

all which preceded their arrival could only have been preserved in very confused traditions, and could have been only supplied by unfounded inventions, similar to those of the monks of the middle age concerning the origin of the nations of Europe.

Thus, not only we should not be astonished that, even in ancient times, there should have existed many doubts and contradictions on the epochs of Cecrops, Deucalion, Cadmus, and Danaus; not only would it be childish to attach the least importance to any one opinion concerning the precise dates of Inachus(1) or Ogyges;(2) but, if any thing could surprise us, it is that these personages have not been made from remote antiquity. There must have been some weight in the received traditions which the inventors of fables could not do away with. One of the dates assigned to the deluge of Ogyges agrees so accurately with one that had been mentioned as the period of the deluge of Noah, that it is almost impossible but that it must have been derived from some source by which this latter deluge must have been intended.(3)

of primitive history of Greece; but when we read of the genealogies of the Arabians and Tartars, and all that the monkish chronologists have invented for the different European monarchs, and some in particular,—we easily comprehend that the Greek writers must have done for the early time of their nation what has been done at all other epochs, when criticism had not given its lights to history.

(1) 1856 or 1823 before Christ, and other dates, have been fixed; but always about 350 years before the principal Phœnician or Egyptian colonies.

(2) The common date of Ogyges, according to Acusilaus and Eusebius, is 1796 years before Christ, consequently many years after Inachus.

(3) Varro placed the deluge of Ogyges, which he calls the first