been tranſlated into the Greek language, and made ge­nerally known; and there is nothing in the work itſelf, or at leaſt in thoſe parts of it which he has preſerved, that could induce a wife and good man to obtrude it upon the public as genuine, had he himſelf ſuſpected it to be ſpurious. Too many of the Chriſtian fathers were indeed very credulous, and ready to admit the authenti­city of writings without duly weighing the merits of their claim; but then ſuch writings were always belie­ved to be favourable to the Chriſtian cauſe, and inimical to the cauſe of Paganiſm. That no man of common ſenſe could ſuppoſe the coſmogony of Sanchoniatho fa­vourable to the cauſe of revealed religion, a farther proof cannot be requiſite than what is furniſhed by the following extract.

“He ſuppoſeth, or affirms, that the principles of the univerſe was a dark and windy air, or a wind made of dark air, and a turbulent evening *chaos;* and that theſe things were boundleſs, and for a long time had no bound or figure. But when this wind fell in love with his own principles, and a mixture was made, that mix­ture was called *deſire* or *cupid (ποϐος).*

“This mixture completed, was the beginning of the (χτισεως) making of all things. But that wind did not know its own production; and of this, with that wind, was begotten *Mot,* which ſome call *Mud,* others the putrefaction of a watery mixture. And of this came all the ſeed of this building, and the generation of the univerſe.

“But there were certain animals, which had no ſenſe, out of which were begotten intelligent animals, and were called *Zopheſemin,* that is, the ſpies or overſeers of Hea­ven; and were formed alike in the ſhape of an egg. Thus ſhone out *Mot,* the fun and the moon, the leſs and the greater ſtars.

“And the air ſhining thoroughly with light, by its fiery influence on the ſea and earth, winds were begot­ten, and clouds and great defluxions of the heavenly wa­ters. And when all theſe things firſt were parted, and were ſeparated from their proper place by the heat of the ſun, and then all met again in the air, and daſhed againſt one another, and were ſo broken to pieces; whence thunders and lightenings were made: and at the ſtroke of theſe thunders the fore-mentioned intelli­gent animals were awakened, and frighted with the found; and male and female ſtirred in the earth and in the ſea: This is their generation of animals.

“After theſe things our author (Sanchoniatho) goes on ſaying: Theſe things are written in the *Coſmogony* of *Taautus,* and in his memoirs; and out of the conjectures, and ſurer natural ſigns which his mind ſaw, and found out, and wherewith he hath enlightened us.

“Afterwards declaring the names of the winds, *north and ſouth* and the reft, he makes this epilogue. 'But theſe firſt men conſecrated the plants ſhooting out of the earth, and judged them gods, and worſhipped them; upon whom they themſelves lived, and all their poſterity and all before them: to theſe they made their meat and drink offerings. ’ Then he concludes: "theſe were the devices of worſhip agreeing with the weakneſs and want of boldneſs in their minds.”

Let us ſuppoſe Euſebius to have been as weak and credulous as the darkeſt monk in the darkeſt age of Europe, a ſuppoſition which no man will make who knows any thing of the writings of that eminent hiſto

rian; what could he fee in this ſenſeleſs jargon, which even a dreaming monk would think of employing in ſupport of Chriſtianity? Euſebius calls it, and calls it truly, direct atheiſm; but could he imagine that an ancient ſyſtem of atheiſm would contribute ſo much to make the Pagans of his age admit as divine revelations the books of the Old and New Teſtaments, that he ſhould be induced to adopt, without examination, an impudent forgery not 200 years old as genuine remains of the moſt remote antiquity?

If this Phenician coſmogony be a fabrication of Por­phyry, or of the pretended tranſlator, it muſt ſurely have been fabricated for ſome purpoſe; but it is impoſſible for us to conceive what purpoſe either of theſe writers could have intended to ſerve by forging a ſyſtem ſo extrava­gantly abſurd. Porphyry, though an enemy to the Chriſtians, was not an atheiſt, and would never have thought of making an atheiſt of him whom he meant to obtrude upon the world as the rival of Moſes. His own principles were thoſe of the Alexandrian Platoniſts; and had he been the forger of the works which bear the name of Sanchoniatho, inſtead of the incomprehenſible jargon about *dark wind, evening chaos, Mot,* the *overſeers oſ heaven in the ſhape oſ an egg,* and *animation proceeding from the found oſ thunder,* we ſhould doubtleſs have been amuſed with refined ſpeculations concerning the operations of the *Demiurgus* and the other perſons in the Platonic Triad. See Platonism and Porphy­ry.

Father Simon of the oratory imagines @@\* that the purpoſe for which the hiſtory of Sanchoniatho was forged, was to ſupport Paganiſm, by taking from it its mythology and allegories, which were perpetually ob­jected to it by the Chriſtian writers; but this learned man totally miſtakes the matter. The primitive Chri­ſtians were too much attached to allegories themſelves to reſt their objections to Paganiſm on ſuch a founda­tion: what they objected to that ſyſtem was the immo­ral ſtories told of the gods. To this the Pagan prieſts and philoſophers replied, that theſe ſtories were only *mythologic allegories,* which veiled all the great truths of Theology, Ethics, and Phyſics. The Chriſtians ſaid, this could not be; for that the ſtories of the gods had a ſubſtantial foundation in fact, theſe gods being only dead men deified, who, in life, had like paſſions and in­firmities with other mortals. This then was the objec­tion which the forger of the works of Sanchoniatho had to remove, if he really forged them in ſupport of Paganiſm; but, inſtead of doing ſo, he gives the genea­logy and hiſtory of all the greater gods, and ſhows, that they were men deified after death for the exploits, ſome of them groſsly immoral, which they had performed **in** this world. We have elſewhere (Polytheism, n⁰ 17.) given his account of the deification of *Chryſor,* and *Ouranos,* and Ge, and *Hypſiſtos,* and *Muth;* but our rea­ders may not perhaps be ill pleaſed to accompany him through the hiſtory of *Ouranos* and *Cronus,* two of his greateſt gods; whence it will appear how little his wri­tings are calculated to ſupport the tottering cauſe of Paganiſm againſt the objections which were then urged to it by the Chriſtian apologiſts.

“Ouranos (ſays he), taking the kingdom of his father, married Ge his ſiſter, and by her had four ſons; *Ilus,* who is called *Cronus; Betylus; Dagon,* who is ***Siton, or*** the *god oſ corn;* and *Atlas.* But by other wives

@@@ [m] \*Bib. Cri. vol. i. p. 140.