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 ; and 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 *Prières et Instructions chrétiennes.*

SANASHYGOTTA, a flourishing town of Bengal, in the district of Purneah, on the Mahanuddy river, much frequented by Hindu pilgrims on their route to the places of ablution in the Northern Mountains, from which circum­stance it takes its name. Long. 88. 32. E. Lat. 26. 35. N.

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. 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 eight thousand 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 with it a flagrant ana­chronism. For a hundred and twenty years before this, that is, in the year of the world 3550, Sanballat was governor of Samaria ; wherefore Dr Prideaux, in his Connexion of the Histories 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 Darius Codomannus, and to build his temple upon Mount Gerizim by license from Alexander the Great ; whereas it was per­formed by leave from Darius Nothus, in the fifteenth 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.

SANCERRE, an arrondissement of the department of the Cher, in France, extending over 209,684 hectares, equal to 819 square miles. It comprehends eight cantons, and seventy-six communes, and in 1836 the inhabitants amount­ed to 70,907. The capital is the city of the same name, upon an elevation rising from the river Loire. In 1836 it contained 3482 inhabitants, who are chiefly employed in making hats and hosiery, and in working some marble quar­ries in the neighbourhood. Long. 2. 45. 15. E. Lat. 47. 16. 53. N.

SANCHEZ, François, called in Latin *Sanctius,* was a native of Las Brocas, in Spain, and has been dignified by his own countrymen with the pompous titles of father of the Latin language and doctor of all kinds of letters. He wrote, 1. An excellent treatise entitled Minerva, or *Be cau­sis Linguæ Latinae,* which was published at Amsterdam in 1714, in 8vo; 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 seventy-seventh year.

We must be careful to distinguish this author from an­other François Sanchez, who died at Toulouse in 1632. This last was a Portuguese physician, who settled 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.* They were printed at Toulouse in 1636.

SANCHONIATHO, a Phoenician philosopher and his­torian, who is said to have flourished before the Trojan war, and about the time of Semiramis. Of this most ancient writer the only remains extant are various fragments of cosmogony, and of the history of the gods and first mortals, preserved by Eusebius and Theodoret, both of whom speak of Sanchoniatho as an accurate and faithful historian ; and the former adds, that his work, which was translated by Philo-Byblius from the Phœnician into the Greek language, contains many things relating to the history of the Jews which deserve 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 of great learning, however, 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 by 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 appears to us to be the truth, and refer such of our readers as are desirous of fuller information to the works of the authors mentioned below.@@1

The controversy respecting Sanchoniatho resolves itself into two questions : First, was there in reality such a writer ? and, second, was he of the very remote antiquity which his translator claims for him ?

Now 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, we are com­pelled to believe by the following reasons.@@2 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 on the one side, nor carried over by the rage of innovation on 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 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 wise 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 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, further proof cannot be requisite than what is fur­nished by the following extract.

“ He supposes, or affirms, that the principles of the uni­verse were 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.

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

@@@, Of these indeed there are several proofs. Philo makes Sanchoniatho speak of Byblus as the most ancient city of Phoenicia, which, in all probability, it was not. We read in the book of Judges of Berith or Berytus, the city where Sunchoniatho 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.