Dione, to cut off Kronus by deceit, whom Kronus taking, made wives of these sisters. Ouranos, understanding this, sent Eimarmene and Hore, Fate and Beauty, with other auxiliaries, to war against him ; but Kronus, having gained the affections of these also, kept them with himself. More­over, the god Ouranos devised Bætulia, contriving stones that moved as having life. But Kronus begat on Astarte seven daughters called Titanides or Artemides ; and he be­gat on Rhea seven sons, the youngest of whom, as soon as he was born, was consecrated a god. Also by Dione he had daughters, and by Astarte, moreover, two sons, Pothos and Eros, that is, Cupid and Love. But Dagon, after he had found out bread-corn, and the plough, was called Zeus Aratrius. To Sydyc, or the just, one of the Titanides bare Asclepius. Kronus had also in Peræa three sons, first, Kro­nus, his father’s namesake ; second, Zeus Belus ; and, third, Apollo.”

Is it conceivable, that a writer so acute as Porphyry, or indeed that any man of common sense, cither in his age or in that of Philo, would forge a book filled with such stories as these, in order to remove the Christian objections to the immoral characters of the Pagan divinities ? The very sup­position is impossible to be made. Nor let any one ima­gine that Sanchoniatho is here writing allegorically, and by his tales of Ouranos, and Gé, and Kronus, is only personi­fying the heaven, the earth, and time. On the contrary, he assures us, that Ouranos, or Epigeus, or Autochthon (for he gives him all these names), was the son of one Eliaun or Hypsistos, who dwelt about Byblus, and that from him the clement which is over us was called heaven, on account of its excellent beauty, as the earth was named Gé after his sister and wife. And his translator is very angry@@1 with the Neotoric Greeks, as he calls them, because that, “ by a great deal of force and straining, they laboured to turn all the stories of the gods into allegories and physical discourses.” This proves unanswerably that the author of this book, whoever he was, did not mean to veil the great truths of religion under the cloak of mythological allegories ; and therefore, if it was forged by Porphyry in support of Pa­ganism, the forger so far mistook the state of the question between him and his adversaries, that he contrived a book, which, if admitted to be ancient, totally overthrew his own cause.

The next thing to be inquired into with respect to San­choniatho is his antiquity. Did he really live and wτite at so early a period as Porphyry and Philo pretend ? We think he did not ; and what contributes not a little to confirm us in our opinion, is that mark of national vanity and partiality, common to after-times, in making the sacred mysteries of his own country original, and conveyed from Phoenicia into Egypt. This, however, furnishes an additional proof that Porphyry was not the forger of the work ; for he well knew that the mysteries had their origin in Egypt (see Mys­teries), and would not have fallen into such a blunder. He is guilty, indeed, of a very great anachronism, when he makes Sanchoniatho contemporary with Semiramis, and yet pretends that what he writes of the Jews is compiled from the records of Hierombalus the priest of the god Jao ; for Bochart has made it appear in the highest degree probable,@@2 that Hierombalus or Jeromb-baal is the Jerub-baal or Gi­deon of Scripture.

Between the reign of Semiramis and the Trojan war a period elapsed of near eight hundred years, whereas Gideon flourished not above seventy years before the destruction of Troy. But supposing Sanchoniatho to have really con­sulted the records of Gideon, it by no means follows that he flourished at the same period with that judge of Israel. He speaks of the building of Tyre as an ancient thing, while our best chronologers@@’ place it in the time of Gideon.

Indeed, were we certain that any writings had been left by that holy man, we should be obliged to conclude, that a large tract of time had intervened between the death of their author and their falling into the hands of Sanchonia­tho ; for, surely, they could not, in a short period, have been so completely corrupted as to give any countenance to his impious absurdities. His atheistic cosmogony he does not indeed pretend to have got from the annals of the priest of Jao, but from records which were deposited in his own town of Berytus by Thoth, a Phoenician philosopher, who was afterwards made king of Egypt. But surely the annals of Gideon, if written by himself, and preserved pure to the days of Sanchoniatho, must have contained so many truths of the Mosaic religion, as must have prevented any man of sense from adopting so impossible a theory as Thoth’s, al­though sanctioned by the greatest name of profane anti­quity. Stillingfleet indeed thinks it most probable that Sanchoniatho became acquainted with the most remarkable passages of the life of Jerub-baal from annals written, by a Phœnician pen. He observes, that immediately after the death of Gideon, the Israelites, with their usual proneness to idolatry, worshipped Baal-berith, or the idol of Berytus, the town in which Sanchoniatho lived ; and from this cir­cumstance he concludes, that there must have been such an intercourse between the Hebrews and Berytians, that in pro­cess of time the latter people might assume to themselves the Jerub-baal of the former, and hand down his actions to posterity as those of a priest instead of a great commander. All this may be true ; but if so, it amounts to a demonstra­tion that the antiquity of Sanchoniatho is not so high by many ages as that which is claimed for him by Philo and Porphyry; though he may still be more ancient, as we think Vossius has proved him to be, than any other profane his­torian whose writings have come down to us either entire or in fragments.

But granting the authenticity of Sanchoniatho’s history, what, it may be asked, is the value of his fragments, that we should be at any trouble to ascertain whether they be genuine remains of high antiquity, or the forgeries of a mo­dern impostor ? We answer, with the illustrious Stiilling- fleet, that though these fragments contain such absurdities as it would be a disgrace to reason to suppose credible, though the whole cosmogony is the grossest sink of atheism, and though many persons make a figure in the history, whose very existence may well be doubted ; yet we, who have in our hands the light of divine revelation, may in this dungeon discover many excellent relics of ancient tradition, which throw’ no feeble light upon many passages of holy scripture, as they give us the origin and progress oif that idolatry which was so long the opprobrium of human na­ture. ’ They furnish, too, a complete refutation of the extra­vagant chronology of the Chaîdæans and Egyptians, and show, if they be genuine, that the world is indeed not older than it is said to be by Moses.

SANCOT, a town of Hindustan, in the province of Se- rinagur, situated in a well-cultivated and fertile country. It is tributary to the Ghoorkali rajah of Nepaul. Many of the inhabitants are affected with tumours in their neck.

SANCROFT, WILLIAM, archbishop of Canterbury, was born at Fresingfield in Suffolk in 1616, and admitted into Emanuel College, Cambridge, in 1633. In 1642 he was elected a fellow ; but was ejected from his fellowship for re­fusing to take the covenant. In 1660 he was chosen one of the university preachers, and in 1663 was nominated to the deanery of York. In 1664 he was installed dean of St Paul’s. In this situation he set himself with unwearied diligence to repair the cathedral, till the fire of London in 1666 em­ployed his thoughts on the more noble undertaking of re­building it, to which he gave L.1400. He also rebuilt the

@@@, Apud Euscbium, *Praep. Evang.* lib. i. cap. vi.

*@@@’ Geogr. Sac.* p. 2, book ii. lib. ii. cap. xvii.\

@@@’ Scaliger.