verſions and notes of M. Damer. Sanadon tranſlated with elegance and taſte; but he has not preſerved the ſublimity of the original in the odes, nor the energy and preciſion in the epiſtles and ſatires. In general, his verſion is rather a paraphraſe than a faithful tranſlation. Learned men have juſtly cenſured him for the liberty which he has taken in making conſiderable changes in the order and ſtructure of the odes. He has alſo given offence by his uncouth orthography. 3. A Collection of Diſcourſes delivered at different times, which afford ſtrong proofs of his knowledge of oratory and poetry. 4. A book entitled *Prieres et Inſtructions Chretiennes.*

SANBALLAT, the chief or governor of the Cuthites or Samaritans, was always a great enemy to the Jews. He was a native of Horon, or Horonaim, a city beyond Jordan, in the country of the Moabites. He lived in the time of Nehemiah, who was his great opponent, and from whoſe book we learn his hiſtory. There is one circumſtance related of him which has occaſioned ſome diſpute among the learned; and the ſtate of the queſtion is as follows: When Alexander the Great came into Phoenicia, and ſat down before the city of Tyre, Sanballat quitted the intereſts of Darius king of Perſia, and went at the head of 8000 men to offer his ſervice to Alexander. This prince readily en­tertained him, and being much ſolicited by him, gave him leave to erect a temple upon mount Gerizim, where he conſtituted his ſon-in-law Manaſſeh the high-prieſt. But this ſtory carries a flagrant anachroniſm: for 120 years before this, that is, in the year of the world 3550, Sanballat was governor of Samaria; wherefore the learned Dr Prideaux (in his Connection of the Hi- ſtories of the Old and New Teſtament) ſuppoſes two Sanballats, and endeavours to reconcile it to truth and probability, by ſhowing it to be a miſtake of Joſephus. This author makes Sanballat to flouriſh in the time of Dari us Codomannus, and to build his temple upon mount Gerizim by licence from Alexander the Great; whereas it was performed by leave from Darius No­thus, in the 15th year of his reign. This takes away the difficulty ariſing from the great age of Sanballat, and brings him to be contemporary with Nehemiah, as the Scripture hiſtory requires.

SANCHEZ (François), called in Latin *Sanctius,* was of Las Brocas in Spain, and has been dignified by his own countrymen with the pompous titles of le *Pere de la Langue Latine, et le Docteur de tous les Gens-de-lettres.* He wrote, 1. n excellent treatiſe intitled Minerva, or *de Cauſis Linguae Latinae,* which was publiſhed at Amſterdam in 1714, in 8vo. The authors of the *Portroyal Methode de la Langue Latine* have been much indebted to this work. 2. The Art of Speaking, and the Me­thod of tranſlating Authors. 3. Several other learned pieces on grammar. He died in the year 1600, in his 77th year.

We mull be careful to diſtinguiſh him from another *François Sanchez,* who died at Toulouſe in 1632. This laſt was a Portugueſe phyſician who fettled at Toulouſe, and, though a Chriſtian, was born of Jewiſh parents. He is ſaid to have been a man of genius and a philoſopher. His works have been collected under the title of *Opera Medica. His juncti ſunt tractatus quidam philosophiri non inſubtiles.* They were printed at Toulouſe in 1636.

SANCHONIATHO, a Phenician philoſopher and hiſtorian, who is ſaid to have flouriſhed before the Tro­jan war about the time of Semiramis. Of this moſt ancient writer, the only remains extant are ſundry frag­ments of coſmogony, and of the hiſtory of the gods and firſt mortals, preſerved by Euſebius and Theodoret; both of whom ſpeak of Sancho niatho as an accurate and faithful hiſtorian; and the former adds, that his work, which was tranſlated by Philo-Byblitis from the Phenician into the Greek language, contains many things relating to the hiſtory of the Jews which de­ferve great credit, both becauſe they agree with the Jewiſh writers, and becauſe the author received theſe particulars from the annals of Hierombalus, a prieſt of the god Jao.

Several modern writers, however, of great learning, have called in queſtion the very exiſtence of Sanchoniatho, and have contended with much plauſibility, that the fragments which Euſebius adopted as genuine upon the authority of Porphyry, were forged by that author, or the pretended tranſlator Philo, from enmity to the Chriſtians, and that the Pagans might have ſomething to ſhow of equal antiquity with the books of Moſes. Theſe oppoſite opinions have produced a controversy that has filled volumes, and of which our limits would hardly admit of an abſtract. We ſhall therefore in few words ſtate what to us appears to be the truth, and refer ſuch of our readers as are deſirous of fuller information to the works of the authors @@(a) mentioned at the bot­tom of the page.

The controverſy reſpecting Sanchoniatho reſolves itſelf into two queſtions: 1. Was there in reality ſuch a writer? 2. Was he of the very remote antiquity which his tranſlator claims for him?

That there was really ſuch a writer, and that the fragments preſerved by Euſebius are indeed parts of his hiſtory interpolated perhaps by the tranſlator @@(b), we are compelled to believe by the following reaſons. Euſebius, who admitted them into his work as authentic, was one of the moſt learned men of his age, and a dili­gent ſearcher into antiquity. His conduct at the Nicene council ſhows, that on every ſubject he thought for himſelf, neither biaſſed by authority to the one fide, nor carried over by the rage of innovation to the other. He had better means than any modern writer can have of ſatisfying himſelf with reſpect to the authenticity of a very extraordinary work, which had then but lately

@@@(a) Bochart, Scaliger, Voſſius, Cumberland, Dodwell, Stillingfleet, Moſheim’s Cudworth, and Warburton.

@@@(b) Of this there are indeed ſeveral proofs. Philo makes Sanchoniatho ſpeak of *Byblus* as the moſt ancient

city of Phenicia, which, in all probability, it was not. We read in the book of Judges of *Berith* or *Berytus,* the city where Sanchoniatho himſelf lived; but not of Byblus, which was the native city of Philo, and to which he is therefore partial. He makes him likewiſe talk of the Greeks at a period long before any of the Grecian ſtates were known or probably peopled.