of Pindar, Plato, and Lucian; which are a plain indication that they were unknown to those three. Nay, the last of these, besides the proof above named from his silence and prætermission, does as good as declare expressly that he never saw our Epistles; for, not to mention other differences of less moment, he makes both Phalaris† and his smith, Perilaus, to be born at Agrigentum; but the Letters bring one of them from Astypalæa, and the other from Athens. Lucian then knew nothing of them, or at least knew them, as I do, to be spurious, and below his notice. Much less could he be the Author of them, as Politian and his followers

[507]

* Διφθέραι Διός.

† Phalar. i. Ἐγὼ γὰρ ἐ τῶν αἰφανῶν ἐν Ἀγρίγεντι ὦν. & ibid. Περύλαος ἦ τις ἡμεδαπός.

believe; for he would neither have been guilty of such flat contradictions, nor have so forfeited all learning and wit, by those gross blunders in chronology, and that wretched pedantry in the matter. And whosoever those Authors were that Lucian followed in his narrative of Phalaris, they too are so many witnesses against the Epistles. One can hardly believe, indeed, that the Sophist should venture to fetch his Tyrant from Astypalæa without the warrant of some old Writer; but yet [508] Lucian and other Authors compel us to think so; and we find him as fool-hardy on other occasions. Heraclides of Pontus*, that lived within two centuries of Phalaris' age, says the Agrigentines, when they recovered their liberty, burned him and his mother; but our Sophist makes him an orphan, ὀρφανίας περιπαῖναι †, which if any one shall contend to mean the loss of his father only, yet still he and Heraclides will not set horses together; for if Phalaris fled alone from Astypalæa, neither wife nor child nor any relation following him, according to the Letters, how came the old woman to be roasted at Agrigentum? So little regard had the Sophist to fit his stories to true History; and I have had too much regard to him, in giving him the honour and patience of so long an examination.

THE Examiner, as if he designed to make some amends for his former tedious trifling, will give us very little trouble upon this last article. He would only parallel the thousand years that Phalaris' Epistles lay in obscurity, with some examples of other genuine Books, that had the same fortune. Velleius Paterculus, he says, is not quoted till Priscian's time, 500 years after he wrote; and then we hear no more of him till Aventinus' time, 900 years after Priscian. So Phædrus is first mentioned by Avienus (400 years after the Author's time) and by none after him till Pithœus brought him to light. And Lactantius "De Mortibus Persecutorum" was not seen since St. Jerom's time, till after [509] a thousand years Baluzius published it. But the Gentleman is

* De Polit. ἐνέχυρος δὲ καὶ τὴν μητέρα.

† Ep. xlix.

but, in his last instance; for Lactantius's Book is mentioned by Freculphus, an Author of the ixth century, and by Honorius Augustodunensis, in the xiith, as the very editions of Lactantius might have informed him. But, to pass that over, what are all these examples in comparison of Phalaris's case? Paterculus's Book was owned within 500 years, Phædrus's within 400, and Lactantius's within 100; and if they were not mentioned from those times till the restoration of learning, the reason is apparent, because the Western world in that interval of time was so wretchedly ignorant and immersed in barbarity, that such books as those were not read; or, if they were read, the Readers of them were not Writers themselves, so as to let posterity know that they read them. So that the case of these three Authors is common with most of the rest; for there are several others of the ancient Books, which we now have and acknowledge for genuine, that are not mentioned by the Writers of those barbarous ages; but the fortune of Phalaris's Epistles runs counter to all this: — the thousand years that followed that Tyrant's age was the greatest and longest reign of learning that the world has yet seen, or perhaps ever will, and in all that time these Epistles were never once heard of; but they first came into notice when learning was decaying, in the very dusk and twilight before the long night of ignorance. Neither were they mentioned at 100, or 400, or 500 years after the date of them, and then forgotten for some centuries (as it happened in Mr. B.'s instances); but they were never seen for the first thousand years after their pretended writing; and when they once appeared, they continued always in use. A man must have a very singular "cast of his head," that can think these cases to be parallel. But the greatest difference is yet behind; for though the Writers of the barbarous ages do not speak of Paterculus, nor Phædrus, nor Lactantius, yet they do not tell us of any thing that implies there were no such Books in being. If they say any thing amiss, that they might have corrected out of those Authors, it is to be imputed to their own ignorance or laziness, that they would not search into them, and cannot pass for a negative proof that there were no such Authors; but the Writers for the first ten ages after Phalaris, being men very inquisitive, and of universal learning, and acquainted with all sorts of books, some of them must needs have met with the Epistles in all that time, if the Book had been above ground; and yet they tell us several particulars relating to Phalaris, which of necessity imply that they never had seen the Letters.

[510]

P. 106.

As,

As, besides the passages that I have already produced, there was a controversy in those ages about Phalaris's Bull; for Timæus, the famous Sicilian Historian, who wrote about Olymp. CXXVIII, said the whole story of the Bull was a mere fiction, though it had been so much talked of by Historians as well as Poets. Τίμαιός φησι μήτε γεγονέναι τοῦτον (ταῦρον) ἐν τῇ προειρημέτῃ πόλει (Ἀκράγασι) says Polybius*. Τῶτον τὸν ταῦρον ὁ Τίμαιος ἐν ταῖς ἱστορίαις διαβεβαιωσάμενος μὴ γεγονέναι τὸ σύνολον, says Diodorus†. This I suppose is a plain argument, that in the age of Timæus (who was a native of Sicily, and the son of Andromachus, the founder and governor of Taurominium, and wrote his Histories at Athens‡) the Epistles were neither known in Sicily, where they are supposed to be written, nor at Athens, the common academy of learned and curious men; for if Timæus had heard of these Letters, how durst he have called in question the common tradition about the Bull, since these Letters, if they be genuine, are such an authentic and demonstrative proof of it? Well, but Polybius and Diodorus endeavour to refute Timæus, and to prove that there was really such a Bull. And pray how do they go about it? Do they appeal to the Tyrant's own Letters? the most certain and easy way of conviction, if such Letters were then in the world:—nothing like it; but the sole argument that they go upon is a brazen Bull that Scipio found in Carthage, with a door in the side of it, which was therefore supposed to have been Phalaris's Bull, and to have been carried to Carthage, Olymp. XCIII, 3, among the spoils of Agrigentum. But could either of them have omitted to mention the Tyrant's Letters, if ever they had met with them? and yet the one of them was a Sicilian born, and both of them great travellers and great scholars. The Epistles, therefore, were not heard of in Polybius's time, CXX years after Timæus; nor in Diodorus's time, CXX years after Polybius. I am aware that the Scholiast of Pindar represents Timæus's narrative quite another way; for he tells us, as from that historian, “that the Agrigentines cast Phalaris's Bull into the sea; and that the Bull in Agrigentum, which in his time was shewn for Phalaris's, was only a statue of the river Gelon§.” So that, by this account, Timæus did not deny that the Tyrant had a brazen Bull, but only censured the mistake of those that

* Polyb. Excerpta, p. 58.

† Diod. p. 110.

‡ Plutarch, De Exilio,

§ Schol. Pind. Pyth. i.

took a statue of a river for it*; for rivers were often represented (*ταυρόμορφοι*) in the shape of Bulls. And if any one pleases to give credit to this Scholiast before Polybius and Diodorus, this passage of Timæus will have no force against the Epistles: but I suppose there will not be many of that mind; or, if all should be so, yet the authorities of Polybius and Diodorus are still as strong against the Epistles for their two ages, as if they were believed in their account of Timæus; for, since it is evident and undeniable that they both supposed Timæus had denied the whole story of Phalaris's Bull, they would as certainly appeal to the Epistles, upon the supposition that Timæus denied it, as if he really had denied it.

Another instance, which seems plainly to imply that the Epistles of Phalaris were not extant in those ages, is a tradition that he ate his own son. Aristotle, among other examples of eaters of human flesh, reckons (*τὸ περὶ Φάλαριν λεγόμενον*) "the report about Phalaris†." What that report was, the Philosopher does not say expressly; but perhaps we may be informed by his Scholar Clearchus, who, in his book of Lives, says, "Phalaris the Tyrant came to that degree of cruelty and immanity, that he devoured sucking children‡." And from him perhaps Tatian might have it, where he tells us "That Phalaris used to take infants from the mothers' breasts and eat them§." But this can hardly pass for Aristotle's meaning, because he says there, that some of the savage nations about the Euxine were eaters of children; and yet he makes Phalaris's inhumanity to be different from theirs. He seems to explain himself presently after, where he says *Φάλαρις ἐπιθυμῶν παιδὶς φαγεῖν*, "Phalaris longing to eat a child;" but his Paraphrast, Andronicus Rhodius (as he is commonly supposed to be) says it was Phalaris's own son that Aristotle makes him eat: *Ὁ Φάλαρις ἐποίησε φαγὼν τὸν ἑαυτοῦ παῖδα* and so Aspasius the Scholiast: *Ὁ Φάλαρις λέγεται φαγεῖν τὸν ἑαυτοῦ παῖδα*, "Phalaris is reported to have eaten his own son||." It appears, I suppose, sufficiently from these several Authors, that there was a prevailing tradition about Phalaris's eating his own son when he was an infant; and that alone will effectually prove, that in those ages they had never heard of the Tyrant's Epistles;

* Ælian. Var. Hist. ii, 33.

† Aristot. Ethic. Nicom. vii, 5. Endem, vi, 5.

‡ Athen. p. 396. Γαλαθηνὰ δοιᾶσθαι βρίφη.

§ Tatian. Sect. 54. Ὁ τὸς ἐπιμαστιδίας δοιόμενος παῖδα.

|| Aspasius ad Aristot. p. 154.

for

for we have five there to his son Paurolas, and two to his wife Erythia, about his son's education, by all which it appears that he was a very fond father; that his son was then grown a man, and that he was his "only son*." How then could he eat his own son while he was an infant, according to that tradition? or, how is it possible that such a story could obtain in the world, if the authentic Letters of the father could be produced to disprove it?

[514]
P. 115. I had observed that Lucian, in his two tracts about Phalaris, where he supposes the Tyrant to have sent the brazen Bull to Delphi, as a donary to Apollo, and endeavours to persuade the Delphians to accept of it, has several particulars that contradict the Epistles; which is an argument that he either never heard of them, or believed them to be a cheat. Mr. B. endeavours to answer this by producing my own words, "That Lucian FEIGNS an embassy from Phalaris to Delphi; so that if the whole," says he, "be a fiction, how can we argue from it seriously?" But if Mr. B. himself argue *seriously* here, he discovers no extraordinary judgment; for the whole story may be *feigned* by Lucian, and yet the several parts of it may and ought to be agreeable to truth.

Ψευδοίμην αἰσίου ἂν καὶ περὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις.

"If I tell lies," says Callimachus, "I would tell such as are probable and plausible." Ovid's Epistles of the Heroines are all fictions of his own, but yet the subject and ground of them is taken from ancient history; he does not confound countries and ages together. So Lucian's Dialogues of the Dead are nothing but romances; but he takes care to represent the true history and character of each person: he does not make Cræsus a Cynic Philosopher, nor Diogenes a King. By the same reasoning, if Lucian had seen and believed these Epistles, he would not call Phalaris an Agrigentine, whom they declare an Astypalæan; nor Perilaus a Sicilian, whom they represent as an Athenian; nor have mentioned such obscure names as Acanthus, Timocrates, and Leogoras, for examples of the Tyrant's clemency, when the Letters themselves would have furnished him with such an illustrious instance of it, in the story of Stesichorus.

But Mr. B. is pleased to say farther, that Lucian's differing from the Epistles, either proves nothing against them, or proves too much; "even that Lucian never saw Timæus, as

* Ep. 18. Ὡς πατὴρ ὑπὲρ υἱὸς ὑμῶν φροῦμαρος.

"learned

“learned as he was, and as often as he mentions him; for P. 115.
 “Timæus relates that the Agrigentines threw the Bull into the
 “sea; but Lucian,” says Phalaris, “sent it to Delphos.” [515]
 Now I am afraid he that “consulted books” for the Ex-
 aminer, has deceived him here; for I do not remember that
 Lucian ever quotes Timæus’s Writings, much less “mentions
 “him so often,” as Mr. B. here pretends. He names him,
 indeed, once in his *Macrobii*, “That he lived xcvi years;”
 but he could hardly have that from Timæus himself, but from
 the accounts of others. But, however, I will allow Mr. B.
 that Lucian had read Timæus; but I cannot by any means
 allow him, that this argument of mine must, if it prove any
 thing at all, “prove that Lucian never saw Timæus:”—that
 is such an inference, as I could hardly have believed a man
 that has dealt so much in Logic, could possibly be guilty of;
 for it is evident that, if Lucian had seen and approved the
 Epistles, he would never have departed from them in his ac-
 count of Phalaris’s country, for the Letters had been an au-
 thority above all exception. But the case is very different with
 Timæus, who wrote his *Histories* ccxl years after Phalaris’s
 death. Lucian might have read those often enough without
 giving as much credit to them as to Phalaris’s own Letters.
 Nay, it is plain he might have read this very account that
 Timæus has given of Phalaris’s Bull, and yet might purposely
 contradict it; for he might read in Polybius and Diodorus,
 whose passages we have cited above, that the very Bull was
 found at Carthage, and restored to the Agrigentines by Scipio’s
 order; and so think Timæus to be both ways mistaken, whether
 he denied, as those two historians say, that there ever was such
 a Bull; or affirmed, as the Scholiast of Pindar says, that the
 Bull was sunk in the sea. So very weak and absurd is Mr.
 B.’s inference, that, if Lucian has receded from Timæus’s ac- [516]
 count, he might as well depart from the Epistles themselves,
 though he looked upon them as genuine; but, besides all this,
 there is no contradiction at all between Lucian and Timæus;
 so that the very ground that Mr. B. reasons from is as fallaci-
 ous as his way of reasoning; for Lucian says no more than
 this, that the Tyrant sent the Bull for a present to Delphi; and
 the Delphians demurring whether they should accept it or no,
 he makes two Orations in Phalaris’s name to persuade them to
 receive it; but that they really received it, there is not a word
 said. Nay, one may rather infer, from the custom of Lucian
 and other Sophists, to choose the *ἥττω λόγον*, the weaker and
 paradoxical side of a dispute; that there was some tradition
 that

the Bull was sent to Delphi, and rejected by the Priests there. It might be returned therefore to Agrigentum, and afterwards be either thrown into the sea, according to Timæus; or carried to Carthage, according to Polybius and Diodorus.

In the next attempt, Mr. B. would reconcile the Epistles with Jamblichus's story about Abaris's conversation with the Sicilian Prince. In the former Edition of my Dissertation, I had allowed that story a place among the historical accounts of Phalaris, though even then I believed it a mere Romance of Jamblichus; but I had no room nor occasion to examine and refute it. But in this Edition where the exceptions of the Examiner have made it necessary to enquire into all those particulars, I have freely declared, and, as I humbly conceive, have fully made out my opinion, that there is no credit to be given to that story about Abaris*.

[517]
P. 117.

To go on then to the following paragraph, where he endeavours to make Heraclides agree with the Epistles; he takes hold of a small handle I had given him, that the *ὀρφανία* of Phalaris may possibly mean "the loss of his father only," not the loss of "both parents." But then he ought to have retracted his own translation of Phalaris; for there he renders it "*A prima infantia PARENTIBUS fuisse orbatum*†." But perhaps, as he says, "he did not remember any such Epistle in his Edition of Phalaris;" and, indeed, he seems, by the frequent contradictions he makes to that Edition, to have quite forgotten that he ever set it out, though some have been so free as to make a question, whether that proceeds from the badness or the goodness of his memory. But *that* is no question with Me; the question here that I am concerned in, is, "Whether it may be gathered from the Epistles, that Phalaris's mother did not follow him to Agrigentum." Now the reasons why I think that she did not are these: — First, the Tyrant tells us that he was "an orphan in his childhood‡," which is likely to signify that his mother was then dead; then he tells us, in several Epistles, that he was forced to leave his wife and only son behind him; which is a shrewd sign that the mother too, if alive, was left with them. Besides this, there is not one word in all the Epistles relating to the old gentlewoman,—which Mr. B. will confess, a man of Phalaris's "benevolence and affection to his family§" could hardly have omitted; and in the Let-

* See here, p. 46, 47, 98.

† Phal. Ep. 49.

‡ Ep. 49.

§ Index Phalar.

ters to his Son, there is no mention made either of the young man's duty to his grandmother, or of her love to him; and so, in the Letters to his Wife, there is as great a silence about the mother's kindness to her daughter-in-law. Now, it can hardly be supposed that, in familiar Epistles as these are, and never intended for the public, the mother should be quite forgotten when he writes to his son and his wife. In the xivth Book of Tully's Epistles which are written to his family, we have his wife Terentia, his daughter Tullia, and his son Cicero, all that were then alive, mentioned in every page; and if his aged father or mother had lived then, without question, scarce a Letter would have escaped him without some testimony of his duty and affection to them. If Mr. B. therefore, will not take it ill that we compare a Roman Senator's Epistles to his Sicilian Prince's, we may fairly infer, from the comparison, that Phalaris's mother was dead before the date of these Letters; and consequently that Heraclides contradicts them, where he says that the old woman was burned in the Bull when her son was deposed. [518]

Mr. B. has two exceptions still behind, which must briefly be considered. He denies "that his copy of Heraclides says Phalaris was burned in his Bull;" but I have answered this already*, and no more needs to be said to it. Then he tells us "that his copy of Phalaris has no such Epistle as implies that the Tyrant fled alone from Astypalæa; but if there should be such an one in the King's MS. he will answer this objection when the Library-Keeper is in so good a humour as to favour him with a sight of it." Now, in my opinion, Mr. B.'s own Edition of Phalaris sufficiently implies it, as I think I have newly proved. But there is no Epistle in the King's MS. but what is extant in the common copies: on the contrary, there are several wanting; and if Mr. B. pleases to make trial of my "good humour," either for a sight of that MS. or of any thing else in my power, he may then represent me to the world upon his own knowledge, and not upon the reports of those that think to ingratiate with Him by calumniating Me, though they never knew me any more than He does. P. 117. [519.]

I have now gone through all the Gentleman's exceptions to my Dissertation about Phalaris's Epistles; and, that I may oblige him at parting, I will help him to a rare expedient, that will give a clear and plausible account why the Tyrant's

* See here, p. 188.

Epistles were not known for about 1000 years after his death. It appears, by the xxxivth Letter, that he began to be very apprehensive of some conspiracies against him; it is very probable, therefore, that he would provide against a sudden stroke, and secure such things as he esteemed most valuable; and, because all other monuments besides Letters are short-lived and perishing, he must needs have a particular regard to his Epistles, those monuments of his wit, and learning, and virtues, which might do him right to posterity against the calumnies of popular hatred. We may suppose then that he would put these his precious remains into a chest of cedar or cypress, secured against moisture with pitch and other bituminous substances, and so bury it in the earth in a case of marble, where it might remain for a thousand years, till at last it was fortunately dug up, though the manner and circumstances of the discovery of it are now quite extinct. We have a famous instance like this of our Sicilian Prince in the story of Numa, the Roman Prince. Numa ordered some writings to be put up safely in a coffin of stone, and to be privately buried with him*; and they happened to be dug up, A. U. C. DLXXII, when they had lain in the ground cccxc years. Here are very good witnesses of this matter of fact: Cassius Hemina, Lucius Piso, Valerius Antias,—all Roman Historians of great antiquity and reputation. It is true, indeed, that Numa's Books are not now to be had, for they were burned, by order of the Magistrate, because they contained something that was dangerous to the public religion. But, however, the story we see has three substantial vouchers; and if the years that these Books continued under ground do not reach to the number that Phalaris's lay buried, we must consider what Livy tells us from the Historians named above, "that the Writings were not only entire, but looked as fresh as if they were newly written†." If they lasted then nearly 500 years, with all the freshness of a new book, we may reasonably suppose they would have been legible still, had they lain 500 years longer.

P. 100. Now, to use the words of Mr. B. "what is there in this story
P. 89. "about Phalaris's *burying his Letters* either absurd or unnatural?" What was really done at Rome, may be fairly presumed to have been done too in Sicily. Nay, farther, as he judiciously observes, "This supposition must be shewn IM-
"POSSIBLE, before any convincing argument can be drawn

* Liv. lib. xl. Pliny, xiii, 13. Plut. Numa, Lactantius i, 22.

† Liv. xl. "Non integros modo, sed recentissima specie."

"from

"from the silence of all the Antients, to prove these Letters "spurious." And if once he can bring his matters to that point, he can lie so intrenched there, that he may hold out for his Phalaris as long as Troy did against the Greeks.

Nay, to leave the Gentleman still in better humour, I will oblige him with a farther remark, and shew how all the objections against the Letters may be evaded, by his single supposition that they were buried under ground; for as the lives of the greatest Heroes have been attended with such extraordinary events as seem to be either miraculous or incredible, so the writings that have had the singular fortune of lying some ages under ground, have all of them had some remarkable qualities that cannot be found in vulgar Books. As the Writings of Numa, for instance, were 11 Latin Books and 11 Greek Books*, and yet they were VII Latin and VII Greek; nay, they were XII Latin and XII Greek†. Now, for the same things to be 11, VII, and XII, is no ordinary case, but a peculiar property of buried Writings‡. Again those Greek Writings of Numa's were a System of the Pythagorical Philosophy§; and yet we know that Pythagoras, the Founder of that Philosophy, lived IV or V generations after Numa's time. And again, the Books of Numa were made of Ægyptian papyrus, which was not applied to the use of writing till a good while after Numa was dead; but if Numa's Books could consist of Ægyptian paper, and contain the precepts of Pythagoras, so many generations before paper was made, or Pythagoras was born, what wonder is it if the Epistles of Phalaris, which we suppose now to have been buried like Numa's, should have the names of several towns and other things that were not built nor heard of till long after the Tyrant's death? So the famous Hetruscan monuments that Curtius Inghiramius dug up in Italy, after they had been buried some thousands of years, were written upon vulgar paper, such as now is in use, and made of linen rags, a very recent invention; and, which is still the more wonderful, upon every sheet there was the cypher of the man that made it, who was either then alive, or newly dead, when the monuments were found. It is the privilege, therefore, of buried Books to have that prophetic quality of considering future things as if they were present; which will fully account for all the odd things in Chronology that the Letters are taxed with. And then for the Attic dialect that Phalaris has used there, we have a salvo clear

[521]

[522]

* Pliny.

† Livy.

‡ Plut.

§ Pliny. Livy.

F f

beyond

beyond Mr. B.'s project of *transdialecting*; for the Revelation of St. James, that was written with the Apostle's own hand, and lay buried in Spain from that time to the xvth century, had some parts of it in modern Spanish, which was not in being in the time of the Apostle. Now, if the buried Writings in Spain can use dialects that were nowhere spoken till many ages after the date of them, why might not the buried Epistles in Sicily use the new Attic dialect, though it was first formed and introduced some generations after the Author's death? It is true the learned Aldrete* endeavours to account for the modern Spanish in the Apostle's writings, from the gift of prophecy that he was inspired with, by which he foreknew when his buried writings would be dug up, and therefore used the language that would then be in fashion. But he needed not to have recourse to any Apostolical gift, if he had but considered that it is the general property of all such buried writings to speak
[523] proleptically, and to anticipate those things that are to happen in future ages; so Numa did, so the Hetruscan Heroes of Inghiramus, and so the Sicilian Prince†.

* Bern. Aldrete, " Varias Antigüedades de Espana, African, y otras Provincias."

† The first edition of Dr. Bentley's Dissertation consists of 152 pages; to which is prefixed one leaf from Sir W. Temple. The part relating to Phalaris's Epistles contains 65, the last 12 of which are on the Oxford edition; as also p. 22, 29, and 44; p. 47 is Ocellus Lucanus; p. 52 on *ερωδιδωμ* and *διώνω*, both left out afterwards; the rest is in xvi articles, at the following pages. In the second edition of 1699, there are iv articles more; and the pages of the second and third editions at which each of the xx may be found, are put after those of the first edition, 1697. The part relating to Æsop is from p. 134 to p. 152, in x articles. The remaining 66 are on the Epistles of Themistocles, Socrates, and Euripides.

| Sect. | Ed. 1. | 2. | 3. |
|-------|--------|------|------|
| I. | 15— | 91— | 66. |
| II. | 16— | 102— | 73. |
| III. | 17— | 109— | 78. |
| IV. | 23— | 145— | 104. |
| V. | 27— | 169— | 121. |
| VI. | 30— | 178— | 127. |
| VII. | 33— | 189— | 135. |
| VIII. | 35— | 195— | 139. |
| IX. | 36— | 216— | 154. |
| X. | 38— | 220— | 157. |

| Sect. | Ed. 1. | 2. | 3. |
|--------|--------|------|------|
| XI. | 39— | 224— | 160. |
| XII. | 40— | 320— | 223. |
| XIII. | 51— | 592— | 283. |
| XIV. | 53— | 427— | 308. |
| XV. | 55— | 480— | 346. |
| XVI. | 63— | 506— | 365. |
| XVII. | | 523— | 376. |
| XVIII. | | 527— | 379. |
| XIX. | | 529— | 381. |
| XX. | | 535— | 385. |

WHEN

XVII.

WHEN I was to write my Dissertation upon Phalaris, at the request of my learned friend, I read the Epistles over ; and the passages that I remarked as I went along, were the topics of that discourse ; but having since been obliged, upon the account of Mr. B. to read the Epistles over again, I observed three or four places that then had escaped me ; which are as certain signs of an imposture as any I had produced before.

In the IIId Epistle, the Sophist uses the word ΠΡΟΝΟΙΑ, to express the notion of *God's providence* ; εἰς τὴν τῆ δαιμονίᾳ πρόνοιαν ἀναφέρον τὰ περὶ ἐμῶ. And again, in the CIVth, he threatens the Catanæans “ that he will “ never cease to be their enemy,” ἕως ἂν ἡ διοικήσα πρόνοια τὴν αὐτὴν ἁρμονίαν τῷ ΚΟΣΜΩ φυλάτῃ, “ as long as Providence sustains the frame of the world ;” and he presently adds, “ That they profaned the fire of Ætna, “ if the fire of that mountain, like the other elements “ of nature, had any thing of divinity in it,” Εἶγε θείας τύχης, says he, ὥσπερ τὰ λοιπὰ τῆς φύσεως ΣΤΟΙΧΕΙΑ, καὶ τὸ κατὰ τὴν Αἴτην πῦρ μεμοίραται. Now here are no fewer than three words, ΠΡΟΝΟΙΑ, ΣΤΟΙΧΕΙΑ, ΚΟΣΜΟΣ, that were never taken in those senses in the days of the true Phalaris ; for Laertius * acquaints us, out of the famous Phavorinus's VIIIth Book, Παντοδαπῆς Ἱστορίας, of Omnifarious History, “ That Plato first applied “ Στοιχεῖον, *element*, to a philosophical sense, and first “ named Πρόνοια, the Providence of God :” Πρῶτῳ ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ ὠνόμασε ΣΤΟΙΧΕΙΟΝ καὶ Διαλεκτικὴν, καὶ θεῷ ΠΡΟΝΟΙΑΝ so that Πρόνοια, before Plato's time, did not signify Divine Providence, nor was ever ascribed to the Deity ; but was used only to denote human consideration and forecast. And so Στοιχεῖον seems to have meant nothing else but the Letters of the alphabet, till Plato first applied it to signify the elements of natural bo-

[524]

* In Platone.

dies. Τα μὲν πρῶτα, says Plato *, οἵαπερ εἰς ΣΤΟΙΧΕΙΑ, ἐξ ὧν ἡμεῖς τε συγκείμεθα καὶ τᾶλλα, “The first elements, as it were, whereof men and all other things consist;” and in another place he says †, Τὸν δὲ τὸν κόσμον, ζῶον ἐμφυχον ἐνενθῆ, τῇ ἀληθείᾳ διὰ τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ γενέσθαι ΠΡΟΝΟΙΑΝ. [525] “The world, being an animal endued with soul and mind, was in reality made by the Providence of God;” where Proclus, in his Commentary ‡, tells us “Οτι δεῖ μεμνηῆσθαι, καὶ ὧν ὁ χερωνεύς εἶπε περὶ τῆς Προνοίας ὀνόματι, ὡς Πλάτων, ἔτω περὶ τὴν θείαν κελεύσαντι for χερωνεύς, we must read Χαίρωνεύς that is, Plutarch who was born at Chæronea; and the latter part of the sentence may thus be corrected:—ὡς Πλάτων ἔτω πρῶτα τὴν θείαν καλεῖσαντι. “We must remember,” says he, “what Plutarch says about the name of Πρόνοια, that Plato was the first that applied the word to signify Divine Providence.” There is little question to be made, but that this is a true emendation; though, whether Plutarch says this in any of his Books that are now extant I do not now remember. Well, since it appears from so good authority, who it was that first put these new significations upon Ξρόνοια and Στοιχεῖον, we may justly pronounce that the Epistles are a cheat, since they have used the words in the Platonic sense, and yet pretend to bear date above a whole century before Plato.

And now that I am speaking of Πρόνοια, I cannot omit a very elegant saying of Hierocles, the Stoic, which, as A. Gellius tells us §, the Platonic Philosopher Taurus had always in his mouth when Epicurus was mentioned: Ἡδονὴ τέλ· πόρνῃς δόγμα ἐκ ἔστιν πορνεία, ἐδὲν πόρνῃς δόγμα which, being manifestly corrupted, our most excellent Bishop Pearson || corrects it thus:—Ἡδονὴ τέλ· πόρνῃς δόγμα. ἐκ ἔστι πρόνοια ἐδὲν πόρνῃς δόγμα i. e. “Pleasure is the *summum bonum*: a strumpet’s tenet. Providence is nothing: a strumpet’s tenet.” [526] Now the emendation in the main is true and good;

* In Sophista.

† In Timæo.

‡ Proc. in Plat. Tim. p. 126.

§ Gellius ix. 5.

|| Prolegom. ad Hieroclem. p. 14.

for

for Πρόνοια is with great sagacity changed by him into Πρόνοια, which is the basis of the whole sentence ; but yet there is something harsh in the Syntax that his Lordship has made there, Οὐκ ἔστι πρόνοια ἔδεν for the Author, if he had used ἔδεν, would have said Πρόνοια ἔδεν ἐστὶ. Besides, that the same answer (Πόρνης δόγμα) coming twice, makes the saying a little flat, and scarce worthy to be used by Taurus so frequently ; nor is it true that all strumpets deny Providence. I am persuaded that the true reading is thus : Ἡδονὴ τέλῃ πόρνης δόγμα. Οὐκ ἔστι πρόνοια ἔδὲ πόρνης δόγμα. Now, it is impossible in our language to express this saying with the same brevity and turn that the original has ; but the meaning of it is, "Pleasure is the *summum bonum* : a strumpet's tenet. There is no Providence : a tenet too bad even for a strumpet."

In the passage already quoted from the Letters, we had ἁρμονία τῷ ΚΟΣΜΟΥ, "the harmony and frame of the world." But I have sufficiently proved above*, by the testimonies of four or five good witnesses, that Pythagoras was the first that called the universe Κόσμος. And I humbly conceive, that very few, when they have considered what I have said about the ages of Phalaris and Pythagoras, will believe that the Tyrant was a disciple of the Philosopher's. The word ΚΟΣΜΟΣ, therefore, is another detection of the Sophist's imposture, and not Κόσμος only, but ΑΡΜΟΝΙΑ too ; for *that* also is a Pythagorical expression ; and it was a position of that Sect, Καθ' ΑΡΜΟΝΙΑΝ συνεσθάναι τὰ ὅλα, "That the universe, and all things in it, consisted by HARMONY† ;" which is the very notion here of the Sophist.

XVIII.

DEMOSTHENES made the Oration "De Corona," when Aristophon was Archon, Olymp. cxii, 3.

* See here, p.254.

† Laërt. in Pythag.

This we know from the famous Critic, Dionysius Halicarnassensis; but the passage where he tells this wants emendation*. 'Ο περὶ τῷ Στεφάνῳ λόγος, ἐπ' Ἀριστοφῶνι ἄρχοντι μὲν ἐνιαυτὸν μετὰ τὴν ἐν Χαιρωνείᾳ μάχην, ὅλῳ δὲ μέλῳ τὴν Φιλίππου τελευτήν. Some Editions have in the margin ἐνιαυτῷ, instead of ἐνιαυτόν but the whole passage is to be read thus: ἐπ' Ἀριστοφῶνι ἄρχοντι, ἡ (i. e. ὁ γδω) μὲν ἐνιαυτῷ μετὰ τὴν ἐν Χαιρωνείᾳ μάχην, ἔκτω, δὲ μετὰ τὴν Φιλίππου τελευτήν that is, "The Oration about the Crown was" made in Aristophon's Archonship, the viiith year "after the battle at Chæronea, and the vith after "Philip's death." That the numbers here are agreeable to matter of fact, appears from Diodorus, and from Dionysius himself, in his Life of Dinarchus. In that Oration, the Orator has given us the Epitaph that was made by public order upon some of those that were slain in the war against Philip; the last distich of which is this †:—

Μηδὲν ἀμαρτύνει ἐγὼ θεῶν, καὶ πάντα κατορθύνει
Ἐν βιοτῇ μοῖραν δ' ἔτι φυγεῖν ἔπορει.

"To miscarry in nothing, and to succeed well in every thing, belongs only to the Gods." This part of the Epitaph became very famous in the following ages, and was often cited; as by Themistius ‡, Ἐπεὶ δὲ τὸ μηδὲν ἀμαρτάνειν ἔξω τῆς φύσεως κείται ἀνθρωπίνης, &c.; that is, "To miscarry in nothing, is above the power of human nature; for I cannot believe there were ever such men as the Stoics describe and call wise; and the Epigram that was written upon the public sepulchre at Athens seems to say truer, for it makes the miscarrying in nothing to be the attribute of the Gods alone." Καὶ γὰρ τοῖς θεοῖς μόνοις τὸ πάντα κατορθύνει ἀπονέμει. It is cited too by an anonymous Author in Suidas §: Ὁρθῶς γὰρ εἶρηται τὸ μὲν μηδὲν ἀμαρτύνειν θεῶ ἐγὼ, καὶ πάντα κα-

* Dion. Halic. de Demost. p. 124.

† Demost. de Cor, p. 187.

‡ Themist. Orat. iii.

§ Suid. v. Συγγράμματα.

τοῦτον ἀνθρώπου· δι' ἐκ αὐτῶν εἶποι ἐπ' ἑδενί, ὅτι μὴ πείσεται τὸ δέ τι.

“ It is a good saying, that to miscarry in nothing, and
“ to succeed in every thing, is the property of God;
“ but a man can say upon no occasion that such a thing
“ shall not befall him.” Justinian too, seems to mean

it, when he says *, “ Omnium habere memoriam, et
“ penitus in nullo peccare, divinitatis magis quam
“ mortalitatis est; quod à majoribus dictum est.”

But the strangest thing of all is, that the Tyrant
is introduced with that very saying in his mouth:

—Τὸ μηδὲν ἀμαρτάνειν εὐδότης ἴσως καὶ δικαίως θεῷ νομίζεται.

“ Never to miscarry in any thing, is reasonably, per-
“ haps, and justly, accounted to be the privilege of
“ God alone†.” And yet the Tyrant himself had
made his last and fatal *miscarriage* above cc years
before that Epitaph was written.

XIX.

THERE is nothing in the world more liberal and
profuse than a Sophist; he can give Five or Six
Thousand Pounds Sterling, with as little concern as
another man would part with Ten Shillings. The first
present that the Writer of Euripides's Letters gives the
Poet, was no less than XL Talents, which amounts to
7200*l*. English‡. But our Mock-Phalaris goes quite
beyond him in generosity; for he rewards Polyclitus, a
Physician that had cured him of a dangerous distem-
per, “ with iv goblets of refined gold, 11 silver bowls
“ of ancient workmanship not to be matched in the
“ present age, x couple of large Thericlean cups, xx
“ young boys for his Slaves, and 50,000 Attic drachms,
“ besides an annual salary for life, as great as was
“ paid to the chief officers of his fleet and army§.”
Now this is a story credible enough, if we consider that

[530]

* Cod. lib. i. Tit. 17. leg. ii. § 14.

† Ep. 129.

‡ Eurip. Epist. v.

§ Phal. Ep. 70.

a Sophist was the Paymaster; for as the Actors in Comedies paid all their debts upon the stage with Lupins, so a Sophist pays all his with Words. But if we consider the true Phalaris and real Physician of that age, the whole is most improbable and absurd, both in respect of Him that gives, and of Him that receives.

- [531] First, it does not at all suit with the state of those times, that the Tyrant should so abound in gold, as “to give iv cups of that metal;” which, perhaps, were more than he had in all his possessions. We are assured, by good hands, that in those days “gold was a very scarce commodity in Greece.” *Σπάνιον ὄντως τὸ παλαιὸν παρὰ τοῖς Ἕλλησιν ὁ χρυσὸς καὶ πάνυ*, are the words of Athenæus*; who adds, that the first gold that shone among the Greeks, was that which was plundered from the Temple of Delphi by the Phocæans, which happened Olymp. cvi, 3. Afterwards, says he, when Alexander had conquered Asia, there was plenty of it brought among them; but, in Phalaris’s time, there was scarce any gold to be found in all Greece, as appears by this story. The Spartans were commanded by the Oracle to gild the face of Apollo’s statue with gold; and having in vain enquired in Greece for some of that metal, they asked the Oracle where they might purchase any; and he ordered them to go to Cræsus, King of Lydia, and buy some of him; which was accordingly done†. This is told us by Athenæus, out of two very ancient and credible historians, Theopompus, a Scholar of Isocrates’s, and Phanias, a Scholar of Aristotle’s. Now Cræsus, we know, was contemporary with Phalaris; so that in the Tyrant’s time there was not gold enough in Greece (except what was already
- [532] consecrated in the Temples) to gild the face of a statue; and yet the Sophist gives away in one Letter, more than would have gilt the whole statue from head to foot. Nay, even at or after the plundering of the

* Athen. p. 231.

† Athen. 232.

Temple

Temple at Delphi, gold was yet so scarce in Greece, that Philip, King of Macedon, having a little golden cup (φιάλιον χρυσῶν) weighing no more than L Drachmæ, or Half a Pound Troy weight, was so chary of it, and afraid it should be stolen from him, that every night when he went to bed he put it under his pillow *; and yet we see the Sicilian Prince so abounded with it, cc years before, that he could spare four golden cups (φιάλας τέσσαρας) of the very same fashion with King Philip's, only all of them larger, for one gift to a favourite. But perhaps the admirers of Phalaris will be ready to say, that gold might be common in Sicily, though scarce in other countries in Greece. But then another piece of history lies cross in their way; for the same Theopompus and Phanias tell us farther, that when Hiero, King of Syracuse, who began his reign above LXX years after Phalaris's was ended, had purposed to make a Tripus and a Victoria of fine gold (ἀπέφθε χρυσῶ) and present it to Apollo at Delphi, he sought a long time in Sicily for gold, but none could be found †; whereupon he sent messengers into Greece; who, after a long search to no purpose, at last met with some at Corinth, in the hands of one Architeles, who, having for many years bought up gold by little and little, had amassed a pretty quantity of it. But it is something strange that Hiero should be forced to send out of Sicily for gold; and yet Phalaris, so long before him, would have his very Physician served in gold plate (ἀπέφθε χρυσῶ) of the very same fineness that Hiero wanted. It is true, the same Historians tell us, that, a year or two before Hiero's reign, his brother Gelo had dedicated a Tripus and a Victoria to Apollo ‡. But of Gelo's donary we have had occasion to speak already §; and it appears there that the gold which Gelo then had was the spoil of the Carthaginians; so

[533]

* Athen. p. 155, & 231. Pliny xxxiii, 3. Eustath. Iliad, p. 815.

† Athen. p. 132. , ‡ Ibid. p. 231. § See here, p. 330.

that

that it was not in Sicily in Phalaris's days, neither did it continue long there; for the Carthaginian army brought it, Olymp. LXXV, 1; and before the end of Hiero's reign, Olymp. LXXVIII, 2, there was none of it to be found.

In the next place, if we consider the receiver of this vast present, Polyclitus the Physician, the reward will seem disproportioned to the condition of the man. It [534] was the common practice of those old times to hire Physicians by the year for the service of a whole city, and to pay them out of the public stoek*; nay, some of the Lawgivers took express care of it in the very constitution of their governments†. The general price of a year's service we may learn from Herodotus‡; where he tells us how Democedes the Crotonian, who had the greatest reputation of all the Physicians of his time, which was a few years after Phalaris's death, was hired publicly a whole year by the Ægeineans for one Talent; and the next year by the Athenians for a hundred Minæ, *i. e.* a Talent and $\frac{2}{3}$; and the next year by Polycrates the Samian for two Talents. Now what proportion does this bear to the extravagant present of the Sicilian Prince? where, besides the Gold and Silver Vessels, and the score of handsome Slaves, and the yearly pension equal to an Admiral's, the very ready money, 50,000 Attic Drachms, comes to VIII Talents and $\frac{1}{2}$, which is more than Democedes could earn in four whole years; and yet Polycrates excelled Phalaris in riches and power, as much as Democedes may be supposed to excel in his art this unknown Polyclitus! And if we take our measure from those [535] Physicians that were not hired by the Public, but practised privately for fees, as the custom is now, the disproportion will still be the greater; for the ordinary fee of a Physician was very low in those days, and

* Strabo, p. 181. Aristoph. & Schol. p. 301.

† Diodor. p. 80.

‡ Herod. iii, 131.

after,

after, as appears by those famous verses of the Philosopher Crates, where he represents the account-book of some of the wealthy men of that age* : —

Τίθει μαγείρῳ μίᾱς δίκ', ἰατρῷ δραχμὴν,
Κόλακι τάλαια πάντα, συμβούλῳ καπνόν,
Πόρτῃ τάλαιον, φιλοσόφῳ τριώβολον,

i. e. "To a Cook, 30*l*.; to a Physician, Two Groats; "to a Flatterer, 900*l*.; to a Counsellor, Nothing; "to a Whore, 180*l*.; to a Philosopher, a Groat." It is true, the same Democedes, when he afterwards in Persia cured Darius's foot, had a very rich present of gold by the Emperor's wives; but to argue from the riches of the Persian Court, that the like might be done at Agrigentum, is truly, as the Mock-Phalaris says, "to compare an Indian Elephant to a Fly."

XX.

TATIAN, in the beginning of his Oration "Against the Greeks," gives a list of some Inventors; and among the rest, he tells us, out of Hellanicus the Historian, "That Atossa the Persian Empress was the first that wrote Epistles;" *Ἐπιστολὰς συντάσσειν ἐξεῦρεν ἡ Περσῶν ποτε ἡγεσάμενη γυνή, καθάπερ φησὶν Ἑλλάνικος, Ἀτοσσαι δὲ ὄνομα αὐτῇ ἦν.* [536] The same thing is affirmed by Clemens Alexandrinus, and from the same Author; *πρώτην Ἐπιστολὰς συντάξει Ἀτοσσαι τὴν Περσῶν βασιλεύσασάν φησιν Ἑλλάνικος*†. Now, that Atossa was younger than Phalaris by one or two generations, appears several ways. She was the sister and wife of Cambyzes; who began his reign Olymp. LXII, 4†; she was afterwards married to Darius, and was alive at his death, Olymp. LXXIII, 4. Nay, she was still alive when Xerxes returned from his expedition, Olymp. LXXV, 1, as it is evident from Persæ, a Tragedy of Æschylus. The odd man-

* Laërt. in Cratete.

† Clem. Alex. Serm. i, p. 132.

† Herod.

ner of her death is told us by Aspasius ; “ That her son Xerxes, in a fit of distraction, butchered her, and ate her † :” *Ξέρξης*, says he, *ὁ τῶν Περσῶν Βασιλεὺς μαγεῖς ἔφαγε τὴν αὐτῆ μητέρα κρεουργήσας*. Now, suppose him to have done this in the very year of his return, yet Atossa would survive Phalaris LXX years, though we allow him by the most favourable account to have lived till Olymp. LVII, 3 : and, according to Hippostratus † and the Scholiast of Pindar, she is two generations lower than Phalaris : —

- [537] Phalaris — 1 Telemachus.
 2 Emmenides.
 3 Ænesidamus. 1 Atossa.
 4 Theron. 2 Xerxes. Reigned Olymp.
 Reigned Ol. LXXIII, 1. LXXIII, 4.

It is evident then, that, if Atossa was the first inventress of Epistles, these that carry the name of Phalaris, who was so much older than her, must needs be an imposture. And that she really found out the way of Epistles, we have the most proper and competent witness that can possibly be had ; for Hellanicus was a contemporary of this Atossa, being LXV years old at the beginning of the Peloponnesian war † ; so that he was born at Ol. LXXI, 2. and was in the xvth year of his age at Xerxes's expedition. But, besides the authority of Hellanicus, Clemens tells us of himself §, that he took his account of the several inventors from Scamon, Theophrastus, Cydippus, Aristophanes, Aristodemus, Aristotle, Philostephanus, and Strato ; in their books “ About Inventions || ; so that either all, or at least some of these must be supposed to have reported that invention of Atossa's. And I conceive, we have a double argument here against our Mock-Phalaris ; a positive one, that Atossa first invented Epistles ;

[538]

* Aspasius ad Aristot. *Ethic.* p. 124.

† Gellius, xv, 13.

§ Clemens, *ibid.*

† See here, p. 24.

|| *Περὶ Εὐρημάτων.*

and

and a negative, that the Epistles of Phalaris were not heard of in the days of those Writers.

The words of Tatian and Clemens are, Ἐπιστολάς συντάσσειν now, whether we take συντάσσειν in a general sense for “writing,” or more strictly for “comprising” in a volume, and publishing,” it is either way sufficient to prove Phalaris’s Epistles a cheat. But it may be objected in their behalf, that Epistles were in use many hundred years before Phalaris, even before the Trojan times, as appears from Apollodorus, and Zenobius §, and others; who relate how Bellerophontes carried (Ἐπιστολάς) Epistles from Præetus to Jobates; and how then can Atossa be called the inventress of Epistles? But, in answer to this, we are to observe that those Authors speak not accurately there, but accommodate their expression to the manners of their own times; for Homer, out of whom they all have it, does not call it an Epistle, but Πίναξ πικτός —

— Πόρεν δ’ ὄγε σήματα λυγρὰ,
Γράψας ἐν πίνακι πικτῷ θυμοφθόρα πολλά †.

Now Πίναξ πικτός is the same with δελτός, and in Latin Tabellæ, Pugillares, Codicilli; small leaves of wood covered with bees-wax, and so written on by a pen of metal. So Pliny interprets this passage of Homer:—

[539]

“Pugillarium usum fuisse etiam ante Trojana tempora invenimus apud Homerum †.” And he expressly affirms, that the writings that Bellerophontes carried, were not Epistles, but Codicils:—“Homerus Bellerophonti Codicillos datos, non Epistolas, prodidit §.” Now it is evident that these Codicils could never serve for a volume of Letters, as Phalaris’s are; for the use of them was only for a single Letter, which as soon as read was erased, and the wax smoothed anew; and so the Codicils were returned, with an answer upon the same wax where the former Letter was written. The

* Apollod. p. 81. Zenob. p. 50.

† Hom. II. § 169.

‡ Pliny, xiii, c. ii.

§ Ibid. c. 13.

occasion

occasion of Pliny's writing this last passage is pleasant enough. Licinius Mucianus had reported in his history, "That, when he was Governor of Lycia, Himself saw and read in a certain Temple there, a Paper-Epistle, written from Troy by Sarpedon*." Now, if this were true, Hellanicus and his followers must be miserably out, when they make Atossa invent Epistles so many hundreds of years after. "But I wonder," says Pliny, "at this Paper Letter of Sarpedon's†, since even in Homer's time, so long after Sarpedon, that part of Ægypt, which alone produces Paper, was nothing but sea, being afterwards produced by the mud of the Nile. Or, if paper was in use in Sarpedon's time, how came Homer to say, that in that very Lycia where Sarpedon lived, not Epistles, but Codicils were given to Bellerophontes‡?" So that learned Naturalist refutes the pretended Letter of Sarpedon, though, with humble submission, he puts a false colour upon one part of his argument; for the Epistle was not given to Bellerophontes in Lycia, but in Argos of Peloponnesus, to be carried to Lycia. However, without that needless colour, he has sufficiently confuted the credulity of Mucianus; who, though he was Governor of a great Province, and General of a great army, and three times Consul in Claudius's and Vespasian's time, and, besides all that, a learned and inquisitive man, was miserably imposed on with a sham Letter of Sarpedon's: a remarkable instance, that not only the Title of Honourable, but even the highest quality and greatest experience cannot always secure a man from cheats and impostures!

* "Sarpedonis a Troja scriptam in quodam Templo Epistolæ chartam." Plin. xiii c. ii.

† Papyrus, Charta.

‡ "In ipsa illa Lycia Codicillos datos, non Epistolas."

DR. BENTLEY'S
D I S S E R T A T I O N
UPON
THE EPISTLES
OF
Themistocles, Socrates, Euripides,
AND OTHERS;
AND
THE FABLES OF ÆSOP.

OF

Themistocles's Epistles.

SIR,

I PRESUME I have been as good as my word, in [79]
 detecting the cheat of Phalaris's Epistles; the other
 part of my promise was a censure of Æsop's Fables.
 But, before I meddle with those, I am willing, now
 that my hand is in, to examine some other impostures
 of this sort, out of the same schools of the Sophists.
 It will be no unpleasant labour to me, nor, I hope,
 unprofitable to others, to pull off the disguise from
 those little Pedants that have stalked about so long in
 the apparel of Heroes.

The Epistles of Themistocles were printed first at
 Rome, in MDCXXVI, out of a manuscript in the Va-
 tican. The Editor, a Greek Bishop, believed them
 genuine; but there were some that suspected a forgery,
 as Leo Allatius * informs us; who himself leaves the
 matter in doubt; but withal observes in their favour,
 that nobody had ever said a word in print to prove
 them to be spurious. Suidas † is an evidence in their
 behalf; for, speaking of their reputed Author, he says,
 “ he has written Letters full of spirit :”—ἐγραψεν ἐπιστολάς [80]
 φρονήματι γεμάτας. He, I think, is the only Writer that
 makes any mention of them. Which alone, as before
 in Phalaris's case, is a shrewd prejudice against their
 credit and reputation. Thucydides ‡ and Charon
 Lampsacenus say, that Themistocles, when he fled into
 Asia, made his address to Artaxerxes, who was newly
 come to the throne; wherein they are followed by Cor-
 nelius Nepos § and Plutarch, against the common tra-

* De Script. Socrat. p. 78.

† V. Θεμιστοκ.

‡ Lib. i. p. 90.

§ Vita Themistoc.

G g

dition

dition of Ephorus, Heraclides, and most others, that make Xerxes the Father to be then alive. Some Writers * relate that he had five cities given him by the Persian ; others but three. Now if the Letters had been known to any of those authors, both these disputes had been soon at an end, or rather never had been raised ; for he himself expressly says † it was Xerxes he went to ; and that he gave him but three cities. Now, where could these Epistles lie, unknown and invisible, from Themistocles's time to Suidas ? We must needs say, that the Letters had a worse exostracism than their Author, since he was banished but for Five years,—but they for Ten years.

[81] II. It is observable, that every one of the Letters bears date after his banishment : and they contain a complete narrative of all his story afterwards, without the least gap or interruption. Now, it is hard to say whether is the more strange of the two,—That not one single Letter of his, before that time, should be preserved ; or not one, afterwards, lost, though written from so distant places : Argos, Coreyra, Epirus, Ephesus, Magnesia ; from whence there was no very sure conveyance to Athens. What a cross vicissitude of fortune !—while the Author is in prosperity, all his Letters are unlucky ; and not one of them is missing, after he himself miscarried. But the Sophist can easily account for this, though Themistocles cannot ; for here are no Letters before his exile, because the latter part of his life was the whole tour and compass that the Sophist designed to write of : and not a Letter afterwards perished, because, being forged in a Sophist's closet, they run no hazard at all of being lost in the carriage.

III. Themistocles was an eloquent man ; but here are some touches in his Letters, of such an elevated strain, that, if he did not go to school to Gorgias Le-

* Plutarch, Diodor. Athenæus, &c.

† Ep. xx.

ontinus,

ontinus, the Sophist of that time, I can hardly believe he wrote them. The Historians tell us moderately, [82] that, after he was driven from home, he was made much on at Argos; but he himself is all melting when he talks on that subject. He was met, he says*, on the road by two Argivans of his acquaintance, who, when he told them the news of his banishment, railed bitterly at the Athenians; but when they heard he was going to Delphi, rather than to their town, in a kind quarrel they tell him, "that the Athenians had justly punished him †," since he so much wronged the city of Argos, to think of any sanctuary but that. Well, he goes with them to Argos; and there the whole city "teazes him by mere force to take the government upon him ‡;" taking it as the greatest injury that he offered to decline it. These, you will say, are choice flowers both of Courtesy and of Rhetoric; but there is another, clearly beyond them; where he tells us that he is so resolved of going to the Persian court, though it was a desperate risque, "that neither the advice of his friends, nor his father Neocles's ghost, nor his uncle Themistocles's, nor augury, nor omen, nor Apollo's oracle itself, should be able to dissuade him §." Here is a bold resolute Blade for you! here is your Stoical κέρικα! It is almost impossible for a Sophist not to betray himself. Nothing [83] will relish and go down with them that is ordinary and natural. Then they applaud themselves most, when they have said a forced extravagant thing. If one speaks of any civility, the compliment must be strained beyond all decorum: if he makes a resolution, he must needs swagger and swear, and be as wilful as a madman.

IV. The subject of many of the Letters is commonplace, mere chat, and telling a tale, without any bu-

* Epi. i.

† Ἐπειρῶν Ἀθηναίους, ὡς δίκαια τινόντων ἡμῶν.

‡ Ἀναλαμβάνειν, ὡς ἀδικήματα, ἢ μὴ ἀρχόμεν.

§ Ep. xiv.

siness ; an errand not worth sending to the next town, much less to be brought from remote countries some hundreds of leagues. The xv and xviii Letters are written to enemies ; his friends, I suppose, failing in their correspondence ; and contain nothing but a little scolding, which was scarcely worth the long carriage from Ephesus to Athens.

V. In the xx Epistle we have this story : — When Themistocles was at Corcyra, he designed for Sicily, to Gelo the Syracusan Tyrant ; but, just as he was going a ship-board, the news came that Gelo was dead, and his brother Hiero succeeded him. Now, if we make it appear that Hiero was come to the crown some years before Themistocles's banishment, and this voyage to Corcyra, what becomes of the credit of our [84] Epistles ? It is true, the chronology of this part of history is not so settled and agreed as to amount to a demonstration against the Letters * ; but, however, when joined with the arguments preceding, at least it will come up to a high probability. Theophrastus, in his Treatise of Monarchy †, relates, That when Hiero had sent race-horses, and a most sumptuous tent, to the Olympian Games, Themistocles advised the Greeks to plunder the Tyrant's tent, τοῦ Τυράντη and not to let his horses run. It is evident then, if Theophrastus speak properly, that Hiero was Monarch of Syracuse when Themistocles was at Olympia ; but it is most certain he never came thither after his exile.

But, to deal fairly, it must be confessed, that Ælian, in telling this story, varies from Theophrastus ; for he says Hiero himself came to the games ‡. But that he would go thither in person after he had gotten the government, is wholly improbable ; so that, if Ælian be believed, this business must have been done before Hiero came to the throne ; for even in Gelo's life-

* Οὐδ' αὐτοῖς χρονικοῖς ἀπρέμα συλλεγμένοις. Plut. Them. p. 225.

† Περὶ Βασιλείας apud Plut. Them. p. 225.

‡ Var. Hist. ix, 5.

time,

time, who left him the monarchy, he kept horses for the race; and won at the Pythian games, Pythiad the xxvi, which answers to Olymp. lxxiv, 3*. But besides that Theophrastus is of much greater authority, the other refutes himself in the very next words; for he says Themistocles hindered Hiero upon this pretence, "That he that had not shared in the common danger, ought not to share in the common festival;" where it is certain, by "the common danger," he means Xerxes's Expedition, when Gelo either refused or delayed to give the Greeks his assistance†. This affront then was put upon Hiero after that expedition; but the very next Olympiad after, Hiero was in the monarchy‡. It cannot be true then, that his first accession to the throne was, according to the Letters, while Themistocles stayed at Corcyra.

[85]

Besides these inferences and deductions, we have the express verdict and declaration of most of our Chronologers§, who place the beginning of Hiero's reign Olymp. lxxv, 3, and Themistocles's banishment seven years after, Olymp. lxxvii, 2. The Arundelian Marble, indeed, differs from all these in the periods of Gelo and Hiero; which would quite confound all this argumentation from notes of time. But either that Chronologer is quite out, or we can safely believe nothing in history; for he makes Gelo first invade the government two years after Xerxes's expedition. But Herodotus || spends half a dozen pages in the account of an embassy to Gelo from Sparta and Athens, to desire his assistance against the Persian. And it is agreed among all, That Gelo's victory over the Carthaginians in Sicily, was got the very same day with the battle at Salamis¶.

[86]

* Pind. Schol. Pyth. i. iii.

† Herod. vii. c. 163. Diod. xi. p. 2.

‡ Diod. xi. p. 2.

§ Schol. Pind. Pyth. i. Diod. xi. p. 29, 41. Euseb. in Chron.

¶ Herodot. ibid. & Diod. l. xi

|| Lib. vii.

VI. The whole volume of Themistocles's Letters consists of *xxi* only; and three of these are taken up in the story of Pausanias. The second is written to Pausanias himself, before that Spartan's conspiracy with the Persian was discovered. There he exhorts him to moderation in his prosperity, lest some very great turn of fortune should speedily befall him. Can you desire now a surer indication of a Sophist? Without doubt, he that penned this Epistle, knew before-hand what happened to Pausanias, who was soon after recalled home by the magistrates, and put to death for treason. The *xix* is to Pausanias again; but after his conspiracy was detected. Here he tells the particulars of that plot, as exactly as if he had been one of the Ephori that overheard it; nay, he foretells him that the Lacedæmonians would take away his life. Now, besides that Themistocles would scorn to insult so, and run to no purpose, as this Letter does, he would surely [87] have had more wit than knowing, to write to the dead; for at the same time that he heard those particulars of Pausanias's treason, he must needs hear of his execution, since those things were not known till after his death, and the rifling of his papers. The *viii* Epistle is a long narrative of the whole business of Pausanias; for that was a subject worthy of eloquence, and therefore was to receive ornament from the pen of the Sophist. But it was scarce worthy of Themistocles to send such a long News-letter to Athens, where, in all likelihood, the story was common before he heard of it himself.

But how shall we reconcile this affair of Pausanias, according to the Letters, with what Diodorus has left us upon the same subject? The Letters, we see, make Themistocles to be banished before Pausanias was suspected *; and make the one reside at Argos, while the other was convicted and put to death †. But Diodorus,

* Ep. ii.

† Ib. *xix*.

who

who has brought all his history into the method of Annals, places the death of Pausanias Ol. LXXV, 4*, and the exile of Themistocles, six years after, Olymp. LXXVII, 2†. Now, I would fain know of our Sophist how he came to dispose and suit his matters so negligently, to bring Pausanias upon the stage again, when he had been six years in his grave? I imagine he will refer me to Thucydides‡, who makes an immediate transition from one story to the other, "That the Spartans accused Themistocles, who was then banished from home, of conspiring with Pausanias." This, indeed, might draw the Sophist and some others into a mistake. But it may be taken two ways; either that it was done presently, upon the death of Pausanias; or a few years after, when Themistocles's exile gave the Spartans, that hated and feared him, an opportunity to ruin him. Plutarch follows the first way§; for he makes Themistocles, after his banishment, to have private dealings with Pausanias; in which opinion he favours the Author of these Letters. But the second will rather appear to be the sense of Thucydides, if we consider that he places the matter of Pausanias just after the flight of Xerxes||; but, when Themistocles went into Asia, he makes Artaxerxes to be in the throne¶, which was a considerable time after. Besides that Diodorus, whose design was to refer all occurrences to years, and not to follow the thread of story beyond the annual period, is of more credit, in point of chronology, than Plutarch, or any others that write lives by the lump.

[88]

* Lib. xi. p. 36.

† Lib. i. p. 88.

‡ P. 63.

† Ib. xi. p. 41.

§ In Themist. p. 224.

¶ P. 90.

OF.

Socrates's Epistles.

89] **T**HE Epistles of Socrates, and his Scholars, Xenophon, Aristippus, &c. were published out of the Vatican Library by the learned Leo Allatius, and printed at Paris, MDCXXXVII. He was so fully persuaded himself, and so concerned to have others think that they are the legitimate offspring of those Authors they are laid to, that he has guarded and protected them, in a Dialogue of LVII pages in quarto, against all the objections that he or his friends could raise. And nobody since, that ever I heard of, has brought the matter into controversy; but I am inclined to believe that, by that time I have done with them, it will be no more a controversy, but that they are spurious. I shall make use of nothing that Allatius has brought, except one objection only; and that I shall both manage in a new way, and defend it against all his exceptions.

I. The first Letter is Socrates's to some King (it is supposed to Archelaus, King of Macedonia) in which he
[90] refuses to go to him, though invited in the most kind and obliging manner. That he really denied his company to Archelaus and others, we are assured from very good hands, which was the ground for our Falsary to forge this Epistle; but I believe none of those that mention it make so tall a compliment to Socrates as he does here to himself; for he says "The King offered him part of his kingdom;" and "that he should not come thither to be commanded, but to command both his subjects and himself*." Can you desire a better token of a Sophist than this? It is a

* Τῆς βασιλείας ἕφης μέρος δίδουαι· & τὰ ἄεξον καὶ τῶν ἄλλων καὶ σὺ αὐτῷ,
fine

fine offer, indeed, to a poor old man, that had nothing but his staff and one coat to his back. But a Sophist abhors mediocrity, he must always say the greatest thing; and make a tide and a flood, though it be but in a basin of water.

II. Well; our Philosopher goes on, and gives a reason of his refusal, That his dæmon forbid him to go; and then he falls into the long story of what happened to him in the battle at Delium; which was a tale of twenty years standing at the date of this Letter. But the Sophist had read it in Plato, and he would not miss the opportunity of an eloquent narration. I will not here insist upon the testimony of Athenæus *, That the whole business is a mere fiction of Plato's; let that be left in the middle: but we may safely infer thus much from it, That even Athenæus himself, whose curiosity nothing escaped, never met with these Epistles, which alone creates a just suspicion that they were forged since his days, especially when the universal silence of all Antiquity gives a general consent to it.

There is a passage, indeed, in Libanius †, which, in Allatius's judgment, seems plainly to declare that he had seen this very Epistle; for, after he had mentioned Socrates's refusal to go to Scopas, and Eurylochus, and Archelaus, he adds, *Ἀδελφῶν δὲ ἐδεόμην τῶν Ἐπιστολῶν, ἐν ἐλεΐναις τὸν ἄνθρωπον κάλλιστα ἂν ἴδεε*. Now, should we concede what Allatius would have, this is all that can be inferred from thence in their favour, That they are older than Libanius, which I am willing to believe; and, That He believed them true, which I matter not at all; for so we have seen Stobæus, Suidas, and others, cry up Phalaris for a genuine Book, and yet, I fancy none of my Readers are now of their opinion. But, with Allatius's good leave, I would draw the words of Libanius to a quite contrary purpose. After he had said that many Princes had solicited Socrates, by letter, to

* Lib. v. p. 215.

† Analogia Socrat.

come

come and live in their courts, and he answered them all with a denial; "but," says he, "I want the Letters themselves; in which you might perfectly see the spirit of the man." This, to me, is an indication that the Letters he means were not extant; for if he had them in his hand, according to Allatius, how could he want them? And it is plain he speaks here of several Letters, being Replies to several Messages; but in this collection here is but a single one. "I wish," says he, "the Letters were to be had; in those you might read his character." If this be the sense of those words, as probably it is, Libanius is so far from being Patron to our Epistles, that he is a positive witness against them.

III. The viith Letter is written by Socrates to one of those that had fled to Thebes from the violence of the xxx Tyrants; in which he gives him an account of the state of Athens since their departure; "That himself was now hated by the Tyrants, because he would have no hand in the condemnation of Leon the Salaminian;" and then he tells the story at large. Now, here is a manifest discovery that the Letters are supposititious; for the business of Leon was quite over before those fugitives left the town; for Leon was murdered before Theramenes was*; and Theramenes was murdered before Thrasybulus and his party fled to Thebes; and that Socrates means them in this Letter, it is evident from hence, That he speaks here of their conspiracy, to resort privately towards Athens and set upon the Tyrants, which afterwards came to pass.

[93]

IV. The viiith, ixth, xth, and xith, are Letters of Jest and Raillery between Antisthenes, and Aristippus, and Simon the Shoemaker. It is an affront to the memory of those men to believe they would fool and trifle in that manner; especially send such impertinent

* Xenoph. Hist. lib. ii. p. 467, 470. Dioid. l. xiv.

stuff

stuff as far as from Sicily to Athens, which could not decently be spoken even in merriment at a table.

V. In the xiii Epistle, among the acquaintance of Simon, he names Phædrus; the same that gives the title to the Dialogue of Plato; and the xxv is writ by Phædrus himself to Plato; and both these are dated after Socrates's death. I will appeal now to Athenæus, if these two Letters can be genuine. He, among other errors in Chronology for which he chastises Plato, brings this in for one, "That he introduces Phædrus discourses with Socrates, who must certainly be dead before the days of that Philosopher*." How comes he then to survive him in these Epistles, and discourse so passionately of his death? It is true, for want of ancient History, we cannot back this authority with any other testimony. But I am sure, all those that have a just esteem for Athenæus, can have no slight one of this argument against the credit of the Letters. [95]

VI. The xiv Epistle gives Xenophon a long narrative of Socrates's trial and death; being written presently after by one of his Scholars that was present at both. Among other particulars, he tells him, "That the Oration or Charge against Socrates was drawn by Polycrates the Sophist." But I doubt this will turn to a charge against another Sophist, for counterfeiting Letters; for, I think, I can plainly prove, that at the date of this Letter there was no such report ever mentioned that Polycrates had any hand in it; and that this false tradition, which afterwards obtained in the world, and gave occasion to our Writer to say it in his Letter, did not begin till some years after Socrates's condemnation.

Diogenes Laërtius brings Hermippus's testimony, That Polycrates made the charge ‡: — Συνέγραψε δὲ τὸν λόγον Πολυκράτης ὁ σοφιστής, ὡς φησιν Ἑρμιππός. But, in oppo-

* Lib. xi. p. 505. Ἀδύνατον δὲ καὶ Φαῖδρον κατὰ Σωκράτην εἶναι.

† Ἡ δὲ λόγος Πολυκράτους τῷ λογογράφῳ.

‡ Vita Socrat.

sition

[96] sition to this, he presently subjoins, " That Favorinus, " in the First Book of his Commentaries, says, " That " Polycrates's Oration against Socrates is not true and " real, because he mentions in it the walls built by " Conon, six years after Socrates's death." To which Laërtius subscribes his own assent, — Καὶ ἔστιν ἕτως ἔχον " And so it is." I may freely say that this passage of Favorinus has not been yet rightly understood. It is generally interpreted, as if he denied the Oration that is attributed to Polycrates to be really his. But this is very far from being his opinion; for then he would be flatly confuted by Isocrates, a witness unanswerable; who, in a discourse which he addresses to this very Polycrates, tells him, — " I perceive you value " yourself most upon two Orations; *The Apology of Busiris*, and *Accusation of Socrates**." But Favorinus's meaning was, That Polycrates did not make that Oration for a true charge to be spoken at the Trial of Socrates; but wrote it several years after, for no other trial than that of his own wit. The words in the Greek can admit of no other sense: Μὴ εἶναι ἀληθῆ τὸν λόγον τὸν Πολυκράτους κατὰ Σωκράτους ἐν αὐτῷ γὰρ μνημονεύει τῶν ὑπὸ Κόνων⊙ τειχῶν, &c. Observe, that he says μνημονεύει. Polycrates mentions, If he had denied him to be the Author, he would have said, in the passive, " There is " mentioned." Besides, he expressly calls it τὸν λόγον τὸν Πολυκράτους only denies it to be ἀληθῆ. But if he had denied it to be His, he would have said Μὴ εἶναι Πολυκράτους, τὸν λόγον τὸν κατὰ Σωκράτους as Laërtius speaks in other places; Λακεδαιμονίων Πολιτείαν, ἣν φησιν ἄκ εἶναι Ξενοφῶν⊙ ὁ Μάγνης Δημήτρι⊙ †. Διαλόγους, ἃς Πεισίστρατ⊙ ὁ Ἐφέσ⊙ ἔλεγε μὴ εἶναι Αἰσχίνε†. This, I think, is sufficiently clear. Now, we are to know that it was the custom of the old Sophists to make an ostentation of their art upon some difficult subjects and paradoxes, such as other people could speak nothing to; as the commendation of a fever or the gout. Polycrates, therefore, to shew his rhetoric

* Ἐπὶ τῷ Βυσίριδος ἀπολογία καὶ τῇ Σωκράτους κατηγορίᾳ. Isoc Busir.

† In Xenoph.

‡ In Aeschine.

in

in this way; wrote an apology of Busiris, that killed and eat his guests; and of Clytæmnestra, that murdered her husband*; and to give a proof of his skill, as well in accusing virtue as in excusing vice, he wrote an indictment against Socrates; not ἀληθῆ, *the true one*, as Favorinus truly says, but only a Scholastic Exercise; such as Plato, Xenophon, Libanius, and others, wrote in his defence; so that we are no more forced to believe that his Oration was the true Charge that was spoken at Socrates's Trial, than that he really pleaded for Clytæmnestra, when Orestes was going to kill her. Nay, it appears to me, from Isocrates himself, that it was but a Scholastic Exercise, and after Socrates's death; for he blames Polycrates for reckoning Alcibiades among Socrates's disciples; since, besides that nobody else ever counted him his scholar; had he really been so, he had been a commendation to his Master, and not a disparagement, which was the aim of the Sophist. "So that," says he, "if the dead could have knowledge of your writings, Socrates would thank you." Is not this a clear indication that Socrates was *dead* before the Oration was made? and that this was not the true Charge? for then he would have heard it at his Trial, and there had been no occasion to say "If the dead could have knowledge of it." In the close of all, he advises him to leave off shewing his parts upon such "villanous themes," πονηρὰς ὑποθέσεις; lest he do public mischief, by putting false colours upon things. Here again we are plainly told that his action against Socrates, like those for Busiris and Clytæmnestra, was but a declamation, a theme and exercise in the school, and not a real indictment in the Areopagus at Athens. To all which let me add, That neither Plato, nor Xenophon, nor any body contemporary with Socrates, ever once mention Polycrates for the author of the Charge; which,

[97]

[98]

* Quintil. lib. ii. cap. 18.

† Εἰ γένοιτο ἔχουσα ταῖς τελευτηκόσι, βαλεῖσθαι περὶ τῶν εἰρημίων, ὁ μὲν χάριν ἂν εἰδείη σοί. Isoc. Busir.

had

had the thing been true, they would certainly have thrown in his teeth, considering the perpetual quarrel between Sophists and Philosophers. And it is well known that the Athenians, in a penitential mood, either banished or put to death all those that had any hand in Socrates's accusation. If Polycrates then were so eminently guilty as to draw up the impeachment, how could he escape untouched when all the rest suffered?

But when the Accusation of Socrates, though only a Sophistical Exercise, came abroad in the world, it was natural enough, in some process of time, that those that heard of it only, or but perfunctorily read it, should believe it to be the real Charge. We have seen already that Hermippus was in that mistake, who lived a hundred years after; and with him Quintilian, Themistius, and others innumerable. Favorinus, it seems, alone had the sagacity, by a notice from Chronology, to find it of a more recent date than Socrates's Trial. And even that very passage of Favorinus has lain hitherto in the dark, so that my Reader may forgive me this prolixity and niceness, since he learns by it a piece of news. As for Hermippus, lest the authority of so celebrated an author should deter one from so plain a truth, I will shew another slip of his, and a worse than this, in the story of Socrates. When Gryllus the son of Xenophon was slain in the same battle that Epaminondas was, most of the Wits of that age wrote elegies and encomiums on him, in compliment and consolation to his father. Among the rest, Hermippus says Socrates was one*; which is a blunder of no less than xxxvii years, the interval between Socrates's death and the battle of Mantinea.

Socrates was put to death Olymp. xcv, 1. when Laches was magistrate. This is universally acknowledged †; and to go about to prove it, were to add light

* Laërt. in Xenoph.

† See Diodorus, Favorinus, Diog. Laërtius, Aristides, Marmor. Arund. Euseb. Argumentum Isocr. Busir. &c.

to the sun. And six years after this, Olymp. xcvi, 3. in Eubulides's magistracy, Conon repaired the walls *; which gave the hint to Favorinus, and after him to Diogenes, to discover the common mistake about Polycrates's Oration. But Leo Allatius, to avoid the force of their argument, undertakes an impossible thing, to prolong Socrates's life above twenty years beyond Laches; so that He might see Conon's walls, and Polycrates's declamation be the true Charge at his Trial; which he would make out, by comparing together some scraps of different Authors, and some synchronisms of other men's lives with Socrates's; as if those things, which are only mistakes and unwary slips of the Writers, could have any force or credit against so many express authorities. By the same way that he proceeds, I will shew the quite contrary, that Socrates died twenty years before Laches's government; for we have it from good hands, that Euripides, in a Play of his, called Palamedes, using these words, 'Ἐνάειν', ἐνάειν πάνσοφον, &c. designed to lash the Athenians for Socrates's murder †; and the whole theatre perceiving it, burst into tears. Socrates therefore died before Euripides; but it is well known that the latter died six years before Laches was Archon. Nay, Socrates must needs be dead before Palamedes was acted. But that was acted Olymp. xci, 1. which is sixteen years before Laches ‡. Have I not proved now exactly the quite contrary to Allatius? But still, I hope, I have more judgment than to credit such an oblique argument against so many direct testimonies. If Allatius had looked round about him, he would not have committed so great a blunder; while he defends his Epistles at one post, to expose them to worse assaults. If Socrates died in Laches's magistracy, one Epistle must be spurious that mentions Polycrates.

[100]

[101]

* Diodor. xiv. p. 303. Favorin. Diog. Laërt.

† Diog. Laërt. Socrät. Argum. Isoc. Busir.

‡ Ælian. Var. Hist. ii, Schol. Aristoph. 'Οπειθ. p. 401.

This

This breach Allatius would secure ; and, therefore, he will needs make him live several years longer. But then, say I, if we concede this to Allatius, not one Epistle only, but the whole bundle of them are spurious ; for, most of them plainly suppose that Socrates died under Laches. Even this very Epistle complains that Xenophon was abroad when Socrates suffered * ; and that the expedition of Cyrus hindered him from being present then at Athens : and a second Letter †, to name no more, dated after Socrates's death, makes Xenophon to have newly escaped the dangers of his long march through enemies' countries. Now, all the world knows ‡ that Cyrus's expedition and Xenophon's march was in Laches's time, and the year before him ; so that, upon the whole, there is no escape, no evasion from this argument ; but our Epistles must be convicted of a manifest cheat.

[102] VII. In the xvii Letter, one of Socrates's Scholars, supposed to be present at Athens when the things he speaks of were acted, says, the Athenians put to death both Anytus and Melitus, the prosecutors of Socrates § ; which, being contrary to known matter of fact, proves the Epistle to be a forgery. Melitus, indeed, was killed ; but Anytus was only banished ; and several Writers speak of him afterwards at Heraclea in Pontus ||.

VIII. The xviii is a Letter of Xenophon's, inviting some friends to come to see him, at his plantation near Olympia. He says, Aristippus and Phædo had made him a visit ; and that he recited to them his " Memoirs of Socrates ¶ ;" which both of them approved of **. This alone is sufficient to blast the reputation of our famous Epistles ; for, how is it likely

* Ep. xiv.

† Ep xviii.

‡ Marm. Arund. Laërt. Diodor, &c.

§ "Ανύτης τε καὶ Μελίτῃος ἀπέκλιναν.

|| Laërt. in Socrat. & in Antisth. Themist. Orat. ii. Augustin. de Civ. Dei, viii, 3.

¶ Ἀπομνημονεύματα.

** Ἐδόκει ἀξιόδια τίνα εἶναι.

that

that Aristippus would go so far to see Xenophon, who was always his enemy*? Much less would he have given his approbation to a book that was a satyr against himself; for the book is yet in being; and in it he introduces Socrates, in a long lecture, reprehending Aristippus for his intemperance and lust†. Even Laërtius takes notice that he brought in Aristippus's name upon that scandalous occasion, out of the enmity he bare him.

IX. We have already seen Xenophon writing Socrates's Memoirs at Scillus, near Olympia; but in the xxii, to Cebes and Simmias, he is writing them at Megara, for there the Letter is dated; and in the xxi, to Xanthippe, he invites her to come to him to Megara. One would think there were more Sophists than one had a finger in this volume of Letters; or, if he was but one Author, Nature gave him a short memory without the blessing of a great wit. It is true, upon Socrates's execution, his Scholars left Athens for fear, and retired to Megara to the house of Euclides‡, which occasioned our Sophist to bring Xenophon thither too; but he should have remembered, that while They were scared out of Athens for fear of their own lives, He was safe at a great distance, in the retinue of Agesilaus; from whose company he went to Scillus without ever residing at Megara. Nay, the Sophist is so indiscreet as to bring in Xenophon *in forma pauperis*, to beg and receive relief from Cebes and Simmias, whereas every body knows that he got great riches in the war§, and lived in very great splendor and hospitality at Scillus. [103]

X. In the xxiv Epistle, Plato says he is quite weary of a city life, and had therefore retired into the country, διαφύγων ἡ μακρὰν ἑφεστιάδων which Allatius translates

* *Ξενοφῶν δὲ εἰς τὸν πρὸς αὐτὸν δυσμενῶς.* Laërt. in Aristippo.

† Xenoph. Memorab. lib. ii. in princip.

‡ Laërt. in Euclid.

§ Laërt. in Xenoph. Exp. Cyri, l. v. p. 350.

[104] "non longe ab Ephestiadibus." He ought to have said "ab Hephæstiadis;" for the true word, in the Greek, is Ἐφαιστιάδων. Plato had some estate there, which he disposed of in his will, τὸ ἐν Ἐφαιστιάδων χώριον, as it is in Laërtius*, Hesychius (Ἐφαιστιάδαι, Ἀθηναῖοι.) Stephanus Byzant. Ἐφαιστιάδαι, δῆμος Ἀθηναίων τὰ τοπικά, ἐξ Ἐφαιστιάδων, &c. In the Roman Manuscript of Laërtius, it is written ἐν Ἐφαιστιάδων which manner of spelling is found also in Hesychius, Ἰφίστιος, ἥρως, ἀφ' ἧς Ἰφιστιάδαι. If the Reader does believe that our Letter-monger, like Hesychius, spelled the word wrong, he will be satisfied of the forgery; for surely Plato himself knew the true name of his own estate. But if he incline to absolve the Author, and lay the blame upon the Copyers, he may please to accept of this only as an emendation.

[105] XI. The xxvii Epistle is Aristippus's to his daughter Arete, which, perhaps, is the very same that is mentioned by Laërtius, who, among the writings of this Philosopher, names Ἐπιστολὴν πρὸς Ἀρήτην τὴν θυγατέρα. Allatius, indeed, is ready to vouch it, but I am not so easy of belief; for here are two other Letters† of his in this parcel, and both of them written in the Doric dialect, though directed to Athens; because, forsooth, he was a Cyrenæan, and the Doric his native tongue. Pray, what was the matter then, that in this he uses the Attic, though he wrote from Sicily, a Dorian country, to his own daughter at Cyrene? One would suspect, as I observed before, that a couple of Sophists clubbed to this collection. It is true, we know from Laërtius, that of xxv Dialogues published by Aristippus, some were in the Doric idiom and some in the Attic; but that, I suppose, was done, because of the variety of his persons. In some Dialogues the speakers were Sicilians, and those were written in the Doric; and where the Athenians were introduced, the Attic was proper. But now, in this Letter to his daughter, both parties

* Vita Platon.

† IX. XI.

are Dorians; and so this Epistle should rather be Doric than either of the other two.

XII. In the same Letter he mentions her estate in Bernice, τὸ ἐν Βερνίκῃ κλῆμα. There is no question but he means Βερνίκῃ, perhaps that city not far from Cyrene; but there was nothing then in all Afric called by that name, for Βερνίκῃ is the Macedonian idiom for Φερνίκῃ, "the victorious." In that country φ was generally changed into β; — as, instead of κεφαλὴ, they said κεβλή for φίλιππος, βίλιππος for φαλακρός, βαλακρός and so in others*; so that Βερνίκῃ was unknown in Afric till the Macedonians came thither; and, indeed, they had their names from the wives of the Ptolemees, a whole century of years after the date of this Letter.

[106]

XIII. He goes on and tells his daughter, "That if he should die, he would have her go to Athens, and live with Myrto and Xanthippe, the two wives of Socrates." It was a common tradition among the Writers of Philosophic History, that Socrates had these two wives at once, and from thence our Sophist made them the compliment of a place in this Epistle. There are cited, as Authors of this story, Callisthenes, Demetrius Phalereus, Satyrus, and Aristoxenus, who all took it from Aristotle in his Book "Of Nobility," περὶ Εὐγενείας but polygamy being against the law of that commonwealth, and the story therefore improbable, Hieronymus Rhodius produces a temporary statute made in Socrates's days, That, by reason of the scarcity of people, a man might marry two wives at a time. But notwithstanding such a flush of authorities, Panætius, the Stoic, a very great man, wrote expressly against all those named above †; and, in the opinion of Plutarch, sufficiently confuted the tradition of the two wives ‡; for my own part, I dare pin my belief upon two such ex-

* Etym. Magn. &c.

† Laërt. in Socrat. Plutarch. Aristid. Ather. xiii. p. 556.

‡ Athenæus, Plutarch. ib.

|| ἱκανῶς.

cellent judgments as Plutarch's and Panætius's, and upon their credit alone pronounce this Letter to be an
 [107] imposture. What grounds they proceeded on I cannot now tell, but I think there is apparent reason for rejecting the story, even laying aside their testimony; for none of Socrates's acquaintance, not Plato, not Xenophon, say one word of this Myrto. Aristotle, we see, was the first that mentioned her; but Plutarch suspects that Book to be spurious*; so that all this tradition rose at first from a Falsary that counterfeited Aristotle's name. Besides, they do not agree in telling their tale; one says that he had both wives together; another, that Myrto was his first wife, and the second came after her death; another, that Xanthippe was the first. Let either of them come first, and our Epistles are false; for here we have both surviving him, and living together. One says, this Myrto was Aristides's daughter†; another, his grand-daughter; and another, his grandson's daughter. Whatsoever she was, if she outlived her husband, according to the Letters, pray where was her ladyship at the time of his suffering? Xanthippe, like a loving wife, attended him in the prison‡; but the other never came near him. It is a mistake, sure; that has past upon the world, that Xanthippe was the scold: it should seem that Myrto had the better title to
 [108] that honourable name. But what shall we say to Hieronymus, who brings you the very Statute that gave allowance of two wives at once? Panætius, you see, believed it not; and why may not a Statute be forged as easily as these Epistles? If there was such an Act, there appears no great wisdom in it. It is certain there is nearly an equality in the births of males and females; so that if some men had two wives for their share, others must go without; and what remedy would that be against the scarcity of people? Besides that, by such a Law the rich only would be accommodated, who

* Ibid.

† Ibid.

‡ Plato Apolog.

were

were able to maintain a couple; the poorer sort, who are always the most fruitful, would be in worse circumstances than before. And without doubt, a very strong interest would have been made against the passing of such a Bill, as we know what the Roman matrons did when Papirius Prætextatus made a like story to his mother*. It is very odd too that nobody but Hieronymus should ever hear of this Statute, and he too a suspected witness, because he brings it to serve a turn, and to help at a hard pinch; but certainly such a political occurrence, had it been true, could never have lain hidden from the whole tribe of Historians. It had [109] very well deserved, not only a mention, but a remark; but how could it possibly escape the fancy and spleen of all the Comedians of that age? How could they miss so pleasant an argument of jest and ridicule? Those that are acquainted with the condition of those times, will look upon this as next to a demonstration. But let us grant, if you will, half a dozen wives to Socrates; yet, nevertheless, our Epistles will be still in the mire; for here our Sophist makes the two women live amicably together, which is pretty hard to believe; for (as those that make them Two tell the story of them †) while their husband was alive they were perpetually fighting. But, which is worse yet, there are other Letters in the bundle that plainly suppose Socrates to have had but one wife. He himself, writing to somebody, tells him this domestic news, "That Xanthippe and the children are well ‡;" but says not a word of my Lady Myrto. Xenophon sends a Letter top full of kindness and commendation to Xanthippe and the little ones §; but it was very uncivil in him to take no notice of the other, since, according to the story, she brought her husband the more children. Nay, if

* A. Gellius, lib. i. c. 23.

† Aristoxenus apud Theodoret. Serm. xii. ad Græcos.

‡ Ep. iv.

§ Ep. xxi.

[110] we allow this Letter of Xenophon to be genuine, he played a false and dirty trick, much against his character; for, at the date of this Epistle, if we believe the very next to it, he was writing Socrates's Memoirs*; so that while he here in his Letter wheedles the poor woman and makes her little presents, and commends her for her love to her husband, and for many good qualities, — in his Book he traduces her to that present age, and to all posterity, for the most curst and devilish shrew “that ever was, or ever would be †.” Nay, which makes it the baser, he was the only man that said this of her; for neither Plato nor any of the old Socratics wrote a word about her scolding, which made Athenæus suspect it was a calumny ‡; especially since Aristophanes and his brethren of the Stage, in all their railery and satyr upon Socrates, never once twitted him about his wife. Well, let that be as it will; but what shall we say to Xenophon's double-dealing? For my part, rather than I will harbour such a thought of that great man, I will quit a whole cart load of such Letters as these.

XIV. Xenophon, in the xv. Letter, tells this story of Plato, to whom he bore a grudge, That he should say “None of his Writings were to be ascribed to “himself, but to Socrates, young and handsome:” —
 [111] Φησὶ μὴδὲν εἶναι ποίημα αὐτοῦ, Σωκράτης μὲντοι νέος καὶ καλοῦ ὄψεως. Now this sentence is taken out of Plato's Second Epistle to Dionysius the Younger: — Οὐδ' ἔστι σύγγραμμα Πλάτωνος ἂνδρ', ἐφ' ἔσται· τὰ δὲ νῦν λεγόμενα Σωκράτης ἐστὶ, καλοῦ καὶ νέου γεγονότος. Here is a blunder with a witness, from the Sophist's ignorance in Chronology; for his forged Letter of Xenophon bears date immediately after Socrates's death; but the true one of Plato, which Xenophon here alludes to, is recenter by a vast while, for Dionysius came but to the crown Olymp. ciii, 1. which is xxxii years after the Trial of Socrates.

* Ep. xxii.

† Xenoph. Conviv. p. 876.

‡ Lib. v. p. 219.

I must observe one thing more, that by no means should be omitted. There were formerly more Epistles of Xenophon extant than appear in this collection. A large fragment is cited in Stobæus*, out of his Letter to Crito; two fragments out of a Letter to Sotira†; and two more, out of one to Lamprocles‡; none of which are found here in Allatius's parcel. Theodoret produces a passage out of a Letter of his to Æschines, wherein he jerks Plato "for his ambition and voluptuousness; to gratify which he went to Sicily, to Dionysius's court§." Eusebius has this passage, and more out of the same Epistle||; and the whole is extant in Stobæus¶. What, shall we say that the true Letters of Xenophon were extant in those days? or, that those too were a cheat, and belonged to the same volume whence these of Allatius were taken? And so, as I observed before, they will be older than Libanius's time. I am afraid it will be thought ill manners to question the judgment of Eusebius and Theodoret; but we know they have made other mistakes of a like nature** ; and the very Letter which they cite betrays itself to be a counterfeit. Xenophon, we see, reproaches Plato in a Letter to Æschines. If this were true it was a most rude affront to the person he wrote to, whose friendship he courts so much in the rest of his Letter; for Æschines himself was guilty of the very same fault, and is wounded through Plato's side. It is well known that He too, as well as Plato, and Aristippus, and others, made a voyage to Sicily, and struck in with Dionysius, and that purely for money and the table††. Lucian says he was parasite to the Tyrant‡‡; and another tells us he liked his entertainment so well, that he

* Serm. 81.

† Serm. 120, 123.

‡ Serm. 5.

§ "Εως τυρανίδος, καὶ ἐπὶ λυτῆς διαίτης Σικελιώτης γὰρ πρὸς ἀμύτρου τράπηδης.

|| Præp. Evang. xiv. 12.

¶ Serm. 78.

** See Dissert. upon Jo. Malal.

†† Laërt. & Suidas in Æsch. Plut. de Adulat.

‡‡ In Parasito.

did not stir from him till he was deposed*. I would ask any man now if he can still believe it a genuine Letter, let him have what veneration he can for the learning of Eusebius.

- [113] In the beginning of this Discourse I have said, "That I heard of none that, since the first publication of these Letters, called them into question." But I was shewn to-day (after mine was in the press) in Bishop Pearson's "*Vindiciæ Epp. Sancti Ignatii*," a digression made on purpose against Socrates's Epistles†. I must confess, with some shame, I had either never read that chapter, or utterly forgotten it; but I am glad now to find that incomparable man both to think it worth going out of his way to discover this imposture, and to confirm me in my judgment by the accession of his great authority. There is nothing there disagreeing with what I had said, but that his Lordship allows the Epistle to Æschines, cited by Eusebius, to be genuine, which I had endeavoured to convict of a forgery. I refer it to those that please to read both, whether they think I have just reason to change my opinion; especially when I shall tell them that not Æschines only, but even Xenophon himself made a visit to Dionysius. I have Athenæus‡ for my authority, a witness beyond all exception. *Ξενοφῶν γοῦν ὁ Γρύλλης παρὰ Διονυσίῳ*, &c. "Xenophon," says he, "the son of Gryllus, when at Dionysius the Sicilian's table, the cup-bearer forced the company to drink; Pray," says he, "Dionysius (speaking aloud to the Tyrant) "if your Butler forces wine upon us against our wills, why may not your Cook as well compel us to eat?" So that, if we suppose the Letter genuine, the absurdity will double itself; both parties being guilty of the very same thing that is charged upon Plato.
- [114]

* Polycritus apud Laërt.

† Par. II. p. 12, 13.

‡ Lib. p. 427.

OF

Euripides's Epistles.

IT is a bold and dangerous venture to attack Euripides's Letters, since a very learned Greek Professor has so passionately espoused them, that he declares it to be "great impudence, and want of all judgment," to question the truth of them*. I do not care to meddle with controversy upon such high wagers as those; but if I may have leave to give my opinion, without staking such valuable things as modesty and good sense upon it, I am very ready to speak my mind candidly and freely.

I. There are only five Epistles now extant ascribed to Euripides; but without doubt there were formerly more of them, as we have seen just before, that we have not now the whole set of Xenophon's Letters. Neither can we suppose a Sophist of so barren an invention as to have his fancy quite cramped and jaded with poor five. We have here a peculiar happiness, which we wanted in the rest, to know whom we are obliged to for the great blessing of these Epistles. Apollonides, that wrote a Treatise (Περὶ κατεψευσμένης Ἱστορίας) "About falsified History," says "one Sabirius Pollo † forged them; the same man that counterfeited the Letters of Aratus." This we are told by the Writer of Aratus's life (no unlearned Author) who does not contradict him about these of Euripides; but for Aratus's, he says, that, bating this Apollonides, every body else believed them to be genuine. I cannot pass any judgment of what I never saw, for Aratus's Letters are not

[115]

* "Perfrictæ frontis et judicii imminuti." Eurip. edit. Cantab. par. ii. p. 523.

† Σαβίριος Πόλλων.

now

now to be had; but if they were no better than these of our Tragedian, I should, in spite of the common vogue, be of Apollonides's mind; and I wish that Book of his were now extant. One may know, by the manner of the name, that this Sabirius Pollo was a Roman; but I do not find such a family as the Sabirii, nor such a surname as Pollo. What if we read Sabinius, or Sabidius Pollio?

“ Non amo te, Sabidi; nec possum dicere quare.”

[116] If that Sabidius in Martial was the forger of our Epistles, though the Poet could give none, yet I can give a very good reason why I do not love him.

But the learned advocate for the Letters makes several exceptions against the testimony of Apollonides. As, first, “ That we may fairly infer from it that a great “ many others believed them to be true.” Alas, how many more, both Antients and Moderns, believed Phalaris's to be true! If that argument would have done the work, I might have spared this Dissertation. “ But “ prove that these Letters now extant are the same that “ were forged by Sabirius.” Commend to me an argument that, like a flail, there is no fence against it. Why had we been told too that he made Phalaris's Epistles, yet how could we *prove*, unless some passages were cited out of them, that they were the same that we have now? But though I cannot demonstrate that these are Sabirius's, yet I will demonstrate them by and by to be an imposture; and I hope then it will be no injustice to lay them at his door. “ But it is an evidence “ that the true Epistles of Euripides were once extant, “ because somebody thought it not improper to father
[117] “ false ones upon him.” Now I should think the very contrary, that the cuckoo does not lay her egg where the nest is already full; at least, I am resolved I will never go a bock-hunting after the genuine Epistles of Phalaris, though somebody has cheated the world with a parcel of false ones.

II. It

II. It might easily have happened, though we suppose the Letters spurious, that in so small a number as five there could be nothing found to convict them by. But so well has the Writer managed his business, that every one of them has matter enough to their own detection. The last and principal of them is dated from Macedonia, in answer to some reproaches that were cast upon him at Athens, for his going to Archelaus. "As for what you write from Athens," says he, "pray know that I value no more (ὥν νῦν Ἀγάθων ἢ Μέσατος λέγει) what Agatho or Mesatus now say, than I formerly did what Aristophanes babbled." Here we have the Poet Agatho (for without doubt he means the Poet, since he has joined him with Aristophanes) residing at Athens, and blaming Euripides for living with Archelaus. Now, could any thing be more unfortunate for our Sabirius Apollo than the naming of this man? for even this Agatho himself was then with Archelaus, in Euripides's company*; besides that, they were always good friends and acquaintance, not there only, but before at Athens. [118]

But perhaps some may suspect it was another Agatho, a Comic Poet, that was meant in the Letter, and not the famous Agatho, the Tragedian†. This I find to be the opinion of the learned person above named. But I will make bold to expunge this Comic Agatho out of the catalogue of mankind; for he sprang but up, like a mushroom, out of a rotten passage in Suidas; who, after he has spoken of Agatha the Tragic Poet, has these words, κωμωδοποιὸς Σωκράτης διδασκάλῳ ἐκωμωδεῖτο δὲ εἰς θηλυτῆα which his Interpreters (Wolfius and Portus) thus translate:—"Fuit et alius Agatho, Comœdiarum Scriptor." But there is nothing like "fuit et alius" in the original; but the same Agatho is here meant that was mentioned before. This they might have known from the

* Ælian. ii, 21. & xiii, 4. Plut. in Apophth. Schol. Aristoph. Βαλραχ.

† Vita Eurip. p. 29. ed. Cant.

following

following words (ἐκωμωδεῖτο δὲ εἰς θηλύτητα) “he was libelled
“for his effeminateness;” for whom can that belong
to but to Agatho the Tragedian, whom Lucian ranks
with Cinyras and Sardanapalus*? Do but read Ari-
stophanes’s Thesmophorizansæ, and you will see him
ridiculed upon that score for some pages together,

[119] The Scholiast upon Βάτραχοι, of the same Poet:—’Αγάθων,
says he, ἔτ’ ἐπὶ τραγικὸς ποιητὴς ἐπὶ μαλακία δεβάλλετο. Here,
you see, it is expressly said, “Agatho the Tragedian
“was traduced as effeminate †.” It follows presently
in the same Scholiast, Οὗτος δὲ ὁ ’Αγάθων κωμωδοποιὸς τῆ
Σωκράτους διδασκάλης where we have the very words of
Suidas applied to the Tragedian, ἔτος, “this same
“Agatho was a Comedian, Socrates being his master;”
not *another*, as the Translators of Suidas interpolate
the text. But is it true then that our spruce Agatho
wrote Comedies too? Nothing like it; though the
learned Gregorius Gyraldus affirms it from this very
passage ‡. It is a mere oscitation of our Scholiast,
and of Suidas that gaped after him; the occasion and
ground of the story being nothing but this:—Plato’s
Convivium was in the house of this Agatho; in the
conclusion of which § Socrates is introduced, proving
to Agatho and Aristophanes, “That it belonged to the
“same man, and required the same parts, to write
“both Comedy and Tragedy; and that he that was a
“skillful Tragedian was also a Comedian.” Hence
have our wise Grammarians dressed up a fine story,
that Agatho was a Comedian, and of Socrates’s teach-
ing. And now, I hope, I have evidently proved the
[120] thing that I proposed, to the utter disgrace of our
admired Epistles.

III. Euripides, we have seen, did not value one far-
thing “what either Agatho or Mesatus said of him ||.”

* Πάναξόν τινα Σαρδανάπαλον, ἢ Κινύραν, ἢ αὐτὸν ’Αγάθωνα τὸν τῆς τραγω-
δίας ἡγέμενον ποιητὴν. Rhet. Præc. † P. 135. ‡ Dialog. de Poët

§ P. 336. Τὸν τέχνη τραγωδοποιὸν ὄντα καὶ κωμωδοποιὸν εἶναι.

|| ἢ Μίσσατος.

I would

I would gladly be better acquainted with this same Mesatus; for I never once met with him but here in this Letter;—he must be a brother of the Stage too, by the company he is placed in. But what was the matter? Was he so hissed and exploded, that he durst never shew his head since? I have a fancy he was of the same family with Phalaris's two Fairy Tragedians; Aristolochus and Lysinus*; and that these Letters too are akin to those of the Tyrant. But, perhaps, you will say, this Mesatus is but a fault in the copies. It may be so, and I could help you to another Tragedian of those times, not altogether unlike him; one Melitus, the same that afterwards accused Socrates; who was likely enough to hate Euripides, that was the Philosopher's friend. Or I could invent some other medicine for the place; but let those look to that, that believe the Epistles true, or think them worth the curing.

The very learned Defender of the Epistles, one of a singular industry and a most diffuse reading, has proposed some objections against the Letters, communicated to him by a private hand. That private person, at the request of the Editor, imparted his opinion to him in a very short Letter; to which he had no answer returned, till he found it, with some surprize, brought upon the stage in print; and his reasons routed and triumphed†. But let us see, if we can rally them again; perhaps, they may keep their ground in a second engagement.

[121]

IV. Our friend Sabirius Pollo to make the whole work throughout worthy of himself, has directed this same Letter to Cephisophon, who was Euripides's actor for his Plays; for he had often heard of Cephisophon, and so he would not let him pass without a share in his Epistles. But he should have minded time and history a little better, if he hoped to put himself upon

* Epist. lxiii, & xcvii.

† Eurip. edit. Cant. p. 27, & 523.

us for the Author he mimics. It is true, Cephisophon and our Poet were once mighty dear acquaintance; but there fell out a foul accident that broke off the friendship; for Euripides caught him acting for him, not upon the stage, but in private with his wife; which business taking wind abroad, and making a perpetual jest, was one of the main reasons why he left Athens, and went to Macedonia. And is it likely, after all this, that our Poet should write a Letter to him as soon as he got thither? that he should use him as his most intimate friend, nearer to him than his own children? I know, there are some so fond of our Epistles, that they "value all this as nothing." Cephisophon is so much in their Books, that, whatsoever is said against him, must be calumny and detraction. Give me an advocate that will stick close, and hang upon a cause. By being their Editor, he is retained for the Letters, and therefore he must not desert his client. But why shall no testimony be allowed that touches Cephisophon? are not Aristophanes and his Commentator*, and Suidas, and Thomas Magister†, all lawful and good evidence? and is there one single witness against them in his behalf? Not a Writer is now extant that mentions his name, but what tells the story of him; and, if we must not believe them, we shall want new evidence to prove there ever was such a man.

V. In a disquisition of this nature, an inconsistency in time and place is an argument that reaches every body. All will cry out that Phalaris, &c. are spurious, when they see such breaches upon Chronology. But, I must profess, I should as fully have believed them so, though the Writers had escaped all mistakes of that kind; for as they were commonly men of small endowments that affected to make these forgeries, a great man disdaining so base and ignoble a work, so they did their buisness accordingly; and expressed rather them-

* P. 167, 184.

† In Vita Eurip.

selves than those that acted ; for they knew not how to observe decorum. in a quality so different from their own ; like the silly Player, that would represent Hercules ; tall indeed, but slender, without bulk and substance. Let us see the conduct of this Author : — In the first Letter, Archelaus sends Euripides some money ; and our Poet, as if his profession were like a monastic vow of poverty, utterly refused it. And why, forsooth, does he refuse it ? why, “ it was too great a sum for his “ condition.” Yes, to be sure, when a Sophist makes a present, the greatest sum costs no more than the least. “ But it was difficult to be kept ; and the fingers of “ thieves would itch at it.” Alas for him ; with the expence of one bag, out of many, he might have provided a strong box, and new doors and locks to his house. But why could he not accept a little of it ? Even Socrates himself, and Xenocrates, took a modicum out of presents, and returned the rest again *. And is a Poet more self-denying than the most mortified of the Philosophers ? But the best of all is, “ That Clito, [124] “ the King’s chief Minister, threatened to be angry “ with him if he refused it.” What ! could Clito expect before-hand that the present would be refused ? — the most sagacious statesman, sure, that ever monarch was blest with ! Alexander could not foresee such a thing ; but was mightily surprized when Xenocrates would not receive some money that he sent him : “ What !” says he, “ has Xenocrates no Friends to give it to, if he need it not himself † ?” As for our Poet, he had Friends, I assure you, but all of his own kidney, — “ men of contentment, that would not finger a penny “ of it :”—τὸ αὐταρκὲς ἡμῶν τε καὶ τοῖς φίλοις παρόν. What would one give to purchase a set of such acquaintance ? — and yet, I know not how, in the fifth Letter, their appetites were come to them ; for in that, Euripides himself, from Archelaus’s court, shared some presents

* Laërtius, in Socrat. Xenoc.

† Plut. Apoph.

among

among them, and we hear not one word but that all was well taken.

[125] VI. The rest of this Letter is employed in begging pardon "for the two sons of a Pellæan old fellow *," who had done something to deserve imprisonment. And the third and fourth are common-places of thanks for granting this request. Now, besides that the whole business has the air and visage of Sophistry, for this same is a mighty topic too in Phalaris's Epistles, it is a plain violation of good sense to petition for a man without telling his name; as if Pella, the royal city, had no old man in it but one. How can such an address be real? But to this they give a double answer, "That a Sophist, if this was one, could not be at a loss for a name; he might easily have put one here, as here—after he names Amphias, Lapretes, and others." But the point is not what he *might* have done, but what he *has* done. He *might* have named some other Poet at Athens, and not Agatho, that was then in Macedonia. All those mistakes and blunders of Phalaris and the rest, *might* easily have been avoided, had the Writers had more history and discretion. "But he had written a Letter before this, about the same business; and there, we must suppose, he had mentioned his name †." This indeed would be something, if it would carry water. But, though the Sophist has told you so, do not rashly believe him; for it is plain, that pretended Letter must have been sent to Archelaus, before this vast present came from him. Why then did not the same messenger that brought the money, bring the grant too of his petition? Would the king, that did him this mighty honour and kindness, deny him at the same time that small and just request? for the crime of those prisoners was surely no heinous business. Had it been a design to assassinate the king, he would never have interceded for them. The charge against them

[126]

* Πηλλαιῶς γέρον.

† Πρῶτον ἐπεμίλαμέν σοι.

was a venial fault; or, were it the blackest accusation, their innocence at least would clear them; for our Poet himself tells us "They had done nobody any wrong*."

VII. The second Epistle is to Sophocles; whom he makes to be shipwrecked at the island Chios; the vessel and goods being lost, but all the men saved. That Sophocles was at Chios, we are informed by Ion Chius, the Tragedian †, who relates a long conversation of his there. If our Author here means the same voyage, as probably he does, he is convicted of a cheat; for then Sophocles was commander of a fleet with Pericles in the Samian war; and went to Chios, and thence to Lesbos for auxiliary forces ‡. But our mock Euripides never thinks of his public employment; but advises him to return home at his leisure, as if it had been a voyage for diversion. "Yes," says his advocate; "but why might he not be at Chios another time, though nobody [127] speak of it, about private affairs?" Yes, why not indeed? for Sophocles was so courteous and good-natured a man, that, to do our Letter-monger a kindness, he would have gone to every Island in the Archipelago §. But it is hard though, that a good ship must be lost, and our Poet swim for it, to oblige the little Sophist; for I fear, the vessel was cast away, purely to bring in "the great loss of Sophocles's Plays ||." Alas! alas! Could he not go over the water, but he must needs take his Plays with him? And must Euripides, of all men, lament the loss of them, whose own Plays must probably have truckled to them at the next feast of Bacchus? Must Euripides, his rival, his antagonist, tell him "That his orders about family-affairs were executed ¶," as if He had been employed by him as steward of his household?

* Οὐδὲν ἀδικεῖν τοῖνασιν.

† Athen. XIII, 603.

‡ Ibid. & Thucyd. i, 75.

§ Ion Chius, ib. Aristoph. Ranis.

|| Ἡ περὶ τὰ δαίματα συμφορὰ.

¶ Τὰ οἴκοι ἴσθι κατὰ τοῦ ἄνθρωπου.

VIII. The fifth Letter is a long apology for his going to Macedonia. "Can they think," says he, "that I came hither for love of money? I should have come then when I was younger, and not now to lay my bones in a barbarous country*, and make Archelaus richer by my death." I observed it as no small mark of a Sophist, That our Author foretells he was to die in Macedonia; where we know he was worried to death by a pack of dogs. [128] "But what wonder," say they, "if an old man of seventy predict his own death?"—I do not question but our Poet might presage himself to be mortal; but it was an odd guess, to hit upon the time and place, when and where he was to die; for, what ground was there to be so positive? The Letter, we see, carries date just after his arrival at court. He had, as yet, had very short trial whether all things would continue to his liking: and we have no reason to suppose that he came thither for good and all, never to see Athens again. Might he not by some accident, or supplanted by some rival, lose the king's favour? or was he sure His life would last as long as his own? It was a violent death, and not mere age and craziness that took our Poet away at last: and he knew Sophocles to be then alive and hearty, and making of Plays still, that was fourteen years older than himself. In these circumstances, to be so positive about his dying there, was a prophecy as bold as any of the Pythian Oracle. "But," say they, "he gives a hint too that Archelaus might be deposed; which a Sophist would not say, because it never came to pass." That was true, and came to pass every [129] day, that he *might* be deposed; and he does not suggest that it actually would be so; for he expressly says "God would always stand by the king, and support him†." But indeed, as they interpret a pas-

* Ἦνα ἐν Βαρβαρίῳ γῇ ἀποθάνωμι.

† Παύσαι μὲν αὐτὸς ὁ Θεός, καὶ γένῃται κατ' ὅπῃ.

sage there, it looks as if he had foreboded real mis-
 chief:—Οὐδὲ ἀνιάσει, ὅτι οἴχεται ὁ καιρὸς εἰς ἀνθρώπων εὐεργεσίαν,
 ἀνεθεὶς φρεσὶ ἥδη. Which last words they translate *ubi*
jam destitutus fueris et abdicatus, “when you are de-
 “serted and deposed.” But, with all due submission,
 I will assume the freedom of changing the version;
 for ἀνεθεὶς and φρεσὶ belong to the word καιρὸς, and not
 to Archelaus; and the distinction is to be put thus:—
 ὅτι οἴχεται ὁ καιρὸς, εἰς ἀνθρώπων εὐεργεσίαν ἀνεθεὶς, φρεσὶ ἥδη *tem-*
pus ad exercendam benignitatem concessum, “You
 “will not grieve that the time is gone, past recalling,
 “which was granted you by God to do good to man-
 “kind in.” This, I suppose, is now clear enough;
 and Archelaus is in no danger of being deposed by this
 sentence. But let us examine our Author’s next words,
 “To make Archelaus richer by my death*.” A very
 good thought indeed, and worthy of Euripides. But
 pray, what could the king get by his death? Would
 the Poet be compelled to make him his heir, as some
 were forced by the Roman Emperors? or, would the
 King seize upon his estate, and defraud the true in-
 heritor? If the Poet had such suspicions as these, he
 would never have gone to him. But though he had left
 all to him at his death, what would the King have been
 richer for him? for surely Euripides, having settled af-
 fairs at home, carried no great stock with him to
 Macedonia, unless he thought Archelaus would make
 him pay for his board. He might well expect to be
 maintained by the King’s liberality, as he found it in
 the event †. The King, therefore, were he his sole heir,
 would only have received again, what himself had
 given before. Nay, even a great part of that had been
 lost beyond recovery; for our Poet, by the very first mes-
 senger, had packed more away to Athens, that Arche-
 laus had given him, than all that he carried with him
 could amount to; perhaps, than all he was worth before.

[130]

* Ἰσχυρίσθαι Ἀρχιλάω καταλίπομαι χρήματα.

† Ep. v.

IX. But he has more still to say to those that blamed him for leaving Athens. "If riches," says he, "could draw me to Macedonia, why did I refuse *these very same riches** when I was *young* or *middle-aged*†, and while my mother was alive, — for whose sake [131] "alone, if at all, I should have desired to be rich?" He alludes here to the first Letter (and perhaps to others now lost) where he refuses an ample sum of money sent him by Archelaus. Alas, poor Sophist! it was ill luck he took none of the money to fee his advocates lustily, for this is like to be a hard brush; for how could the Poet, while young, or middle-aged, refuse presents from Archelaus, since, according to most Chronologers‡, he was about seventy, and, by the most favourable account, above sixty when Archelaus came to the crown?

X. But what a dutiful child had Mother Clito, the Herb-woman! "For her sake alone her son Euripides" could wish to be rich, to buy Her oil to her sallads. But what had the old gentleman, the father, done, that he wishes nothing for his sake? And how had his three sons offended him, that they have no share in his good wishes§? It is a fine piece of conduct that our Sophist has shewn! He had read something of our Poet's mother, for she was famous in old Comedy for her lettuce and cabbage; but having heard nothing of his sons, he represents him, through all his Letters, as if he had no children. As here the only motive to desire wealth, is his care of the Old Woman; and when she [132] is supposed to be dead, all his concern is only for his Friends. In the first Letter he and his friends are such contented men, that they refuse the royal gift||. Not a word of the three young sparks, who, it is hard to think, were so self-denying. In the fifth, he keeps

* Τὸν αὐτὸν τῶτον πλῆτον.

† Νίσι τε καὶ μέσσι τὴν ἡλικίαν.

‡ Diod. Sicul. & alii apud Athen. l. v. p. 217.

§ Suidas, Tho. Magister, &c.

|| Ἡμῖν τε καὶ τοῖς φίλοις.

none

none of the King's presents by him, but sends all away to Athens, to be shared among his friends and companions*. How, again, would the young gentlemen look to be forgotten thus by their own father? If it be suspected, in favour of the Letters, that the sons might be all dead before, I can soon put a stop to that from a good evidence, Aristophanes; who, in a Play made the very year of our Poet's death, mentions the sons as then alive†.

XI. The Romans may brag as much as they please of Mæcenas and others; but, of all Patrons of Learning, Archelaus, of Macedonia, shall have My commendations. Within two or three days after Euripides's arrival, he makes him a present of Forty Talents‡, which was a greater sum of money than our Poet could ever have raised before, though all that he had should have been sold four times over. The great Themistocles was not worth Three Talents before he meddled with public affairs§; and Two Talents was thought a good portion for a substantial man's daughter||. Alexander the Great, when he was lord of the world, sent Xenocrates, the Philosopher, a present of Thirty Talents, or, as others say, Fifty; which Cicero calls a vast sum, especially for those times¶. But Alexander's natural munificence was stimulated and exalted to that extraordinary act of bounty out of a pique he had to Aristotle**. How generous then, nay, how profuse was Archelaus, that out of his little and scanty revenue, could give as much as his great successor in the midst of the Persian treasures? But all this is spoiled again, when we consider it is a Sophist's present, who is liberal, indeed, of his paper notes; but never makes solid payment. [133]

* Τοῖς ἑταίροις καὶ ἐνὶ ἡδύοις,

† Βάτραχοι, p. 184. edit. Basil.

‡ Ep. v.

§ Plut. Themist.

|| Terent. Heaut.

¶ Cicero, Tusc. v. "Pecunia temporibus illis, Athenis præsertim, maxima."

** Laërt. in Arist.

And now, I suppose, it will be thought no great matter whether Sabirius Pollo, as Apollonides affirms, or any other unknown Sophist, have the honour of the Epistles. I will take my leave of Him and Them after I have done the same kindness to Apollonides that I did to Sabirius; for, as I read the name of the one Σαβίδιος Παλλίων, instead of Σαβίριος Πόλλων, so, for Ἀπολλωνίδης ὁ Κηφεύς, I dare make bold to substitute Ἀπολλωνίδης ὁ Νικαεύς. The former was never heard of but here; [134] this latter is mentioned by Laërtius, Harpocration, and others. He wrote several Books, and dedicated one of them to Tiberius*. The time, therefore, agrees exactly with this emendation; for, living in that Emperor's days, he might well cite a Roman Author, Sabidius Pollio. But to take away all manner of scruple, this very Book "About Falsified History," is ascribed to Apollonides Nicenus, by Ammonius†; Ἀπολλωνίδης, says he, ὁ Νικαεύς ἐν τῷ τρίτῳ περὶ κατεφεισμένων just as the Writer of Aratus's Life says Ἀπολλωνίδης ὁ Κηφεύς ἐν τῷ ὀγδόῳ περὶ κατεφεισμένης Ἱστορίας.

* Laërt. in Timone.

† V. Καλοῖκης. "De Dissert. Vocab."

OF

*Æsop's Fables.**

I COULD easily go on and discover to you many more impostures of this kind, the Epistles of Anacharsis, Heraclitus, Democritus, Hippocrates, Diogenes, Crates, and others. But, perhaps, I may be *exhorted* hereafter to put this Dissertation into Latin, with large additions; till which time I will adjourn the farther discourse upon those several Authors, and proceed now to the last thing proposed, "The Fables of Æsop."

And here I am glad to find a good part of the work [135] done ready to my hand; for Monsieur Bachet, S. de Méziriac has written "The Life of Æsop," in French; which Book, though I could never meet with it, I can guess from the great learning of the Author, known to me by his other works, to have in a manner exhausted the subject. Vavasor too, "de Ludicrâ Dictione," ascribes the present Fables to Maximus Planudes, and not to Æsop himself. See also a great deal upon this head in the late "Historical Dictionary" of Mr. Bayle; all which make me look upon Sir W. T.'s mighty commendation of the Æsopian Fables now extant, which is the occasion of this Treatise, to be an unhappy paradox; neither worthy of the great Author, nor agreeable to the rest of his excellent Book; for, if I do not much deceive myself, I shall soon make it appear That, of all

[* A Latin dissertation on Babrius was published last year by the learned Mr. Tyrwhitt; in which the author, having frequent occasion to mention Dr. Bentley takes leave to differ from him sometimes; but seems very greatly and seriously to regret His not having answered the Oxford examination of his Dissertation on Æsop. "Sed ille, adversarios dissertatione secunda Phalaridea, velut fulmine, prostravisse contentus; a pugna impari recessit indignabundus." Whether he would, as this Gentleman thinks, have altered any thing (and what if he had replied) is now impossible to say; but he scruples not to speak of the Oxford performance on Æsop, very as greatly inferior to that on Phalaris. S.]

the compositions of Æsopic Fables, these that we have now left us are both the last and the worst; though I do not intend a set discourse, but only a few loose things that I fancy may have escaped the observation of others.

[136] I. It is very uncertain if Æsop himself left any Fables behind him in writing; the Old Man, in Aristophanes* learned his Fables in conversation, and not out of a book: —

Αἰσωπικὸν γελοῖον ἢ Σούδαρικόν
Ὡς ἱμαθὶς ἐν τῇ συμποσίῳ ———

There is another passage in the same Poet †, οὐδ' Αἰσωπον πεπλάτηκας, which Suidas ‡, and from him Erasmus, Scaliger, &c. affirm to be used proverbially, “ You “ have not read so much as Æsop ” (spoken of Ideots and Illiterates): from whence one might conclude that Æsop wrote his own Fables, which were in every body's hands. But it plainly appears from the Poet himself, that it is not a proverbial saying; for when one had said “ He never heard before that birds were older “ than the earth; ” the other tells him “ he is unlearn- “ ed, and unacquainted with Æsop, ” who said That the “ Lark was the first of things; and she, when her fa- “ ther died (after he had lain five days unburied, be- “ cause the earth was not yet in being) at last buried “ him in her own head.” Now, what is there here like a Proverb? But pray take notice that this Fable is not extant in our present collection: a good testimony that ours are not of the Phrygian's own composing.

[137] I will mention another place of our Poet, that I may on this occasion correct a gross error of the Scholiast. It is extant in Vespis, p. 330: —

Οἱ δὲ λέγουσι μύθους ἡμῖν, οἱ δ' Αἰσώπῃ τι γελοῖον.

Where he interprets Αἰσώπῃ γελοῖον, of “ one Æsop, a “ ridiculous Actor of Tragedy.” But our Scholiast

* In Vespis, p. 337.

† In Avibus, p. 387.

‡ Παῖσι.

himself

himself is more ridiculous ; if it was He that wrote this, and not some trifler that foisted it in among the other's annotations ; for there was no Æsop, a Greek Actor, in the days of Aristophanes ; he mistakes him for the famous Æsop in Cicero's time, an Actor of Tragedy on the Roman Stage, and far from being ridiculous : —

“ Quæ gravis Æsopus, quæ doctus Roscius egit.”

But the Æsop meant by our Poet is the Phrygian himself, whose Fables were called Jests, Γελοῖα* so in the other passage, already cited, Αἰσωπικὸν γελοῖον. Hesychius, Αἰσώπη γελοῖα* ἔτιωι ἔλεγον τὰς Αἰσώπη μύθους. Dion Chrysostom*, speaking of our Æsop, Ἠνείχοντο αὐτὸν, says he, ἡδόμενοι ἐπὶ τῷ γελοίῳ καὶ τοῖς μύθοις. Avienus, in his Preface, “ Æsopus, responso Delphici Apollinis monitus, RIDICULA ORSUS EST.”

II. The first that we know of who essayed to put [138] the Æsopic Fables into Verse, was Socrates the Philosopher†. Laërtius seems to hint that he did but one Fable, and that with no great success ; the beginning of it was this : —

Αἰσωπὸς ποτ' ἔλιξε Κορίνθιον ἄνθρωπον,
Μὴ κρίνειν ἀρετὴν λαοδικῶ σοφίῃ.

It is observable again, that Socrates does not say he made use of a Book of Fables ; but, “ I wrote,” says he (ὡς ἠπιστάμεν) “ those that I knew, and that I could first “ call to mind.” And this Fable too does not appear in our present collection, if we may gather so much from his naming the Corinthians.

III. After Socrates's time, Demetrius Phalereus made Λόγων Αἰσωπείων Συναγωγὰς, “ Collections of Æsopean Fables‡,” which, perhaps, were the first in their kind committed to writing ; I mean, in form of a book. These seem to have been in prose ; and some, perhaps, may imagine that they are the same that are now

* Orat. lxxxii. p. 631.

† Plato in Phædonc. Plutarch. de Aud. Poët. Laërt. in Socrat.

‡ Laërt. in Demet.

extant.

extant. I wish they were ; for then they would have been well written, with some genius and spirit. But I shall demonstrate ours to be of a modern date, and the composition itself speaks too loud that it is not Demetrius's.

- [139] IV. After him there was somebody, whose name is now lost, that made a new edition of the Fables in Elegiac verse. I find no mention of them but in Suidas, who cites them often under the name of *Μῦθοι*, or *Μυθικά*. I will set down a few fragments of them, both to shew that they belong to the Æsopic Fables, which has not yet been observed that I know of ; and to enable you to judge whether if we could change our modern collection for these, we should not get by the bargain.

Τέσσα τὴν ἰδίην ὅτις ἔπνευε δόην*.

This belongs to the Fable about the two bags that every man carries ; one before, where he puts other men's faults ; another behind him, where he puts his own. This is mentioned by Catullus, Horace, Phædrus, Galen, Themistius, Stobæus, &c. and it is a blot upon our modern set that there it is wanting.

† Αἰπειναῖς ἱλαταῖς ἔρπον βάτος· ἢ μὲν ἔπνευ
Καὶ καὶ καὶ καὶ καὶ καὶ, ‡ τεμνομένη τιλάει.

And, Αἰπεινὴν ἱλάτην ἔρπον ἄρπον αἰσιν φάσθαι.

And, Οὐδ' οἱ ἐδ' αἶθον ἀδὲ πάρδαλις, ἔσσα θυμῷ
Ἐμπλήν————— §

- [140] And, Πικρὴ μίλη λύκοισιν, ἄτρε χιμάρουσι ἀκροῖς||.

Some of them, it seems, were all Hexameters : —

———* Ὅθι συφιλῶν ἐπὶ πειρῶν
Ὅτρακίονι δ' τε ἰῶτα καὶ ἀκκύλα γυῖα κιάσθη||.

It is an easy matter to find what Fables these pieces relate to ; and I think they are all extant in the present collection.

* Suidas in Δόγη.

† Id. in Αἰπεινῷ.

‡ Vulgo τεμνομένη.

§ Id. in Ἀδῶν.

|| Id. Ἀκροῖς.

¶ Id. Στυφ. & Schol. Aristoph. p. 220.

V. This

V. This, you see by this specimen, was no contemptible Author; and after him came one Babrius, that gave a new turn of the Fables into Choliambics*. Nobody that I know of mentions him but Suidas, Avienus, and Jo. Tzetzes. There is one Gabrias, indeed, yet extant, that has comprized each Fable in four sorry Iambics. But our Babrius is a writer of another size and quality; and were his Book now extant, it might justly be opposed, if not preferred, to the Latin of Phædrus. There is a whole Fable of his yet preserved at the end of Gabrias, of “the Swallow and “the Nightingale.” Suidas brings many citations out of him, all of which shew him an excellent Poet; as this of the Sick Lion:—

—οἷά τις νέσω
Κάμουν ἑξέβλη†, ἐκ ἀληθείς ἀσθμαίνων†.

and that of the Boar:—

Φρίξας δὲ χαίτην ἔκθορε φιλιάδου κούρης†.

and a great many others.

VI. I need not mention the Latin Writers of the Æsopian Fables, Phædrus, Julius Titianus §, and Avienus, the two first in Iambic, the last in Elegiac; but I shall proceed to examine those Greek ones now extant that assume the name of Æsop himself. There are two parcels of the present Fables: the one, which are the more ancient, cxxxvi in number, were first published out of the Heidelberg Library, by Neveletus, A. D. MDCX. The Editor himself well observed That they were falsely ascribed to Æsop, because they mention holy Monks ||; to which I will add another remark, That there is a sentence out of Job (Γυμνοὶ γὰρ ἦλθομεν οἱ πάντες, γυμνοὶ ἔν ἀπελευσόμεθα) “Naked we all “came, and naked shall we return ¶.” But because

* Suidas, in Βάβριος.

† Suidas, in Ἀσθμ.

‡ Suidas, in Ἐκθορε.

§ Ausonius, Ep. xvi.

|| Φιλερήμοις κατὰ Δεδὸν Μοναχοῖς, Fab. 152.

¶ See Fab. 288. Job i, 21.

these

these two passages are in the Epimythion, and belong not to the Fable itself, they may justly be supposed to be additions only, and interpolations of the true Book; I shall therefore give some better reasons to prove they are a recent work. That they cannot be Æsop's own, [142] the CLXXXIst Fable is a demonstrative proof; for that is a story of Demades the Rhetor, who lived above 200 years after our Phrygian's time. The CXCIII is about Momus's carping at the works of the Gods. There he finds this fault in the Bull, — "That his eyes were not placed in his horns, so as he might see where he pushed." But Lucian*, speaking of the same Fable, has it thus: — "That his horns were not placed right before his eyes." And Aristotle† has it a third way: "That his horns were not placed about his shoulders, where he might make the strongest push, but in the tenderest part, his head." Again, Momus blames this in the man: — "That his *Φρένες* did not hang on the outside of him, so as his thoughts might be seen;" but in Lucian‡ the fault is, "That he had not a wind-dow in his breast." I think it probable from hence, that Æsop did not write a Book of his Fables, for then there would not have been such a difference in the telling; or, at least, if these that are now extant were Æsop's, I should guess from this specimen that Lucian had the better of it, and beat him at his own play.

VII. But that they are recenter than even Babrius, who is himself one of the latest age of good writers, I discovered by this means. I observed in them several [143] passages that were not of a piece with the rest, but had a turn and composition plainly poetical; as in the CCLXIII^d Fable, which begins thus: — *Ὁρῶ πατήσας σκόλοπα χαλὸς ἐγῆκει*. This, I saw, was a Choliambic verse; and I presently suspected that the Writer had taken it out of Babrius. And I was soon confirmed in my

* In Nigrino.

† De Part. Anim. l. iii. p. 55.

‡ In Hermotimo.

judgment

judgment by this fragment of his, that belongs to the same Fable* :—

Ὁ δ' ἐκλυθεὶς πόνων τε καὶ νείας πάσης,
τὸν κηκίαν χάσκοῖλα λακτίσας φεύγει·

for in the Fable in prose there are these words :—Ὁ ῥῆϑ· δὲ ΛΥΘΕΙΣ ΤΟΥ ΠΟΝΟΥ, ἐπὶ τὸν λύκον ΧΑΣΚΟΝΤΑ ΛΑΚΤΙΣΑΣ ΦΕΥΓΕΙ· whence it evidently appears that the Author of that parcel, which was published by Neveletus, did nothing else but epitomize Babrius, and put him into prose. But I will give you some farther proofs of it. The cclxi begins thus :—Ὅταν τις ἐπιθεὶς ξόανον ἦγε· which, at the first reading, one perceives to be part of a Scazon ; and thus it is in a fragment of Babrius † :—

Ὅταν τις ἐπιθεὶς ξόανον εἶχε κωμῆτης.

In the clvi, about the Fox and the Firebrand :—Ταύτην δὲ δαίμων εἰς τὰς ἀράρας τῷ βαλόντι ὠδήγει· who does not discover here a Scazon of Babrius ?

[144]

Εἰς τὰς ἀράρας τῷ βαλόντι ὠδήγει.

The ccxliii is a manifest turning out of Choliambics into prose ; for the whole is made up either of pieces or entire verses :—

— ἥλιος πλέον λάμπει.

And, Ἀνέμω δὲ συρρίψασθαι, εὐθὺς ἐσβέσθη.

And, Ἐκ δευτέρω δ' ἄπλων τις —

And, — φαῖνε λύχνε καὶ σίγα,

τῶν ἀγέρων τὸ φέγγος ὑπὸ' ἐκλείπει.

In the ccxciii there are these remnants of Babrius :—

Πόση γὰρ ἑλκῇ τ' ἔμην αἶμα προσθήσθαι.

And, Ἔσται μάγειρος, ὅς με συντόμως δύσει.

And, — καὶ πάλιν κερῖ με, καὶ τώσμι.

[145]

The clxv begins thus :—Ἀνὴρ μεσοπολιὸς δύο ἐρωμένους εἶχεν. ὃν ἢ μὲν μία νεάνις, ἢ δὲ ἄλλη πρεσβύτις· which I suppose to have been in Babrius thus :—

Ἀνὴρ μεσοπολιὸς δύο ἐρωμένους εἶχεν,

ὃν ἢ μία νεάνις, ἢ δὲ πρεσβύτις.

Or, ὃν ἢ μὲν ἦν νεάνις.

* Suidas, in Κηκίας.

† Suidas, in Κωμῆται.

In

In all these passages here are most visible footsteps, by which we may trace our Imitator; but generally he has so disguised the Fables, that nobody can find they ever belonged to Babrius. In the ccxlvth, about the Priests of Cybele, there is nothing but a short dry story, and no relics of a verse. But there is a noble fragment of Babrius belonging to the same Fable, which I will here set down, both to correct it (for he that has given it us * has printed it false) and to shew you how much we have lost:—

Γάλλοις ἀγύρλαις εἰς τὸ κοιὸν ἐπράβη
 "Οἷ· τις ἐκ εὐμοιρῶ, ἀλλὰ δυσδαίμων·
 "Ος τις φέρε πτωχοῖσι καὶ πανέργοις
 Πίσις ἄκος δίδης τι, καὶ κακὴν τέχνην.
 Οὗτοι δὲ κύκλῳ πᾶσαν ἐξ ἔθους κόμην
 Περιτόνεις ἐλέγοιτο· τίς γὰρ αἰγροίκων
 Οὐκ οἶδιν "Αἴην λευκὸν, ὡς ἐπηρεῖται;
 Τίς ἐκ ἀπαρχῆς δωπρίων τι καὶ σίτων
 "Αἰψὺ φέρον δίδωσι τυμπάνῳ "Ρίης.

[146] VIII. Thus I have proved one half of the Fables now extant, that carry the name of Æsop, to be above a thousand years more recent than He; and the other half, that were public before Neveletus, will be found to be yet more modern, and the latest of all. That they are not from Æsop's own hand, we may know from the lxxth, "Of the Serpent and the Crab-fish;" which is taken from a Scolion, or Catch, much older than Æsop, that is extant in Athenæus †, and must be corrected thus:—

Ὁ παρσίτος ὅδε ἔφα, χαλᾷ τὸν ὄφιν λαβόν
 Εἰθὲν χρηῖταιρον ἔμεν, καὶ μὴ σχολιὰ φρονεῖν.

And there is great reason to believe that they were drawn up by Planudes, one of the later Greeks, that translated into his native tongue Ovid's Metamorphoses, Cato's Distichs, Cæsar's Commentaries, and Macrobius; for there is no Manuscript anywhere above ccc years old that has the Fables according to that copy.

* Natal. Com. l. ix. c. 5.

† Lib. xv. c. 15.

Besides

Besides that, there are several passages that betray a modern Writer; as in the LXXVII, Βέταλις, a Bird; and XXXIX, Βέντιρον, a Beast, both unknown to all ancient Authors; and in the CXXIX, βοῶν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ, "crying in his heart:" a manifest Hebraism, in imitation of Eccles. xi. 1. εἶπον ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ μου. The LXXV, about the Æthiopian, is taken almost word for word out of the VI of Athonius the Rhetorician, who made an Essay upon some Æsopic Fables that is yet extant. The IV, as appears from the last sentence of it, is a paraphrase on CCLXXXIV of Neveletus's parcel, which parcel, as I have proved above, are a traduction of Babrius; and particularly in this very Fable there are footsteps of his verses: —

— κατῴθην εἰς βαθὺν κρημόν.

And, — μίλιόν, καὶ βοηθὸν ἰζήτηι.

This collection, therefore, is more recent than that other; and coming first abroad with Æsop's Life, written by Planudes, it is justly believed to be owing to the same Writer.

IX. That Ideot of a Monk has given us a Book which he calls "The Life of Æsop," that, perhaps, cannot be matched in any language for ignorance and nonsense. He had picked up two or three true stories, That Æsop was slave to one Xanthus, carried a burthen of bread*, conversed with Croesus, and was put to death at Delphi; but the circumstances of these and all his other Tales are pure invention. He makes Xanthus, an ordinary Lydian or Samian, to be a Philosopher†, which word was not heard of in those days, but invented afterwards by Pythagoras. He makes him attended too, like Plato and Aristotle, by a company of Scholars, whom he calls Σχολαστικοί, though the word was not yet used in that sense, even in Aristotle's time. It was the King of Æthiopia's Problem to Ama-

* Eustath. in X Odyss. v. 785.

† Πάριδος ὁ Φιλόσοφος.

sis, King of Egypt, "To drink up the sea *;" but Planudes makes it a wager of Xanthus with one of his Scholars. To say nothing of his Chronological errors, mistakes of a hundred or two hundred years, who can read, with any patience, that silly discourse between Xanthus and his man Æsop, not a bit better than our Penny-Merriments printed at London Bridge?

X. But of all his injuries to Æsop, that which can least be forgiven him, is the making such a monster of him for ugliness: an abuse that has found credit so universally, that all the modern Painters, since the time of Planudes, have drawn him in the worst shapes and features that fancy could invent. It was an old tradition among the Greeks, That Æsop revived again, and lived a second life †. Should he revive once more, and see the picture before the Book that carries his name, could he think it drawn for himself,—or for the
[149] Monkey,—or some strange beast introduced in the Fables? But what revelation had this Monk about Æsop's deformity? For he must learn it by dream and vision, and not by ordinary methods of knowledge. He lived about two thousand years after him ‡; and in all that tract of time there is not one single Author that has given the least hint that Æsop was ugly. What credit then can be given to an ignorant Monk that broaches a new story after so many ages? In Plutarch's Convivium, our Æsop is one of the guests, with Solon and the other Sages of Greece; there is abundance of jest and raillery there among them, and particularly upon Æsop; but nobody drolls upon his ugly face, which could hardly have escaped had he had such a bad one. Perhaps you will say it had been rude and indecent to touch upon a natural imperfection. Not at all, if it had been done softly and jocosely. In Plato's Feast,

* Plutarch. in Conviv.

† Suidas in Αἴσ. & Ἀνακρίων. Schol. Aristoph. p. 357 & 387.

‡ A. D. MCCCLXX.

they

they are very merry upon Socrates's face, that resembled old Silenus; and in this they twit Æsop for having been a slave; which was no more his fault than deformity would have been. Philostratus has given us, in two Books, a description of a gallery of pictures, one of which is Æsop with a chorus of animals about him*. [150] There he is represented "smiling and looking towards the ground, in a posture of thought; but not a word of his deformity; which, were it true, must needs have been touched on, in an account of a picture. The Athenians set up a noble statue to his honour and memory: —

" Æsopo ingentem statuam posuere Attici,
 " Servumque collocarunt aterna in basi:
 " Patere honoris scirent ut cuncti viam;
 " Nec generi tribui, sed virtuti gloriam †."

But, had he been such a monster as Planudes has made of him, a statue had been no better than a monument of his ugliness; it had been kinder to his memory to have let that alone. But the famous Lysippus was the Statuary that made it. And must so great a hand be employed to dress up a lump of deformity? Agathias, the Poet, has left us an Epigram upon that statue ‡: —

Εὖγε ποῖον, Δόσιππε γέρον, Σικνόντι πλάσας,
 Δείκταλον Αἰσώπου γήσας τῷ Σαμίῳ, &c.

How could He too have omitted to speak of it, had his ugliness been so notorious? The Greeks have several proverbs about persons deformed: — Θεροίτιον βλέμμα, Εἰδεχθῆς Κορυδαῖς, &c. Our Æsop, if so very ugly, had been in the first rank of them, especially when his statue had stood there to put every body in mind of it. [151]

* P. 735.

† Phædrus, l. ii, ult. [Dr. B. in his edition of *Phædrus*, offers from others an emendation of the first verse; and would read *Æsopi ingenio*; but though *ingens* is very awkward, *ingenio* seems no better, unless we say it must be *ingens statua* indeed, whose *basis* is *æterna*. S.]

‡ Anthol. lib. iv. Εἰς Φίλαρ.

K k

He

He was a great favourite of Cræsus, King of Lydia, who employed him as his Ambassador to Corinth and Delphi; but would such a Monster, as Planudes has set out, be a fit companion for a Prince? or a proper Ambassador, to be hooted at by all the boys wherever he came? Plutarch represents him as a polite and elegant Courtier, rebuking Solon for his gruff and clownish behaviour with Cræsus; telling him he must converse with Princes (ἢ ὡς ἡδιστα, ἢ ὡς ἥμισυ) “either agreeably, or not at all*.” Now, could either such a station, or such a discourse, befit Æsop, if he was truly that scarecrow as he is now commonly painted? But I wish I could do that justice to the memory of our Phrygian, to oblige the Painters to change their pencil; for it is certain he was no deformed person; and it is probable he was very handsome; for, whether he was a Phrygian, or, as others say, a Thracian, he must [152] have been sold into Samos by a trader in Slaves; and, it is well known that *that* sort of people commonly bought up the most beautiful they could light on, because they would yield the most profit. And there is mention of two slaves, fellow-servants together, Æsop, and Rhodopis, a woman; and if we may guess him by his companion and *contubernalis* †, we must needs believe him a comely person; for that Rhodopis was the greatest beauty of all her age; and even a Proverb arose in memory of it ‡: —

“Ἀπὸ τοῦ δμοῦ, καὶ Ῥοδόπιδος ἡ καλὴ.

* Plut. in Solone.

† Pliny, xxxvi, 12.

‡ Herodotus, Suidas, Strabo.

Copy of a Letter from Dr. Bentley to Dr. Davies;
found in the latter's Study, after his death, by his
Successor at Fen-ditton, in Cambridgeshire, xx years
after it was written.*

DEAR SIR,

AFTER you left me this morning, I borrowed of Dr. Sike, Mr. Barnes's new edition of *Homer*; where I was told that I should find myself abused. I read over his dedications and prefaces, and there I found very opprobrious words against enemies in general; and one *Homo inimicus* in particular, which I cannot apply to myself, not being concerned in the accusation. But if Mr. Barnes has, or does declare in company, that he means Me by those expressions, I assure him I shall not put up such an affront, and an injury too, since I was one of his first subscribers, and a useful director to him, if he had followed good advice. He struts and swaggers like a *Suffenus*, and challenges that same enemy to come *aperte*, and shew him any fault. If he mean Me, I have but dipped yet into his Notes; and yet I find everywhere just occasion of censure. Il. H. ver. 201, — Ἀλλὰ ἀποπλανέουσιν, ἐρωήσουσι δὲ χάρις. Thus all editions have it; but in this we have it in the very text, Αὐταρ ἀποπλανέουσιν and this noble note added, Αὐταρ] Ita omnino, pro Ἀλλὰ,

* [Mr. Barnes being mentioned sometimes in this controversy (see p. 326) as having officiously thrust himself into it; and being afterwards much better known by Dr. B. than he was probably at that time, it may not be disagreeable to reprint this letter from Dr. B. to Dr. Davies, the learned master of *Queen's College* in *Cambridge*, which, upon the latter's death many years after, got abroad, and was printed in a monthly magazine. Barnes had some knowledge in the Greek language (about as much, Dr. B. used to say, as an *Athenian* Cobler); but was, in all other respects, a very poor creature indeed: *felicis memorie*, as the burlesque epitaph upon him says. *expectans judicium*. See a paper of verses upon him in the *Musæ Anglicanæ*, intituled *Sub-professor Linguae Græcæ*; which shews what a contempt even the boys at *Cambridge* had for him. Dr. Clarke had certainly seen this letter, as appears by his notes on Hom. Il. A. 461. & Il. H. 101; in which he expresses himself in a strain so unlike himself, that Barnes might justly have replied, had he lived to see them, *Non te dignum C. fecisti; nam si ego dignus essem hæc contumelia quam præsums, at tu indignus qui faceres tamen.* S.]

K k 2

ut

ut olim. So we have αὐταρ clapped in *pro imperio*, only to avoid the *hiatus* of two vowels, ἀλλὰ ἀ — Now for this interpolation alone his book deserves to be burned. Let us examine into the passage a little: What is ἀποπτανέειν? He translates it *respicient*, but says not one word to explain it. His friend *Eustathius*, to whom he owes the better half of his notes, knows not what to make of it, whether it be ἀπ — οπτανέειν, from ὀπῶ, ὀπταίνω, i. e. ἀποβλέψω or ἀπο — πτανέειν, from πῶ, πταίνω, φοβέμαι, i. e. πηξέειν or from πέτω, πταίνω, i. e. πελασθήσονται. But who ever heard of either ὀπταίνω or πταίνω? where does our Professor find either of them? He is wholly mute upon this word, which is ἀπαξ λεγόμενον and yet the wretch would venture blindfold to put in αὐταρ but the true reading is thus: — 'Ἄλλ' ἀποπαπτανέειν — ἀποπαπταίνω fut. — παπτανῶ, Ionicè — παπτανέω. Παπταίνω comes forty times in Homer; and, if he had been, as he thinks himself, *Mæonides*, *sextus pavone ex Pythagoreo*, he might have found out the emendation, which is clear, *per se*; but I will prove it so by authority. Etymol. in 'Ἀποπταίνεσθαι, πέτω πεταίνω καὶ παπτανῶ παπτανῶσι καὶ μετὰ τῆς προθέσεως ἀπὸ, ἀποπτανῶσι' so it is printed indeed; but it is evident that he wrote it ἀποπτανέεισι, and had respect to this place, as Sylburgius well observes. Again, Hesychius, in the right series between ἀποπαξ & ἀποπαρ, has it thus: — 'Ἀποπτανέειν, περιβλέψω ὅπως φεύγωσιν' correct 'Ἀποπαπτανέειν, περιβλέψωσιν. — He means this very passage, as appears by the Scholiast: — ἀποπτανέειν ἦτοι εἰς τὰς ναῦς ἀποβλέψωσιν, ἢ ἀλλάχουσι ὁ εἶσι, φεύξονται. What says our Professor to this job? Ἔργον Ὀμηρείοιο τὸδ' ἐπέλεξεν Βαρεισίοιο, to foist in αὐταρ of his own head; and so, *quantum in se*, extinguish the true reading for ever! which, while ἀλλὰ was preserved in the text, might sometime be retrieved.

I dipped into his second volume, and there I found this learned correction. Od. A. ver. 546, p. 307. *Agamemnon*, says the Scholiast, to judge fairly whether *Ajax* or *Ulysses* best deserved Achilles's armour, Αἴχ-

μαλώτης

μαλῶτες τῶν Τρώων ἀγαγὼν ἡρώτησεν, ἀπὸ ὁποτέρου τῶν Τρώων
 μαλλον ἐλυπήθησαν εἰπόντων δὲ Ὀδυσσεύα, he gave the armour
 to Him — Here our Professor corrects it, ἀπὸ ὁποτέρου
 αὐτῶν οἱ Τρῶες and thus acts *Thraso* in his note — *Ita*
emendo ; sensu postulante : quique hoc valent, ad hos
provoco. Impertinence ! to appeal to men of sense
 here, as if it required much sense to know that *Ajax*
 and *Ulysses* were not Trojans ! The business is to cor-
 rect the place neatly, that is, truly as the Author
 wrote it ; which he has not done ; but has gone clumsily
 about it. I'll give him the true lection, with altering
 half a letter : — ὑπὸ ὁποτέρου τῶν Ἡρώων from which of the
 two Heroes they suffered most. This is clear and
 neat ; but our Professor, besides his botching in the
 words, has sullied even the sense ; for the captives
 were not asked what (οἱ Τρῶες) all the Trojans thought * ;
 but what they themselves thought. — Again, over the
 leaf, p. 309, ver. 576, I find this worthy note : The
 poet had said of *Tityus*, ὃ δ' ἐπ' ἐνεία κείτο πείλεθρα. Upon
 which the Scholiast, πλέθρον, ἕκλον μέρϑ ραδίε — ὥς τε Τίβης τὸ
 σῶμα κατέχειν τόπον ἐνὸς ἡμίσεος ραδίε. So all former editions.
 One πλέθρον being one sixth of a Stadium ; nine πλέθρα
 make one Stadium and a half. Now comes our learned
 Professor's note. *Cum πλέθρον sit sexta pars Stadii,*
et Tityus occupet novem πλέθρα sequitur, illum spatium
occupare non unius dimidii ; sed unius stadii et dimidii ;
quare inter ἐνὸς et ἡμισίϑ addendum erat τὸ ΚΑΙ. Here
 is your *Professor emeritus*, that has made Greek his
 study, *per annos quadraginta* : to whose *pueritia* other
 people's manhood cannot reach ! Now, to pardon him
 his silly interpolation of ἡμιστός for ἡμίσεος, and so making
 the Scholiast write Ionic, — it is plain he thought ἐνὸς
 ἡμίσεος signified one half, and not one and a half : — a piece

* [Nor does Mr. *Barns's* reading imply this ; but only, from whether of
 them the Trojans had suffered most. And it may be added, in favour of
 his emendation, that the inquiry was not, from whether of them they (the
 Trojan captives) had suffered most ; but the Trojans in general. How-
 ever, Dr. B.'s emendation is far better than Mr. B.'s. S.]

of ignorance, for which he deserves to be turned out of the Chair; and for which, and many others like it, *si magis me irritaverit*, I, as his principal elector and governor, may call him to account. What! he, that in his preface has bragged of perusing *Pollux*, *Suidas*, *Etymologus*,—not to know, what all of them teach us! ἐν ἡμῖσι τέλειον, says *Pollux*, lib. ix, is τρεῖς ἡμιτάλαντα one talent and a half; not one half talent, as this booby would think it. So in those lexicographers and authors *passim*, δύο ἡμῖσι, τέσσαρα ἡμῖσι, ἕξ ἡμῖσι, 2½, 4½, 6½; δεκάδω ἡμῖσι, 12½;—not twelve half, I hope. A fit man indeed, *per annos quindecim in Græca Cathedrala celeberrimæ Academiæ sedere!*

From thence I dipped into his fulsome *ἐπὶ λόγος* enough to make a man spew, that sees the vanity and insolence of the writer; where I met with these verses:—

Ἀὖ τότ' ἐγὼ, τρίγλωσσος ἔδην καὶ αἰσθημὸς ἀνὴρ,
Εὐπρωγίης τ' ἱλαχον, καὶ τιμῆς κυδανέλης.

But what a shame it is, for a man that pretends to have been (*a teneris unguiculis*) a great Grammarian and a Poet, not to know that the second syllable of *εὐπρωγίης* is long.

Sir, I write to you as a common friend; and desire you to shew Mr. *Barnes* this letter; but not to let him keep it, nor transcribe it. If it be true, that he gives out, that he means Me by those villanous characters, I shall teach him better manners towards his elector; for though I shall not honour him so much as to enter the list against him myself, yet in one week's time I can send a hundred such remarks as these to his good friend *Will. Baxter*, whom I have known these twenty years; who, before the Parliament sits, shall pay him home for his *Anacreon*; but if it be otherwise, that he does not describe Me under those general reproaches, a small satisfaction shall content me; which I leave you to be judge of; for I would not, without the utmost provocation, hurt the sale of his book: upon which he professes

esses to have laid out his whole fortunes. Pray let me hear from you, as soon as you can.

Trin. Coll.
Saturday Evening.

I am, &c.

D. FRANCISCO GACON, S. P. D.

RICHARDUS BENTLEIUS.

LITERAS tuas ix Novembris datas nudius tertius accepi; quibus significas, te Anacreonti in metra Gallica vertendo dare operam: et de duobis locis sententiam meam scire cupere. De priore illo num. xiii. quæris, utrumne Attis Cybeles amore in furorem agi dicendus sit; an potius ira Cybeles, quod is aliò amorem verterat. Neutrum ex his verum: quippe locus iste mendo laborat, et in hunc modum corrigendus:—

Οἱ μὲν καλὴν Κυβέβην
τὸν ἡμίθην Ἀττίν
ἐν ἔρσιν βοῶσαι*
Δίγουν ἱμαῖναι·
Οἱ δὲ, Κλάρυ παρ' ἔχθαις
Δαφνηφόροιο Φοίβῃ
Δάλον πτόντας† ὕδωρ
Μιμηρότας βοᾶσαι†.

Quæ sic accipienda sunt: “Sunt qui dicunt, formosam “Cybelen insaniisse; inclamantem in montibus pul- “cherrimum Attin.” Ipsa, vides, *Cybebe*, sive *Cybele*, amore *Attidis* percussa, insaniit: ut ex Phrygum historia rem diserte narrat *Diodorus Siculus*, lib. iii. *Cybebe* ergo hic *puella* est; nondum scilicet inter Deos relata: neque καλὴ est *alma*; sed, ut passim, *formosa*: neque ἡμίθης est *Gallus*, *Spado*; sed mollibus fœmineisque fere membris, præ pulchritudine: ut in illo *Ausonii*,

Dum dubitat natura, marem faceretne puellam;
Factus es, ô pulcher, *pene puella*, puer.

* Vulgo βοῶντα.

† Vulgo πτόντας.

‡ Vulgo Μιμηρότας βοῶσι.

K k 4

Pene

Pene puella est ipsum illud ἡμίθελος. Hanc nostram emendationem et verborum series constructioque, et Diodori quem consulas locus, planè efflagitat. Jam illa quæ sequuntur, vide modo Antithésin; οἱ μὲν λέγουσιν, sunt qui dicunt; οἱ δὲ, alii vero; subaudiendum, dicunt: unde necessario, ut vides, Nominativos illos πιδόλεις et μεμνότες in Accusativos immutari oportet. Tu igitur in versione tua, si ad Anacreontis elegantiam adspiras, sic locum adumbrabis: “ Alii dicunt, formosam Cybele-
“ len in montibus pulchrum Attin invocantem, insa-
“ niisse: Alii dicunt, eos qui Clari aquam bibunt
“ furentes clamare.” Nisi hoc modo oppositionem expresseris, perit magna pars venustatis. Ceterum in loco altero, num. xlv. ubi quæris de istis verbis,

“ Ἐλαβεν βέλεμον Ἄρης

Ἵππευιδίασε Κύπρις.

Ὁ δ' Ἄρης ἀναγενάξας,

Βαρυ φησιν, ἄρον αὐτό.

Ὁ δ' Ἐρως, ἔχ' αὐτό, φησὶ.

utrumne id velint, Amorem suum jaculum *in manus modo Marti dedisse*; an in Martem *contorsisse*, et eum *vulnerasse*: Neutra ex his sententia, sed alia inter utramque media, vera est. Quippe Cupido non contorsit jaculum; sed manu tantum capiendum tradidit: at repente jaculum, ex vivo scilicet igne et æthereo fulgure constans, in Martis corpus se sponte insinuavit; et reconditum latuit. Inde est illud, ἀναγενάξας, *gemitum et suspirium ducens*; ob vulnus scilicet: et ἄρον αὐτό tolle, *quæso*; quippe in intima corporis penetraverat: ἔχε vero αὐτό, *tecum serva*, ait Cupido irridens; qui solus potuit extrahere, sed noluit.

Hæc αὐτοσχεδίασι et extempore tibi exaravi: quibus utere tuo arbitratu. Multa quidem in aliis Anacreontis locis emendatione indigent; non pauca etiam sunt spuria: quæ a genuinis dignoscere paucorum erit hominum, &c.

Cambridge, die xx Nov. mdccxi.

ADDI-

ADDITIONAL NOTES.

Pref. p. xiv. *the estate of Rupilius.*] Dr. B.'s memory failed him here; it was not Rupilius, but his adversary Persius, who permagna negotia dives habebat Clazomenis; or perhaps he mistook wittingly, in order to contrast the better the one's pus atque venenum with the other's estate. Dr. K. was a beggar. S.

P. xxxvi. *Reppulit Actorides, &c.*] Here Dr. B. is as much mistaken as John Freind, whom he is exposing. *Defensore* means Ajax only, who had boasted that He had sustained Hector's fire, and secured the fleet from it; which Ulysses ran away from. See this observed from Mr. Sam. Hoadly, in Clarke's note on Homer, Il. ii. 126. S.

P. xxix. Theocritus has τᾶν αἰγῶν Idyll. viii. 49. if it be not a false print. S.

P. xliv. *Cotemporary.*] Against this, it has been alleged that we have the words *Co-founder*, *Co-mate*, and *Co-partner*; and the Mathematicians have *Co-secant*, *Co-sine*, and *Co-tangent*; and the Lawyers have *Co-parceny*. But as every one of these words is formed contrary to all rule, so no one of them has any thing to plead for it; two of the first three having, indeed, no meaning at all, but what was already fully conveyed in *Mate* and *Partner*; the second three being merely technical and elementary, nor ever in ordinary or common use; and the last only to be found in authors who do not pique themselves upon elegance of style or correctness of expression: and the constant form of all these compounds, agreeably to Dr. B.'s rule, compact, compare, compartment, compeer, compile, complain, complete, comply, compose, comprehend, comprise, compunction; contact, contagion, contaminate, contain, condemn, contend, contiguous, contingent, contorted, contusion; cōaction, cōæval, cōætaneous, cōequal, cōercion, cōeternal, cōincident, cōition, cōoperate, cōordinate; which are all regular, and in common use, prove what is the genuine and only just rule of formation to all of this class. Yet so perverse and obstinate are many, that *co-temporary* is now, after fourscore years, as much used as ever; but chiefly, I believe, by those who either never heard of this correction, or were early taught to despise it, and disdain the author. Dr. Johnson has put both *Contemporary* and *Cotemporary* into his Dictionary: which is very right, as they are both in use; but he might have given better authority than Locke for the latter; for I believe Stillingfleet always wrote *Cotemporary* in his earlier works; probably, in compliance with custom; as Lord Lyttleton had done, in his History

tory of Henry II. and declared he knew not but it was universal ; but was afterwards convinced ; and had every leaf cancelled in which it occurred. S.

P. lv. John Freind was the Director of Mr. B.'s studies, mentioned above, p. xxxv ; and wrote the part on *Æsop* : Smallridge wrote the banter spoken of in the following page. S.

P. lvi. Yet *Hare*, once the great admirer and almost idolizer of *Bentley* (as *Scioppius* was of *Jos. Scaliger*) was mean enough, in his *Epistola Critica* to Dr. *Bland*, to speak of Him, as fully convicted of Plagiarism in both these instances, and in many others. But this is easily accounted for. *Hare* was himself too good a Scholar not to have a just sense, and consequently a high veneration, of *Bentley's* masterly learning ; and cultivated his friendship with the greatest assiduity. During their friendship, the emendations on *Menander* and *Philemon* were transmitted through him, then Chaplain-General to the Army, to *Burman*, in 1710 ; and the Remarks on the Essay of Free Thinking (supposed to be written by *Collins*, a Pupil of *Hare's* at Cambridge) were inscribed to Him, in 1718. As soon as the first part of these was published, *Hare* formally thanked Dr. *Bentley* by name for them, in a most flattering letter, called the Clergyman's Thanks to *Phileleutherus*, &c. printed the same year, now very scarce, as having never been reprinted, nor admitted into the posthumous collection of *Hare's* works ; for he was turned off by Dr. B. not long after, for a reason which (to say the truth) does neither of them any honour ; and was excessively piqued at the utter annihilation of his *Terence* and *Phædrus* ; the one, soon after it's birth ; the other, before it's birth, by *Bentley's* edition of both together, in 1726. *Hare* nibbled at the former, in the *Epistola Critica* mentioned above, professing only to attack the *Phædrus* at present, but announcing a future attack on the *Terence*. That threatened attack was not only never made, but certainly never intended ; the whole of what he could say against it being introduced here, in 7 or 8 places, with singular asperity ; as also an absurdly officious confirmation of the Oxford charge of Plagiarism, though ten years at least after their friendship was (as Dr. B. expressed himself to Me) *dissuta, non dirupta* ; and almost thirty years after B. had himself disproved this accusation.

In the short introduction to *Hare* of the remarks on *Collins*, *Bentley* affects to thank him for his Taciturnity, &c. in executing the former commission ; which was all a Joke ; for, by some unaccountable blunder, those papers which were intrusted to *Hare*, and sent by him in the Duke of Marlborough's packet, miscarried ; and, after passing through several hands, got into those of a Burgomaster of Amsterdam, who shewed them to Toland, then in Holland. He immediately pronounced them to be *Bentley's*. *Burman* wrote a Preface to them, very abusive upon *Le Clerc* ; and no otherways considerable. This *Bentley* dropped, when he reprinted the book at Cambridge ;

bridge; as he did also the *F. H. D. D.* in the second edition of his Remarks on *Collins*; nor ever once names *Hare* in his *Terence*. — One Sheet only of a Third Part of the Remarks was printed; and then the author stopped, upon some disappointment and disgust; nor would ever resume his pen. He used to say, he found those he wrote *for*, as bad as those he wrote *against*. S.

P. 22. Mr. *Dodwell*.] This learned man resided then at *Oxford*; where he was very much and very justly esteemed. As he made himself in some sort a party in this controversy, a very particular court was paid to him by the *Christ-Church* men; yet he very readily sent the sheets of his book then printing to Dr. B. at the Doctor's request; and though he reproved the Doctor, with some severity, in a letter which I saw and read, as guilty of unpardonable affectation, in pretending a contempt for his adversaries (which, in this instance at least, was not at all pretended or affected, but very real and sincere) yet to Them, who much less pardonably affected a contempt for this answer of *Bentley's*, he declared he never learned so much from any book of the size in his life. And the great author was, almost immediately after the publication of it, promoted to the Mastership of *Trinity College* in *Cambridge*; and thereby brought into a very near and close connection with *Christ-Church* and *Westminster School*. S.

P. 101, 102. Perhaps the aspirate in *αἰσας* and *οἶα* will make — *οἶα* long, without the *γ'*, both in the 6th and 12th examples. This at least is asserted, in *Philargyrius Cantabrigiensis*' Emendations on *Menander* and *Philemon*, opposed to *Phileleutherus Lipsiensis*'; but His authority is not great. Dr. Clarke says the same, on Hom. II. A. 51: and three examples occur, all *extra cæsuram* too; Z. 157, I. 392, and II. 460: but the word, which follows in every one of them, is the pronoun *ἐ, οἱ, ἱ*, which had a Digamma prefixed to it in Homer's time; as had also *αἰαξ, αἰκω, αἰπω, ἱκας, ἱς, οἰκος, οἶκος, οἶμος*, and many others. S.

P. 150. The *some other person* here mentioned, l. II. is Mr. Milner; who wrote a View of the Controversy. S.

INDEX

OF

THE PRINCIPAL MATTERS.

- ABARIS*, the Hyperborean, his age, p. 34
- Ælian* refuted, 188, 191
- Æsara*, the Pythagorean, her name retrieved, 277
- Æschylus* corrected several times, 100, 101. His improvement of Tragedy, 165. When he invented Scenes, &c. 255
- Æsop*, the Fables which pass under his name a forgery, 429. Whether he left any in writing, 430. The ancientest of those we now have were published by Neveletus, 433. His statue made by Lysippus, 439. A great favourite with Croesus, *ib.*
- Æsop*, the Tragedian at Rome, eminent in his profession, 431
- Agatharchus* the first Painter of Scenes, 255, 256
- Agathias*, an epigram from, 439
- Agatho*, no Comic Poet of that name, 417
- Agathyrside*, a Samian Historian, a mistake for Agatharchides, 238
- Agrigentines* forbade their citizens wearing blue clothes, 158, *n.*
- Ἀκρότις, λαιός*, explained by Dr. Bentley, 145
- Alasa*, a Town in Sicily, 74
- Alexander* the Great, his munificence to Xenocrates, 427
- Alexis*, the Comic Poet, corrected, 28
- ΑΑΚΗΤΙΣ*, a Play of Thepis, a mistake, 171, 172
- Alsop* (Mr. *Anthony*) speaks of Dr. Bentley with great rudeness and contempt, 309. *n.*
- Allutius* believed the Epistles of Themistocles to be authentic, 391. First published those of Socrates, Xenophon, Aristippus, &c. 398. Corrected, 407
- Anacharsis*' Epistles forged in his name, 429
- Anacreon* illustrated, 445, 446
- Anapaestic* verses, their measures discovered, 94—104
- Anaxagoras* acquainted with Themistocles, 198
- Anaxilas*, king of Rhegium and Messana, 104—114
- Ἀπών*, a chariot of mules, when and by whom used at the Olympics, 112, 113
- Aphepsion*, or Apsephion, when Archon at Athens, 203
- Apollonides*, his sophistry exposed, 428
- Apuleius* explained, 50
- Archestratus*, the Syracusian, his age, 62. His verses rectified, *ibid.*
- Archilochus* corrected, 213. Archilochian verse the same with Saturnian, 162
- Aristolochian* verse a mistake, 163
- Aristophanes* corrected, 190, 191, 193, 215, 216. Explained, 214, 218. Cited, 430
- Aristotle*

- Aristotle* corrected, 189, 266. Noted, 27
- Aristoxenus*, ὁ Μουσικὸς, 276
- Asandrastus* a mistaken name, 113
- Astypalæa* no city of Crete, 225, 233, 234. An island of the Sporades, planted by the Megareans, 227. Ἀστυπάλαια, not Ἀστυάλη, 235
- Ἀθάνατον ὄργην μὴ φύλαττε, Σηκτός ὢν, whose saying, 139
- Athenæus* corrected, 62, 88, 107, 169, 170, 213, 216, 217, 253, 257. Explained, 79, 80, 81, 82, 85, 270. Defended, 88, 89. Discredits two passages in Plato, 399, 401. A story cited from him, 414
- Atossa*, the Persian empress, invented Epistles, 385. Her age, 386. Eaten by her son Xerxes, *ibid.*
- Ἀφελῶδης, an emendation of Dr. Bentley in Arcestratus, 62
- Attic* dialect, its rise and progress, 229, 281. New Attic, 284, 288, &c. Attic solæcisms, 229, 230
- Avienus* cited, 431.
- Babrius*, an excellent poet, 433. One of the latest age of good writers, 434
- Barnes* (Mr.) Reprehended by Dr. Bentley, 439
- Bentley* (Dr.) his letter to Mr. Wotton, 8; *n.* Ingenuously acknowledges a mistake, 303. Had no malignity against his adversaries, 309, *n.* A numerical mistake of his corrected, 340. *n.* An instance of his humanity, 413. His letter to Dr. Davies, on Barnes's Homer, 441. To M. Gacon, on Anacreon, 445. Some account of his Remarks on Collins, 448. Dr. B. corrected, 449
- Blue*, the livery of Phalaris, 158, *n.*
- Boyle* (Mr.) believed one part of his own book (as many others did the whole of it) to be unanswerable, 309, *n.*
- Callimachus*, a false emendation of him, — ill applied to Dr. Bentley, — corrected and explained, xxx
- Censorinus*, de Metris, corrected, 161, 162
- Κεφαλειῶδης explained, 62, 63
- Cephisophon*, what broke off his friendship with Euripides, 420
- Chalcidic* towns in Sicily, which, 263
- Charondas*, the Law-giver, his age, 261. No Thurian, 262. The Book of Laws extant under his name after the time of the Ptolemæes, an imposture, 249, 259, &c. Some of his true Laws, 264, 265, 266. His Laws in verse, and sung, 269, 270, 271
- Chorus*, Tragic, Comic, Cyclian; the expenses of each, 259, 260, 261
- Christ - Church men* frequently went out of their way to have a fling at Bentley, 305, *n.*
- Clarke* (Mr. William) corrects Gronovius and Dr. Bentley, 328, *n.*
- Clemens Alexandrinus* corrected, 39. Mistaken, 244. Deceived by a Play falsely ascribed to Thespis, 172
- Collins* (Mr.) was a pupil of Dr. Hare's, 448
- Comedy*, when invented, 142 — 150. At first extemporal, 142. Its first prizes, 149, Κωμῳδία, at first the common name of both Comedy and Tragedy, 222
- Cotemporary*, that word censured, xlv. 447
- Crates*, Epistles forged under his name, 429

- Κύλων** *χορὴς*, Dithyramb, 217
Cylon's conspiracy against the Pythagoreans, when, 52, 53
- Δαμαρέτιος ὄνομα**, the name of a coin, 330
- Δαμῶν ἴτατος**, whose expression, 154, 156
- Δαρίτιος χυρὸς**, corrupted for *δαμαρέτιος*, 331
- Δικάλιτρος**, what it was, 331, 334
- Demetrius Phalereus** made collections of Æsopian Fables, 431
- Democritus**, Epistles forged in his name, 429
- Demologus**, a false name for Dinolochus, 332
- Dinolochus**, a Sicilian Comic Poet, *ibid.*
- Diodorus Siculus** corrected, 203, 270, 271. Imposed on by a forgery of Zaleucus' Laws, 248, &c. By a forgery of Charondas' Laws, 258, &c. Why his authority preferable to that of common historians, 397
- Diodorus'** age, the Aspendian, 62
- Diogenes**, Epistles forged in his name, 429
- Diogenes Laërtius** corrected, 39, 48, Explained, 51, 58
- Dionysius I**, From his time, money was sunk to half value, so that 3 *Decalitra* made a Talent, 312, 316
- Dionysius Halicarnassensis** corrected, 380. A reading there defended, 42, 43
- Dioncorides** the Poet corrected, 165. His Epigrams published and corrected, 149, 166
- Dodwell** (Mr.) his opinion of Dr. Bentley, 448
- Dolon**, the inventor of Comedy, a mistake, 143, 149
- Ἐκκλησιμὸς** explained, 192
- Ἐλυσίος**, what it properly meant, 359, 360
- Empedocles** corrected, 48. His *Φυσικά* and *Καθαρμοὶ*, 274, 275
- Ephebi**, at what age, 30
- Epic Poem**, 286, 287
- Epicharmus**, Inventor of Comedy, 142, 143; and Horace accordingly makes it later than Tragedy, *ibid.* His age, 143. Corrected, 333, 334, 335
- Epigenes** the Sicyonian, the pretended inventor of Tragedy, 168, &c.
- Epigenes** cited by Athenæus, not the Sicyonian, but the Athenian Comic Poet, 169. His age, 170
- Epimenides** the Cretan, his age, 41
- Ἐριουμῆς**, instituted by Charondas, 267
- Eubulus**, the Comic Poet, explained, 85, 86
- Euripides**, the Epistles forged in his name extant in the time of Tiberius, 77. Corrected several times, 110, 102. His *Phœnissæ*, when acted, 253. Explained, 302, n. Letters forged under his name, 415. By whom written, *ibid.*
- Euseboneora**, a mistaken name for Eusebon Chora, 132
- Eustathius** used the Epitome of Athenæus, not the entire Book, 93, 94
- Festus Pompeius** corrected, 335, 336. Explained, 336. A reading there defended, 315, 327
- Forgeries**, some instances of them, 9, 10, 374, 375, 387, 429
- Fortunatianus Atilius** corrected, 162
- Freind** (Dr. John) wrote the Examination of Dr. Bentley's Dissertation on Æsop, 319, n.
- Gabrias** an indifferent poet, 433
- Gellius** corrected, 378

Gold,

- Gold**, anciently how scarce in Greece, 382
- Gorgias Leontinus**, the Sophist of Themistocles' time, 392
- Gronovius**, a mistake of his about the Talent, 328, *n.*
- Gunpowder**. When its use was first known, *xlviii, n.*
- Hare** (Bp.) anecdotes of, 448
- Ἡμύλιος**, 331, 334
- Hephæstion** explained, 23
- Heracleian cups**, a mistake, 81, 84
- Ἡράκλειος**, a cup that Hercules sailed in, 81
- Ἡρακλειῶτιδων σκύφος**, its etymology, 84
- Heraclides Ponticus** set out Tragedies in Thespis's name, 170
- Heraclitus**, Epistles forged under his name, 429
- Herodotus** explained, 211
- Hermippus** censured, 404
- Hesychius** corrected, 192. Cited, 431
- Ἡΐος**, 356, 359, 360
- Hierocles**, his saying against Epicurus restored, 378
- Hippias**, Tyrant of Athens, his death, 193
- Hippocrates**. Epistles forged under his name, 429
- Homer** corrected, 442, 443
- Jamblichus** censured, 33, 50, 61, 62. Corrected, 48, 52, 60, 61
- Isæus**, the Orator, corrected, 361, 267
- Justin** noted, 58
- Keil** (Dr.) went out of his way to reflect on Dr. Bentley, 305, *n.*
- King** (Dr. William) characterized by Dr. Bentley, *xvi.* Defended himself, *xvii, n.* And continued ridiculing Dr. Bentley in Dialogues of the Dead, &c. 309, *n.* Why compared to Rupilius, 447
- Κόσμος**, the World, first named so by Pythagoras, 254
- Λίγυραι**, what it implies, 86, 87
- Λιπταὶ καὶ παχύϊαι δραχμαὶ**, illustrated, 250
- Letters**, the *xxiv*, by whom perfected, 172, 173
- Libantus**, a positive witness against the authenticity of Socrates' Letters, 400
- Licensing Act**, 13 & 14 Car. II, illustrated, *xv, n.*
- Locrians** of Italy, their dialect, 256. Their Laws, &c. 244, 248
- Λόγος ἔργου συνή**, whose saying, 135, &c.
- Λοχεῖον ἄσμα**, in Athenæus, corrected, 258
- Lowth** (Bp.) cites Dr. Bentley, to confirm his opinion of the use of a participle, 159, *n.*
- Lysias** explained and corrected, 286. The date of one of his Orations, 287
- Lysis**, Præceptor to Epaminondas, not Scholar to Pythagoras, 55, 56, 57.
- Macrobius** corrected, 81
- Manilius**, an edition was preparing by Dr. Bentley in 1699, which was printed in 1739, after his death, *xxii.*
- Markland** (Mr.) explains Euripides, 302, *n.*
- Marmor Arundelianum** noted, 28, 29. Explained, 29, 30, 31. Its true reading restored, 146—149, 171, 172. Explained and defended, 177, &c.
- Μένδρι ἀμαρτίῃσι θιά**, whose saying, 379
- Melissus**, the Philosopher, an acquaintance of Themistocles, 198
- Mesatus**, an imaginary Comedian, 419
- Messana**,

- Messana*, a city of Sicily, when first named so, 104—121
- Meziriac* (M. de) wrote a Life of *Æsop*, 429
- Milner* (Mr.) wrote a View of the Controversy, &c. 449
- Μόσχ*®, a calf, the prize τῆς Κιθαροδίας, 218
- Mucianus Licinius* imposed upon by a forgery, 387, 388
- Μύθοι*, or *Μυθικά*, a sort of Elegiac Fables, 432
- Nævius* corrected, 162
- Νισομίλιντα γράμματα* explained, 166
- Νιστός*, Nestor's cup described by Homer, 82
- Nevel-tus* published the ancientest collection of *Æsopic* Fables now extant, 433
- Νεμωδός*, a word and office never heard of but in Strabo, 270
- Nonnus*, that wrote upon Greg. Nazianzen, not Nonnus the Poet, 17, 18. By others called Maximus, 18
- Nossis*, the Poetess, corrected, 256. Three of her epigrams, not published before, 256, 257. A Locrian, 256. Her age, Mother, Daughter, 336, 337
- Νῆμ*®, what that coin was, 335
- Ὄργανισμός*, what it was, 64
- Ὀγγία* explained, 337
- Παιδείας* explained, 285, 302
- Pausanias*, his account of Anaxilas and Messana refuted, 106—115
- Pearson* (Bp.) his opinion of Socrates' Epistles, 413
- Περικλυτοῦ ἀνδρὸς* explained, 329
- Περικλυσίων* explained, 336
- Periclyone*, the Pythagorean, a forgery, 275, 276
- Phædon*, when Archon at Athens, 203
- Phalaris*, his age, 20—35, 63, 64, 65. A Sicilian born, 231. Eat his own son, 369. His Bull, 367, 368. Himself burnt in it, 133, 134, 135. His Epistles published by Mr. Boyle, in 1695, vi. By whom mentioned, 12, 15. Spurious, but were extant in the time of Titus, 77
- Φιλόσοφ*®, who first called so, 157
- Phintia*, a city of Sicily, when built, 66, 70. Its situation, 68, 69
- Phintias*, Tyrant of Agrigentum, his age, 70, 71. ΦΙΝΤΙΑ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣΕ in a coin, explained, 71
- Phormis*, the inventor of Comedy, an officer of Gelo, the Syracusian, 143
- Photius*, in Bibliotheca, corrected, 277
- Phrynichus*, the Tragic Poet, his age, 183, 184. Μελωποῖς καὶ ὀρχηστὴς, 189, 194. But one Tragedian of his name, 289—194
- Phrynichus*, the Comic Poet, 188
- Phrynichus*, the Athenian General, 188
- Πίντυς* δικὴν ἐν τῇ Γαίᾳ, whose saying, 121—127
- Planudes* drew up a set of *Æsopic* Fables, 436, and wrote the Life of *Æsop*, 437. Had no foundation for describing him as ugly, 438, 439
- Plato* noted, 42, 168, 200. Explained, 42, 201
- Pliny*, the Historian, noted, 78, 384
- Plutarch* noted, 197, 198. Corrected, 202. Imposed on by Heraclides Ponticus, 175
- Pollux* corrected, 176, 192, 193, 267, 331, 332, 333, 337. Explained, 314. Deceived by a forged Tragedy, 176

- Polycrates*, Tyrant of Samos, his age, 44, 45
- Polygamy*. The allowance of it impolitic, 410
- Printing*, when and where invented, xlviii, n.
- Proclus*, in Platonis *Timæum*, corrected, 44, 45
- Προδιδῶμι* and *Διόνω*, the sense of those words mistaken by Dr. B. which gave matter of triumph to Mr. Boyle, 303
- Πρόνοια*, Divine Providence, whose word, 377
- Pythagoras*, his birth, death, and all the known periods of his life, his successors, &c. 34—63
- Roman Names of Monies* taken from the Sicilian, without varying the sense, 338—342
- Royal Library*. See *Licensing Act*
- Sabirius Pollo* forged the Letters of Aratus, 415; and of Euripides, *ibid.* 428
- Salmasius* noted, 334, 341
- Sannyrrio*, the Comic Poet, his age, 150
- Sara*, the Pythagorean, a mistake, 277
- Saturnian verse*, 162
- Scholiast* on Aristophanes interpolated, 15, 16. Censured, 188, 190, 191, 217, 429
- Scholiast* on Pindar corrected, 25, 108, 118
- Scylax* corrected, 235
- Sicilian Monies*, a large account of them, 308—346
- Simonides*, his Epigram explained, 30. Two of them now published and corrected, 218, 330, 331. His birth and death, 29, 30, 31. His victories, 217
- Smallridge* (Dr.) wrote the burlesque parody, to prove that Dr. Bentley could not be the author of the Dissertation, 309, n.
- Socrates*, his Epistles proved spurious, 399—414
- Socrates* the Philosopher, first put *Æsopic Fables* into verse, 431
- Solæcism* to put the Nominative for the Oblique Case, 230
- Solon*, his death, 196. His tables, and the language of them, 221, 222
- Sophocles* corrected thrice, 101
- Stage Plays*, none before the time of Thespis, though there were dramatic stories earlier, 168, n.
- Stationers' Company*. See *Licensing Act*
- Stephanus Byzantinus* explained, 268, 269
- Stesichorus*' age, 27, 28
- Stobæus* corrected, 238, 265. Explained, 276. Zaleucus' procemium there a forgery, 248, &c. Charondas' procemium another forgery, 272, &c.
- Στοιχείον*, *Element*, Plato's word, 377
- Strabo* explained, 270
- Suidas* corrected, 137, 170, 269, 331. Censured, 45, 188, 190, 199, 269. His age, 16. An evidence in behalf of Themistocles' Letters, 391. Mistaken by his interpreters, 417
- Susarion*, the inventor of Comedy, 144—151. His Iambics corrected, 144, 145. No Plays of his published, *ibid.*
- Syncellus* corrected, 37
- Τάλαλον* of Sicily, 314, 315, 326. How *Talentum magnum* distinguished from the *parvum*, 328
- Talents*, two of them a good portion for a substantial man's daughter, 417

- Taurominium**, a city of Sicily, when built, 127—135
- Taurion**, a bull, the prize of the Dithyramb, 218
- Temple** (Sir William) his argument for the genuineness of Phalaris, 18. His commendation of the Æsopic Fables censured, 429
- Tetras**, what it was, 336, 339, 340, 341. Tetrans, 340
- Themistocles**, by whom his Epistles were first printed, 391. Only one good writer mentions them, *ibid.* Arguments to prove them spurious, 391—397
- Theocritus** corrected, 318, 319
- Theophrastus** explained and corrected, 265
- Thericles**, a Corinthian Potter, 78, 90. His age, 78, 86
- Thericlean** cups, whose invention, 79, 87
- Thersias** or **Thersander**, the first victor at Olympia with the *Agôn*, 112, 113, 114
- Theseus**, his tomb at Athens, 202, 204
- Thespis**, the inventor of Tragedy, 165, &c. Published nothing in writing, 170. His Plays were all Satyric, *i. e.* the story of Bacchus; the Chorus consisted of Satyrs, and the argument was merry, 174. His age, 176, &c. *Ῥοχνηνός*, 190, 191. The Plays ascribed to him a forgery, *ibid.*
- Thurii**, a city of Italy, when built, 249. Whose colony, 267. Its Lawgiver, 264. Its Laws, 265
- Toup** (Mr.) Dr. Bentley's citations of Suidas corrected from him, 331, 334, 335
- Tragedy**, when invented, 160—223. At first was all Chorus, 199. One actor introduced by Thespis, *ibid.* Turned by Phrynichus and Æschylus to Fable and doleful Stories, 174. Æschylus added a second actor, Sophocles a third, 180. Others say Æschylus added a third, 200. The first subject of it, Bacchus and Satyrs, 174. *Tragœdia* never signified Comedy, 220, &c. The word no older than Thespis, 210, 212
- Τῆς*, explained, 336, 339, 340
- Tragœdia*, Comedy, never Tragedy, 214
- Tyrwhitt** (Mr.) his Dissertation on Babrius cited, 429, *n.*
- Tzetzes**, Joannes, corrected, 217
- Vavator** ascribes Æsop's Fables to Planudes, 429
- Vibius Sequester** corrected, 132
- Virgil**, Georg. explained, 208
- Vitruvius** explained, 341
- Upton** (Mr.) his opinion of the origin of Tragedy, 168, *n.*
- Warburton** (Bp.) his opinion of the Laws of Zaleucus, 243, *n.*
- Xenocles**, the Tragic Poet, 163
- Zaleucus**, the Locrian, suspected, 241, 242. His age, 244, 245. No Pythagorean, 242, 243, 246. His book of Laws extant after Ptolemee's time, a forgery, 246, 248—259

THE END.

~~~~~  
G. Auld, Printer, Greville Street, London.









