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THE PREFACE.

Wherein is occasionally shown The Unreasonableness, and Groundlesness of a Late Writer (a), His calling in Question the Accomplishment of this PROPHET, In the Litteral, and Primary Sense of it.

HERE having been formerly set forth a brief Exposition of the Seventy Weeks of the Prophecy of Daniel in the Chronological Tables, (b) by me published under the Direction of the late Bishop LLOYD (c), and there having been also giv'n to the Publick by the late Dr. Prideaux (d), a very elaborate, but in all respects a very different Exposition of these Weeks, and since that also a third Hypothensis of them by the Reverend Mr. Lancaster (e), It hath been therefore thought by some incumbent on me to appear in vindication of the late Bishop's Hypothesis of these Weeks: Especially as to them the same hath appeared on all accounts to approve it self infinitely beyond either Mr. Lancaster's, or even Dr. Prideaux's; or indeed any other Hypothesis that ever was yet extant of the said Seventy Weeks.

(a) Of a Book entitl'd, A Discourse of the Grounds, and Reasons of the Christian Religion. (b) These Tables were Printed at Oxford in the Year 1714. (c) Bishop of Worcester. (d) In Con. Hist. Vol. I. p. 262, &c. (e) In his Chron. Essay on the Seventy Weeks.
And as in order thereunto I was at the first thus encouraged, and persuaded to draw up the following Treatise; so now by their Approbation of it, I am prevailed with to let it go Abroad into the World.

I do so, however not without some reluctancy, by reason of the method which I have here us'd: whereby, while I am paying a just deference to the consummate Judgment of the deceased Bishop, I may yet be thought to be wanting in respect, and good manners to the Living (f), or the now deceased (g).

But were it really so with me, I should be still very unwilling thus to appear in Publick. — I do sincerely profess that I retain a most just value for the memory of the learned Dr. Prideaux. And if I did not, I should be singular from all Mankind. His other (h) useful Labours challenge an universal Esteem: more particularly do his late Books just now refer'd to; Collections thereof so valuable, that 'twere almost a Crime, 'tis doubtless a piece of self-injury, for a Man of Learning to be without them. But this particular (i) part of it I must, and do except against: as I have done equally against Mr. Lancaster's Essay on these Weeks.

I persuade my self, that he will however pardon me the liberty that I have taken with his Essay. 'Tis no more than I have done with Dr. Prideaux's Hypothesis also. And I am therefore the more inclin'd to promise my self that he will take it no otherwise than in good part.

I have aimed as much as possibly I could, at a fair and exact View, or Representation of the several Hypotheses under Examination: being no otherwise concerned in favour of the late learned Bishop's, than as zealous of Truth; and therefore zealous of this Hypothesis, its appearing in a much clearer, and consequent fuller Light, than it was possible for it to appear in, when set forth only as above in a compendious Chronology.

(f) Mr. Lancaster. (g) Dr. Prideaux. N. B. The Reader will find that the greatest part of this Treatise was printed off before Dr. Prideaux's Death, as he is here often mention'd as Mr. Dean of Norwich. It is therefore desirable that in such mention made of Dr. Prideaux, he will always understand the late Mr. Dean of Norwich.

(h) Life of Mahomer, the Marm. Arundeliana published by him; and other useful Tracts written by him.

(i) P. from p. 269, &c. so far as he treats of these Weeks.
I will not say but that this might have been done in another Method, and without any the least regard had to the other Hypotheses here concern'd. But so much as such is the nature of some things, that they are illustrated by Comparison, and so I think it is very much in the Case before us; I could not therefore but fall into this Method; in order to shew with respect to Dr. Prideaux's Hypothesis, the manifest Failings, and Imperfections of his figurative Sense, and Accomplishment of the express Characters of this Prophecy; and with respect to the late Bishop Lloyd's, to support and establish his literal Sense of them.

Nor was this Method less necessary with respect to Mr. Lancaster's Hypothesis also: As his coming forth after the other two, and especially as being exceedingly different from them in every respect, ought also to have exceeded them in Truth, and Perfection. Both of them came forth after the late Bishop's. And yet how short of his they are both of them, I leave with the unprejudiced Reader.

I will however here be bold to say it, for 'tis what will surely be made out in the ensuing Treatise, that both Mr. Lancaster's, and also Dr. Prideaux's Hypothesis of these Weeks are demonstrably inconsistent both with the express Letter of this Prophecy in point of Exposition, and also with Ptolemy's Canon in point of Time, or of their respectively and expressly assigned Accomplishments of the several parts of it.

On the other hand, as to the Hypothesis here established, which in a small Point only excepted (k) entirely owes it's Original to the late Bishop Lloyd, it will be found to have this twofold Harmony peculiarly recommending it, which never had any Hypothesis of these Weeks yet extant: and without which no Hypothesis of them can rationally, and unexceptionably recommend it self: and that is it's entire Agreement both with Scripture, and with this Canon.

I have, I hope, fully made good this Assertion in the following Treatise, in every Part, or Period, of this solemn

(k) Fix, the late Bishop his Ending the Seven Weeks in the Prophet Malachi's writing his Book at the distance of Seven Weeks, or forty nine Years from the going forth of the Commandment to rebuild Jerusalem in the twentieth Year of Artaxerxes (Longimannus) King of Persia: As to which see p. 167, in the ensuing Treatise.
Prophecy: taking every therein predicted Event in its plain, natural, and easy Sense, and evident Series of Order, as there lying before us. And if this be not a rational way of proceeding here, and indeed the only way for us to know, and understand, as in the Prophecy (l) we are expressly directed, no doubt both for our greater Attention, and Encouragement in order to attain unto the Knowledge, and Understanding of it, I am truly at a loss to say, or even to conceive what is so. But if this be allowed, and upon rational Principles it cannot be disallowed, then I am not without hopes that I have made good the Assertion: As especially

In that momentous (m) part of it, which relates immediately to our blessed Redeemer, and to the precise time of his Sufferings, in the Prophecy (n) signified to us by the cutting off of the Messiah after the seven Weeks, and threescore and two Weeks therein appointed for it, so also

In the two different Fates of the Holy City, after the Babylonish Captivity, the predicted Restoration of her Buildings to the condition they were in before her Destruction by the Babylonians (o), and again her final Subversion long after by the Romans (p), as also predicted in the Prophecy: the former within the first Period of it, or the first Seven Weeks thereof (q); the latter in the separate one Week (r), or last of the Seventy Weeks of this Prophecy. And this latter Event, viz. the final Destruction of Jerusalem in the said Week had its general Accomplishment, and the several Express Characters of it had their particular Completion also most truly, and exactly; as these things may be seen at large in their proper Places hereafter; and in their OBVIOUS, and LITERAL Sense, and unquestionably also in their PRIMARY Sense: However this be doubted, if not insidiously denied by a late Writer (s) in consequence of his daring, but groundless Assertion of there being

(l) Dan. ix. 25.  
(m) It is of great Moment for the Conviction of Jews and other Infidels, who reject the Faith of Christ, to have this Prophecy well clear'd, and made out: for the Conversion of the Jews especially, as this Prophecy doth relate primarily, and especially to them. [Prin. Con. Hist. Vol. L. p. 262.]  
(o) When they destroyed the City, and Temple in the 11th of Zedekiah, and in the Year before Christ, 588.  
(p) Under Titus in the Year of Christ 70.  
(q) Dan. ix. 25. See Note. (d) in p. 3. In the ensuing Treatise.  
(r) Dan. ix. 27.  
(s) Of a Book already mention'd.
being no manner of Con- nection (i) between the Old, and New Testament, as to Prophecies cited from the former, and said to be fulfilled in the latter.

This, faith that Writer, (x) (viz. his pretended) Incon- sistency is thrown to the hands of the Jews, and other Enemies of Christianity by the most learned Men of the Christian Church; who according to Mr. Whiston have taken no small pains to show, that the Apostles Arguments from the Old Testament are not grounded on the literal Sense thereof. Grotius shows this of most, if not all, of the Prophecies, and Citations quoted from the Old in the New Testament: DODWEL, in a posthumous (u) Work, does (with the learned (w) Sir JOHN MARSHAM) refer even the famous Prophecy in DANIEL about the Weeks, to the times of Antiochus Epiphanes; wherein he shows, that the Expressions taken from thence by (x) CHRIST, and urg'd by him as substantiating the Destruction of Jerusalem by the Romains, have only in a Secondary Sense, a respect to that Destruction.

It is beside my present Purpose here to look into what Mr. Whiston, or this Writer, and Others by either of them quoted one way or t'other have said on this general Occasion. And I am sufficiently prevented, as this Affair hath been already manag'd by (y) infinitely abler, and better Hands. I need only to take upon my self, with respect to Daniel's Weeks, and so much indeed concerns me, viz. to remark how fallaciously, or otherwise how triflingly this Writer hath dealt with his Reader in what he may have either slily infinuated, or plainly said here relating to the Authorities now quoted.

First, As to Grotius, What hath he said as to the accomplishment of this part of the Prophecy? —— Hath he refer'd it to the Destruction of Jerusalem by the Roman only in a Secondary Sense? —— So far from it, that he hath actually referred the Expressions taken by our blessed Saviour (z) from the Prophet Daniel immediately, and primarily to that Destruction. He (a) hath positively told

(y) Especially by the most learned Bishop Chandler, in his Defence of Christianity.  6c.    (z) In Mat. xxiv. 15.    (a) In Mat. xxiv. 15. In these Words, refexic

Chritus ad Daniel ix. 27.
told us that Christ had regard here to Daniel ix. 27. In other Places (b) of Daniel, he faith, We grant to the Jews, (and we do so likewise to this Writer,) the Prophet treats of the times of Antiochus Epiphanes, but not so here.—

Grotius (c) goes on to expose the great absurdity of the modern Jews, their referring this (a) place of Daniel to the times of Antiochus: Whereas the ancient Jews, as he also (c) tells us, understood it of the Destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans.

This Writer therefore plainly laid a snare here for his Readers, if when quoting Grotius immediately before, as shewing his (this Writer's) pretended INCONSISTENCY in MOST, if not ALL, of the Prophecies and Citations quoted from the Old in the New Testament, he meant to pooffess them with a Notion, as if this Prophecy also were among the All, or the Most there spoken of. Grotius hath evidently shewn the contrary. And therefore this Prophecy, 'tis plain, how many more I know not, must be excepted. And had this Writer dealt fairly and ingenuously by his Readers, he ought to have told them at least as much as this, when from his general Quotation immediately preceding from Grotius, he drops next upon this particular Prophecy, without any more of Grotius; but the only Men with him now are Sir John Marsham, and Mr. Dodwell.

I do therefore for that Writer, except Grotius's Authority here: and I desire that it may stand against Sir John Marsham's, and Mr. Dodwell's in this particular.

But if his single Testimony be not sufficient, I have many others (f) at his Service: I throw in here Light-

(b) Viz. Ch. xi. 31. and xii. 11. His locis de Antiocho agi concedimus Judaeis. [Ib.]
— aeq; adeo [φήμι] ibi effe Idolum Jovis Olympii quod Antiochus in Templo collocaverat: [Grot. Aen, Cap.,] quodque Scriptor 1 Mac. loco hac Danielis respons. nunc ut demolirem

cum Ephesios. [Grot. ib.]

(c) Quem locum, viz. Dan. ix. 27; ad Antiochum frustra vabat Hebræi, cum Hebdomades ibi nominata dieum non possit intelligi, etsi enim multum sita Antiochii tempora confiderunt, & Annonem Optimam multum ultra Antiochum procuravat, a qua, cum, tandem reformato Urbiis, aut Templi Edificio memorans, di exordium sumpsit. Alias autem Hebdomades Hebræus Ufias non agnosit. [Ib.]

(d) Dan. ix. 27.


(f) Capellus, Erasmus, Gerharidis, Jaminus, Piscator. [V. Pol. Syn. in Matt. xxiv. 15.]
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Rightfoot (g), and especially our truly learned, and judicious Mr. Mede (b), and the late Bishop (i) Lloyd.

And therefore what though we are told by this Writer, that Sir John Marsham formerly, and Mr. Dodwel since, have referred even the famous Prophecy in DANIEL, about the Weeks to the times of ANTIOCHUS EPIPHANES, and that therefore the EXPRESSIONS taken from thence by (our Saviour) Christ, and urged by him as foretelling the Destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, have only in a SECONDARY Sense, a respect to that Destruction?

Have they shewed it in the Primary?

First, Hath Sir J. M. shewn this? —— He hath attempted it if this Writer will; but how vainly, with the Reader's leave I shall soon shew.

I have occasionally noted some of the many that learned Gentleman's Absurdities in this particular, (truly unworthy of him as he was a Gentleman of great Learning) as the Reader will find in the ensuing Treatise, when I had not the least thought of the flagrant occasion which this Writer hath given since. He therefore calls for more at our Hands, and let him take them if he will as some (k) of them here follow.

In the beginning of his Exposition (l) Sir J. M. having first laid hold on a mistaken, and (m) groundless Division of the two first Periods of these Weeks, and in the next place having quoted Tertullian (n) for his mistaken

---

(g) In Hor. Ebr.
(b) Lib. iii. c. x. in fine. —— Item in Daniel's Weeks, in the Exposition of v. 27. p. 706 Edit. 1672.
(i) As the Reader will see in the third part of the ensuing Treatise.
(k) For to take Sir J. M. Hypotheca in every particular would be surely to whey the Reader, and after all be of no Service to him. A few Instances may suffice to shew with how little Readon this Writer cited him.
(m) As he hath faimed here upon the mistaken Hebrew Pointing; but nothing certain is to be built upon the present punctuation. [See Prud. Con. Hist. Vol. I. p. 348.] See the true Reading in the ensuing Treatise in the Prophecy explain'd, p. 2, 3.
(n) Con. Judass. —— The end of the last of the Seventy Weeks was partly at the ceasing of Offering, and Sacrifice, i.e. of the daily Worship of the JEWISH Church. [Dan. ix. ult.] And so Tertullian understanding it, according to his Chronology, the Seventy Weeks must have begun from the first of Darius Notthus, as his first of Darius must have been the first of this Darius. But Sir J. M. though he quotes Tertullian for the first of Darius, yet he takes another Darius, viz. Darius the Mede. Thus he took advantage of this that Tertullian said, viz. The 70 Weeks begin at the first of Darius: tho' his Darius is one that Tertullian never intended. And at the same time he rejected that which Tertullian did intend, and which was certainly true, not only according to Josephus, but according to Christ's Interpretation, namely, that the last of the Seventy Weeks was to end with the Destruction of the Temple; which was in Christ 70.
ken beginning of the first Seven Weeks of them, from the first of Darius, (just after the like manner, as this Writer hath cited other Authors to make for his purpose,) as he thus set out, so (and no wonder at it,) he proceeded in a continued multiplicity of Mistakes, even to the end of his Hypothesis. As in this First Period of Weeks.

First, He hath supposed the Prophet Daniel's (\textit{o}) abstinence to have been of the continuance of \textit{one and twenty} Years from his mistaken\textit{eleventh} of Zedekiah, or the Year of the burning of the Temple, in his Account of it, \textit{viz.} in the Year of the \textit{Nabonassarian Æra 141 (p)}: Whereas Daniel then fasting by his own telling but 21 Days (q); And the burning of the Temple in the 11th of Zedekiah, was not 'till the Year of the said Æra 160 (r): As the Reader will see fully prov'd in the ensuing Treatise.

Secondly, Upon these mistaken Notions Sir \textit{J. M.} hath run into one as great with respect to the first of Darius the Mede, as he hath placed it in the Year of the \textit{Nab. Æra 162 (s)}, which in Daniel's Account thereof, could not be 'till after the Death of Belshazzar, or the \textit{Naboradius (t) of Ptolemy (u)}, in the 209th Year of the said Nab. Æra (w). And consequently the next Year was Daniel's \textit{first} of Darius the Mede, the Year in which he fasted (x) and prayed, as perceiving (y) that the Captivity was now (z) near expiring.

Thirdly, Sir \textit{J. M.} hath gone on in a mistake, to suppose that in his mistaken twenty first of the Captivity, and mistaken Year of Daniel's Fasting, and Praying, and mistaken first of Darius the Mede, Daniel (\textit{a}) had by Commandment from God to the Angel this Revelation of the Seventy Weeks.

And therefore from thence,

\textit{Fourthly,}

\textit{(o) Dan. x. 2. 3. See the ensuing Introduction, p. 8, 9. (p) Or in the Year before Christ. 607. (q) See the preceding Note, (o) (r) Or in the Year before Christ, 586. (s) Or in the Year before Christ. 586. (t) See the learned Dr. Prideaux, Con. Hist. Vol. I. p. 125, &c. (u) In Canone. (w) Or in the Year before Christ. 539. (x) Dan. ix. 5. 4. (y) Verse 2. from the Prophet Jeremiah. Ch. xxv, and xxix. (z) Viz. in the Year before Christ. 538. (a) Anguis mandatam a Deo acceptis non respondere, Danieli de quaestis.}
Fourthly, He hath reckoned the first Period of these Weeks, viz. the first Seven Weeks, or forty nine Years of it, and ended them in the Year of the Nab. A.D. 210 (b), as being his first of Cyrus, or the Year of the going forth of Cyrus's Decree for the Jews to return to Jerusalem to rebuild their Temple: Whereas (c) 

First, This was not the Scripture first of Cyrus, or the Year of the Jews release from Babylon, and return into their own Land.

Secondly, Cyrus his Release of the captive Jews, and Licenfe to them to rebuild their Temple was not the Commandment to rebuild Jerusalem, the Wall and the Streets thereof, the Commandment expressly referred to by Daniel in this Prophecy.

Thirdly, If it were, it will in no wise suit Sir J. M's Hypothetis in his ending therein the first Seven Weeks of this Prophecy; which (d) evidently begins the said Period of Weeks from, (not as Sir J. M. doth end it in) the going forth of a Commandment, &c. ——

But perhaps enough of this Period. Go we on therefore to the next, or the

Second Period of these Weeks. Those are the threescore and two Weeks mention'd in general in Verse the twenty fifth, together with the preceding Period, both as taking date in Succession, or continuation of Reckoning from the going forth of a Commandment, &c. —— Then in the end of that Verse, the Event (e) of that first Period being declar'd, there follows in the next (f) Verse the grand Event, or Purpose of the Second Period, viz. the Cutting off of the Messiah after the following (g) threescore and two Weeks.

These things are as plain in the Text as can be: and in this their obvious Sense they are most easy to be understood, as the Prophecy in this part of it evidently foretells the putting of Christ to Death, and the precise time of it. But Sir J. M. hath made it most obscure, and unintelligible by his

(b) Before Christ 538. (c) As these particulars are shown at large in the ensuing Treatise. (d) V. 25. FROM the going forth of a Commandment —— shall be SEVEN WEEKS, and THREESCORE and TWO Weeks, &c.
(e) Note that these things are shown more particularly in their proper Places hereafter. (f) V. 26. (g) As these 62 Weeks follow in successive, or continued reckoning upon the preceding seven Weeks: as will be seen hereafter.
his false Glosses on the Text, and misapplication of these Times. He hath here so miserably abused the Text, and eluded the great END of this part of the Prophecy, that One cannot but wonder how he could possibly away with it himself, if he had no turn to serve in it.

One while, (viz. in Verse 25) He reads those words, Unto MESSIAH the PRINCE, ad Unítum Ducem: Anon (in Verse the 26th) what we truly read (b) the MESSIAH shall be CUT OFF, he reads, Exterminabitur ei Unítio (i). In this mistaken Sense he runs away with the sixty two Weeks from his arbitrary (k) Beginning, to his arbitrary Ending of them in the times of Antiochus Epiphanes.

It would surely weary the Reader's Patience to follow Sir J. M. through all his Absurdities, and Inconsistencies, and groundless Application of these Times. It may suffice to note in general, as follows, that had Sir J. M. been consistent either with the Prophecy, or with himself here, then

First, The Word Messiah which he understood as meaning Unítus in one place, he ought to have understood it so likewise in the other: for to turn his (l) Argument upon him here, if that were of any consequence, in Hebrew Punctuation the Word Messiah is the same in both Places. But

Secondly, The Messiah the Prince in v. 25, as he hath understood him to have been Cyrus, or otherwise Zoroabel, or Jesba, the one, or other of them, (so loose did Sir J. M. fit to the Person surely predicted, and no wonder when he overlook'd the true Messiah here) he should have stuck to the same Messiah the Prince however, to one, or other

(b) According to the Syr. and Arab. Verf. and V.L. and Com. in locum, &c.
(i) With the Greek indeed: But here Sir J. M. leaves the Current [See the Note foregoing] merely to suit his Hypothec. And 'tis for that likewise that he again cites Tempio Scilicet here falliciously, as he refer'd the sealing of Sacrifice, [as above thewn] not with Sir J. M. to the Days of Ant. Ephiph. but to the times of the Romans. (k) Sub Tempio secundo Ritu Sacri disperte babebant. Anno 70 velhibis Popumin, et Urba adficiari incipierat; post annos inda 22, alspecto Templo inanierato iuge Sacrificium, Sed cum duraverit anno 342, Antiochus Epiphanes (alterum Judæorum flagellum) regnabat.---- Here are the Numbers by which Sir J. M. hath proceeded, which I call Arbitrary, as there is none of them in this Prophecy; nor any thing in the least corresponding them, or even admitting of such fancied Sense, And Reference, as we shall see presently.
(l) See the last Note (m).
other of them in Verse the twenty sixth: as one and the same Messiah is spoken of throughout. I add

Thirdly, Before he had referred the Hebrew (m) Word, which we most truly render CUT OFF, to the ceasing of Sacrifice and Oblation, he should have been better informed of the true and proper Signification, and of the peculiar (n) Importance of that Word, as having weight in it vastly greater than his little, and mistaken Accomplishment hath given it. I add

Fourthly, And especially Sir J. M. for his Credit should have consider'd better, before he run into that wretched, and unpardonable Mistake, and absurdity of applying those Words (o) of the People of the Prince that should come, to the People of Antiochus Epiphanes, and therein to the making Antiochus to be the Prince there predicted (p), and consequently to his being the Messiah the Prince in Verse 25; as in the plain and obvious Sense of the Prophecy but One, and the same Messiah, and one and the same Prince, that is Prince Messiah, is spoken of throughout. This is a necessary Consequence here, if we will preserve the natural Sense of the Prophecy, or indeed allow it to have any.

Now to come to the Point here. Is it not a monstrous Absurdity that Sir J. M. hath been (q) guilty of, in referring this sacred and singular Denomination of Messiah the Prince, to such a Miscreant of a Prince. I may say of a Man also, as was Antiochus (r) Epiphanes?—And all was for the sake of the

Third

See Bishop Chandler's Defence of Chrift. p. 155.

(m) See Bishop Chandler's Defence of Chrift. p. 155.

(o) In verse 16.

(p) Dan. venturus eit Epiphanes.

(q) By consequence here; for I do not say that Sir J. M. hath actually made Ant. Epiphanes to be the Messiah the Prince; (he hath himself opposed him to his Vindic. Dan. in v. 25, by telling us in v. 16, that Dan. venturus Epiphanes his opposit videtur Unico Ducil illustr; and yet this is repugnant with the Text, as one and the same Prince only is there spoken of;) but I say it is a necessary, and sure Consequence for the Reason above given.

(r) A King of fierce Countenance Dan. viii. 23. [I.e. hard of face, hircen-faced, impudent. All. Ann. in 1.]—A vile Peron. Ch. xi. 21. — the King that exal'teth himself, and magnifieth himself above every God, and speaketh outrageous things against the God of Gods; v. 56. &c. Sirnamed Epiphanes per Antichristus; and by the Hebrew Writers, particularly by Polybius called Epiphanes, i.e. the great Man. Could this Man thus branded as he is here, with Characters of Infamy both Sacred and Prophan, be the Messiah the Nagid, spoken of in this Prophecy, a most solemn Title this by divine Designation belonging to the Tribe of Judah, 2 Chr. v. 2; and thereto was given to David himself, ii. 4. It is also applied to Messiah the Son of David by the Prophet Isaiah, lv. 4.
Third Period in this Prophecy, to which I now proceed, as he would have us to suppose with him that the Express Character (s) of Daniel's (t) ONE WEEK, and those (u) of the HALF (w) Part thereof really had their accomplishment in the times of Antiochus Epiphanes: when there was truly a Ceasing of the Daily Sacrifice (x) and Oblation, and when also there was (y) a setting up of the Abomination that maketh desolate. But these Facts in Antiochus's time, were after all, the sure Accomplishments of the like Events predicted by the Prophet (a) in other Prophecies, but not possibly in this (b), as it may be easily collected from the (c) foregoing Reasons, and as it must be also concluded from those which here follow.

First, Not even the One Week it self will admit of such Reference of Accomplishment in respect of the grand Purpose of it. That, as 'tis evident from the whole scope of the Prophetick (d) Text is the total Subversion, and utter Extirpation of Daniel's People, and Holy City (e). But not so as this was it with the Jews, in the times of Antiochus.

For though the Holy City did then come into the hands of the Heathen, and though the Sanctuary was trodden under foot, first by Antiochus (f), and two Years after by Apollonius (g) who was over the Tribute; and thus the City did become desolate of its natural Inhabitants (h), in all this there was indeed, yet it was no more than a great Devastation. And though, as to the Temple also, as before noted, there was now truly a very great Pollution, or Prophanation of it, and Interruption of the Service of the true God; yet which much alters this Case from what it was with the Jews in the Roman times, it was as I here call it, only an Interruption. These things were but for a short Season of Persecution. The People of

---

(a) He shall confirm the Covenant with many in One Week. (b) D. iv. 27. (c) He shall curse the Sacrifice, and the Oblation to cease, and cast down the Temple, and hand the Idols of the Desolator. (d) 1 Mac. i. 45. (e) Ver. 54. (f) VIII. ii. xi. 31. xi. 11. (g) VIII. iii. 27. (h) As it hath appeared that Antiochus his People were not, could not be the Party here predicted to accomplish &c. (i) Veres 26. 6. 7. (j) As they are call'd in this Prophecy, v. 24. (k) 1 Mac. i. 1. 21. This was in the Year before Christ 170. (l) In the Year before Christ 188. 1 Mac. i. 29. Antiochus Epiphanes having sent him with an Army of two and twenty thousand, 2 Mac. v. 24. (m) 1 Mac. i. 38.
of God saw an end of them even before the Death of their great Oppressor. Their City and Temple were both recover'd. To the former were restor'd her Inhabitants; to the latter the Daily Sacrifice, and Oblation: And tho' it had been polluted by the Heathen, yet upon its recovery there ensued a new Cleansing and Dedication (i) for the Service of God: and in short the Jewish Worship was again restor'd, and carried on in it, as in former times. But

Secondly, This One Week of Daniel here (k) will not admit of Sir J. M. his conceived Accomplishment of the Express Characters of it in the times of Antiochus Epiphanes on a[n]other account also, viz. because that of the (l) One Week, and also chofe of the HALF Week (m) were all of them to have their Accomplishment in one and the same Week, as is evident from the express Letter of this Prophecy.

'Tis evident from the twenty fourth Verse of this Prophecy, that it was no more than (n) of Seventy Weeks. And the Angel having accounted with Daniel for no more than sixty nine Weeks, before he comes to speak of the One Week in Verse the twenty seventh, that therefore is plainly the last, and only remaining Week of the seventy: and consequently the Half Week there spoken of, can be no other than a more distinguished Half Part thereof, even of the latter Half Part, as the exact Accomplishment of its predicted Events in that Destruction of Jerusalem which was by the Romans, (as it will appear hereafter,) doth evidently demonstrate.

Now if these predicted Events had really a primary Accomplishment, in the times of Antiochus, they must all of them necessarily have had in it one and the same Week, in order to prove the Truth of such assigned Accomplishment in full Agreement with the Prophecy.

And if this be not shewn, then all is nothing to the purpose. ——— But this is so far from being done in Sir J. M. his Hypothesis, that 'tis not so much as pretended.

He

---

(i) 1 Macc. iv, 43 —— 56. This was in the Year before Christ 165

(k) Dan. 

(l) 27.

(m) 27.

(n) Verse 24.
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He (nn) makes Antiochus to confirm the Covenant with Many in One Week, in the first seven Years of his Reign: and so in this account for this Week, and having before, after his manner accounted for seven Weeks, and sixty two Weeks, and now in the whole for Seventy Weeks, the Prophetick number of Weeks determined upon Jerusalem; after all he makes bold to throw in a Half Week of his own for the conceived Accomplishment of the Prophetick Characters of Daniel’s Half Week, in the latter part of the Reign of Antiochus.

Alas, What is this but making a new Prophecy, instead of giving us the Accomplishment of the several Express Characters of this as they lye in their connected order of Accomplishment in the Prophetick Text?—

However Sir J. M. having thus given his imaginary Completion to the last of Daniel’s Seventy Weeks, at length he bethought himself that our Saviour Christ (o) had giv’n it a Completion yet to come, even after his time, viz. in the Destrucion of Jerusalem by the Romans. Hence he bestowed a Note here, that truly Christ did so: but as if this would serve his turn, he adds (p) that Christ did this by way of Allusion only, and that his referring his Disciples to the Abomination of Desolation spoken of by Daniel the Prophet, doth not argue that Daniel immediatly prophesied of that Destruction which should be by Titus, but gives us only to understand as much as this by it, viz. that those Words of Daniel, (which our Saviour cited) were very applicable to the Subject of Discourse then in hand.

And thus according to Sir J. M., and the Quoter of him, we are to understand this Citation.

Truly no wonder either that Sir J. M. thought, and writ thus, for it was for his Hypothesis; or that the latter cited his Opinion here, for that was also for his Purpose.

---

(nn) Antiochus confirmabit pacem multis Hebdomada una: non statim, regno inito, prophanasit Templum: sed post annos post septem. (o) Viz. in Mat. xxiv. 15. (p) Est autem Paradoxa: Illud ου το το τω Προ Φιλων non inmit peculiarem a Daniele editam saepe Prophegium, de Calamitate a Titto inferenda; sed significat verba Danielis rei de qua Sermo est optime convenire. [In Hdb. Dan. fab.]
But did Sir J. M. formerly, and the Quoter since imagin that this will go down with Men of Learning upon the pretended Proof that Sir J. M. hath given for his Assertion?

Is it sufficient for Sir J. M. to have said this upon no better Proof than only by telling (q) us there are Instances in St. Matthew's way of writing elsewhere of Citations out of the Prophets by him applied to Christ, or otherwise, which had literally in other respects a primary Accomplishment before, and therefore in such Application they had only in a secondary Sense any relation to him, or them to whom they are applied? —— There may be some such Instances in St. Matthew's Gospel, and what then? —— Is this any thing to the purpose here? —— Plainly 'tis not. For it is our Saviour Christ's own immediate Reference, and Citation that we are here concern'd with, not St. Matthew's, who hath no other part here in the Citation, but only as a Reciter, or Recorder of our Lord's Discourse with his Disciples, which gave occasion to it.

The Fallacy, and Absurdity therefore of Sir John Marsham's Argument here is too apparent to be insisted on any longer, in this respect.

The Groundlessness of the Assertion is also apparent from the whole scope, and tenor of our Lord's Discourse with his Disciples, which gave occasion to this Reference. The subject of that Discourse (r) was the approaching Destruction of Jerusalem, which our Lord gave them to understand was not now far off. They were importunate with him to know (s) the exact time of it, and therefore desir'd of him a Sign whereby they should infallibly know when that time was certainly come. Our Lord gave them one accordingly.

He sent them immediately to the solemn Prediction concerning it by the Prophet Daniel, telling them that the

(9) Sic enim precor tibi quia ut iis in Jerusalem secutus est Prophetae, Illud (Everson iium) ed ejusdem querum transierunt, Mai. ii. 15, quod dictum de egenitu populi Israel sici ex Aegypto, Had. xi. 1. —— Sic tunc inquirerunt tibi in eo quod habebat ipsas in prophetam Infanticidio quadra in Mai. ii. 17, Vox in Ramah, quod dictum est a Jeremia xxxii. 15. De Cappaduca Samaritanæ, Marsham in Heb. Don. tab fine, Ctv. —— [As to these Texts, see Bishop Chandler's Defense of Christianity, p. 235, &c.]

(r) Mai. xxiv. 1, 20, &c.

(q) Ver. 3.
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Temple, and the Jewish Economy should be then finally, and irrecoverably destroyed, when (s) they should see the Abomination of Desolation spoken of by Daniel the Prophet, stand in the Holy Place. What was this but sending them to the Prophecy (m), wherein this Sign had been before given to the Prophet as a sure Sign concomitant of that final Destruction of Jerusalem therein determined?

How then could Sir J. M. tell us that the v, ev, &c. of our Lord was spoken by him in a sense merely, Typical, or by way of Allusion only to a like Accomplishment that had been before? Could Sir J. M. think formerly, or will the Quoter now offer to say it, that the Subject Matter of our Lord's Discourse foreshewing the razing of the Temple, the Destruction of the Jewish Church, and State, and subsequent leading into Captivity of the Remains of that miserable People, of all which the v, ev of Daniel was now the Sign, was ever accomplished before to the giving that v, ev a previous Accomplishment?

He must have the confidence to say any thing that will say this. He must say it in the utmost Ignorance, or Opposition to the Truth, or both, as it hath appear'd from what hath been said of the times of Antiochus Epiphanes, and the utter inaccomplishment of the several predicted Events of the Seventy Weeks in those times.

Therefore to return Sir J. Marsham's Words here, Christ could not urge this Citation from Daniel in a typical Sense, but in a Prophetical, and Historical Sense; as speaking of, and referring to a Prophecy of a predicted Event yet to be accomplished: His v, ev from Daniel the Prophet, implying his Reference to that Prophet, as prophesying immediately and primarily of that Destruction of Jerusalem which was by the Romans. And

Consequently, with the Quoter's leave, the Prophecy of the Seventy Weeks, which is a Prophecy of the Old Testament Scriptures is a Prophecy which in its plain, or obvious, literal, and primary Sense is truly said to have been fulfilled in the New.

And

(a) ver. 15: (s) Especially when it be consider'd also that it is there added, Who reads let him understand: Which words are also from this Prophecy, viz. Dan. ix. 25; Know therefore, and understand. [Proverbs in Matt xxiv. 15.]
And so I might dismiss this Point, were it not that I should then overlook the Testimonies of the ancient Jews and their Historian Josephus, who with us also referred this Prophecy of the Weeks to the Times of the Romans.

As to the former, I have already occasionally noted this from Gracian.

I add here the Authority of Bishop Chandler, who hath sufficiently made it to appear (w).

As to the latter, viz. the Testimony of Josephus, He hath spoken so clearly, and fully in this Matter, that it is not a little surprising that Sir J. M. either could not, or would not see it. And in his Testimony, faith our learned Bishop (x); We have the Testimony of the whole Nation.

That Historian writes thus, (y) "Daniel did not only "foretell things to come, which was common to him, with "other Prophets, but also set a time for their coming to "pass. — He did not only foretell the Calamity that "befell our Nation from Antiochus many Years before it "happened; but he ALSO wrote of the Dominion of the "Romans, and of the great Desolation they should here- "after bring upon our People, &c.

What can be more directly against Sir J. M. than this is, as against his Hypothesis of the Weeks in general, so also against his imagined typical Allusion only in the 6th Psalm of our Saviour? This makes it evident that those Prophecies and Times of Daniel which the Jews then distinguished, Sir J. M. hath blended, and confounded. Hence also the Unreasonableness, and Absurdity of the Quoter opens more and more; to the giving Caule sufficient if it be possible for the making him ashamed of his flying to groundless Authorities to support a groundless, and false Assertion.

For its better Effect, I will only give him the following Quotation out of Bishop Chandler, and then I will have done with him as to Sir J. M.

(w) From the Talmud, and some Jews of high Antiquity. See Defence of Christand,
(x) ib. (y) Ant. xx. 12.
It is well worthy of his Remembrance; He hath hitherto much stood in need of it: And 'tis pity but his Memory should be often refreshed with it. —— "No where else but in this Prophecy of lxx Weeks doth Daniel speak of the Devastation, the Jews were to suffer from the Romans: No where else, is a term fixed for these Events; we may therefore be assured, that Josephus referred to this very Prophecy, for what he writes; and that Jesus Christ had the Authority of the Jews with him, when he interpreted the same Prophecy of the Destruction of the Temple by the Romans (z).

But Secondly, The Quoter hath referr'd us also to the Authority of Mr. Dodwell, as if he had been here a Disciple of Sir J. M. —— And what if he were? We have seen upon what slender, and mistaken Grounds. And after all, Mr. D. published not his mistaken Opinion, however the Quoter thought no better of it than to make use of his Authority.

But by this time it may be that he hath had enough of both these favourite Testimonies, and the Reader, I fear, too much of this Passage of the Quoter.

And yet, though as to this we may, we cannot however now have wholly done with the Quoter; for we hear more of him elsewhere (a), as touching Daniel's Weeks.

And thither therefore with the Reader's leave we must also follow him.

There after a long Sorites of his usual Bravadoes, and some kind Concessions in his way, he concludes peremptorily, and as it were in Defiance, in the following Words, —— "Yet cannot the Prophecy be made to square to the Event they would refer it, and it will after all be subject to GREAT DIFFICULTIES.

And having said this, he falls to his usual Method of quoting certain Passages (b) in a Sense, and to a Purpose, which their Authors, alas, never intended.

Hence we hear (c) of Difficulties, Extensions, Discrepancies of Interpreters, Chronological Niceties, Variety of Computation in this Prophecy, from whence the Quoter would, if he could, make of none Effect the certainty of it.

But

(a) Defence of Christianity. p. 142. (b) Ib. (c) Grounds and Reasons, second ed. Part p. 251.
But hath not the Quoter most egregiously prevaricated with those Authors, by evidently perverting their meaning, and misapplying their Words? Did they mean, as he doth?

What though Dr. Prideaux spake of Difficulties, and Objections in this Prophecy? Did He conclude with this Writer that they are such as do in the least affect the great, and certain (d) Truths of it? —— The Quoter, however licentious yet will not say it of him. Wherefore then did he thus abuse him in misrepresenting, and perverting the end of this Quotation. For the Vindication of that learned Author, and by way of shewing the Quoter his great Dishonour, Dishonesty, and Abusiveness here; Let him take that along with it from Dr. Prideaux which immediately follows, as fully explaining the Doctor's meaning in what he had before acknowledged on this occasion. "God, says he (e), hath giv'n us Prophecies for the magnifying his Omniscience among us, and though they are most of them deliver'd in such dark and obscure Terms, as not to be THOUGHT UNDERSTOOD 'till after they are fulfilled, yet then the EVENTS become SURE COMMENTS upon the Text."

Now is there any thing here giving the Quoter any the least Reason to make that fordid, and vile Advantage, which he would of the Citation above? ——

The other Authors here quoted could all of them, I presume, mean nothing more than Dr. Prideaux did in what the Quoter hath cited from them.

But the Quoter seems to please himself chiefly with the Words which he hath given us from Dr. Nichol's in his elaborate Work, as he perhaps ironically calls it, against the Deists, as we are told that in relation to this Prophecy of Daniel, he hath written as follows, viz. "The wise Providence of God hath suffered these matters to lye in some manner of Confusion, that our Faith might be founded on a nobler Principle than that of CHRONOLOGICAL NICETIES."

—- And what of all this? —— I ask the Quoter, Had Dr. Nichols any Thoughts hereby of excluding Accomplishments of Scripture-Prophecies from being One among other

---

(d) What they are. See Defence of Christianity, p. 134. &c.
Evidences of Faith, or even Chronology from being a necessary part of explaining such Prophecies of Scripture, as do entirely depend on certain Dates of Time fixt for their Accomplishment? —— If not, to what Purpose is the Citation? —— But as to the Citation itself, I cannot but put the Question, how the Christians in Porphyry's (f) age would have been able to have dealt with him, as to the Prophecies of Daniel, or how Jerome after (g) would have been able to have understood those relating to Antiochus Epiphanes, had it not been for Chronology, or the Knowledge of those Times? —— Especially I would ask the Quoter himself, how his FRIEND Porphyry could have otherwise understood them? —— Chronology surely is essential to the understanding of those Prophecies of Scripture which depend upon Time.

But as the Quoter tells us, that Dr. Nichols said this in relation to this Prophecy of Daniel, and 'tis in the same relation that the Citation is made. I ask the Quoter, if it be a Chronological Nicety, or a Chronological Truth with him, that the Messiah was cut off after the time appointed for it in this Prophecy (h)?

It is plainly a Prophecy of Seventy Weeks. There is no doubt of this.

These Weeks we say are certainly Weeks of Years. But this is a doubt with the Quoter. Here is one of his Difficulties, as upon the Authority of Le Clerc we are told that there is no (i) Foundation in the Old Testament for such use of the Word. —— If so, why then did the Quoter's Friend Sir J. M. reckon by Weeks of Years in such use of the word in his Hypothesis? —— If there be no ground for it, then the Quoter had no reason to cite Sir J. Marsham's Authority as above. If there be ground for it here, as there certainly is, and very good (k) Ground for it; then let Sir J. Marsham's Authority stand against Le Clerc's in this particular. And let not this be any longer a Difficulty with the Quoter.

Well

(f) A learned Heathen born at Tyre in the Year of Christ 332.  
(g) He was born in the Year of Christ 328, and died in the Year 418.  
(i) Grounds and Reasons, part 2. p. 250.  
(k) See the Introduction into the ensuing Treatise, p. 8.
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Well then, The Messiah is to be cut off after so many Weeks of Years, as are appointed for it in this Prophecy.

But next it will surely be a Question with him as to the Form of Year that the Angel intended in this Prophecy. 'Tis allowed to be a reasonable Enquiry. And for this I refer him to a distinct Chapter (l) on this Head, wherein I hope that he may find full Satisfaction in this Matter. So that this also, I will not be without hopes, that it may be no longer a Difficulty.

But is that another Difficulty with him, viz. where we are to begin, or whence to reckon the Prophetick Times, after which the Messiah was to be cut off, and hath he told us as to that, that we fix it at pleasure, or when we please? — I tell him that we do not. We fix it there, where the Prophecy hath fixed it: or in other Words, we fix it there, where in the obvious, Litteral, and Primary Sense only can be fixed, so as to agree with the Prophecy. And this if he pleareth, he may see also in the ensuing Treatise (m). And so after all, to return his Words, the Prophecy will be found to Square, even most exactly to Square, to the Events we would refer it, and instead of being subject to great Difficulties, it will appear to the reasonable, and unprejudiced Reader to be subject to very few, or none at all.

But is this Raiser of Difficulties so grossly doubtful as to question, or with the Jews so faithless as to deny that Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews, who suffer'd under Pontius Pilate, was the true Messiah, or the Person intended in this Prophecy in those words, after three score and two Weeks shall Messiah be cut off? — If so, this were truly becoming Jew, or Sceptick with a Witness. —

But as the Jews said in Christ's time with respect to his Miracles (n), Will Christ when he cometh do more, or greater Miracles? —— So if Christ be not already come, and hath not already suffer'd for Sin (o), the Question must be most reasonably put here, as to Christ's Sufferings, Can the things concerning him have an end (p) more truly, and more fully than they had in him? —— Did he not really suffer the things by the Prophets of old predicted of him, or which he

---

(l) p. 233.  
(m) p. 115.  
(n) John vii. 28.  
(o) 1 Pet. iii. 18.  
be ought to have suffered before he enter'd into his Glory (q)? — 
Daniel certainly could not here mean any other than Him, of whom only spake the antient Prophets, viz. the Messiah the Son of David (r): Him whose cutting off the Prophet Isaiah (s) in particular had long before (t) foretold: and Daniel now foretold the same; and also set a time for its coming to pass.

The antient Jews understood that whole Chapter of Isaiah laft (u) referr'd to, of their Messiah, or him whose coming they so earnestly look'd for. But whence did they learn to call him the Christ, or the Messiah, but from this Prophecy of Daniel (w)?

Alas, the Christian Unbeliever may see his own great folly, and unreasonableness in the vain Attempts of the modern Jews to evade these, and other plain Prophecies of their Scriptures concerning a crucified MESSIAH.

From this rock of Offence, this Stumbling-Block of a crucified Messiah arose their Prejudice against the Prophet Daniel. They could not away with his suffering Messiah the Prince (x). Hence to lessen the weight of the Prophecy, they scru-pled not to call in question the Inspiration (y) of the Prophet; and even denying him a place (z) among the Prophets, they threw him into the Hagiographa (a).

And wherefore is it that they have giv'n him no Targums (b), but for the same Reason, even because they are afraid of

(q) Luke xxiv. 26. (r) The Messiah the Nagid as he is here call'd. --- Of the Word Nagid see above in not. in p. 13. (s) Isaiah liii. 8. (t) Isaiah might declare this Prophecy, cir. 718 before Christ. Daniel had not the Prophecy of the Weeks till the Year before Christ 538. (u) Viz. Chi. liii. See Defence of Christianity, p. 192. etc. (v) The Church of Israel in the Gospel (and from them the Apostles took it) had no other place of Scripture, whence they did, or could ascribe the Name of Christ, and Messiah unto him they looked for, but only from this of Daniel: For there is no other Prophecy in all the Old Testament besides this, where this Name is distinctly giv'n him, but only by way of Type. [Mede on Dan., Weeks in these Words: unto Messiah the Prince.] (x) Dan. ix. 25, 26. (y) And therefore they have fled to the most trifling Shirts here, by telling us that Daniel did not live a Prophetical Life, but that of a Centurion; and that he had his Revelations by Dreams and Visions of the Night, which they reckon to be the most imperfect manner of Revelation, and below the Prophetick, and more to the like purpos'. [As to which, see Pole's Synopsis, in Dan. p. 1391: also Prid. Con. Hist. Vol. i. p. 163.] (z) Which he had in Joseph's time, as he [in his first Book against Apion] reckons his among the Writings of the Prophets. And then 'tis therefore most likely that the Book of Daniel stood in that canon of Scripture which is said to have been made by Ezra. [See Prid. Con. Hist. Vol. 1. p. 331.] (a) And yet there after all, he stands in company with the Prophet David, See Prid. p. 163, Vol. I. (b) The Jews tell us of Jonathan Ben Uxziel, that upon his attempting to write a Targum on the Hagiographa, after his having finished one on the Law, he was hinder'd by a Voice from Heaven, which forbid him to proceed in that Work, giving this reason for it, because therein, i. e. in the
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of this great Truth, that Daniel’s crucified Messiah was really no other than the one only Messiah of all their other Prophets?

But is Daniel therefore no Prophet, because the Jews have thus dealt with Him? Who but the God of Daniel could have told things so long before-hand as we find them in this Prophecy? Daniel therefore must needs have been a Prophet of God, as much as were any other of his Prophets to the Jews.

It was 171 Years before the death of the Messiah, that his Cutting off was thus foretold to a Year (b) in this Prophecy. That it was truly of that age we have testimony irrefragable even from a Nation of Adversaries. It is the Jewish Record, though we plead it against them in evidence in that very point in which they are chiefly our Adversaries. It cannot but be forely against their will that they vouch for the Antiquity of that which makes so evidently against themselves in the principal Point of their Controversy.

But they are not our only Evidence for the truth of this Book. It hath enough within it felt to prove its Divinity, if, as to the age of it, no more could be proved than that it was written before Christ’s time. Even then this very Prophecy of His cutting off, is enough to prove that this is a true Prophecy. But that this Book was written long before Christ’s Time we have Evidence enough.

We see that not only our Saviour referr’d to it as Scripture, but Josephus a Jew that liv’d in Christ’s time cited it often (c) as a known Book of their Scriptures.

Even Porphyry, a most learned, as well as the most malicious Heathen that ever employed his Pen against the Christian Religion, and therefore could not but have an aking Tooth at this Book; yet guessed that it might be written in, or near the times of Antiochus Epiphanes (d). — That was about

---

Hagiographa, was contained the END of the MESSIAH: which some Christians lay hold of against the Jews by interpreting it of the death of Christ predicted in the Prophecies of Daniel, (which they place among the Hagiographa) some of the latter Jews have taken upon them to alter that Passage for fear this fabulous Story should affect their Cause. —


c) Ec. Antiq. lib. x. & con. Apol. lib. i. Cc. (d) Daniel’s Prophecies concerning the MESSIAH, and other great Events of time both before, and after, are the clearest and fullest of all that we have in the Holy Scriptures, insomuch that Porphyry [Hieron. in Praem. ad Com. in Dan.] in his Objections against them saith, they
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About some 200 Years before Christ’s Death. And that is surely age enough for any Prophecy. It was not (e) 200 Years before Cyrus his Reign, that Isaiah prophesied of him by Name (f). And yet when God had (g) fore-told by that Prophet that one Cyrus by name should come, and do such and such things, God challengeth all the Devils to do the like.

The Gods of the Heathen, saith the Apostle (h), are Devils. Them God challengeth (i) to do the like. Show the things that are to come hereafter, that we may know that ye are Gods. —— And as for Men, who among the Children of Adam is of himself able to do this, even able to foretell things to come?

This therefore is Evidence enough here surely. ’Tis what is sufficiently proved upon the Evidence of this Prediction of Christ’s Sufferings, that he was truly a Prophet of God, who declared them by such solemn and precise Prediction so long before.

But the Jews themselves know better as to the age of Daniel; Their own Writings (k) prove that He lived and Prophecied before Cyrus his Reign over Babylon (l). In the Language of the Apostle (m), so long before-hand did be testify of the Sufferings of Christ, or in his own Words, so long before did he foretell that the MESSIAH should be cut off, and withal in the Language of Josephus, he SET a TIME for it.

No wonder however, that with the Jews Daniel is not among the Prophets. They who rejected the MESSIAH when he came unto them in a State of Humiliation, and Sufferings, and who also (n) brought him to them; or in the Prophets Words, cut him off, how could they but reject the Prophet also, as in effect they do by undervaluing, or lef-

---

Notes:

(e) It was after Merodach Baladan’s congratulating Hezekiah upon his recovery, Isai. xxxix. That was in the Year before Christ 713. Prud. 4 f) Isaiah xiv. 28. xiv. 1. (g) Ib. 1 Cor. x. 19. 20; 21. (h) Isaiah xli. 23. (k) Ezekiel xiv. 2. xxviiii. 3. (l) Arch Media. [Dan. ix. 1.] in the Year before Christ 598. (m) iv. 1. ii. (n) For Pilate the Roman Governor charg’d his cutting off on the Jews, as being done only by their urging him to it, Matt. xxvii. 24; and they also took it on them themselves in those words of theirs to Pilate, His Blood be on us, and on our Children, v. 25.
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Understanding his Authority, who expressly, and by Name (o), and in a determined time had in all these particulars thus plainly foretold a Suffering Messiah? — When they believe in a Crucified Messiah, then will they also with Christ (p) acknowledge Daniel truly to have been a Prophet, and with their Country Man, and Historian Josephus (q), even One of the GREATEST of the Prophets. — GOD hasten this in his good time.

In the mean time, alas! they of that Nation have sorely found Daniel to have been a true Prophet by long and fa-
sal Experience, from the very time that his Seventieth (r) Week was accomplished upon them. The scatte'r'd Remains of that People have been ever since, and still they are lying Monuments of the (s) Wrath of God yet abiding on them, as by this Prophecy also it was predicted that it should be abiding, and will continue abiding till the time appointed.

Up

(o) Mr. MESSIAH by Name: See the last Note ({w}). — And here the Jews have shifted, and varied, strangely among themselves; some referring the Messiah in v. 26, to

Assw, or some Body else, not Messiah the Son of David, because of his being to be cut off, as in the next verse; and therefore they have divided the Messiah, giving his suffering State to Messiah the Son of Epraim, and the glorious part [as described particularly by Isaiah lii. 12, and lii. 13.] to Messiah the Son of David. — But that these diversions are without Foundation, see Pesch in Appendix Conv. on Malachi. The Jews have made use of them only as a shift to evade the plain Evidences of the Prophecies in Scripture predicting Christ's Sufferings, particularly the hill. Ch. of Isaiah: Which begins with Christ in his suffering State, in order to bring him into Glory at last. — Others have set down the words, the Messiah shall be cut off, to Hored Apolipras; Others yet not to single Person, but to the whole order of Priesthood cut off by Titus. — But as to these Ev-

ations, see Bishop Chandler's Defence of Christianity, p. 147, &c. (p) Mar. xxiv. 15.


Titus Grothus, in Mar. xxiv. 15.

(r) Or the Last of the Seventy. A Week this last as large in the Prophecy, as to any succession of time, or state of Beginning or end for it, as in the two foregoing Periods. And no wonder that after that the Jews had killed the Lord of Life, God no longer gave them a successive Account of their time, as he had before in this Prophecy from the going forth of the Commandment to rebuild Jerusalem, till that Act of theirs of their casting him off. However God by his Prophet here so eminen-

ly distinguished the said One Week, and the Half Part thereof by their express Characters, as that they could not but be known to the Jews, when the Season of their Accomplishment was come, and the Chaldeans were immediately accomplished in their Destruction by the Romans; and were sufficient therefore to have convinced them of that Age, and all of them from time to time since, that their Messiah was really come a Savious, and Deliverer, tho' not in their sense; yet as coming from Sin by suffering for it; and that it was he who had so figured for Sin, whom they had crucified. — Christ himself also in his Prophecies con-

cerning Jerusalem before his Death, gave plainly to understand that Daniel's ONE WEEK was not far off: as he declared that there were those then alive, who in the Destruction of the Temple should see accomplished that which was SPOKEN of by that Prophet.

(s) And yet here we cannot but also behold the Goodness of God to that People, who most insinuously preserves them, aspire, and unmixed with the Nations of the World among whom they are scattered, against his appointed sum of them into their own Land. [See Defence of Christianity, p. 481.]
Upon the whole therefore, the several predicted Events of this Prophecy, having been most fully, and most exactly accomplished in their Seasons therein respectively, determined for them, That was surely a vain Attempt of his, who from his false Glosses, or misrepresentations, and mistaken Authorities, of which we have given some few Instances above, an artful and most useful Collection of Knowledge this, which this Writer seems to be much puffed up with. It was, I say, a vain Attempt of his to go about thus insidiously to rob us of this (e) among other Evidences of the truth and and certainty of the Christian Religion; as God hath confirm'd it to us, as by other infallible Signs, or Marks of Credibility, so also by this of the S U R E Word of Prophecy, and of this solemn and important Prophecy in particular.

Alas, He and other the Disputers of this World may doubt, and dispute in infinitum, if they are so unhappily determined. They may, 'tis possible, and indeed very easy it is to render that to themselves uncertain, which by the testimony of the God of Truth we know to be sure, whether they will be convinced of its certainty or not. For God hath said nothing in vain, and his Word in the Language of King Da-vid is true for everlastings, and his Truth endureth throughout all Ages.

'Tis not therefore in the power of Men to make void his word by their doubtful Disputations: no not the Word of Prophecy; however some cannot, others will not see its Accomplishment; and though finally many who do see, and believe it also, yet see it diversely, or in different views of it. For these things, which God who cannot lie, hath by his Prophets from time to time foretold should come to pass among his People, whether Jews, or Gentiles, or Christians, it is impossible

---

(e) If at the end of the LXX Weeks approaching, the legal Sanctuary were razed, and the Jewish State dissolved, then would it be apparent indeed, That MESSIAH was already come, and slain for Sin; because this was infallibly to come to pass within the compass, and before the expiration of those LXX Weeks.— Not without cause therefore doth St. Peter lay to the Christian Jews, We have a more SURE Word of Prophecy, &c. Yes, and besides, because Jesus, as well as Daniel had prophesied of the approaching Desolation of that City and Temples, mentioning all the Signs that were to usher it in; if the Event, when time came, should fall out accordingly; then must Jesus of Nazareth, who foretold the foregoing Signs, thereof, be approved as a true Prophet; by whom of a Truth the Lord had spoken. — Med. lib. i. c. 15.

(n) 2 Pet. 3. 19.
possible but that they must have their accomplishment in their respectively predicted Sessions, however. Men of Learning may not have been always agreed in one and the same Sense, and assign'd accomplishment of all Scripture-Prophecies, and of this in particular now before us.

Such Variety, and Difference of Exposition of any Scripture Prophecy is evidently owing not to want of Veracity in the Prediction, but to the Weakness, Imperfection, and Uncertainty of Human Knowledge: Which is not always capable of clearing at once all sacred Truths, and Truths of this nature especially, and of this Prophecy in particular; which hath from time to time exercis'd the labours of the most learned Christians: and that for too many Reasons here to be accounted for. They will occasionally appear hereafter.

The great Variety therefore, and Difference of Hypotheses of Men endeavouring to expound this, or any other Prophecy of the God of Truth, however they may serve to exercise our Judgments, have yet nothing in them to shock our Faith, or whereon to ground an unreasonable Humour of Scepticism. Truth, and even Prophetical Truth, however imperfectly explain'd, yet having always certainty, and perfection in it self, will appear sooner, or later, to the full Satisfaction of the Doubtful, and the clear Conviction of Unbelievers, I mean such of them as will be convinced upon reasonable Terms. And those I call reasonable Terms, or Terms upon which in reason Credit is to be giv'n to any Hypothesis, or assign'd Accomplishment of Scripture Prophecies, when such assign'd Accomplishment of the predicted Events of any particular Prophecy approves it self in a full, and perfect Agreeableness in all respects with the prophetick Characters, or Dates of Time therein fixt for the accomplishment of the predicted Events.

Let Reason therefore ever come unbiased, attended especially with an awful Reverence of God's Word, and an earnest desire, or holy thirst after Truth, a Will seriously disposed to receive it, and to acknowledge the Accomplishment, and therein finally, to give God the great Author and Revealer of it the Glory, 'Tis All that is asked in general with respect to the assign'd Accomplishment of such Scripture-Prophecies as are of a certainty already fulfilled, and in particular with respect to that highly important Prophecy before
The P R E F A C E.

fore us, whose full and most exact Accomplishment in its LITERAL, OBVIOUS, and PRIMARY Sense in all its parts gave occasion as well to what the Reader hath been now troubled with, as also to the ensuing TRA-

ERRATA.
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Of the LXX Weeks of Daniel explained in the Hypothesis thereof as asserted and maintained in the following Treatise.

Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy City, to finish the Transgression, and to make an end of Sins, and to make reconciliation for Iniquity, and to bring in everlasting Righteousness, and to seal up the Vision and Prophecy, and to appoint the most Holy. AM come to shew thee, saith the Angel Gabriel to the Prophet Daniel, v. 23, forasmuch as at the beginning of thy Supplications, the Commandment (a) from the throne of God came forth to me for to go unto thee with the following message concerning thy people, and thy holy City, for whom in prayer (b) thou art so solicitous.

Know thou therefore that God hath determined a certain period of time for general Events to befall them therein: And that is a period of seventy weeks of Years, or 490 Years. Thou shalt presently have the particulars relating to thy people, and thy holy City. But as I have withal an important message to deliver concerning the Messiah, let me therefore speak of that in the first place, as being what concerns all mankind, as well as the Jews, tho' them in the first place, as Salvation is of the Jews (c). It is that in the fulness of time (d); and

(a) Or the Word, as in Chapter x. 12. as the same Hebrew word is us'd in both places. (b) Dan. ix. 16. (c) John iv. 22. For of them according to the Flesh Christ came. Rom. ix. 5. (d) Gal. iv. 4.
v. 25. Know therefore, and understand, that from the going forth of the Commandment to restore, and to build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince shall be VII weeks, and threescore and two Weeks. The Street shall be built again, and that also thou shalt precisely know another; for 'tis within these Seventy Weeks, God hath determined to finish the Transgression, or to restrain the power of the extended guilt of the Sin of the first Adam by the Messiah, the second Adam, his taking it away (a); and also to make a full end of sin, and to make reconciliation for the sins of the people (b) in, and through him; as God hath for these great purposes, within this predicted period determined to anoint him the most holy One, with the Holy Ghost and with power (c), for to bring into the place of the Law of Moses the Gospel of everlasting (d) righteousness, by the Grace (e) of God, which shall therein appear unto all men, freeing them from the power (f), and by his blood from the guilt and punishment of sin, as the Messiah will himself become the Sacrifice for it (g) to the fulfilling (h) the things concerning himself as predicted in the Old Testament Scriptures, beginning at Moses, and all the Prophets, as according to them he ought to SUFFER (i).

Note these things in general; this number of Weeks determined upon thy people, and these things concerning the Messiah. I now require thy farther attention while I inform thee of particulars.

Know therefore of a truth, and understand that before these great Concernments of all People be wrought by, and in the person of the Messiah, thy own People yet in captivity shall however after a little time, return into their own Land (k); God's determined time (l) thereof now drawing on (m) apace towards

(a) As the Jews themselves held, as S. Paul. Nevi Shalom. (b) Heb. ii. 17. (c) Acts x. 38. (d) The Gospel may most properly be termed Righteousness, because by its promises, and threatenings, and many and great helps and advantages which it hath above the Law of Moses, it tends infinitely more to the making men righteous, than that Law possibly could for any thing there is in it of this nature, and to that purpose. And it may therefore be said to be EVERLASTING, as it is to continue not as did the LAW for a Season only, but till Christ's coming again. For the Days thereof are the last Days. [Heb. i. 2.] (e) Tishri ii. 11. (f) And therefore the Gospel is called the LAW of LIBERTY. James i. 25. ii. 12. (g) Heb. ix. 26. (h) For so the Original word signifies as well as to fest. ap. (i) Luke xxiv. 27. (j) Jer. xxxix. 10. (k) viii. of a 70 Years Captivity. Jer. xxxvi. 12. (l) For the Prophecy of these Weeks was given in the first of Daniel [Dan. ix. 1] within two years of the Jews return.
winds its conclusion. And in process of time Jerusalem by Holy City now lying in her Desola-
tions, in which she was left by Nebuchad-
nezzar the King of Babylon’s Army, when they
burnt the City and Temple thereof (a), shall sure-
ly be raised out of them. For whereas this
is what thou hast so much had at thy heart,
and made it the earnest request of thy lips (b),
even that God would bebold, and cause to be re-
build the now desolate City. Know assuredly
that God hath determined in favour of her, that
in process of time a royal Commandment, or ex-
press Licence from a King of Persia shall be
issued forth for the causing her to be rebuilt.

Therefore note thou this for thy own
immediate comfort, and satisfaction with re-
spect to the certain restoration of thy holy City.

And with respect to the far more im-
portant restoration of the lost world, or the re-
demption of Jew, and Gentile from the tyran-
ny and Subjection of Sin, Satan, and Death
immediately to be accomplished through the
merits and satisfaction of a suffering Messiah,
Let the whole world, and thy people especially
look for him as such. And let them learn the
precise time by God determined for his Suffer-
ing, from the actual going forth of the now
mention’d Commandment.

For let this be noted as a sure characteristic
thereof, that from the going forth of the Com-
mandment to rebuild Jerusalem unto the Messi-
ach the Prince victorious in his Sufferings, and
in his Cross (c) openly triumphing over Powers
and Principalities, there shall be reckoned in pre-
cise computation of the time thereof seven
weeks, and threescore and two Weeks of these
seventy Weeks here in general determined upon
Jerusalem.

And whereas I have now given thee two
particular and distinct periods of these Weeks.
Note thou also the lesser (d) of these two for

(a) 2 Kings xxv. 8. and parallel places.  (b) Dan. ix. 16, 17,
18, 19.  (c) Coloss. ii. 15.  (d) The מִשְׂרָהּ פִּסָּה
Anguishia temporum, the narrow space of these two
periods, or the pittance of time; and that was the seven
Weeks. In the beginning whereof the Walls of JERUSALEM
were set up by NEHEMIAH, and by his provident manage-
ment the City was put into a way of being rebuilt, as we
shall see hereafter.
The Pro. as it stands in our Translation.

v. 26. And after three score and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself: And the people of the Prince that shall come shall destroy the City, and the Sanctuary; and the End thereof shall be with a flood; and unto the end of the War, Desolations are determined.

The rebuilding of thy holy City. For the walls thereof, which are now in their rubbish shall be repair'd, and set up again; and the houses also of the now naked and ruinous streets shall be rebuilt within the first seven weeks reckon'd from the going forth of the Commandment licen

fing such rebuilding.

But especially let the greater of these two periods be here noted; for that is of the utmost importance to all the sons of men: And therefore I again repeat it, and the precise time thereof, for their more solemn attention, and by way of full explanation of myself in those preceding words, Unto Messiah the Prince; viz. that AFTER, or precisely in the PASSOVER next following upon the expiration of these three score and two weeks, added to the foregoing seven weeks, shall the MESSIAH be cut off; [crucified] (a). For as I before told thee, that from the going forth of the Commandment now mention'd, there must be reckon'd seven weeks, and three score and two weeks unto Messiah the Prince triumphing on the Cross (b), so I hereby confirm the same, by expressly declaring unto thee, and to all mankind, that after those seven weeks, and three score and two weeks the Messiah shall surely die the death of the Cross (c).

Even thy people, they of thy holy City shall be the principal Actors in this Tragedy. The Messiah will come unto them as HIS OWN, but they will not receive him (d): Yea they will reject

(a) The original word here is מתי. He shall be cut off.

Now to be cut off, in the true signification of the word, is to be cut off judicially, either by man's judgment or by the judgment of God. The learned Jews may find that the word מתי signifies for in forty places of their Scripture. And it is never used otherwise in speaking of a person Affirmatively, as it is here in this Prophecy. Now as to our blest Saviour's case, he was cut off judicially both ways. First, He was by the judgement of God, in being made a curse for us; [Gal. iii. 13.] and that according to the sentence of the Law; Which saith, He that is hanged is accursed of God. [Deut. xxi. 23.] Secondly, He was by the judgement of Man. For according to the usual practice upon accursed criminals, He was taken, and tried for his life, and being adjudged guilty, he was condemned, and put to death; even to such a death as the Law of the Land had prescribed for the crime whereof he was accursed: as particularly in the Roman Empire for any one of servile condition that was found guilty of any State crime, by their Law He was to be crucified. (b) Coloss. ii. 15.

(c) See the Note a.  (d) John i. 11.
The PROPHECT Explain'd.

The Pro. as it stands in our Translation.

reject him, and kill him (a). And so in all this their cruel, and despiteful usage of him, the Prince of Life (b), they will most deservedly forfeit all their right, and title in him as their LORD; for hereupon they shall be no more HIs People (c).

Nor is this all,-Their punishment for so ungrateful, and foul an act, shall not consist barely in their being rejected by him, who had been himself first cast out by them (d): but his just Vengeance will proceed so far, as that they shall be no more a PEOPLE. For The ROMANS (e) shall come, and take away both their place and nation (f). For over them as HIS people (g) will the Messiah preside, in order to their destroying thy people, and to their utterly laying waste their City and Sanctuary, as they shall come up against it like an overflowing, and raging Insurrection, sweeping all before it: for as War shall surely be upon the Jewish nation for their cutting off the Messiah (b), as at their hands shall his blood be required, so it shall be most fatal, and final to them, as it shall not be ended but with the entire subversion both of their Church, and State. And therefore to the end of the War, nothing but a continued succession of DESOLATIONS is determined.

To the more effectual carrying on, and compleating of which determined Judgement of

v. 27. And He shall confirm the Co-

(a) Luke xx. 15. (b) Acts iii. 15. (c) לְכָּשׁוּל בָּשׁוּל. Et non erit ei populus ejus. Mede p. 704. The words are explain'd by those which follow populus Principis venturus, i.e. futurum, the People that should be the People of Messiah the Prince, when Israel was rejected. So the Hebrews call seculum futurum עֲלֵו כְּלַעֲלַע: Whence Mark, x. 30. Luke xvii. 30. *Amen o εἰς ποιὸς. The People of the Roman Empire, where Christ was principally to have his Church, and Kingdom: whilst Israel should be rejected. 1b. p. 705. (d) Luke xx. 15. (e) See note c. (f) John xi. 48. (g) The Roman Army in this Service was the army of the Messiah. Matt. xx. 7. He sent forth HIS ARMIES; &c. So Nebuchadnezzar was of old call'd by God, MT SERVANT, Jer. xxv. 9, xxvii. 6, xxviii. 10. And in his Service against TITRE, Ezek. xxix. 18. They wrought for me, saith the Lord God. v 20. (h) Tho' the cutting off the Messiah was by Pilate the Roman Governor of Judæa, yet he charg'd it upon the Jews, as being done only by their urging him to it, Matt. xxvii. 24. And they also took it upon themselves in those words of theirs to Pilate, v. 25. His blood be on us, and on our Children.
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Of God upon the Jewish nation by the said people of the Messiah, the Romans. Be it farther known as to the time, and manner of Accomplishment, that they shall make a firm (a) Covenant with many Nations in one of these seventy weeks here determined in general upon thy people, and holy City. And this is the WEEK yet to be accounted for: as I have hitherto accounted only for seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks of the said Seventy. Let this therefore be noted as the yet remaining ONE WEEK immediately determined upon thy people, and holy City for their, and its utter, or complete Destruction. In which as the Romans shall in the beginning thereof enter into firm alliances with many of their neighbouring nations, that they may be more at leisure to carry on this their great work appointed them of God, so as I must make farther revelation here, for I have it yet in commission to declare, and specify it, that to their rendering the latter HALF (b) of this one week yet more distinguished, they shall be actually at war with the Jews all that time, as in the beginning thereof the war shall break out, and in a continuation thereof the Romans shall carry it on to their coming, and sitting down before the holy City, and laying close siege to it; to the causing in the end thereof the daily SACRIFICE and OBLATION to cease, and also to the causing to stand upon the TEMPLE (c) the ABOMINATION of DESOLATION (d), the sure presage, or token (e) of the time being then actually come upon Jerusalem for her final

(a) The Original word is simply בְּכָלֶא A Covenant without any prefix ב to make it the Covenant. (b) כָּלֶא signifies the HALF part, and not the MIDST. 

Prid. p. 293. Con. Hist. in a bottom Note. The accomplishment of the Event shew'd it was the latter HALF.


(a) Mat. xxiv. 15. Mark xii. 14.
The Pro. as it stands in our Translation. final Desolation: Even the time of her being trodden down by the Gentiles (a). For in this Desolation she shall continue irrecoverably, even until the consummation of God's determin'd Vengeance, with respect to her the Desolate; and with respect to the Gentiles her Desolators (b), even until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled. (c)

(a) Luke xxii. 24. (b) for the word ἁγαίρεσις is rendered both ways, and may be taken either way.
(c) Luke xxii. 24.
INTRODUCTION.

The way of Introduction into the ensuing Treatise, it may not be improper.

First, To premise some few general Observations concerning the Seventy weeks of this Prophecy, for the better understanding of what may be said hereafter concerning them;

Secondly, To lay down some general rules, which are I conceive ever necessary to be followed in the prosecution of a work of this nature; And

Thirdly, To set forth the method used in the ensuing Treatise.

First, of the general Observations to be here premiz'd concerning these Weeks; They are such as relate either to the nature of them, or to their Division, or to their order, or course of reckoning.

First, of the nature of the weeks of this Prophecy.

And in few words, these weeks must be either weeks of Days, as a week contains seven Days, or else they must be Weeks of Years, as a Week in the Language of Prophecy contains seven Years; that is, seven Days prophetically denoting seven Years: An express proof whereof we have in the Prophet Ezekiel (a), A Day for a Year, a Day for a Year. Thus by God's own immediate and express Appointment to that Prophet, his three hundred and ninety Days were to be three hundred and ninety Years, and his forty Days were to be forty Years.

And that these weeks of Daniel must be thus understood as being thus weeks of Years, and not of Days. It appears from the Prophet himself in his different way of speaking, when he cometh afterward occasionally to make mention of Weeks of Days: As he doth in the tenth Chapter (b). There historically making mention of twenty one Days, he expresseth himself not simply by so many Days, but by their proportionate number of Weeks, as Weeks of Days, viz. three weeks of days. For herein the Original is express, though in our Translation it be rendered only in the ordinary Sense thereof three full Weeks. The Prophet hath also a second (c) time repeated

(a) Ezek. iv. 5. 6.  (b) ver. 1. 2.  (c) ver. 3.
repeated his three weeks of Days. In our Translation we read, 'till three whole Weeks were fulfilled: But our three whole Weeks are in the original as before, three Weeks of Days. This Addition of Days in both places is evidently explanatory (a), and sheweth that Daniel here speaks of ordinary Weeks or Weeks of Days, and not of such weeks as in the foregoing Chapter are spoken of as prophetical Weeks, or Weeks of Years.

That the Reader might not be mistaken herein, Daniel did farther explain himself (b) by shewing in what words the Angel excus'd his not coming to him all that Time. The Angel told him that it was because the King of Persia withstood him twenty one Days. These twenty one Days here simply expressed by their number of Days as Days, were plainly the same space of time with that otherwise before expressed by three Weeks of Days.

This Proof might be made yet stronger if it were necessary. But the matter is so plain, that it is acknowledged perhaps universally by all Jews, and by all Christians before our Country-Man Sir John Marsham, who would by all means to have these twenty one Days of the Prophet to have been twenty one Years.

But this assertion is equally true with that other (c) which he hath advanced with it, namely, that Daniel's Abstinence in this tenth Chapter was the same with his fasting in sackcloth and ashes mentioned in the foregoing Chapter. But surely he might as well have said that the third Year of Cyrus was the same with the first of Darius, as he must have said were he to have spoken here to any purpose; (and would his surprising Hypothesis here (See note c) have allowed of it:) for this Fatt was in the first year of Darius (d). And that Abstinence was in the third year of Cyrus (e). The Texts are express therein; and that in Daniel's evident successive reckoning of the reigns of those Kings, as I shall have occasion to shew very fully hereafter (f).

Where-

(a) So Akbarbini, and R. David Kimchi. See Wagensi. p. 51-52.
(b) ver. 13.
(c) Another such Assertion is that of Sir J. Marsham's, of his telling us of another King between Darius and Cyrus, whereas according to Daniel there was no other King between: for the Prophet was careful to tell us that after Darius's death, the next King was Cyrus the Persiam. [Ch. vi. 28.] But here between, Sir J. M. hath clapt in the Ahasuerus in the book of Esther, to whom he hath given a long reign of forty two years. [Cam. Chron. p. 590.] Alas! where did he think Daniel was all that time? A like vain attempt is that of his bringing Daniel's four Visions to terminate in one and the same thing, and that to be only the prophaneing the second Temple, by setting up Heathen Idolatry in it for three or four Years in Antiochus Epiphanes his time; and to make this third Vision of no other use, but only to be a Chronology for it. And for his beginning the first viz Weeks of the 1xx in the first year of Darius, what strange fancies he had to make him to be a Medo-Persian, that was made King over the realm of the Chaldaens, as he faith, at Sippe, by taking that City and Kingdom from King Nebuchadnezzar, who for all that, within four or five years after, by this Gentleman's telling, ran mad with excess of Prosperity? These things are noted here occasionally, to shew that Gentleman's followers that he is not infallible. I shall have farther occasion to observe other instances hereof in such matters as Mr. Lancaster hath followed him, though in them they are both evidently mistaken.
(d) Dan. ix. 1.
(e) ch. x. 1.
(f) i.e., in the next Chapter, wherein Mr. L. hath given us occasion to shew his great mistake in confounding the first year of the reign of Cyrus with the first of his Uncle, and Father-in-law Darius.
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Wherefore the Weeks of this Prophecy being weeks of Years, every one of the seventy weeks do consequently contain seven Years, and so the whole number of Years contain'd in the said number of weeks do necessarily amount to four hundred and ninety Years; to so many, and no more (a).

And herein Chronologers both Jewish (b), and Christian (c) being thus generally agreed, it is the less needful to enlarge upon this subject. And therefore truly it was not my intention to have troubled the Reader with any thing more than what I have now said of the thus agreed nature of these Weeks.

But whereas the reverend Mr. Lancaster in a late Essay upon them hath disallowed this their abstracted nature as thus containing four hundred and ninety years, and no more, and hath rais'd them into a twofold enlarged period, the one of five hundred Years, the other of five hundred and seventy (d), it is therefore become necesserry for me, in order to the full establishment of the true nature of the Weeks of this Prophecy, to enquire into this new (e) proceeding of Mr. L. in his Exposition of these weeks, and to look into the foundation of his Hypothesis, and distinctly, and fully to consider it, that so in a clear and full view of things, we may be enabled to discover if with any sufficient ground, or not, the abstracted nature of the weeks of this Prophecy be rejected by him, and the fore-mentioned twofold enlarged periods of them be preferred and built upon. But these things necessarily requiring a great deal more room than can here possibly be allowed them under general Observations, and with these only we are at the present concern'd, I shall beg the Reader's leave to let them be a while postponed to a distinct, and particular consideration to follow in a Chapter immediately after what I am now in general premising concerning these weeks.

In the mean time the abstracted nature of these weeks of Years as containing exactly four hundred and ninety Years, being taken for granted, I proceed to observe

Secondly, As to the Division of the seventy weeks of this Prophecy, that they have expressly therein a threefold Division, as being divided into three distinct periods of seven weeks, and three-score and two weeks, and one week.

For as the Angel speaks in general of seventy weeks, ch. ix. 24. So in the following verses He speaks particularly of the several just now mention'd periods; viz. of seven weeks in v. 25: and of three-score and two weeks, ib. and especially in v. 26; and also of one separate Week

(a) And so the learned Dr. Prideaux tells us, Comm. Hist. Vol. ii. p. 128. and 263.
(b) Maimolum Ben Israel. [Term. Vit. Hum. p. 168.] faith expressly. The seventy Weeks of Daniel make up four hundred ninety Years. And Rebbi Haschubbel [Comm. in Dan.] expresseth himself to like purpose. So also R. Jef. Jachias [Expicio Dan.] and R. Aben Ezra, and others. (c) Down to Sir J. Marsham. (d) Besides an odd year, or two. [See p. 66, 67. of Mr. L. his Essay on Daniel.] But these we may give Mr. L. and not trouble the Reader with them. (e) As Mr. L. himself truly so calls it, p. 60. l. 13. 5. five.
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Week in v. 27, and of that also as distinguished with a more remarkable Half thereof. ib.

And these three distinct periods in the abstracted nature of these Weeks of Years being in the whole four hundred and ninety Years, Consequently in the first period of seven Weeks there are so many times seven Years, that is to say forty nine Years: In the second period of three score and two Weeks there are also so many times seven Years, that is to say four hundred and thirty four Years: But as we must not fail of noting here, these sixty two Weeks, or four hundred and thirty four Years following in one and the same current reckoning upon the foregoing seven Weeks, or forty nine years (as we shall see anon (a) that they do,) it therefore comes to pass that this second period of weeks is thus truly constituted a period of four hundred eighty three Years. And in the third period of the separate one week of this Prophecy there are just seven Years.

And the Angel hath therefore thus solemnly divided these weeks into this diversity of Periods by reason of the manifest diversity of predicted Events, which according to the express letter of the Prophecy were to have their several completions in these their respective periods: Which completions, as it is evident from History, and as we shall shew hereafter they had accordingly (b). Wherefore I observe.

Thirdly, as to the Order, or Course of reckoning of these weeks, that the whole seventy weeks are not all of them weeks current in one and the same continued reckoning, but only the seven weeks, and sixty two weeks are so.

For the Angel hath plainly taught us to reckon only the two first periods of these weeks, viz. the first period of seven weeks, and the second period of sixty two weeks, from one and the same Beginning; viz. from the going forth of the Commandment to rebuild Jerusalem, as in v. 25. of which more in its proper place hereafter. We note it here to shew, as well that these sixty two weeks of this Prophecy are therefore necessarily current in reckoning upon the foregoing seven weeks, as also that hence it is that the said seven weeks, and sixty two weeks do in such current, or continued reckoning make up the second period of this Prophecy truly a period of four hundred and eighty three Years.

There is consequently a yet remaining one week, as it is called in v. 27. of this Prophecy; A week of Years this, not current in reckoning with the rest, but a week by itself, a separate or single week.

(a) ix. In the next general Observation. (b) And therefore surely Mr. L. might have spared all that needless pains which we find him to have taken in his Appendix, as touching the reason of the Division of these Weeks. For what hath evidently its own foundation in, and of itself needeth not the invention of an imaginary one; especially of such a one as is there giv'n us, which in truth is made up of nothing but Inconsistency, and Mistake in a groundless deduction from Ezekiel's [ch. iv. 4, 5, 6.] three hundred and ninety days of the Iniquity of the House of Israel, and forty days of the Iniquity of the House of Judah. To this I shall speak a few words in the end of the promised Chapter on the nature of these Weeks.
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week, having therefore necessarily, a different beginning from those preceding it; a distinguished week, whose grand Event as we shall see particularly hereafter, was the utter or final Destruction of Jerusalem, the City and Sanctuary, as in v. 26. of this Prophecy.

This at present taken for granted, I urge it as an unanswerable argument against any current reckoning whatsoever of all these seventy weeks, or the whole four hundred and ninety years in one conjoined and continued reckoning from the going forth of the Commandment to rebuild Jerusalem: Which truly is the grand Characteristic, or Note of beginning of the seven weeks, and also of the sixty two weeks of this Prophecy, but not possibly of the remaining one week, as we shall see fully hereafter.

There were but four solemn Commandments, as we shall see anon, which at any time went forth in favour of Jerusalem from the Kings of Persia. But no continued Reckoning whatsoever of the whole seventy Weeks, or four hundred and ninety Years from the going forth of any of those Commandments can possibly be brought to end in the year of the V. A.E. of Christ 70, when Jerusalem was destroyed.

In truth it is impossible for any one to reckon the seventy weeks of this Prophecy by one continued reckoning of the whole of them, but he must necessarily in such case run into Absurdities, and evident Inconsistencies with the express letter of this Prophecy in almost all the parts of it.

And upon this rock the generality of Expositors of this solemn Prophecy have split; and have therefore as I may not improperly say, been lost in their respective Hypotheses. Even the learned Mr. Dean of Norwich by reason of such current reckoning in his late Hypothesis (a) of these weeks, hath verified what I have now asserted. With all due submission be this spoken.

He reckons the seventy weeks of years, or the four hundred and ninety years of this Prophecy, all of them current, or going on in one continued reckoning from the seventh year of Artaxerxes Longimarmus King of Persia. And even this is not the true Scripture beginning of these weeks, as we shall see hereafter. But in such Mr. Dean's continued reckoning of them from such beginning, they end in the year of the V. A.E. of Christ 33. And so Mr. Dean makes the whole number of years of the said weeks to terminate in the death of Christ in that year. He could not make them to end in the destruction of Jerusalem in the year of the V. A.E. of Christ 70, for that overshoots Mr. Dean's reckoning some thirty seven years. Therefore he hath made them to end in the death of Christ.

But surely in such ending of the whole 70 weeks of this Prophecy, Mr. Dean hath departed from the express letter of it, in a twofold remarkable instance. For that expressly set forth the death of Christ as the grand Event of the seven weeks, and sixty two weeks.

(a) In his excellent book of Con. Hist. v. 1. p. 263, &c.
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weeks (a), or four hundred and eighty three years; Mr. Dean contrar-y wife of seventy weeks, or four hundred and ninety years. That also consequently maketh not the death of Christ, as Mr. Dean hath so made it, but otherwise expressly setteth forth the destruction of Jerusalem as the grand and immediate Event of the one week, or the last week of the seventy, and especially of the (latter) Half thereof (b).

So far is the Prophecy from making the said grand Event, viz. the destruction of Jerusalem an Event exclusive of the seventy weeks of it, as Mr. Dean of Norwich hath been constrain’d to make it for the sake of his Hypothesis (c). These and many other Inconveniences attending such continued reckoning of the whole seventy weeks of this Prophecy from one and the same Beginning will be more particularly shewn in their proper places, when we come hereafter to treat of the respective Beginnings, and Endings of these weeks. They are curiously observ’d here by way of shewing in general the utter impossibility that any Hypothesis of these weeks should be a true Scripture Hypothesis of them in all its parts agreeing with the Prophecy, when such Hypothesis is founded, and built upon one continued Reckoning of the whole Seventy Weeks thereof.

Having premis’d these few general Observations, I come

In the second place to lay down some general rules which I conceive are absolutely necessary to be observ’d in the prosecution of a Work of this nature. And they are these following:

First, One place of Scripture must never be so interpreted, as that by the consequences of, or inferences from it, the same shall by such exposition or inference be made to oppose another.

For, if in this case I may be allowed to apply the words of the Apostle (d), No Prophecy of Scripture is of any private Interpretation: And in Mr. Dean of Norwich’s words (e) there must be no Opposition between Scripture and Scripture. For as he very truly saith soon after (f), The sacred Writ being dictated by the holy Spirit of God, must ever be of infallible truth. Indeed it ever was, and will be evermore so; be the Disputers of this World never so wise, or let them gain-say never so much, it matters not.

Secondly, Express Characters in the Text must always closely be adher’d to, and expounded as giv’n in the letter of them, unless there appear very evident cause for the contrary. But especially they must be always then so expounded, when other Scriptures do expressly point out, and immediately warrant such literal Exposition.

Therefore such express Characters must by no means be robbed of their true literal sense in which they are giv’n in holy Writ.

They

(a) v. 26. (b) v. 27. (c) And Mr. Lancaster also no less for the sake of his; tho’ he ends not the seventy Weeks till three years and a half after our Saviour’s death: but this is absolutely without foundation, as we shall see hereafter. (d) St. Peter 2 Ep. i. 20. (e) Comm. Hist. vol. i. p. 301. l. 55. (f) p. 302-1. 2.
They must not be interpreted at large, or expounded away in a figure for the sake of an Hypothesis, or, if we may thus speak here, for the sake of any man's private Interpretation. For this were in truth to adapt a Prophecy to an Hypothesis; And not whereas it surely ought to be every Interpreter's especial care to square that in all its parts exactly according to the Prophecy in the literal express Characters thereof.

Thirdly, the Canon of Ptolemy, as it ought ever to be the Chronologers guide in point of time coincident with Scripture times in any Scripture Exposition, so it ought to be a rule to him once and always in the Chronological Exposition of the Prophecy before us.

It therefore ought to be the Chronologers guide by reason of its great exactness of Chronological truth, it being in the words of Mr. Dean of Norwich (a) the surest guide we have in Chronology, it being built upon Astronomical Observations, and being fixed by the Eclipses; And therefore the truth of it may at any time be demonstrated by Astronomical Calculations; Especially if being also verified by its agreement every where with the holy Scriptures.

And it therefore ought to be always the Chronologers Guide, ONCE and ALWAYS throughout an Hypothesis, because he would otherwise be guilty of an evident inconsistency with himself, no less than of manifest injustice also to this golden Rule.——— I am

Thirdly, to set forth the method made use of in the following treatise.

That in few words is the considering the several periods of the Weeks of this Prophecy; their respective Beginnings, and their respective Endings, according to the three differing Hypotheses now before us under examination: And also the shewing as we go along their agreement, or their disagreement with the rules above mention'd; viz.

First, With Scripture in general;

Secondly, and more particularly with EXPRESS CHARACTERS in the text; and

Thirdly, with Ptolemy's Canon.

And whereas, as I have before noted, there are three distinct periods of the seventy weeks of this Prophecy, I shall therefore divide what I have to say upon them into three parts.

The first consequently will treat of the first seven weeks of this Prophecy, or of forty nine Years; The second of the seven weeks, and sixty two weeks, or of four hundred and eighty three years (b); The third and last part will treat of the separate one week, or of the seven Years of the third, and last period of the seventy weeks of

(a) p. 286  (b) Sixty two Weeks make only four hundred thirty four Years; but these following in one and the same continued reckoning upon the foregoing period of forty nine Years, as having one and the same beginning with them (See p. 11.) do thus become a period of four hundred and eighty three Years.
of Years of this Prophecy. This being the method I am to follow, I might now accordingly proceed immediately to consider the first part, or the first seven weeks of this Prophecy, had I not been brought under a necessity as before-mentioned, of speaking in the first place more largely than I have yet done, concerning the true abstracted nature of these weeks. This therefore I shall endeavour to establish in the following chapter, wherein I shall fully consider what Mr. L. hath urged to the contrary.

And I shall shew as from other considerations, so also from that very Hypothesis which he hath built upon his imaginary nature of these weeks, that it is absolutely impossible that they can contain more or less than really seven times seventy, or four hundred ninety Years.
A CHAPTER.

Shewing the abstracted nature of the Seventy Weeks of Years of this Prophecy, as the said number of Weeks of Years contains exactly four hundred and ninety years, and that as they cannot possibly contain less, so neither can they contain more than that number of Years; Or in other words, that they cannot by any means contain five hundred Years in one view, and five hundred and seventy Years in another view, as it hath been suppos'd that they do in a late Hypothesis of these Weeks built upon such mistaken foundation, as the said foundation is here prov'd to be in a particular view, and refutation of it.

The Reverend Mr. L., in his late (a) Essay on these weeks having rejected their true abstracted nature, as they do therein contain exactly four hundred and ninety years, hath instead thereof advanced a twofold computation of them, consider'd, (in his way) according to the Law, as attended by their Jubilees, and Sabbatical Years, and so, (by his telling us) in respect of Jubilees, amounting to five hundred (b) Years, and in respect of Sabbatical Years, to five hundred and seventy (c). And yet in neither of these additional numbers of years were there according to him (d) any more than just seventy weeks.

For much such another period of Weeks, it seems (e) Mr. L. had found out before the date of Cyrus's Decree for the release of the then captive Jews: in the going forth whereof, as that according to him had its ending, so this after it hath its beginning.

The original production of that preceding period of Weeks on which the second is founded is as follows:

First, Mr. L. fram'd to himself a period of five hundred Years, ending in the year preceding the Captivity of the Jews (in his twenty Years rais'd beginning of it, as it will appear hereafter) equal to

(a) Published in the year 1722. (b) p. 60, and 66. (c) Besides two odd years, with which I shall not perplex the Reader, but speak of, still in the round number. (d) p. 66, &c. (e) p. 67.
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to seventy Scripture Weeks attended with their Jubilees. Afterwards
with the addition of the seventy years of the said Captivity upon
a supposition that the Land of Judea lay WHOLLY desolate all
that time, that is, refit from tillage, and so enjoyed seventy Sab-
baths, of which as is farther supposed she had been depri’t by the
Jews transgression of duty in this particular the whole seventy
Weeks preceding the Captivity (a), he makes another period of
five hundred and seventy years (b), in which however as we are told
by him (c) there were no more than seventy Weeks.

This being Mr. Lancaster’s Hypothesis, and this the ground-work
of it, I object against it in general, and I shall endeavour to make
good the objection by proving

First, That such his addition of seventy years to this imagin’d
period to the making it a period of five hundred and seventy Years,
and withal to the making the said period of Years to remain yet
but seventy Weeks of years, and to the arguing us from thence
into another such period of years after in the seventy Weeks of
this Prophecy, is absolutely without foundation, for that on
which it is built is truly none, and none it hath elsewhere; And
therefore if this first period of five hundred and seventy Years equal
to seventy Scripture Weeks be groundless, the latter of course must
be so likewise, as it is entirely depending upon the former. And
as to this latter, I shall shew afterwards, that even were there any
real foundation for the former, yet after all, there is not any
room possibly for arguing from that to this. But

First, of Mr. Lancaster’s first imagin’d period of five hundred and
seventy years before his (d) date of Cyrus’s Decree for the release of the
Jews, I affirm it to be without any manner of real foundation.
For that on which it is built, Mr. L. is quite mistaken in it, viz.,
in the end, occasion, and nature of the Seventy Years of Jerufalem’s
Desolations toretold by Jeremiab (e), which are the very years added
in this first period to the making it a period of five hundred and se-
venty Years, on a mistaken supposition that the Land of Judea
lay WHOLLY desolate from the very first year of the Captivi-
ty, and did therefore lie so desolate all that time by way of God’s
immediate punishment of his people grounded in the other mis-
taken supposition that they had wholly neglected the Sabbatical Years
of seventy preceding weeks.

But all this is indeed Imagination: and such withal as in truth
there is no manner of ground for it.

For to come to particulars,

(a) viz. in his twenty years mistaken beginning of it, as it will fully appear here-
after. (b) five hundred and seventy one Years is the number. p. 67. initio. But we speak
of it in the round number. See Note c. above. (c) p. 67. initio. (d) For his
Year of the going forth of that Decree is not the Scripture Year thereof: as we shall see
hereafter. (e) ch. xxv.
First, The suppos'd Neglect of the Jews is most improbable.

For had the Jews been really guilty of such suppos'd neglect, or Transgression of a positive duty of God to them (a) in this particular, in their having neglected to observe the respective Sabbatical Years of seventy weeks before their Captivity, they must then without all question have been guilty of such neglect for so many preceding weeks (in the words (b) of Mr. L.) either as regularly proceeding one another, or else at different times.

But if in the former view, then such early neglect will necessarily carry us up not only through the times of Solomon and David, but also even into the times of Samuel (c): times these very likely truly (d) wherein to imagine a rise, and continuation of such neglect of a positive Command of God to his people in this particular.

If in the latter view, I cannot then tell indeed whether Mr. L. will carry it. But as to that, we need not to be concern'd, because wherever he carries it, the FACT of the land's keeping Sabbath, or resting from tillage by way of EXACT (e) recompence for so many Mr. L. his suppos'dly neglected Sabbatical Years among the Jews will after all lie against him, to the proving directly not only against the mistaken supposition of neglect simply, or in it self barely consider'd, but also farther against it, if in the next place we consider it, viz.

Secondly, as it is Mr. L.'s REASON (f), or assign'd OCCASION of the Seventy Years Defolations of the land. I might here make short work with the said imagin'd Occasion, by throwing immediately against it, that the failure in fact (g) plainly overthrows it, or evidenceth the groundlessnes of the supposition.

But I must not so pass over this assign'd Occasion of the land's seventy Years suppos'd rest from tillage, for this is what Mr. L. means by the seventy Years Defolations of the land, without speaking yet a few words to it; especially as Mr. L. hath endeavoured to confirm it by certain texts of Scripture by him interpreted accordingly.

Indeed

(a) Levit. xxv. 2, 3. &c. (b) p. 67. (c) Evidently so in Mr. L.'s Hypothesis: for to his period of five hundred and seventy one years before his first of Cyrus, add five hundred and thirty eight as the year before A. D. answer'd to his first of Cyrus, we have the number given one thousand one hundred and nine before A. D. which is fourteen years above the first of King Saul, which was in one thousand and ninety five before A. D. And in the true reckoning here, as adding to the year before A. D. 606, the true first Year of the Captivity four hundred and ninety years only as the years of seventy weeks, we are thus brought up to the next year after the first of the reign of King Saul. See the learned Dr. Prid. [Con. Hist. Vol. i. p. 137.] as touching this point. (d) For SAMUEL was known by all Israel to be a Prophet. 1 Sa. iii. 22. iv. 1. And he was a second Moses for forty years over all Israel. See our Chronological Tables [printed at Oxford, 1713.] sub anno ante A. D. 1135. (e) Mr. L's word us'd in p. 67. (f) p. 25, the REASON why the WHOLE Land of Jews lay defolate and until'd seventy years was because the Jews had neglected the keeping of seventy sabbatical years. So Mr. L. tells us again p. 26, and also p. 60. (g) For, as it will appear, the Jews could not have neglected more than fifty two of Mr. L's exact Seventy.
Indeed that such asfign'd Occasion of the Defolations of Jerusalem might be so in part, I make not the least question. I add that the transgression of the Jews in this particular might be a main occasion of the protraction of their Captivity, as God would not suffer them to return to their Land, till it had enjoyed her Sabbaths (a). But I can by no means concur with Mr. L. in making the said exact negligence, the whole or sole occasion, as he evidently makes it (b), or the REASON absolutely, as he calls it (c), of the whole land of Judea it's lying desolate, or untilled (as he frequently tells us that it did) SEVENTY years, for the following reasons; viz. because

First, in that case the Land must necessarily, and unavoidably have lain wholly desolate without so much as a possibility, or any the least room left for any Inhabitants to have been remaining in her during those seventy Years. But so far was it from that in fact, that after the destruction of the City, and Temple by Nebuchadnezzar, Gedaliah was by him made Governor over the cities of Judah (d). And unto him were committed Men, Women, and Children and of the poor of the land, of them that were not carried away to Babylon (e) to till the ground, and dress their vineyards (f). And there they might have remained securely so doing for any thing that appears to the contrary, had it not been for the wicked slaughter of Gedaliah by the treachery of their own country-man Ishmael afterwards in that year.

Nay also after that by a positive message from God to them by his Prophet (g), there might yet with safety have tarried in the Land Jobanan and the remnant with him, had they not been deaf to the voice of God to them by that Prophet, and resolutely bent upon going into Egypt to their sure destruction after. Which sooner, or later did befall them accordingly: such of them as either made no long stay in Egypt, but return'd again into Judea, or otherwise had not gone out of their own country at all, being carried away by Nebuzaradan four years after, who were only seven hundred and forty five persons (b); and such of them as staid it out in Egypt, most of them there falling into the hands of the Babylonians in the ravage made upon that Land by Nebuchadnezzar after (i). And yet after all, still a few of them, a small number, according to the Prophet

---

(a) 2 Chron. xxxvi. 21. (b) p. 12, 13, and elsewhere. (c) As in the places quoted in last Note f. (d) Jer xl. 5. (e) ver. 7. (f) ver. 10. See Josephus here also, lib. Ant. x. c. ix. Ed. Hulst. p. 451. where he represents Gedaliah counselling to remain in the Country without any fear of the Babylonians, promising that in MANKIND their LAND they should incur no inconvenience. &c. &c. So far was he from thinking with Mr. L. that the Land was unavoidably, and necessarily to lie desolate the whole time of the Captivity. (g) Jer. xiii. 10. If ye will STILL abide in this land, then will I build you, and not pull you down, and I will plant you. &c. &c. See Josephus also in loc. sup. cit. (h) Jer. lii. 30. (i) Probably in the Year after the taking of Tyre, viz. in five hundred and seventy two before A. D. or according to Dr. Prideaux in the year of the taking of Tyre, viz. in five hundred and seventy three. Nebuchadnezzar ravaging Egypt presently after it.
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phet (a), that escaped the sword (of Nebuchadnezzar) was to return out of the land of Egypt into the land of Judah.—But

Secondly, had the Jews neglected exactly the Sabbaths of seventy weeks preceding their Captivity, they had then surely transgressed against the positive Law of God to them in that particular for four hundred and ninety years at the least (b). But for the Jews to have made full satisfaction to the Land for so many years its neglected Sabbaths, the Land ought in fact to have reseed, or to have lain wholly desolate, and untilled really not only seventy years, as Mr. L. tells us that it did (c), but at the least eighty years, if not more. For to four hundred and ninety years there being added the seventy years of the Captivity, the whole number hereof being 560, this being divided by 7 in order to throw out every Sabbatical year of that number of years, evidently gives 80 Sabbatical years in this period only confider'd thus in relation to its Sabbatical Years supposed by Mr. L. to have been not kept.

That this is no other than a true State of the case it is plain, forasmuch as Mr. L's seventy supposed Sabbatical Years of the Captivity could in this case satisfy only for the four hundred and twenty working years of the whole preceding four hundred and ninety; one of these of the Captivity being added to every sixth of those for sabbatical recompence, and so the whole 70 of the Captivity being added to those four hundred and twenty working years, making together four hundred and ninety sabbatical years. But where all this while is the satisfaction to the Land for the seventy regularly included sabbatical years themselves of the imagin'd preceding period of four hundred and ninety years before the Captivity? For in seventy sabbatical weeks of years, or in four hundred and ninety years, there are ever regularly included seventy sabbatical years. But these seventy sabbatical years, which in the very nature, and foundation of a sabbatical period are ever included, and therefore in their own regular course ought to have been observed, and kept as such, are all here supposed to have been neglected before the Captivity. For 'tis the very foundation of Mr. L's Hypothesis, that for so many sabbatical years of that period of years preceding the Captivity, the land was barrass'd, or torn up as in other ordinary years, for which seventy regular sabbatical years it surely therefore requir'd an exactly proportionate rest also. But for these the seventy supposed Desolations of the land during the Captivity are incapable of making any satisfaction: because as above, they can but satisfy for four hundred and twenty working years of Mr. L's seventy weeks preceding the Captivity.

Therefore in order to have made full satisfaction to the Land even for those seventy regular sabbatical years of that period, as such they really were by divine institution, and order of place, but in the Jews violation of them ceased to be so, as being prophesied, and unhallowed by their tillage of the Land in them, even

(a) Jer. xlii. 28. (b) This number of years there is confessedly in seventy weeks of years, (c) but in a mistake, forasmuch as the land rested at most but fifty two years, as I shall shew.
contain exactly four hundred, and ninety Years.

in all of them according to Mr. L., and in that respect they became like unto the other four hundred and twenty working years thereof, there ought I say on this account to have been an additional ten years to the Captivity by way of recompence to the Land for ten sabbatical Years of ten more neglected weeks of years in this five hundred and sixty years period now before us; the said exact additional number being absolutely requisite upon Mr. L's own Hypothesis here (a), as God's immediate and adequate Punishment of the Jews for such notorious neglect.

And if Farther, we view Mr. L's whole period of five hundred and seventy years here, as not only his seventy years of the Captivity as sabbatical years, but also his ten years as years of Jubilee are thrown into four hundred and ninety, to the making them five hundred and seventy Years equal still according to him only to seventy weeks, and if we divide this larger number by seven for the casting out the sabbatical years of that whole number of years, that evidently gives us one other sabbatical year, as seven times eighty one is certainly found in that number, besides the remaining years. But here the years of the Captivity in this view are still increasing to the farther confirmation of the point in hand. The absurdity whereof is too apparent to be insinuated on, forasmuch as the years of the Jewish Captivity were not of eighty years continuance, as in the former view it must have been; and more it must have been in this upon the footing of Mr. L's supposition before us, but was only a Captivity of seventy years.

Thirdly, Mr. L. himself, however he hath built his Hypothesis upon this his imagin'd neglect of so many sabbatical years among the Jews exactly of seventy weeks preceding the Captivity, as the VERY OCCASION, or REASON absolutely, (as in the places above (b) quoted) of his seventy years desolations of the land, yet he himself hath elsewhere (c) taught us to look upon this only as among other reasons, and consequently not as the whole and sole occasion for which the Desolations of Jerusalem were brought upon the Jews. And Mr. L. hath here (d) at last doubtless spoken the truth, as other great and moving causes, viz. many other notorious, and heinous transgressions among the Jews as well as this were evidently concurring to this God's remarkable punishment of his people in thus his giving them into the hands of, and scattering them among the Heathen; as it might be gather'd from many passages of the Prophets to this purpose, were there occasion for it (e).

C 3

(a) Agreeably to what Mr. L. hath told us, p. 26. 10, &c. and elsewhere.
(b) viz. in page 16 above. (c) in p. 67, 4, 7. (d) ib. (e) It may suffice to note the following Jer. xxxv. 4. &c. where the Prophet in general terms reproving the Jews disobedience, afterwards foretells the seventy years Captivity. And Ch. xxxii. 39, 34, 37, the utter Destruction of the Jews in the 11th of Zedekiah is evidently attributed to their Abominations in causing Judah to sin. So again Ch. xlv. 3. And to mention only one text more, viz. 2 Chron. xxxvi. 14. where we read both of the Priests, and the people their transgressing very much after all the ABOMINATIONS of the Heathen.
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And therefore surely Mr. L. hath in vain endeavou'rd to find out other passages in Scripture in his favour, as proving the seventy years Desolations of Jerusalem to be no other than his imagin'd resting of the WHOLE LAND from tillage all that time by way of the Jews exact payment, or satisfaction to it as above. Such are these Texts following,

First, that in the Prophet Jeremiah. [Ch. xxv. 11.]
Secondly, that in the second book of Chronicles. [ch. xxxvi. 21.]

But neither of these Texts are really for Mr. L's purpose otherwise than he hath made them so by his own mistaken gloss upon them.

In the former Text we read these words of the Prophet concerning Judæa, this whole land shall be a Desolation, and an Affliction. And these nations shall serve the King of Babylon seventy years.

Hence infers Mr. L. (a) that according to the Prophet, the WHOLE Land of Judæa during the space of seventy years was to lye WHOLLY desolate.

But this can be no otherwise than as Mr. L. hath coupled the Prophets seventy years in the end of the verse with the whole of it; whereas the Prophet hath certainly fixed it only to the latter part thereof. For thus he hath told us here expressly as to the Vandalage of the Jews, that their Nation should serve the King of Babylon seventy years: but as to the WHOLE land's lying desolate, at least in Mr. L's sense of the land's resting from tillage all that time, he hath not said it, that this also should be for seventy years.

But Mr. L. hath told us, that the words Seventy years are to be applied to both parts of the said verse. And he hath also told us (b), that this is evident from the Prophet Daniel, as he hath said (c) that he understood the number of years whereof the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah the Prophet, that he would accomplish seventy years in the Desolations of Jerusalem. For adds Mr. L. There is no other place in Jeremiah, to which this word is here said can be properly, if at all referred, as the said 11th verse of the 25th Chapter of Jeremiah.

Now with Mr. L's good leave why might not Daniel refer here also to that other place (d) in Jeremiah hereunto evidently relating, as well as this?

Heathen, and polluting the house of the Lord, &c. —— Here the sacred Historian principally and most expressly singles out the great sin of IDOLATRY as a most certain, and prevailing occasion of the Desolations of Jerusalem; however Mr. L. hath confin'd his affin'd occasion of them to verse 21 of this Chapter, viz. that the Land might enjoy her [seventy] Sabbaths, as in p. 12. of his book, yet at 'tis plain from hence, that this Author never intended that as his meaning here; and that he certainly could not to intend it, we shall see more at large presently.

(a) p. 12. l. 13. (b) ib. (c) Dan. ix. ver. 2. (d) vix. Ch. xxix. 10. Thus faith the Lord, that AFTER seventy years be accomplished at Babylon, I will visit you, and perform my good word towards you in causing you to return to this place.
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What hinders that he should not have referr'd to both? Or
what is there in this more than in that, that should make him
wholly to regard that, and have no regard at all to this?

In both places seventy years are equally predicted to be ac-
complished. But in that referr'd to by Mr. L., and according to him
by Daniel also, only the seventy years Desolations are foretold; In
the other a gracious promise is made by God to his people of
their return from Babylon into their own country after those seventy
years.

To this therefore without all question Daniel might equally re-
fer as to that; indeed much rather, as the here promised return of
the Jews after that God had accomplished seventy years in the De-
solations of Jerusalem, was a much more pleasing reflection, for
him to have fixed his thoughts upon, than barely as in the other
place, the term of the Jews denounced Desolations, or seventy years
Vassalage to Babylon.

But it really matters not to which of these two places Daniel re-
fer'd, as to Mr. Lancaster's inference from thence to the making
the seventy years Desolations of Jerusalem, and the land's lying
WHOLLY desolate to be of equal continuance, or to have had one,
and the same beginning, tho' they had one and the same end-
ing in the Jews return from Babylon. For this is evidently to
confound the history of those times, and to make those things of e-
qual duration, which in fact were otherwise. For, as we shall fully
see anon, the Desolations of Jerusalem were actually commenced in
the fourth year of Jeboiakim, when the City was taken by Nebu-
chadnezzar, and when also the King of Judah became tributary to
the King of Babylon, and when Consequentially began the seventy years
Captiveiy, and Vassalage to Babylon. And these now begun Desolati-
ons of Jerusalem were from time to time increasing and carrying on
till the 11th of Zedekiab; eighteen years after, when they were fully
accomplished in the burning of the City, and Temple, and were
thenceforward attended with the Desolations of the WHOLE land as
then at soonest the Land began to lye WHOLLY desolate, and so
continued till the end of the Captivity.

But as Mr. L. hath, notwithstanding, conceived that Daniel could
not so properly refer to our place of Jeremiah, as to his, it must be,
as I suppose, for this reason, viz. because it was in the first (a)
year of Darius that Daniel understood this, as to the number of the years of
the Desolations of Jerusalem; and in that year the punishment of the
King of Babylon, and of that nation began. Therefore Mr. L.
might be induced to think that Daniel might most properly, if not
wholly refer to his place of the Prophet Jeremiah (b).

But even this doth not hinder but that still Daniel might with
equal propriety refer to that other place of Jeremiah (c) also: tho'
it was but in the first of Darius that he made that reference, and

(a) Dan. ix. 1, 2. (b) See Mr. L. p. 12. (c) Ch. xxix. 10, 14.
two years before the actual accomplishment of the divine promise to the Jews of God’s causing them to return to their place (a).

And there is reason to think that he did so, because he speaks expressly not of Babylon’s downfall at the end of seventy years, but of the ending of the Desolations of Jerusalem after their appointed time, as God by his Prophet Jeremiah had determined to accomplish seventy years in those Desolations (b).

But whereas Mr. L. must here necessarily have imagin’d that as he hath since, so Daniel must also before him have concluded that the Desolations of Jerusalem should have their ending immediately in the downfall of Babylon, this I object against as being very unlike, because as yet the seventy years of the Captivity were not fully accomplished. Nor was it till two years after, when the Jews were released, and returned home by virtue of Cyrus’s Decree, granted to them for that purpose in the first year of his reign after the death of Darius (c). For till that time surely not only Jerusalem, but the land of Judæa did in fact lye WHOLLY desolate; and so long consequentely She kept Sabbath according to Mr. L. himself, from 2 Chron. xxxvi. 21: And therefore the Desolations of the land could not have an end two years before in the first of Darius, which in fact continued two years after, viz. till the first of Cyrus.

Therefore did we after all grant Mr. L. that Daniel in the place before us might more properly refer, as he would have it, to his place of Jeremiah, and have not at all referred to the other place, which by the way as we have shewn is very improbable, yet Mr. L. can get nothing by this: but must herein plainly see himself confuted upon his own foundation. For then his inference or deduction from thence of the WHOLE LAND’s lying desolate or refting from tillage EXACTLY seventy years will be followed with a necessary excess of two years, or of its lying desolate seventy two years: as it necessarily must have done from his mistaken beginning of the seventy years of the Jewish Captivity from the 11th of Zedekiah in his twenty years rise thereof, at the exact distance of seventy years from the year of Cyrus’s taking of Babylon, where he ends the Captivity: of which more hereafter.

However we are still to speak

Secondly, To Mr. L’s like (d) mistaken deduction (viz. of the land’s lying WHOLLY desolate seventy years) from 2 Chron. xxxvi. 20, 21. where we read the following words, Them that had escaped from the sword, carried be (Nebuchadnezzar) away to Babylon: where they were Servants to him, and his Sons, until the reign of the Kingdom of Persia. To fulfil the word of the Lord by the mouth of Jeremiah, until the land had enjoyed her Sabbaths: For as long as

(a) Ch. xxix. 10. 14. (b) Jer. xxv. 12, xxix. 10. (c) Mr. L. would fain persuade us that the seventy years of the Captivity ended in the first of Darius, and Cyrus reigning in conjunction, of which enough hereafter. (d) See Mr. L’s book, p. 11, 12.
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She lay desolate, she kept Sabbath, to fulfill threescore and ten years.

Upon these words Mr. L. hath thus commented,

Here 'tis expressly said that during the time of the Jews Servitude to Nebuchadnezzar, and his sons in Babylon, after that they were carried thither upon their Temple being burnt, the land kept Sabbath, that is, lay desolate, and untill'd seventy years, herein accomplishing Jeremiah's Prophecy.

Thus Mr. L. hath giv'n us his sense of these Texts, with a remarkable Introduction that his said sense of them, as here it stands, is EXPRESSLY said in them.

But that it is really no otherwise said in them, than as he hath so made it by his own improper gloss on the words, it will be evident by considering these texts, and by shewing that in truth nothing more can, or ought to be inferred from them, than what is of a certainty consistent with the sense of the Prophet Jeremiah in the places here referred to, as direct reference is made to that Prophet in them. For Ezra the supposed Author of the book of Chronicles could doubtless have no other meaning in these texts of the Prophet here referred to, than that Prophet himself had in those Texts. But Ezra could I think refer to no other than the places of Jeremiah which have been already here consider'd, and that place especially to which Mr. L. hath confin'd the reference of the Prophet Daniel: but with what foundation, and success we have lately seen.

And as to the WORD of the Lord by the Prophet Jeremiah which is immediately, and expressly referred to, by the Author of the book of Chronicles in the verses now before us (a), that as to the determined time thereof of seventy years, as I have before shewn upon the words (b) of that Prophet, cannot be referred to the WHOLE land's lying desolate; or refting from tillage all that time, (because the Prophet hath not said it;) but only to the Captivity of the Jews; of which, and which only he hath said it expressly, that they should so long serve the King of Babylon. And such in fact was the duration of the Captivity, and of the Desolations of Jerusalem (as I have observ'd, and as I shall undeniably prove anon) but not so of the land's lying WHOLLY desolate; as the former certainly began from the 4th of Jehoiakim, but the latter at foonest only from the 11th of Zedekiah, eighteen years after: as at pleasure it may be seen in the Table annexed.

As therefore we are thus determined as to the sense of the Prophet's words before us, so we must necessarily be determin'd as to the sense of the Author of the book of Chronicles in the place before us, where the Prophet is quoted.

And so we may very well understand that Author's meaning here, as taking the words to fulfill threescore and ten years, and those only, as they certainly are the words of Jeremiah, but all the foregoing

(a) 2 Chron. xxxvi. 20, 21. (b) viz. Jer. xxv. 11.
going from the word Jeremiah downward, viz. [Until the land had enjoyed her Sabbaths, for so long as she lay desolate, she kept Sabbath] as being the words of the Author of the book of Chronicles, as they certainly are, but not as I can any where find, the Word of the Lord by the mouth of Jeremiah.

Therefore I presume that those words may most properly be read, as I have here included them in a Parenthesis, as being an excellent observation of that Author, most probably of Ezra, who a Scribe learned in the Law might therefore thus most significantly, and truly note here with immediate respect to a notorious transgression of it among the Jews in this particular, that whereas they had gone into Captivity for their manifold, and repeated transgressions of duty, and of this among others, and whereas that Captivity was of seventy years determined continuance, for it was the very word of the Lord by the mouth of Jeremiah (a) who predicted it, so in such determined duration of it, it would not consequently be at an end, until the land had, of course, enjoyed her Sabbaths; [that is, those Sabbaths of which by the Jews transgression of duty, as they kept them not, she had been formerly depriv'd:] for adds that accurate Scribe, so long, [or so many years of the Captivity] as she lay desolate, she kept Sabbath. So long without all dispute she did so. She certainly kept Sabbath so long as she lay WHOLLY desolate. But as certainly also she could keep Sabbath no longer than she actually did lye wholly desolate. But she did not lye thus desolate all the years of the Captivity. She lay at the most so, as I shall evidently prove it, but fifty two years. Therefore it is impossible that the Author of the book of Chronicles should have applied, or extended the seventy years of Jeremiah to the Desolations of the WHOLE land, or of the land's being WHOLLY desolate, equally as to the Desolations of Jerusalem, or the Vaillage, and Captivity of the Jews.

But whereas, after all, Mr. L. hath maintain'd the fact, viz. that the land did lye WHOLLY desolate, or refuted from tillage during the WHOLE time of the Captivity of the Jews, and whereas his Exposition of the text before us, and his assign'd OCCASION of the seventy Years Captivity, and indeed his whole Hypothesis is entirely depending upon the mistaken FACT: And yet forasmuch as we ought not to suppose but that Mr. L. thought that he had evident, and

(a) Jer. xxv. 11. (b) Nor hath the said Author any where confin'd the 70 years of Jerusalem's Desolations to their taking date from the 17th of Zedekiah. He spake last indeed of King Zedekiah, ver. 21; but there ends the History of those times in the Jews accomplished Desolations: Which were however begun 18 years before, and which according to this Sacred Historian here last'd until the reign of the Kingdom of Persia.
Then this Writer throws in a general Observation upon the whole with respect to all the great Evils brought upon the Jews by Nebuchadnezzar, of which he had been before giving a relation in this Chapter from verse 6th downward that they were, as in ver. 21, to fulfill the word of the Lord by the mouth of Jeremiah, even to fulfill 70 years; even those 70 Years of which this Prophet had prophesiat the 47th of Jeboiahim, and in the first of Nebuchadnezzar (the Son) King of Babylon [Jer. xxv. 1.] In which the Desolations of Jerusalem began: As it will evidently appear hereafter.
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The fact it self, viz. the fact as suppos'd by Mr. L of the Land of Judah's lying WHOLLY desolate, or resting from tillage 70 Years, is founded in its taking equal date with the Captivity of the Jews. Therefore the Captivity is by Mr. L fixed to the 11th year of the reign of Zedekiah, when Jerusalem was destroyed, the Temple was burnt by Nebuchadnezzar, and the Jews carried captive into Babylon; whence indeed the land's lying WHOLLY desolate (a) may take its date, but then at the soonest: but not so the Captivity; because the true 11th year of the reign of Zedekiah in no wife admits of it, as the same is truly according to our (b) most learned Chronologers but at 52 years distance from the release, and return of the Jews into their own Land in the first year of the reign of Cyrus King of Persia (c).

Therefore Mr. L to help his Hypothesis here hath giv'n the said 11th of Zedekiah a 20 years lift, and in such rife thereof he hath placed the same at the exact distance of 70 years from the taking of Babylon by Cyrus, where he ends the Captivity (d). And in such raised 11th of Zedekiah Mr. L hath of course made the same to correspond with the 19th of Nabopollasar, or Nebuchadnezzar the first; or the father, which in truth, that is according to the holy Scriptures, and even Josephus also, as I shall make it to appear, can possibly be corresponding only with the 19th of Nabopolassar, or Nebuchadnezzar the Great, or the Son (e).

However thus is produced by Mr. L an Hypothesis of the land of Judah its lying desolate, WHOLLY desolate 70 years equal to the Captivity of the Jews from the 11th of Zedekiah to the taking of Babylon by Cyrus.

And these Proceedings Mr. L hath endeavoured to justify, First, from Scripture, Secondly, from Berosus, and Josephus (f). But how truly it will appear from the following Enquiry.

First, Into the Scripture Account of these matters.

(a) The words of Jeremiah, [Ch. xxv. 11.] are, This WHOLE Land shall be a Desolation. Which words were in the greatest measure fulfill'd, when the Temple and City of Jerusalem being destroyed, the WHOLE Land of Judah also was brought in a manner to utter Desolation. But if the words be to be taken in the strictest sense of the WHOLE Land's lying desolate, and being without so much as an Inhabitant, [Jer. xxiv. 2.] and to questionless WHOLLY resting from tillage, then the words were not so fulfill'd in such strict sense of them, till 4 years after the 11th of Zedekiah, viz. in the true year thereof before A.D. 584, in the 23d of Nebuchadnezzar [the Son] when Nebuzaradan coming again into the Land of Israel set'd upon all of that race that he could meet with, and made them all Prisoners, and sent them to Babylon: the number whereof was but 747 Persons. Jer. iii. 30. And this still cuts off from Mr. L's supposed number of neglected Sabbatical Years among the Jews. (b) A. Pp. Utber; Bp. Lloyd; Dr. Prideaux. (c) Extra l.s. (d) Two years short of the true Scripture lift of Cyrus, as we shall shew anon. (e) For thus it seems the Jews distinguished the two Nebuchadnezzars. D. Genz. a Chron. i. l. i. n. 285. Marsh. Chron. p. 135. Prid. Con. Hist. Vol. i. p. 49. (f) P. 14. 15. of Mr. L's book.
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And the holy Writ is in truth so far from having giv'n any the least countenance to Mr. L. in his beginning the 70 Years of the Captivity of Judah in the 11th of Zedekiah in his mistaken rife thereof corresponding with the 19th year of Nebuchadnezzar the father, or in his ending them in the taking of Babylon by Cyrus, that according to it, the said Captivity necessarily began in the 42th year of the reign of Jehoiakim coincident with the 19th of the said Nebuchadnezzar, and coincident with the first (a) of his Son Nebuchad. reigning in conjunction with him; And therefore according to Scripture also the said Captivity had not its ending 'till the actual release, and return of the Jews in the first of Cyrus two years after his taking of Babylon for his Uncle Darius (b). First, as touching the Scripture Account of the Seventy Years Captivity of Judah in the Beginning thereof. That I affirm of a certainty to be in the 42th year of Jehoiakim, (and not in the 11th of Zedekiah) as coincident with the 19th of Nebuchadnezzar the father: And that because, as by all the following accounts it will appear beyond contradiction, and as it may be seen in the Table annexed, the said 42th of Jehoiakim is truly corresponding with the 19th of the said Nebuchadnezzar at 70 years distance from Cyrus's Succession in the whole Empire upon the death of Darius (c): Whereas the 11th of Zedekiah (which was at 18 years distance lower from the said 42th of Jehoiakim) can therefore be corresponding only with the Scripture 19th of Nebuchadnezzar the Son; and not possibly so with the 19th of Nebuchadnezzar the father, as Mr. L. hath made it for the sake of his Hypothesis, in evident inconsistency, and utter irreconcileableness with the Scripture Account of the Beginning of the Seventy Years Captivity of Judah, as the following Instances will clearly, and fully demonstrate.

First, Mr. L's rais'd 11th of Zedekiah as coincident with the 19th of Nebuchadnezzar the father is utterly inconsistent, and repugnant with the Scripture Account of the Captivity of Jeconiah, even in Mr. L's own account of the time thereof.

For the King of Babylon (Nebuchadnezzar the Son) took him in the eighth year of his reign. 2 Kings xxiv. 12, &c. Now if this be made the 8th year not of the Son, but of the father, as Mr. L. hath made it, then of course it falls in with the year of the J. P. 4096 (d). And Mr. L. hath made it to fall in with that year. But from this Year to the year of the taking of Babylon by Cyrus there are full fourscore Years. And thus necessarily all this while they of Jeconiah's Captivity still remained in Captivity. But even the preceding Captivity of Judah in the 4th of Jehoiakim was to be a Captivity but of 70 years continuance. It was the express word of the Lord by the Prophet Jeremiah (e).

But

(a) Jer. xxv. 1.   (b) At 70 years distance from the 42th of Jehoiakim, as it may be seen in the Table annexed. (c) Which was therefore the true Scripture first of Cyrus, as we shall fully shew hereafter. (d) Or which is the most useful way of reckoning to us Christians, in the Year before A. D. 618. (e) Jer. xxix. 10.
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But if the Captivity of Judah did not begin, as according to Mr. L. it did not, till the 11th of Zedekiah, coincident with the 19th of Nebuchadnezzar the father, that Captivity alone being of 70 Years duration, then on the other hand the Captivity of Jeconiah which began with the first of Zedekiah, and thus must have preceded the Captivity of Judah, must in this case be said by Mr. L. to be no Captivity, or if allowed to have been one, it thus necessarily becomes a fourscore Years Captivity. And thus also the truly preceding Captivity of Judah will be proportionably increasing. The great absurdity of which Consequences, and their downright Contradiction to the account of the holy Scriptures in these matters, is evident at sight. And they will be made much more so, if it be consider'd

Secondly, that the express word of God by the Prophet Jeremiah in his letter to all the Captives at Babylon was not, could not possibly be fulfill'd in this Mr. L.'s unaccountable rise of the Eleventh of Zedekiah as made coincident with the 19th of Nebuchadnezzar the father. For it was in the beginning of Zedekiah's reign (a), viz. soon after that Jeconiah, and the captive Courts were departed from Jerusalem (b) for Babylon, that upon the falsely predicted return after two Years, of Jeconiah, and all the Captives of Judah (c), the Prophet Jeremiah, in a solemn letter by God's immediate appointment written in general to ALL the Captives at Babylon (d), viz. to those who had been captivated in the 4th of Jehoiakim, as well as to those of Jeconiah's Captivity, gave them All positive assurances from God (e), that AFTER LXX Years were accomplished at Babylon, He would visit them, and perform his good word to them, in causing them to return to their place. Now here were we to suppose that the Prophet's Letter was writ, and the Promise of God in it was made only to them of Jeconiah's Captivity, yet the promise even in this single view of it was in no wise made good in Mr. L.'s rais'd 11th of Zedekiah. Nor could it possibly have been in such mistaken Hypothesis.

For there being 70 Years according to Mr. L. between his rais'd 11th of Zedekiah, and the downfall of Babylon in the taking thereof by Cyrus, (Mr. L.'s Year of the ending of the Captivity,) it of course follows that the Captivity of those who had been carried away captive with Jeconiah must necessarily become a Captivity of 80 Years, as Jeconiah and they who were captivated with him (f) had been now full ten years in Captivity in the 11th of Zedekiah.

But this is directly contrary to God's express, and especial Promise to his people by his Prophet, of delivering them after that LXX Years were accomplished, &c. as above. Alas, what a strange way is this of evidencing God's faithfulness to his people?-----Especially if we consider farther how much more flagrant the Absurdity, and Inconsistency before us doth yet become, when we look upon the Prophet's

(a) Ch. xxviii. 1. (b) Ch. xxix. 2. (c) Ch. xxviii. 3, 4. (d) Ch. xxix. 1.
All the people whom Nebuchadnezzar had carried away captive from Jerusalem to Babylon.
(e) ver. 10. (f) 2 Kings xxiv. 14.
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Prophet’s letter as written to ALL the then Captives at Babylon, as undoubtedly it was: for the text is therein express, (a) viz. Unto ALL that are carried away Captives, whom I have caused to be carried away, &c.

In this respect both the Prophet’s Letter, and God’s faithful promise herein made to his people are rendered still of less effect, and the latter is still farther off from having been fulfilled according to the express purport of the former, by how much the Captivity of Judah began sooner than did that of Jeconiah.

And that the said Letter of the Prophet did certainly concern those of the Captivity of Judah in the fourth of Jehoiakim as well as those who were carried away captive with Jeconiah, it is also evident from the twenty fifth chapter of Jeremiah. In which chapter as the Prophet had in the 4th of Jehoiakim prophesied of the LXX Years Captivity of Judah, which in that year fell out accordingly, equal to, or coincident with the first year of Nebuchadnezzar (b) King of Babylon, (but that the first not possibly of the father, as Mr. L. would have it, but of the son’s two years reign in conjunction with his father, as I shall fully shew before I have done with this matter) so in that Chapter he did also presignifie to the Jews the determined time of their Captivity; As he told them expressly concerning it (ver. II.) that their Vassalage to the King of Babylon should be of the continuance but of LXX Years.

So that the Prophet’s Letter to the Captives of Babylon now in the beginning of Zedekiah’s reign was in truth nothing else but a recital of what he had declar’d then as the word of the Lord to them in the fourth of Jehoiakim. And the said recital was occasion’d merely by the soothing prediction of a false Prophet (c) as before noted. And therefore the Prophet Jeremiah was necessitated thus to call to the remembrance of those Captives his former prediction for the quieting them under God’s determined Captivity of Judah for 70 years: Which 70 years had been now going on from the very year of their prediction, viz. the fourth of Jehoiakim, and the first of Nebuchadnezzar (d) the son. In which only true view of the beginning of the Captivity of Judah, and of the subsequent Captivity of Jeconiah in the first of Zedekiah, God’s Promise to his people by the Prophet, as above, was most exactly fulfilled. But it was in no wise fulfilled in Mr. L’s Hypothesis of beginning the Captivity of Judah from his rais’d 11th of Zedekiah, to his therefore necessarily making the Captivity of Jeconiah to have preceded that of Judah by ten years, which in fact was not till full 8 years after, as the said Captivity did not begin till the true first of Zedekiah: As may be seen in the Table hereunto annexed. Consequently,

Thirdly,

(a) Jer. xxix. 4.  (b) Ch. xxv. 1.  (c) See Jer. xxviil. 2, 3, 4, and Ch. xxix. 8, 9.  (d) Jer. xxv. 1.
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Thirdly, Mr. L.'s Hypothesis in these particulars is in no wise reconcilable with the Prophet Ezekiel's reckoning of the Years of the Captivity of Jeconiah, by which that Prophet reckons throughout all his Prophecies, as he was one of that Captivity (a).

Mr. L. in truth abounds with mistakes in his several Years of that Captivity, which are all necessary Consequences of his groffly mistaken 11th of Zedekiah in his 20 years unaccountable rise thereof. As it will be very apparent, if we take a short view of his Chronology of the years of Jeconiah's Captivity. For instance, take we in order those Years, as he hath giv'n them in his book.

First, the tenth Year. To this according to Mr. L. is corresponding the year of the J. P. 4105 (b). From thence to the year 4176 (c) where Mr. L. ends the Captivity of the Jews there are 71 Years, to which add the preceding 9 years as this was the tenth, thus this Captivity alone becomes an eighty Years Captivity, as above. And farther the preceding 8 Years of the Captivity of Judah being added, as in the truth it did so many years precede the Captivity of Jeconiah, here is necessarily an 88 Years Captivity of Judah also, as above. Which is directly contrary not only to the very letter of the Scripture elsewhere (d), but also to the Prophet Ezekiel here in his 10th of this Era of the Captivity of Jeconiah.

For in this 10th year now of his own Captivity he prophesied against Pharaoh King of Egypt. But this Pharaoh was doubtless not Pharaoh Nebcho, but Pharaoh Hophra, against whom the Prophet was now to set his face (e): For according both to Scripture (f) and Josephus (g) Pharaoh Nebcho was contemporary with the Kings Josiah and Jehoiakim. But as we are now in the 10th of Jeconiah's Captivity, we are evidently also in the 10th of Zedekiah. And Pharaoh Nebcho could not be now living. For we are now at 21 years distance even from the death of Josiah; and Ph. Nebcho had probably reigned some years before the death of that Prince; but he reign'd at most according to Herodotus (b) but 16 years; and also after him reigned Psammis (i) 8 years, and next King Apries, or the Pharaoh Hophra of the Scripture (k). Against him therefore undoubtedly Ezekiel must here have prophesied in the tenth year of the Captivity of Jeconiah, which was also the tenth year of the reign of Zedekiah.

But to these in the Scripture Account of these times is evidently corresponding the year of the J. P. 4125 (l) not Mr. L.'s year thereof 4105 (m): for to that is certainly corresponding Ezekiel's first year of Jehoiakim, and consequently some year of Pharaoh Nebcho,
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...at no less than 20 years distance above his tenth of Jeconiah's Captivity, or his tenth of Zedekiah, which necessarily concurred with it.

But if Mr. L's Pharao against whom Ezekiel prophesied be also Pharao Hophra, and not Pharao Necho, that cannot be any otherwise than as he has by a most unjustifiable lift of twenty years got the true Scripture 11th of Zedekiah into the place of the true first of Jehoiakim, and thereby got Pharao Hophra into the real place of Pharao Necho, whose reign together with that of Josiah King of Judah he hath therefore proportionally advanced also, and all this ultimately for the sake of a NEW Hypothesis of the LXX weeks of the Prophecy of Daniel. And thus I might dismiss this year, were it not for two other failures under it, which in justice to the Reader, I cannot pass over without some notice of them.

One is Mr. L's placing the 40 Years Prophecy of Ezekiel (a) against Pharao Hophra in order of time before his army's coming out of Egypt to the assistance of Zedekiah, who was now shut up in Jerusalem by the army of the Chaldeans (b). Whereas according to Dr. Prideaux (c) much more agreeably to the truth, Ezekiel had not this revelation against Pharao, 'till after the hafty, and perfidious retreat of his army on the coming of the Chaldeans against them: even for this very reason, because it was for their perfidy therefore expressly noted by the Prophet as the just cause of God's denounced Judgement against them, as they had been a Staff of Reed to the House of Israel (d). And in what could they have made good the comparision more than they now did in their retiring into their own Country upon the approach of the Chaldean army against them, to the exact fulfilling of God's word herein by his Prophet Jeremiah (e)?

And therefore Mr. L. might not take due notice of this place of the Prophet, or else he would not probably have run into a SECOND mistake here soon after under this year (f). As he hath made Pharao's army to be now entirely overthrown by Nebuchadnezzar, and as he hath told us with all, that this Overtrow hapned agreeably to Jeremiah's Prophecy: Whereas that Prophet, as in the verfe before quoted (g) is express to the contrary, as his words there are, that it was the saying of the God of Israel to the King of Judah, that Pharao's Army which was come forth to help the Jews should RETURN to Egypt into their own land. And therefore to the fulfilling the Prophecy they doubtles did so, without being overthrown, or even so much as fighting: but returning home in a shamefull and hafty retreat upon Nebuchadnezzar's approach (b).

There:

(a) Ch. xxix. 12. (b) Not in Mr. L's year of the §. P. 4105, or 609 before A. D. but in the year of the §. P. 4125, or 789 before A. D. (c) Comm. Hist. p. 78 in fine. (d) Ezek. xxix. 6. (e) Jer. xxxvii. 7. (f) See Mr. L. P. 33. (g) As in note. (b) See Prid. here (against Mr. L.) Comm. Hist. p. 78.
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Therefore indeed Mr. L. should not have urg'd the mistaken testimony of Josephus here, who doubtless did not consider this place of Jeremiah, when he abridg'd this part of Jewish History, any more than Mr. L. hath since.

Much less should He have told us that his, and that Historian's ENTIRE OVERTHROW of that Army was agreeable to Jeremiah's Prophecy; for in truth it is so far from it, that as we have seen it is utterly disagreeing with it.

And so pass we to the next year of Ezekiel's Æra, or of the Captivity of Jeconiah which Mr. L. hath noted, and that is the 11th (a).

And the Calculation there as in the year preceding is also 20 years too high, as the same is placed under the year of the Æ. P. 4106 (b); whereas the true Year thereof in that period is the year 4126 (c). And therefore Mr. L. under his rais'd 11th of Jeconiah's Captivity hath placed Ezekiel's Prophecy against Tyre, and Nebuchadnezzar's laying siege to it full (d) 20 years too early for both: Of which more hereafter.

In the 12th year of Jeconiah's Captivity in Mr. L's Calculation of it (e) and in all those years thereof mention'd after (f) it, 'tis all One. The same 20 years clashing with Scripture runs throughout in all the particulars mentioned under it. And here I cannot pass over a very great mistake of Mr. L's, as it is a direct contradiction to Ezekiel, as touching the 40 years Desolation of Egypt.

Mr. L. hath fixed the beginning of that period (g) in the year of the Æ. P. 4122 (b) as being equal to the 27th year of Jeconiah's Captivity. But surely he did not confider the Prophet Ezekiel here, who hath told us expressly (i) that it was in the tenth year of that Captivity that the forty Years (k) Desolation of Egypt was revealed to him; and not in the 27th, of which we have no mention till (l), with a new revelation at 17 years distance.

It was therefore not from the 27th, but from the 10th of Jeconiah's Captivity that the 40 Years Judgements of God to be executed both upon King and People (m) of Egypt in war, Confusion, and Desolation were to take their date.

But to the true Ezekiel's tenth of Jeconiah is corresponding the year of the Æ. P. 4125 (n). And 40 Years reckon'd from thence will end in the year of the Æ. P. 4165 (o). But it was not 'till the next year after that Cyrus took Sardes (p). And thus there is room for such Egyptians as by being taken Prisoners during those 40 years.
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years had been scattered among the nations, and dispersed through the
Countries (a) to return into their own land, agreeably to the ensuing
Prophecy thereof (b), and also according to Xenophon (c), for many
of the Egyptians to come to the assistance of Cyrus in the year
following when Sardes was taken by Persia.

And therefore truly Mr. L. might here have omitted his remark
upon such as would have thee 40 Years denounced against Egypt
to begin in the year of the J. P. 4142 (d); because though that
be not a truly assign'd beginning of these 40 Years, yet his is not the
true beginning of them, as I have shewn that it is not, from his
evident misunderstanding, and departure from the Prophet here (e).

Especially Mr. L. might have omitted his arguing from hence
(f) for his mistaken Equality of the first year of Nebuchadnezzar
the father with the 4th of Jehoiakim, because as he hath here evi-
dently mistaken the year of the prediction, so he hath therein mis-
taken his foundation: Which therefore most certainly can be of
no other use here by way of Confirmation, which he there (g)
speaks of on this occasion, than that, and that truly of confirming
in mistakes; and chiefly in this which is no inconsiderable one
among the many which we meet with in his Hypothesis, viz. his
every where confounding Nebuchadnezzar the father with the son,
and mistaking the first year of the latter for the first of the former:
and all for the sake of his 20 years rais'd 11th of Zedekiah. And
therefore the 13 Years Siege of Tyre is accordingly fixed by Mr. L.
afterwards (h) in the like grand mistake.

And that also is built upon another, as he hath suppos'd (i) from
Josephus, that that siege was begun by Nebuchadnezzar in the 7th year
of his reign in conjunction with his father, in at least a full 20 years
mistaken time of that siege on that account; for which there is no
manner of ground, as Nebuchadnezzar could not possibly have
reign'd above two Years in conjunction with his father, as we shall
shew herafter from Berosus; and also as it is much more likely
than not, with respect to the alleg'd testimony of Josephus, that
the 7th year spoken of by him in his account of this siege, was not
the 7th year of Nebuchadnezzar, (either the father or the son) but
really the 7th of Israbol King of Tyre (k); as I shall shew hereafter
when I come to look into the testimonies of Josephus urged by
Mr. L. in his favour, after that I have done with the Scripture ac-
count of these times, with which I am at present immediately con-
cern'd.

And with the Chronology of the holy Scripture Mr. L's said
rise of the siege and taking of Tyre is utterly inconsistent: as he
hath

(a) Ezek. xxix. 12. (b) ver. 17. (c) As quoted by Mr. L. in p. 39 of his
book. (d) J. P. 4142. (e) As quoted in the year before A. D. 572. (f) See the true beginning of these
40 years under the year before A. D. 589. So Dr. Prideaux also.
(g) As he hath in p. 39. (h) ib. lin. 16. (i) ib. 16. (j) ib. sub fine. (k) Who was most probably slain in the end of the
war according to Eusebius, ch. xxviii. 8—10.
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hath made the 13 years siege thereof to have been ended in the
year of the J. P. 4119, or 4120 (a), about two or three years be-
fore (b) his rais’d twenty seventh of Jeconiah’s Captivity; to which
in his Account thereof is corresponding the Year of the J. P.
4122 (c): But these pretended 2 or 3 years of Mr. E. before the
27th of Jeconiah, are in truth two, or three and twenty years before
the true Scripture 27th of Jeconiah, as the year of the J. P. 4142 (d)
is necessarily corresponding thereunto, in the Scripture Reckoning
of the Years of the Captivity both of Judah, and Jeconiah (d).

And however Mr. L. hath here quoted the Phoenician Annals for
the favouring this part of his Hypothesis relating to the siege and ta-
kings of Tyre, that was merely because he took them in a wrong
view, and applied them to a mistaken first (e) of Cyrus, as he set
out at first in this manner of Tyre in a groundless notion of the 13
years siege thereof having been begun in the 7th of Nebuchadnezzar,
(of which more hereafter;) whereas in the true view of these Annals,
their Chronology is exactly agreeing with that of the holy Scrip-
tures, and their first of Cyrus is the Scripture first of Cyrus. And
therefore Mr. L’s rais’d 27th of Jeconiah’s Captivity, and rais’d
sieve and taking of Tyre clashes with them equally, as with the
holy Scripture.

And these things the learned Dr Prideaux (f) also hath shewn on
this very occasion; and hath settled the taking of Tyre in the end of
the preceding year of Jeconiah’s Captivity, viz. of the 26th thereof:
and that not without sufficient reason, forasmuch as in the first
month, and in the first day of the month of the 27th year (g) that
Prophet speaketh of that City as newly taken by Nebuchadnez-
zar.

With the said 26th of Jeconiah’s Captivity is truly corresponding
the year of the J. P. 4141 (b) and the 32d year of the reign of
Nebuchadnezzar (i); from which year of that King of Babylon if
we reckon 36 years as the time assign’d by the Phoenician Annals
from the taking of Tyre to Cyrus his beginning his Empire, we are
brought up to the Year of the J. P. 4177 (k), which was the second
year after the taking of Babylon by Cyrus (l), and in which year Da-
vius died at Babylon.

(a) Or in the year before A. D. 595, or 594. (b) p. 40. of Mr. L. line 16.
His words there are, two or three Years before the time of God’s making known to Ezekiel
the Desolation of Egypt, &c. that is, before his 27th of Jeconiah: as he had in that year
fixed this Revelation of God to the Prophet against Egypt: another evident mistake, which
makes matter yet worse; as that Revelation against Egypt was 17 years before,
 viz. in the 10th of Jeconiah, as I have shewn from Ezekiel xxiii. 1. 16.
(c) Or the
year before A. D. 592. (d) Or the Year before A. D. 572. (e) viz, the first of a 30
years reckoning of Cyrus’s reign, while of the Scripture first of Cyrus’s 7 years reign over
the Persian Monarchy, of which more hereafter. (f) Con. Hist. p. 92. (g) ch.
xxix. 17. 18. (h) Or the year before A. D. 573. (i) viz, of his reign after
his father’s death, which is the 34th of his reign in conjunction with his father;
of which more hereafter. (k) Or 537. before A. D. (l) See the Table an-
nexed.
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For according to those Annals (a) after the taking of Tyre by Nebuchadnezzar, Baal reigned [in new (b) Tyre] ten years, Ecnibal govern'd two months, Chelbes ten months, Abarus three months, Mitgonus, and Gerafratus six years, Balator one year, Merbal four years, and after him Hirom, in whose fourteenth year Cyrus became Emperor of Persia.

We have thus 36 years [and 3 months over] exactly answering to the placing of the taking of Tyre in the end of Ezekiel's 26th year of the Captivity of Jeconiah.

Upon the whole therefore Mr. L's beginning, and ending of the said siege in his full 20 years rise thereof in his necessary rise of the true 27th of Jeconiah occasion'd by his rais'd 11th of Zedekiah, is in no wise fixed, as it is pretended (c) to be, agreeably to Scripture, but in truth as we have seen, in utter inconsistency with it. Nor indeed is it fixed agreeably to Josephus and Philostratus; as it is pretended likewise to be so fixed (d); as in order I shall shew hereafter.——But pass we on at present to the

Last year of Jeconiah's Captivity, viz. the 37th thereof (e); a most remarkable Year this, as we shall find it to be by the manifest absurdities, and inconsistencies which Mr. L. hath run into therein, utterly irreconcileable with Scripture in his mistaken twenty years rise thereof; for the sake of his imagin'd 70 Years of the Land's lying WHOLLY desolate from the 11th of Zedekiah. To this 37th of the Captivity of Jeconiah, by Mr. L's telling is corresponding the Year of the J. P. 4132 (f). From thence to his ending of the Captivity of Judah in the year of Cyrus's taking of Babylon are about 44 Years. And if to these we add, as we must here, 36 full years of Jeconiah's imprisonment, here of Course the Captivity of those who were carried away captive with him becomes a protracted fourscore years Captivity as above in Mr. L's own view of it: And whereas that of Judah necessarily preceded it 8 years, as the 4th of Jehoiakim certainly so long preceded the first of Zedekiah, thus of course in Mr. L's Hypothesis the Captivity of Judah was a Captivity of 88 years, even in his ending of it: but as it really did not end 'till two years after (g), it must necessarily thus in fact have been a 90 years Captivity.——This is the miserable Consequence of Mr. L's rais'd 11th of Zedekiah.——But this very year of Jeconiah's Captivity, viz. the 37th now before us in the true Scripture Account thereof will evidently cut off those 20 years, and bring Mr. L. his 11th of Zedekiah up to the year of the J. P. 4126 (b), whereas it now stands with him (i) corresponding with the year of that period 4106 (k).

For

(a) Jof. con. Apion. lib. 1. (b) See Marsham. Can. Chron. p. 539. and Prior. Con. Hist. p. 91. (c) p. 41. of Mr. L. (d) ib. (e) Which is the next mention'd by Mr. L. ib. (f) Or before A. D. 582. (g) See the Table annexed. (h) and down to the year before A. D. 588. (i) p. 33. of Mr. L. (k) Of the year before A. D. 608.
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For this is the very year expressly spoken of by the Prophet Jeremiah (a), as the Year in which Evil-Merodach King of Babylon in the first year of his reign lifted up the head of Jehoiachin (Jeconiah) King of Judah, and brought him forth out of prison. And herein we have certain light into the dates of time now before us; as the Prophet hath here giv’n us two unquestionable Characters of it, by his having coupled the 37th of Jeconiah’s Captivity with the first of Evil-Merodach King of Babylon. To the latter we know that of a certainty is corresponding the year of the J. P. 4153 (b); and therefore also to the former must be corresponding the same year of that period. Also hence we come to a certain knowledge of the true 11th year of the reign of Zedekiah, as the 37th of Jeconiah’s Captivity is the 37th from the included first of the reign of Zedekiah; as Jeconiah was carried captive in the first of Zedekiah. And so we have full proof against Mr. L’s 20 years rais’d 11th of Zedekiah, as that is pretended to have been at 70 years distance from the year of Cyrus’s taking of Babylon, which in this the true Scripture account hereof was really but at 50 years distance from it.

Upon the whole therefore Mr. L’s beginning of the 70 years Captivity of Judah from the 11th of Zedekiah is utterly disagreeing with the Scripture Account thereof. For as we have seen, it is impossible that agreeably to that, the said Captivity should take its date from any 11th of Zedekiah: Not from the true 11th thereof, because thus in Mr. L’s ending thereof (c), they fall short by 20 years of that period, as just now noted; not from Mr. L’s rais’d 11th thereof, equal according to him to the year of the J. P. 4106 (d), for that in the Scripture account is evidently the Second of Jehoiakim. It is impossible therefore that the said seventy years should have begun from this year, as the 11th of Zedekiah. Nor could they have had their beginning even from this year of the J. P. at all. For though from thence to the taking of Babylon by Cyrus there are indeed but Seventy Years, yet after all that is not the true Scripture Ending of the LXX Years of the Captivity. For, whereas Mr. L hath thus notoriously mistaken the true Scripture Beginning of the said Captivity, which Assertion I was to make good in the first place, so as I come now to shew

Secondly he hath also mistaken the Scripture ending of it, as he hath confounded the Scripture first of Cyrus’s 7 years reign after the death of Darius, (in which first the Jews return’d home by virtue of his Decree then issued forth for it,) with the first of Cyrus’s nine years from his taking of Babylon two years before.

I have already occasionally (f) shewn against such Mr. L’s ending of the Captivity, that in his Hypothesis of it the land must necessarily have lain desolate, and so kept Sabbath two Years after God’s appointed time of her Desolations. For the Jews are not suppos’d

(a) Ch. li. 31. and 2 Kings xxv. 27. (b) Or the Year before A.D. 561. (c) Which is two years short of the Scripture first of Cyrus, (as we shall soon come to shew) when and not before ended the Captivity. (d) Or the Year before A.D. 608. (e) See the Table annexed. (f) See above.
That the Seventy Weeks of this Prophecy suppos'd by Mr. L. to have return'd home 'till 2 years after Cyrus's taking of Babylon (a). But 'till that time according to him the land had lain wholly desolate full 70 years, and so kept Sabbath; as resting from tillage all that time; even because her Inhabitants were wholly gone out from tillage, and there were none to manure her. For the very same reason I say the land according to Mr. L. must necessarily have rested, and kept Sabbath two years longer, even because confess'dly according to him her Captives did not return 'till two years after. So that in the very truth of the matter here, Mr. L. hath said as much as this, viz. that the Desolations of the whole land were at an end two years before in fact the ceased to lye desolate, or to be without her Inhabitants. Which contradiction in terms deserves no farther notice. Wherefore I observe farther against Mr. L's ending the Captivity in the Year of Cyrus's taking of Babylon, that the same could not be at an end 'till the Commandment went forth from the King of Persia for the release, and return of the Jews into their own land. This Commandment did accordingly go forth in the name of King Cyrus, and in the (b) first of his reign. But neither did this Commandment go forth in the year of Cyrus's taking of Babylon, as Mr. L. hath imagin'd, nor was this the Scripture first of Cyrus, as Mr. L. moit unaccountably hath made it to be; As it will evidently appear in what here follows as touching these Matters.

For First in that case the royal Persian Commandment for the Jews release and return must have gone forth in the life-time of Darius, and consequently also in his name, for whom Cyrus both fought, and conquer'd: if not solely in his name, at least in his name jointly with that of Cyrus. For in truth it is in no wise rational to suppose that Cyrus would have arrogated so much as this to himself; Nor could his Uncle Darius have been pleas'd with it. Therefore whereas that Commandment did actually go forth wholly, and solely in the name of Cyrus, and by a solemn and antient (c) Prediction (d) it was to proceed immediately from him, it is to be concluded that Darius was now dead after his 2 years reign after Cyrus's taking of Babylon; and consequently that the first year of his reign in which he released the Jews from their Captivity was (not the first of a 9 years reign giv'n him by the Astronomers, who in their Canon have thrown in Darius's 2 years reign into those 9 Years of Cyrus, but) the first of his 7 years reign after the death of Darius; as the Scriptures, as we shall see presently, having giv'n those 2 years to Darius, have consequentlly reckon'd but 7 to Cyrus. Nor is that of the least force which Mr. L. hath pleaded to the contrary, as he hath told us (e) from Dan. ix. 23. that at the beginning of his Supplications, in the first year of Darius, ver. 1, the Commandment went forth: For the ori-

(a) p. 54. of Mr. L. (b) Ezra i. 1. (c) 150 years before the birth of Cyrus. (d) Isaiah. xlv. 28. and xiv. 15. (e) Preface to his book. p. 7.
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ginal Debir here hath certainly no other meaning than that barely of the word, and so it is translated in the following Chapter (a), and so it might have been here also. But if Mr. L. would rather have the English word Commandment to stand here, let it: for it could not possibly be any other Commandment than that of God to the Angel for him to go forthwith to his Prophet Daniel to shew him (b), even to shew him that for which he then prayed: for he no sooner prayed but God heard him (c), and immediately order'd his Angel away to him to go and shew him the Vision of the LXX Weeks of this Prophecy (d). This is the plain and natural sense of these words of Daniel, out of which Mr. L. hath wrested the going forth of Cyrus's Commandment in the first of Darius. But this surely is absolutely impossible unless as I observe.

Secondly Mr. L. could prove here withal that the first of Darius was also the first of Cyrus. And the only way to do this is to suppose that those two Princes reign'd in conjunction so long as Darius lived. And accordingly Mr. L. hath fled to this shift (e).

But neither Scripture, nor Xenophon, nor Ptolemy's Canon can help him herein: though he would have us to think that they are all of his side, to (f) the countenancing his imagin'd going forth of Cyrus's Decree in the year of his taking of Babylon, as the Scripture first year of his reign in conjunction with Darius.

Upon enquiry it will be found quite otherwise. For

First, As to Scripture, we find nothing there in the least intimating any conjointed reckoning of the years of the reigns of Darius, and Cyrus. On the contrary we find Daniel speaking of their reigns plainly as separate, and successive (g).

Thus he speaks of the first year of Darius alone, as having the Sovereignty wholly and solely, as without all question it was during his life, lodg'd in him. [Dan. ix. 1, 2.]

The Prophet hath in no wise said there as Mr. L. must here comment according to his notion, In the first of Darius and Cyrus reigning together, or in conjunction, but contrariwise, In the first year of Darius, [ver. 1.] and in the first year of his reign, [ver. 2.] But surely had it been fact that those Princes reign'd together, or had

---

(a) ver. 12. (b) The Angel's express words here [Dan. ix. 23.] are, I am come to shew thee. —— I ask, could the Angel come without God's commanding him to go?—— No surely.—— Therefore we have nothing to do here with Cyrus's Commandment.

(c) Even At the beginning of his supplications, ver. 23. (d) Not as Mr. L. hath imagin'd that Cyrus's Decree was now gone forth. For Daniel could not but have known this, without the message of an Angel, as he was a chief Minister of State, and as such was doubtless no stranger to this before its going forth, and without all doubt a great Promoter of it with Cyrus: of which more hereafter. (e) p. 49. l. 18, and elsewhere.

(f) See his bottom note of p. 1 and 2 for Scripture, and Xenophon: and for Ptolemy p. 15, 24, 25, and elsewhere. (g) And therefore the learned Dr. Prid. [p. 150. Con. Hist.] hath very truly told us that in the Scripture reckoning after the taking of Babylon, and the death of Belshazzar, Darius the Mede is named in succession. [Dan. vi. 28.] before Cyrus the Persian. And the Years [compare Dan. ix. 1. with Ch. x. 1.] of the reign of Cyrus are not there reckon'd 'till the years of the reign of Darius had ceased; and therefore according to Scripture the first of Cyrus cannot be 'till after the death of Darius.
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the Sovereignty been equally lodg’d in Cyrus, as in Darius during Darius his two years reign, in that case Daniel would not have fail’d to have conjoin’d them accordingly in his reckoning. But we do not find so much as one instance hereof throughout the Prophecy of Daniel, but more of the contrary (a).

And all the Acts of Darius’s reign, or publick Decrees issue forth therein, as recorded by Daniel, went always and only in his Name.

Thus [ch. vi. 1.] We read that it pleased Darius to set over the Kingdom, &c.—and [ver. 6.] the Presidents, and Princes said to the King—— (to what King?—to Cyrus?——no.—to King Darius; for it is express there) King Darius, live for ever. And [ver. 9.] King Darius sign’d the Writing:——And [ver. 25.] King Darius wrote unto all people. There is not one word in all this of King Cyrus. For as yet he had not the Sovereignty. It was lodged wholly in his Uncle, and father-in-law Darius. For it seems that soon after the reduction of Babylon (b) Cyrus went first upon a visit to his own father Cambyses in Persia, and thence into Media to his Uncle Darius, whose daughter he now married, and so return’d to Babylon; whither also Darius came with him: And upon his coming he took (possession of) the Kingdom; according to the Prophet (c); Or in the Prophet’s words elsewhere (d), He was mad; King over the realm of the Chaldeans. And so he continued ‘till his death about 2 years after Cyrus’s taking of Babylon (e).

And therefore it is that Daniel reckon’d as above all along by those two years of his reign till Cyrus the Persian. And therefore also speaking of those reigns not in any wise as conjunctive, but plainly as successive, he hath told us (f), that he prosper’d in the reign of Darius, and, he prosper’d also, in the reign of Cyrus the Persian.

Therefore the first year of the latter, in which the Decree in favour of the Jews is said to have gone forth, as expressly by Ezra (g), could not possibly be any other than the first year of his reign after the death of the former. For otherwise he learned Scribe could not have dated it in the first of Cyrus, but he must have dated it in the first of Darius, if not wholly and solely in his name, at least however in his name jointly with that of Cyrus.

And therefore Mr. L. should not have been so bold with Ezra as he hath been to the making his first of Cyrus the fame with Daniel’s first of Darius. At least he should have given us better proof than that which follows (b), viz., that Daniel placed the Decree

(a) Ch. xi. 1. (b) Xenophon Cyrop. lib. 8. (c) Dan. v. 31. (d) Ch. vi. 1. (e) And Mr. L. himself [p. 52. lin. 14.] hath told us expressely, that from the arrival of Darius at Babylon, and his being made King, Daniel dates the first year of his reign, And Mr. L. hath here spoken the whole truth at once. For thus it appears that Darius was now King. Where doth it appear that Cyrus was now so? (f) Ch. vi. 23. (g) Ch. L. 1; (b) p. 54.
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eere which went forth, not in the first of Cyrus, but in the first of
Darius, because he lived in Media under him. Whereas Ezra who
liv’d in Babylon, and long after the time of the said Darius placed
the going forth of the Decree in the first of Cyrus, because he was
the person who issued it out.

Alas, I know not what to say to such Fancies, and Mistakes.

But in few words. How doth it appear that Daniel placeth
the going forth of the Decree in favour of the Jews in the first
of Darius?——

I have already shewn that there is not any the least foundation
for it (a).

And as to the here imagin’d reason of that mistake, How doth
the fact appear that Daniel was in Media, when the Decree went
forth?——Why it seems that Mr. L. was so inform’d by Jose-
phus: And therefore from him (b) we are told by Mr. L. (c) under
the Year of the F. P. 4177 (d) that Darius returning into Media
after a short stay at Babylon took the Prophet Daniel along with him,
where be was shortly after cast into the Lions den. And in that coun-
try by Mr. L’s telling (e) Daniel was praying, &c. (f), and at the
beginning of his supplications the Decree in behalf of the Jews went
forth. For it seems, as Mr. L. hath likewise inform’d (g) us, in
the year of the F. P. last mention’d, and about the same time of
it, in which Darius is supposed to have left Babylon, Cyrus with a
great army marched against Syria, and Egypt: And in this Expedition
passing through Judæa, and being mov’d with the Desolations of the
land, he sent an Express to Babylon with a Proclamation to be publish-
ed for the restoration of the Jews. And no sooner did the Express go
out of Judæa to Babylon, or the proclamation of Cyrus at last was
issued forth, than according to Mr. L. the Angel of God went
forthwith to the Prophet Daniel now in Media with the news.
Thus we have the whole account of this matter, wherein be-
tween Josephus, and Mr. L. we are giv’n to understand

First, that both Darius and Daniel were then together in Media
when he was cast into the den of lions. We are

Secondly, inform’d by Mr. L, for I do not find any thing of it in
Josephus, that Daniel was still in Media, and that Cyrus was then in
Judæa, when also according to Mr. L. the Proclamation of Cy-
rus in favour of the Jews went forth throughout all his Kingdom.

Now briefly to shew the groundlesness of these Assertions.

As to the former, that is in no wise probable that Darius should
be now gone away from Babylon into Media, when Cyrus was
gone now upon his Syrian Expedition. For during the absence of Cy-
rus, surely the stay, and presence of Darius at Babylon was not only
most proper, but even necessary, as many reasons might be assign’d
here,

(a) See above. (b) Jof. Ant. lib. x. p. 463. (c) p. 51. (d) Or before
D. 537. (e) p. 53. (f) as in Dan. ch. ix. (g) p. 54.
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here, especially as it was a new conquest, and as it was also of the utmost concern to maintain it in peace, and subject it.

And therefore the learned Dr. Prideaux (a) is so far from sending Darius now back again into Media, as Mr. L. hath, that on the contrary he hath fixed him there governing the affairs of the Empire; even the affairs of that Kingdom which he had received, or taken possession of. And there is very good reason for this; forasmuch as Daniel was not with Darius: but Daniel was now surely at Babylon, therefore with Josephus's and Mr. L.'s good leave, there was Darius also. For that the Prophet Daniel was not in Media, but at Babylon, when he was cast into the den of lions, 'tis I think sufficiently to be gather'd from the sixth Chapter of Daniel. To take no other hints thereof from that Chapter, at present let it suffice to look into the 10th and 11th verses of it. There we find Daniel at his prayers, and thanksgivings 3 times a day, as afore time. Where?—Even as we there read expressiely, In His HOUSE. But of what House have we mention of Daniel's, but of that at Babylon (b)?—There it had been his manner afore-time during the preceding reigns of the Kings of Babylon from the 2d (c) of Nebuchadnezzar the Son, or the Great, in his House to give himself unto prayer 3 times in a day. And now also there, before his being cast into the den of lions he did as aforetime. At Babylon therefore, and not in Media this Historical fact of the Prophet happened: And King Darius consequently was there also. And Therefore Secondly with respect to Mr. L.'s other Affertion now before us, there is not any the least foundation for it.

As for the Angel's coming into Media to Daniel, there can be none for that: because the Prophet as we have now seen was not in Media with King Darius, but at Babylon.

And the Occasion of his going thither to the Prophet, viz. to tell him the news of the going forth of Cyrus's Decree there is no manner of room for that: because it is impossible that the Angel of God should go to tell him of that, which was not fact 'till after the death of Darius. And as to Daniel's supposed ignorance of the Decree of Cyrus now sent forth by Mr. L., I make no wonder at it at this time: for how was it possible for him to have known that then which was not in being?

But afterward when soon after the death of Darius, the said Decree did actually go forth, then, as I have formerly (d) noted, so I do here again repeat it, Daniel could not possibly be ignorant of it, because as one of the King's chief Counsellors he must necessarily have been privy even to the royal resolution of issuing it forth; and not only so, but he must be supposed like wise under God to have been the main instrument of influencing, or inclining the Persian King thereunto (e).

Nor

(a) Con. Hist. p. 128. (b) Dan. ii. 17. (c) v. 1. (d) See p. 38. (e) See the learned Dr. Prideaux [p. 130. Con. Hist.] Where he truly shews how great a hand
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Nor is there any ground for the Angel’s supposed revelation of the Prophecy of the LXX Weeks to Daniel in Media. For that must have been made to him at his House where he was praying, even at Babylon, after his accustomed manner of giving himself unto prayer 3 times in a day: as before noted.

And finally, as to Cyrus’s ordering the Jewish Grant in his Syrian Expedition, and upon seeing the Desolations of Judæa as he went, how far he might be influenced hereby sooner, or later in her favour, that matters not in the case before us, forasmuch as however that were, yet all this by Mr. L’s own telling was in the time of Darius, and so it was expressly in Daniel’s account of that King’s reign; and therefore for the reasons above given, it could not have been in the first of Cyrus. No, not tho’ his father Cambyses had been now lately dead (for this Mr. L. hath here also advanced a) to help him upon his now publishing the Decree of Cyrus.) For after all Darius was yet living over the realm of the Chaldeans (b), where the Jews were now in Captivity.

Therefore with Mr. L’s good leave, as yet Cyrus could not send forth his Proclamation throughout ALL HIS KINGDOM; for as yet ALL was not HIS: not so ‘till after the death of both his fathers, not only of his own father Cambyses in Persia, but also of his father-in-law Darius the Mede. But about 2 years after Cyrus’s taking of Babylon, Cambyses being dead in Persia, and Cyaxares, or Darius the Mede also dying (c), Cyrus thereupon became sole MONARCH of the whole Empire (d): And so he reign’d 7 years. And (in the words (e) of Dr. Prideaux) the first of these 7 years is that first year of Cyrus, which is mention’d in the first verse of the book of Ezra.

Mr. L. therefore is absolutely mistaken in his making the first year of Cyrus in Ezra, one and the same year with the first of Darius in Daniel.

And his accounting for their different way of calling this his imagin’d one and the same year, viz. (f) as Ezra liv’d at Babylon, and therefore call’d it his way, but the Prophet Daniel liv’d in Media, and therefore call’d it his way, is really trifling; forasmuch as Daniel was surely at Babylon in the first of Darius, and yet did not call it the first of Cyrus, but as it truly was the first of Darius the Mede. And forasmuch also as this Darius reigned two years confessedly before the first of Cyrus’s 7 years reign, therefore Ezra who tho’ he liv’d at Babylon also, yet as he certainly knew of Daniel’s two years of the reign of Darius, could not otherwiser than he did, date the going forth of Cyrus’s Decree in the first year of that King’s reign, as being really the first of his reign after the preceding two years reign of King Darius.

Other-hand Daniel must necessarily have had in obtaining this Decree: as for other reasons, so also as it is most likely that Daniel shew’d Cyrus the Prophecies of Scripture concerning him; which as it appears from the testimony of Josephus [Ant. lib. xi. c. 1.] and as it is plain from Scripture. [Ex. i.] he had seen, and read. (a) p. 52. And even this admits of a dispute if he were as yet dead. But that matters not; as Darius was still living. (b) Dan. ix. 1. (c) As are Dr. Prior, his words; Con. Hist. p. 129. (d) Xenophon Cyrop. lib. 8. (e) As in note c. (f) p. 74. of Mr. L.
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Otherwise, if Ezra's first of Cyrus had been equal to Daniel's first of Darius, in that case Daniel had surely call'd it so before him. But this could not possibly be otherwise than in the supposed conjunction of their reigns by Mr. L. And for this, as I have shewn, there is not only no foundation in Scripture, but ground sufficient against it, as Daniel's reckoning of the years of the reigns of those Princes as distinct, and successive reigns abundantly testifies.

So little reason is there for Mr. L. to have appeal'd to Scripture in this case. Nor really had he more for his appeal Secondly, to Xenophon (a).

For His first of Cyrus is evidently the first of that Prince's 7 years reign after Darius; when Cyrus had now no King over him (b). He hath told us expressly (c) that Cyrus reign'd 7 years after the death of Cyaxares. But the Cyaxares of Xenophon is confessedly (d) the Darius of Daniel. Therefore without all dispute Cyrus reign'd according to Xenophon 7 years after the Darius of Daniel. Consequently Xenophon's first of Cyrus is the first of Cyrus's 7 years, as before had been that of Ezra after the death of Darius. Nor

Thirdly, can Ptolemy's Canon be of any service to Mr. L. in this case. For tho' it be true that Cyrus hath a nine years reign in that Canon, yet the reason of it is plainly, because the Astronomers at Babylon gave the Scripture two years of Darius to Cyrus; having taken no notice at all therefore of Darius: and that because not he, but Cyrus was their Conqueror, and the Subverter of the Assyrian Monarchy, and therefore, or therein accounted the founder of the Persian.

Thus the Astronomers computing the first of Cyrus from his taking of Babylon, their first of him became first, and so remains in that respect the first of his 9 years reign. But they had reason good for this, as just now noted.

But whereas according to the holy Scriptures, the Kingdom (of Chaldea) was to be given to the Medes, as well as to the Persians (e), and whereas the Medes, even the Cyaxares of Xenophon, and the Darius of Daniel accordingly accepted it (f) and held it for 2 years as above, therefore Daniel most exactly, and truly hath assigned those 2 years to Darius. And Consequently there are remaining to Cyrus only the other seven years. And thus the first of Cyrus in the Canon is necessarily equal to the first of Darius in Daniel: and the whole 9 years therein assigned to Cyrus are equal to the two years of Darius, and the 7 years of Cyrus according to Ezra and Xenophon. And therefore what is the first of Cyrus in the Canon, and so only in this respect cannot possibly be

(a) p. 1. and 51. of Mr. L. (b) For as I have above shewn, the Sovereignty was wholly in Darius while he lived. Mr. L. indeed hath taken upon him to give us some inferences out of Xenophon of Cyrus's equal Sovereignty with Darius, during Darius's life, in favour of his Hypothesis of their reigning in conjunction, so long as Darius lived. But in truth those Inferences fall exceeding short of proof here, as really importing no other than a delegated Power, such as any King of course would allow to such a wife, valiant, and victorious Prince, as was Cyrus, and might allow, and yet at the same time be himself the Sovereign, or sole ruling Monarch: As was Darius doublets all his life time. (c) Cyrop. Lib. 8. (d) p. 42. of Mr. L. (e) Dan. v. 28. (f) Dan. v. 31. ix. 1.
be the first of Cyrus at 2 years distance according to them, which is so only in another respect: and consequently cannot be coupled together as by Mr L. (a) they are, as one and the same year, without the utmost confusion, and manifest departure from the truth. And so upon the whole it follows that Mr L. being mistaken in his first of Cyrus, he must of course be mistaken in his ending of the LXX years of the Captivity of Judah in such supposed first year of the reign of that Prince from his taking of Babylon.

The holy Scripture in no wise admits of such mistaken Ending of the Captivity, any more than as we have seen it doth of Mr L.’s mistaken beginning of it in his unwarrantably rais’d 11th year of the reign of Zedekiah. But if from this the true Scripture Ending of the Captivity in the first of Cyrus, as really and truly the first of his 7 years reign after the death of Darius, we reckon upwards 70 years, we are then brought in couer to their true Scripture beginning in the fourth of Jehoiakim (b).

And with this Historical matter of fact is evidently concurring to the making the said year of Jehoiakim the first of the Jews Vassalage to Babylon. Forasmuch as in that very year (c) Nebuchadnezzar the son after his other expeditions, on which he was sent by his father in the year foregoing (d) (of which more pretently) invaded Judea, and besieged, and took Jerusalem (e) putting King Jehoiakim in chains to carry him to Babylon (f). However, upon his Humiliation he continued him in the Kingdom (g). But before Nebuchadnezzar removed from Jerusalem (as in the words (b) of the learned Dr Prideaux, we have the following history hereof) be had caused great numbers of the people to be sent Captives to Babylon. And particularly (i) he gave orders to Athpenaz, the Master of his Eunuchs, that he should make choice out of the Children of the royal family, and of the Nobility of the land, such as he found to be of the fairest countenance, and the quickest parts, to be carried to Babylon, and there made Eunuchs in his palace. At the same time also be carried away (k) a great part of the Vessels of the House of the Lord to put them in the House of Bel his God at Babylon.

THEREFORE the people being thus carried away at pleasure, the sons of the ROYAL FAMILY, and of the NOBILITY of the land made Eunuchs, and slaves in the palace of the King of Babylon, the Vessels of the TEMPLE carried thither, and the KING made a TRIBUTARY, and the land brought into VASSALAGE under the Babylonians, from hence (faith this learned Historian) must be reckon’d the LXX years of the Babylonish Captivity (l) foretold by the Prophet Jeremiah a little before in this very year (m).

And

(a) p. 1. bottom note, and p. 3. notes, and elsewhere. (b) See the Calculation in the Table annexed, (c) Jer. xxy. 1. (d) Dan. i. 1. (e) Dan. i. 2, and 2 Chron. xxxvi. 6. (f) ib. (g) As it appears from 2 Kings xxiv. 1. (h) Con. Hist. p. 62. (i) Dan. i. 3. (k) ver. 2. (l) Jer. xxxv. 11, and xxix. 10. (m) Jer., xxy. 1. See Pride. p. 61.
And this very year, or the 4th of Jehoiakim that Prophet having expressly coupled with the first of Nebuchadnezzar (a), and the said 4th of Jehoiakim by the Accounts above (b) giv'n, and as also it may be seen in the Table annexed, being necessarily but at 70 years distance from the Scripture first of Cyrus, it evidently follows against Mr L. that this first of Nebuchadnezzar mention'd by the Prophet as coincident with the fourth of Jehoiakim, could be no other possibly than the first of the son (c).

And how it was so, We cannot be better informed than we are also by the learned Dr Prideaux (d), as he hath very truly told us that the Jews reckon'd the years of Nebuchadnezzar (the son, or the Great) from his Copartnership with his father in the Empire 2 years before his father's death. For (As it appears from Berosus (e), whose testimony therefore Dr. Prideaux hath here cited) in the third year of Jehoiakim, Nabopolassar (or Nebuchadnezzar the father) King of Babylon finding on (the King of Egypt's) Necho's taking of Carchemish, all Syria and Palestine had revolted from him, and that he being old and infirm was unable to march thither himself to reduce them, he took Nebuchadnezzar his son into PARTNERSHIP with him in the Empire, and sent him (f) with an army into those parts. And from hence the Jewish Computation of the years of Nebuchadnezzar's reign begins, that is, from the end of the third year of Jehoiakim. For it was about the end of that year that this was done: And therefore according to the Jews (g), the fourth year of Jehoiakim was the first year of Nebuchadnezzar [the Son.]. But according to the Babylonians his reign is not reckoned to begin 'till after his father's death, which happen'd 2 years after. And both Computations being found in Scripture, it is necessary to say so much here for the reconciling of them.

And these, this learned Chronologer hath also farther reconciled, by telling us elsewhere (h) that Daniel speaking of the Captivity begins the History of it from the third year of Jehoiakim, which (faith he) placeth it back still a year farther than I have done. And this is an Objection. But (as he immediately addeth) the Answer hereto is easy. Daniel begins his computation from the time that Nebuchadnezzar was sent from Babylon by his father in this Expedition, which was in the latter end of the third year of Jehoiakim. After that 2 months at least must have been spent in his march to the borders of Syria. There in the 4th of Jehoiakim (we suppose in the beginning of that year) he fought the Egyptians, and having overthrown them in battle besieged Carchemish, and took it. After this he reduced all the Provinces, and Cities of Syria, and Phoenicia, in which having employed the greatest part of the year,
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in the beginning of October, he came, and laid siege to Jerusalem, and
about a month after took the City.

And from hence (adds Dr. Prideaux) we date the beginning of DA-
NIEL's Servitude, and also the beginning of the LXX Years of the
Babylonish Captivity, and therefore do reckon that year to have been
the first of both.

There is one other short passage which I meet with in the late
excellent book (a) of that learned Chronologer, and Historian, most
useful, and worthy of our noting here by way of full, and final
illustration of the point in hand; and therefore I shall beg leave to
transcribe, and insert it here. It is as follows,

Towards the end of the 5th year of Jehoiakim died Nabopolassar
King of Babylon, and father of Nebuchadnezzar; after he had reigned 21
years (b). Which Nebuchadnezzar (now upon his Expedition)
being informed of, be immediately with a few only of his followers hastned
through the Desert the nearest way to Babylon, &c; where he suc-
cceeded his father in the whole Empire, &c; and reigned over it accord-
ing to Ptolemy 43 years: the first of which begins from the January
following, which is the Babylonish Account; from which the Jewish
Account differs 2 years, as reckoning his time, as above (c).

From hence we have a DOUBLE Computation of the Years of his
reign, the JEWISH, and the BABYLONISH. Daniel follows the
latter; but ALL OTHER Parts of Scripture that make mention of
him the other.

Thus evidently in the fourth year of the reign of Jehoiakim, and
in the first year of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar as in the Jewish
Account coincident therewith began the Babylonish Captivity.

Nor are Mr. L's Objections against such Beginning of the least
weight, as Daniel is now supposed to have been carried away cap-
tive in this the first year of it. And as Mr. L hath therefore told
(d) us, that in this case As the Prophet having after been educated about
3 Years at Babylon, and at the end of them stood before the King, it
will unavoidably follow, that the King before whom they (viz. He and
the rest of them (e) with him) stood at the end of the said years, was
the same person with the King whose dream Daniel interpreted in the
second year of his reign: Which (adds Mr. L.) is altogether inconsistent
with the first, and with the second Chapters of Daniel: For (adds he yet
by way of reason here) from comparing together the said Chapters it will
evidently appear, that Nebuchadnezzar in the first Chapter, and Nebu-
chadnezzar in the second were two different persons. Indeed I profess
myself wholly at a loss to find out this which yet according to Mr.
L. here is evidently apparent.

For upon carefully comparing together these two Chapters, I see not
any the least cause to conclude otherwise than that the Nebuchadnez-

---

(a) Con. Hist. p. 66. (b) According to Ptolemy's Canon. (c) From his father's
taking him Partner with him in the Empire about 2 years before his death. (d)
p. 20. of Mr. L. (e) Dan. i. 19.
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in both these Chapters must necessarily have been one and the
same person, even the Nabopolassar of Ptolemy, the Son of his Na-
bopolassar; or in other words, the Jewish Nebuchadnezzar the
Great, son of their Nebuchadnezzar the first. Sure I am that he
must have been the Nebuchadnezzar of both those Chapters for any
thing that there is in Mr. L.'s assign'd reasons for a different Nebu-
chadnezzar in each of those Chapters. For, As to Mr. L's
First (a) reason to the contrary, viz. that Nebuchadnezzar in the
first Chapter upon examining the children that were carried captive from
Judæa, at the end of the three years, which he had appointed for their
Education, not only approved of Daniel, and his three Companions a-
bove all the rest, but likewise above all the Wise men in Babylon. I
see nothing here to the purpose for which Mr. L. hath said it. This
is all most readily granted. But what then?—How doth it hence
follow, that one was Nebuchadnezzar the father in one Chapter, and
the other Nebuchadnezzar the Son in the other Chapter?—why,
faith Mr. L. in what there follows (b), because Nebuchadnezzar in the
second Chapter had so little knowledge of Daniel, and his Companions,
that he never so much as once consulted them about his Dream; which
undoubtedly first, or last he would have done, before he had issued out
the Decree there mention'd, if he had been that person before whom
they had been brought at the end of the said time, and who upon the
examination then made, so very highly approv'd of them.

So that the Sum of what is here brought to prove two different
Nebuchadnezzars in the first, and second Chapters of Daniel plainly
amounts to this, viz. that Nebuchadnezzar in the first Chapter knew
Daniel, and therefore that must have been the father; but Nebuchad-
nezzar in the second Chapter did not know Daniel; at least he had ve-
ry little knowledge of him; and all because he did not consult Daniel a-
bout his dream.

But alas, what most improbable Arguing is here?—For can
Mr. L. think that Nebuchadnezzar in the second Chapter had no
knowledge of that Daniel, whom Nebuchadnezzar in the first Chap-
ter had so signaliz'd, and distinguisht? Even as the King himself
had communed with him, and his Companions (c); and among them all (d)
was found none like Daniel, &c (e). Even in all matters of wisdom, and
understanding, that the King enquir'd of them, be found them ten times
better than all the Magicians and Astrologers that were in all his
realm (f).

But should Mr. L. ask us therefore, why did not Nebuchadnezzar
consult him first, and not the Magicians as to his dream?—The
Answer is easy.

First, Because it was but natural for him to have recourse to
his own royal Professors of these arts in the first place. And for
ought that he knew, they might have interpreted his dream.

I add

(a) p. 20. of Mr. L. sub fine.  (b) p. 21. initio.  (c) Dan. i. 19.  (d) All that
had been brought to Babylon of those mention'd in Ch. i. 3, 4.  (e) ver. 19.  (f)
Dan. i. 20.
I add Secondly, and more especially because it seems as if God so order’d it that he should not, forasmuch as the fact of his not having done so tended in the end to the greater credit of Daniel, and therein also to the greater honour, and glory of that God whom Daniel served. And therefore the all-wise Providence of God might purposely so ordain it. But still Mr. L. tells us that the King never consulted him at all, neither first, nor last.

And what then?—Wherefore was it, but because Daniel prevented him (a)? He was before-hand with the King herein, by getting access to him, and offering to show unto him the interpretation, upon his having heard of the King’s hasty (b) resolution against his wife men, that for their inability thereunto they were to be put to death (c). And doubtless the King’s enraged Passion (d) at that time occasion’d by his great disappointment through their ignorance, in their not being able to make known a matter of such great weight, and importance to him, and equally great was it in other respects also, might therefore be so exceedingly, or beyond measure raised, as to have put him beside all thought of sending for Daniel, before that the Prophet himself sought occasion, and in all haste got admission to him, as he hath told us that he did (e).

Had it not been for this prevention in Daniel, as he was thus plainly before-hand with the King, he had doubtless first, or last been consulted by him, if not before, however after that he had had his hasty revenge upon his own Magicians by him destin’d to death for failing to inform his royal mind full of perplexity (f), and labouring with distraction, and pain for want of its dear’d knowledge herein.

But afterwards, as God in mercy so order’d it by his Servant Daniel, the King was quickly eased, and his innocent Magicians rescued from Death.

And in all this as the glory of God was the more magnified in his Prophet, so the Prophet’s great charity, and hearty concern for so many condemned innocents, and withal his singular, and divine wisdom and knowledge was the more remarkably manifested.

But Secondly, Mr. L. hath giv’n us another reason why he thinks that the Nebuchadnezzar in the second chapter of Daniel should not be the same with the Nebuchadnezzar of the first, and that is because Daniel had a House of his own in the 2d Chapter, whereas in the first he had his residence at court (g). And what of all this?----Is there any consequence here to the point in hand? Or doth it therefore follow that because he liv’d in a house of his own, he had nothing to do, or was not known at court?----Alas, it doth not: It cannot. For

---

(a) Ch. ii. 14, 24. (b) So Daniel speaks of it, ver. 15. (c) ver 12, 13. (d) The text here [Dan. ii. 12.] is expres’d that the King was ANGRY and very FU-
RIOUS. (e) ver. 24, &c. (f) ver. 3. The King’s Spirit was TROUBLED to

know the dream. (g) p. 21. of Mr. L.
First, Daniel's House in the 2d Chapter might have been within the districts of the Court, or otherwise.

Secondly, if it were, or were not, he might notwithstanding be everyday at Court. For possibly many a Courtier, and even chief Minister of state lives at some distance from the Court, and yet gives daily and due attendance there. And nothing can possibly follow from hence but that the Prophet might be at court as much now in the second Chapter, as he had been in the first.

And with Mr. L's good leave I add,

Thirdly, that without all question Daniel had a House of his own in the first Chapter no less than he had one, of which Mr. L. hath taken so much notice, in the 2d Chapter. For though it happens not to be mention'd there, as well as here, it is I think however sufficiently to be collected from the first Chapter, that in fact he must have had one then, as well as now. For where else can we think that he and his Companions were exercised with that their chosen austerity of life, of eating pulse and drinking water (a)? Where more likely than in their House appointed them by him whom the Prince of the Eunuchs had set over them (b)? For doubtless they were not publicly under this mortifying regimen of Diet: because it was at the utmost peril of the King's Officer who had care over them to make this rigid alteration of the royal immediate appointment of meat and wine for them. And so that Officer was himself apprehensive (c). This Experiment therefore of course could not have been made amongst the other captive Youths, for that had been surely to have published it throughout the Court. Consequentially Daniel and his Companions must then have had a House immediately appointed them, where they might live together, and be as retir'd as they pleas'd. And this the Prince of the Eunuchs and his Deputy (d) had doubtless a power of allotting as they pleas'd, for it was their immediate business: And God so order'd it himself for Daniel, that he might have his way herein, as he had given him the heart of the Prince of the Eunuchs (e), as therein the text is expres'd. And therefore without all question the said Court Officer gave unto Daniel a House for himself, and his Companions: which favour Daniel could not but ask of him on many accounts too tedious here to be mention'd, but especially because otherwise he could never have had those opportunities of serving God daily, after his holy and religious manner, or practice, which was the very joy of his Soul; and without which he could never have lived in any comfort in a strange land.

'Tis therefore I think even more than probable that Daniel must have had a House of his own at Babylon in the first Chapter, as well as in the second. And for any thing that Mr. L. hath, or can make appear

(a) Deu. i. 12, 16.  (b) Melcar. v. 13.  (c) ver. 10. The Prince of the Eunuchs said to Daniel, I fear my Lord the King----And ye shall make me endanger my head to the King.  (d) ver. 11.  (e) ver. 9. God had brought Daniel into favour, and tender love with the Prince of the Eunuchs.
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pear to the contrary, he must have been as much at court in the 2d Chapter, as he had been in the first, even though as Mr. L. hath thought fit to tell us that he now lived in a House of his own.

And therefore Mr. L. hath argued here for his 2 different Nebu-chadnezzar very inconclusively indeed from this Observation. And he hath mistakenly attributed Daniel's ignorance (a) of the King's haughty resolution against his Magicians to this cause, viz. of his not living now at Court, but having a House of his own. Whereas that observed ignorance in Daniel here is evidently owing to another cause, viz. the heat, and suddenness of this whole Transaction.

Why Daniel was not immediately sent for I have already accounted. And as to his ignorance of the King's Resolution against his Magicians, before he was made acquainted with it by the Captain of the guard, it was not as Mr. L. imagines, because he was not at Court in the 2d Chapter so much as he was wont to be in the first, (as in the 2d Chapter he had a house of his own) but it was I say, because, as it is plainly to be gathered from the History, this whole matter must have happened in the most abrupt, and confused manner; and also as it is most probable in the dead time of night: And Daniel doubtless heard of it the next morning (b).

For the King having no sooner dreamed his strange dream, but therewith his Spirit was troubled (c), and his Sleep brake from him, doubtless thereupon the Magicians were called in at his immediate Command (d): For what could he do now for his ease but send for them forthwith?—They came accordingly. But between his want of natural rest, and his great perplexity occasion'd by his dream, they found him like a Fury. For unless they would make known unto him the dream with the interpretation thereof, nothing else would satisfy him in such disappointment that they should be cut in pieces, and their Houses should be made a Dunghill (e). For their lives therefore they must tell him out of hand, for he would give them no time (f). But they could not tell him, therefore it was the King's word to them that they must die (g).

And all this being done thus accidentally, and unseasonably, confusedly, and hastily, even while Daniel was taking his rest in his House, it is no wonder that he was ignorant of it the next morning, when the Captain of the King's guard came to his House (b) to let him know his (i) sentence among the rest upon this the King's great disturbance, and rash proceedings thereupon.

E 2

(a) p. 21. (b) For then the chief Captain came to him, Dan. ii. 13, 14. (c) ver. 1. (d) ver. 2. (e) ver. 5. (f) ver. 8. (g) ver. 12. (h) Dan. ii. 13. (i) Not that there is any ground to suppose that the King had sentenced him among the rest, for 'tis in no wise probable that he should have condemned him who was in no fault, for he was not called: because as I have already shewn the great impiety of the King did not give him leave to think of him. The Magicians might, but the King would not give them any time. But probably upon the King's determination the Sentence against the Magicians, such Courtiers as envied Daniel might think of this Opportunity of getting him out of their way by making him A Magician also, and so sending the Captain to his House accordingly.
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But though the King had been thus hasty in his sentence, and Daniel therefore thus necessarily ignorant of it 'till the morning, yet after all, 'tis plain that he had interest enough with the King immediately to repulse the sentence, as it appears in the sequel of the story. And therefore I observe here against Mr. L. that Daniel could not but be as well known at Court in the second, as he had been in the first Chapter of his book. Consequently, He must have been as well known to Nebuchadnezzar in the second Chapter, as he was to Nebuchadnezzar in the first, as being one and the same Nebuchadnezzar in both.

Nor is that of any the least weight which Mr. L. hath objected to the contrary, viz. (a).

Thirdly, that Daniel when he was brought in before Nebuchadnezzar spoken of in the first Chapter was but a Youth. Whereas in the second year of Nebuchadnezzar mention'd in the second Chapter, he was grown a Man, and was so stiled by the chief Captain of the Guard, by whom he was introduced to the King, &c.

To which I reply, that Daniel might be very properly call'd a Man in the second Chapter; For doubtless He was a young Man, when he stood before Nebuchadnezzar in the first Chapter. For what I pray is a Youth in common decency, or civility of speech but a young man? Mr. L's Youth therefore in the first Chapter was then a young man; but now he was a Year older in the second Chapter. What therefore could the chief Captain have call'd Daniel but as he did, A man (b), when he introduced him to the King?—For necessarily (c) even at his being captivated, near 4 years before, he was (And Mr. L. hath told us that he was) then a Youth, that is a Young man. Nor is there any thing in the manner of the chief Captain's introducing Daniel to the King: At which Mr. L. hath also caught here (d); As if Daniel were introduced into the royal presence,

First, as one whom the King had no knowledge of before the Decree went forth against the Magicians. And

Secondly, as one whom the chief Captain had lately found amongst the Captives of Judah.

(a) p. 21. cf. Mr. L. (b) The Original word is חכם which ordinarily signifies the same with the Greek ἀρχιστήρ, the Latin Homo. But 'tis all trifling fully to argue from hence to the point in hand. (c) He was then a Νεβουχοδορός faith Græus [on Dan. i. 4.], from the Greek Translauton, and indeed as it appears from the Context. [i.e.] For the King's orders to the Master of the Eunuchs were for such to be captivated from among the סנה, as were skilful in all wisdom, and cunning in knowledge, and understanding in Science. [i.e.] But these must necessarily have been of an Age deserving the name more than that of Children, or even School-Boys. They must questionless have been young Students, to whom these Characters are properly suitting, of being such as had thus made a considerable proficiency in Arts and Sciences. And Daniel being one of these when he was carried captive, he could not then be at an age under that of 15 or 16. And as it was in the 4th year of his Captivity that he interpreted the King's Dream [equal to the second year of Nebuchadnezzar the Son in the Babylonish Account, and the 4th in the Jewish, as above.] He must now consequently have been about, or near twenty years of age. Dr. Prideaux supposeth him to have been 18 years old when he was carried captive. [Con Hist. p. 162.] (d) p. 22. Judg.
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To the former of these fancies I have already replied. And as to the latter, I am at a loss to know what Mr. L’s meaning is in his speaking of Daniel as one lately found (a).

If he means thereby to set forth Daniel at this time as an obscure person, or as one unknown either to the King, or to Arioch his Captain of the guard (and this must be his meaning here, if he meant it to any purpose) my reply is from the Text even in this second Chapter, (not to insist here upon the remarkable distinction of Daniel in the first Chapter,) that by Daniel’s own account there, he was certainly known before to both: to the Captain who sought him among the rest of the Wise Men to be slain (b); to the King, as going in unto him thereupon, and desiring of him to give him time (c), for to shew him the interpretation of the dream (d). But had he not been before known, I will add also well known to the King, ’tis not to be supposed that he had thus presum’d upon the royal patience in both these instances, the one of going into his presence, the other of making such a petition to him, as his own Magicians had not interest enough with him to obtain, but Daniel ’tis plain had, for he did obtain it (e).

But ’tis I think high time to have done with these little objections to the grand point in hand, which in truth have no other foundation than mere fancy, and invention for the sake of a mistaken Hypothesis to the confounding the first of Nebuchadnezzar the father with the first of Nebuchadnezzar the son, from the first, and 2d Chapters of Daniel: Whereas as I have shewn the Nebuchadnezzar of both could be no other than one, and the same Nebuchadnezzar; even the son: Or that Nebuchadnezzar, who in the third year of Jehoiakim (f) by his then infirm father was sent upon the Syrian Expedition, (as above) and who in the fourth of Jehoiakim (g) took Jerusalem: and by whom also Daniel was then captivated, and before whom at 3 years end he stood in the first Chapter; and finally whose Dream he interpreted in the second Chapter.

And thus, (Mr. L’s objections notwithstanding,) the first Year of the Captivity of Judah according to the holy Scripture remains fixed to the fourth Year of Jehoiakim, equal to the first of Nebuchadnezzar the son also according to the Scripture, viz. in the Jewish (b) reckoning of his reigning two years (as above) in conjunction with his father before his death.

E 3 And

(a) The original word here translated found, is the same with that in Psalm lxxxix. 20, I have found David my servant, &c. But here the word is us’d with respect to one known long before. Why therefore not equally so by the chief Captain concerning Daniel? There is not the least room for the contrary supposition. (b) Dan. ii. 12, 14, 15. (c) Which the Magicians had beth’d in vain, ver. 8. (d) ver. 16. (e) And herein the Providence of God is also visible, that whereas the King had form’d at his Magicians, and would not give them any time beyond the present, God now inclin’d the heart of the King towards Daniel to his receiving him with patience; and to the granting him his request. (f) Dan. i. 1. (g) Jer. xxv. 1. (b) Jer.
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And this is the only Objection against the 4th of Jehoiakim its being the first year of the Jewish Captivity, with which we are concern'd, among the many which Mr. L. hath heaped together (a) on this occasion: forasmuch as we have clear'd and fully proved the coincidence of the 4th of Jehoiakim with the first of Nebuchadnezzar the son in the respect now mention'd: in which alone according to the truth, that is, according to the sacred Account, there could possibly be such coincidence. For, as it will appear hereafter, Nebuchadnezzar could not have reigned more than two years in conjunction with his father, however Mr. L. by reason of his rais'd 11th of Zedekiah hath been forced to give him a full nine years (b) reign in such conjunction; for which there is no possibility of truth from the Scripture Account, as we have now seen: Nor in truth is there any foundation for it elsewhere, however Mr. L. hath quoted Josephus, and Berosus in his favour, as justifying him in such beginning of the Captivity of Judah.

And an Enquiry into these testimonies is the next part of our general Enquiry on this Occasion: As we think that we have now fully gone through the Scripture Account of these times, together with Mr. L's immediate Objections to its certain beginning of the LXX Years Captivity, as here settled from the sacred Account; which was our first Enquiry (c).

Therefore proceed we now Secondly to Josephus, and Berosus. And what have they said in these matters? Or rather what hath Mr. L. said from them? For as to Josephus, it will be found upon enquiry that Mr. L. hath said most, if not all himself from him; who really justifies, or bears him out in nothing in any consistency with the holy Scriptures, or even with himself or with Berosus.

And as to Berosus, as we shall see cause sufficient to conclude, as we go along, He is evidently against Mr. L.; and plainly confirms the Scripture coincidence of the fourth of Jehoiakim with the first of Nebuchadnezzar the son, as reigning only 2 years in conjunction with his father before his death. And therefore if Josephus hath cited his testimony here otherwise, he must have been asleep, and knew not what he writ. But after all we shall find Mr. L. in the mistake. For though Josephus hath writ too confusedly of these matters, as is the real truth, yet he could not possibly have meant, as Mr. L. hath given us to understand that he did, and as upon such mistake meaning he hath built his Hypothesis; viz. that the Temple of Jerusalem was burnt in the 11th of Zedekiah

(a) As in p. 16. and thence forward to p. 25. of Mr. L's book. (b) For he makes the Siege of Tyre to have been begun in the 7th of Nebuchadnezzar the Son, viz. in the year of the J. F. 4106, which in his account is evidently the 7th of his reigning in conjunction with his father, as may be seen in p. 39. of Mr. L., and in his mistaken Calculation as noted in the Table annexed. But that is equal only to the 19th of the father, who reigned at least 21 years according to Ptol. Canon. For which see also the Table annexed. (c) See p. 25.
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Zedekiah as being coincident with the 19th (a) of Nebuchadnezzar
the father, or at LXX Years distance from the taking of Babylon by
Cyrus. For he hath saied enough to prove the contrary. And
therefore he must be notoriously inconfident not only with the
holy Scriptures, and with Berosus likewise, but also with himself,
if he be supposd to have so meant in what he hath sometimes
confusely said of these matters.

Therefore to look into his testimonies as urged by Mr. L. What
are they?—In Mr. L's telling they are (b)

First, (c) that Agreeably to this (viz. to what Mr. L. had been be-
fore groundlessly urging from 2 Chron. xxxvi. 21 (c) of the Land's
enjoying 70 Sabbaths, as lying desolate WHOLLY the 70 Years of the
Captivity) Josephus (d) says that [from the Captivity of the Jews in
the 11th of Zedekiah.] All Judea, Jerusalem, and the Temple lay
desolate seventv years.

Secondly, (e) That the first of Cyrus was the 70th year after that
the Jews [in the said 11th of Zedekiah] were carried captive into Ba-
bylon. And

Thirdly, (f) that after the space of LXX Years [from the Temple's
being burnt by Nebuchadnezzar] Cyrus released the Jews from their
Captivity. And

Lastly, Josephus is suppos'd by Mr. L. to assert the same from
Berosus (g).

As to the first of these Quotations here brought by Mr. L. in
his favour from Josephus, I observe that the most material words in
it which shoul make for his Hypothesis are really added by
him, viz. those which I have therefore included in a Parenthesis.
All the rest following are Josephus's: but those other are entirely of
Mr. L's adding. Josephus was now in the conclusion of that Jewish
History, which he had been upon from the 4th of Jeboiakim (b).
And therefore he saied that For this cause Judea, Jerusalem, and the
Temple lay desolate 70 years. As if he had said, the Desolations of
Judea and Jerusalem began in the fourth year of Jeboiakim, for then
began the 70 years Vassalage to the King of Babylon, from whence for-
ward All Judea was continually liable to, and harassed with the in-
roads and incursions of the Chaldeans 'till the 11th of Zedekiah; but
those Desolations were not wholly accomplished 'till the destruction of the
City, and burning of the Temple afterwards at 18 years distance in the
said 11th of Zedekiah.

But should Mr. L. reply against this as the meaning of Josephus,
and that because he will doubtless tell us here that Josephus hath
expressly excepted any invasion of Judea in that year, viz. in the
fourth year of Jeboiakim, forasmuch as he hath said (i) In the fourth

E 4

(a) This 19th, as we shall have occasion to note hereafter, is in Josephus only the 18th:
(b) p. 12. of Mr. L.  
(c) Which Text hath been fully consider'd above in p. 22, &c.
(e) Ant. lib. xi. c. 1. p. 458.  
(f) lib. xx. p. 900.  
(g) lib. i. con. Ap. p. 1344.  
(i) Ant. lib. x. c. vi. initio.
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year of his (viz. Jehoiakim's) reign Nebuchadnezzar having smote Pharaoh Necho's army, thereupon passing Euphrates seize'd all Syria as far as Pelusium, JUDEA only excepted, the Answer is easy, that 'tis true here is the Exception: but by whom we know not. Not likely by Josephus, nor by any one else that knew, at least consider'd the testimony of Berosus, as cited by Josephus after in two places of his book (a), wherein the contrary is evident from Berosus. For by his account Nebuchadnezzar must necessarily have invaded JUDEA also in that Expedition; because he speaks expressly of JEWISH Prisoners, as well as Egyptian, Syrian, and Phoenician taken in it in both those places as quoted by Josephus from him. And as now according to the express testimony of Berosus as cited by Josephus, Nebuchadnezzar had his Jewish Captives, as well as those of other countries there named, where does Mr. L. think that that Prince had those Jewish Captives but in JUDEA? He had his other Prisoners there mention'd out of their respective Countries; and therefore also his Jewish Captives out of JUDEA, and even from Jerusalem it self now taken by him in the fourth of Jehoiakim: according to the express testimony of Berosus likewise as cited by Josephus (b). For according to that Historian upon Nebuchadnezzar's coming to Babylon in the year after, upon his father's death, and becoming Lord of all his father's Empire, He with the Spoils of War magnificently repaire'd, and deck'd the Temple of Bel, &c.

Now what, or whence doth Mr. L. think were these Spoils of War, which now became the deckings of Belus his Temple but the Vessels of the House of God at JERUSALEM which Nebuchadnezzar now carried into the land of SHINAR to the House of his God, according to the Prophet Daniel (c)?

How Nebuchadnezzar the son had gone out on this Expedition against Pharaoh Necho in the year before, viz. in the latter end of the third of Jehoiakim according to Daniel (d), I have before (e) shewn from the learned Dr. Prideaux: as also how after Pharaoh Necho's Overthrow in the beginning of Jehoiakim's fourth, and also after the reduction of Syria and Phoenicia, before the end of that year Jerusalem was taken (f). And thus the Jewish Captives, and the Spoils of War mention'd by Berosus (g) as the deckings of the Temple of Bel, even Daniel's (b) Vessels of the House of God were taken by Nebuchadnezzar in the fourth year of Jehoiakim thus necessarily coequal, or coincident with the Scripture first (i) of the said Nebuchadnezzar: but not of the father, as Mr. L. most mistakenly hath made it to be, but necessarily of the son in Berosus his account of his reigning in conjunction with his father, (about two years before his death,) who being them unable to undergo the fatigues of

(a) Ant. lib. x. c. xi. p. 459. &c. Ap. lib. 1. p. 1342. (b) ib. (c) Ch. 1. 2. (d) Ch. i. 1. (e) See p. 46. &c. (f) See ib. (g) As in the places of Josephus mention'd under note a. (h) Ch. i. 2. (i) Jer. xxvi. 1.
contain exactly four hundred, and ninety Years. And war took his son into (a) a Copartnership of Government with him, and sent him upon the expedition, as above.

And there is a remarkable Circumstance here twice noted by Berosus (b) which confirms us herein; viz. that Nebuchadnezzar the son, when he went upon this expedition, was in the flower of his age. He must then probably have been about 30 years of age. And as he reigned 43 years after his father's death (c), he must thus have been 73 at his own death: Which is 3 years beyond the age of King David.

But if as Mr. L. would have it, this Expedition had been in the fourth of Jehoiakim as coincident with the first of Nebuchadnezzar the father, then of course the Son must have been about 22 years older, that is, he must have been about 95 years old at his death. An Age this in no wise likely for him to have arriv'd at, who had been so exceedingly harassed in war, as he had been more or less, for six or seven and thirty years together (d). But had this been fact of his living to such an advanced age, or pretty near it, there is no doubt but it would have been somewhere, or other remarked of him: Whereas I know of nothing like it.

There is yet another particular in the testimony of Berosus which unavoidably proves against Mr. L. in the case before us, viz. that the fourth of Jehoiakim in which was made this Expedition of Nebuchadnezzar against Judea, must have been in the said fourth, as equal to the first of Nebuchadnezzar the son, (and not the father, as Mr. L. hath made it,) and that is, that the father died while the Son was upon this Expedition (e). But if the Son was upon this expedition in the first of the father, he must in that case have been full 20 years upon it at least before his father's death (f). And thus the father must have been infirm from the first year of his reign, and the son must have been upon this expedition all that time, in doing that which according to the account of the holy Scriptures must certainly have been done in two years, and according to Berosus also must have been done in the two last years of Nebuchadnezzar the father, and consequently in the first of the son's Conjunction with the father, when now towards the latter end of his reign he was got infirm, and so was become unable to bear the fatigues of war, and his Son was now expressly according to Berosus also, in the flower of his age.

For these plain reasons therefore Jos. plus, or whoever it was for him that excepted the invasion of Judea in this Expedition, hath

(a) Nabopolassarum audita rebellionne Egipti nifiis filium eodem regio Imperio, & regio Excitatu. A quo tempore confugit Initium Nabuchodonosori cum patre regnantis. Jos. Scal. de Emendatione Temp. p. xiii. prologe, where he shews how it was customary for Kings thus to appoint. (b) In loc. sup. cit. (c) See Ptol. Can. and the Table annex'd. (d) viz. from the end of the third Year of Jehoiakim, or from the Year before A. D. 607 to the Year before A. D. 570, when, and not before, he was at rest from all his wars. See the Chron, Table annexed. (e) See Berosus expressly in loco supra cito. (f) For he reign'd 21 years. Ptol. Can.
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That the Seventy Weeks of this Prophecy hath excepted it against the express testimony not only of Scripture (a), but also of Berosus, whose testimony in the several particulars thereof is evidently concurring with the sacred Account. And therefore we must say either that Josephus was asleep here, when he made this exception, for'tis plain that he knew not what he did, if he made it, or else if we would consult, and gave his credit, who himself hath quoted Berosus, as above, no less than twice against himself here as to such Exception, we must conclude that some other Person either through ignorance, or design here contrary to all truth clapt it in. And so Josephus hath suffered for it ever since. And such who have followed him in it, have done it perhaps inadvertently, as having not duly considered the express testimonies against them in this matter either of the holy Scriptures, or of Berosus.

And however the said Exception of Judea out of this Expedition of Nebuchadnezzar the son against Pharaoh Necho (b) came into Josephus in this place, yet he elsewhere hath coupled Nebuchadnezzar the son's coming against Egypt with his coming also in that Expedition into Judea: As having quoted Berosus his testimonies in other matters, he says (c) in the following words with respect to the matter in hand, that this Historian informs us how King Nebuchadnezzar sent his son into Egypt, and to OUR COUNTRY with great power, &c. But this Expedition into Egypt as cited from Berosus could be no other than that, in which, as I have above shewn, Nebuchadnezzar took the Vessels of the Temple at Jerusalem, which afterwards by Berosus his telling became the dekings of the Temple of Bel. But this, as I have also shewn, was in the fourth of Jehoiakim coincident with the first of Nebuchadnezzar the son, as reigning two years, and according to Berosus the two last years of the now inharm old man his father's life in conjunction with him. And therefore Mr. L. is exceedingly mistaken if he here couples those words last quoted by Josephus from Berosus [viz. Our Country with great power] with the words immediately following, [after the word Power] of Nebuchadnezzar's finding the Jews rebels and subduing them, and burning the Temple at Jerusalem, and so departing, and carrying with him all the nation into Babylon; Whereupon the city was desolate LXX years until the reign of Cyrus the Persian. For these things happened not in, but after the 4th of Jehoiakim; the Jews rebelling in the 7th year of Jeboiam, after he had serv'd the King of Babylon 3 years (d), and the burning of the temple not 'till the 11th of Zedekiah, which is at 18 years distance from the 4th of Jehoiakim. But Josephus his testimony here reacheth no lower than the said 4th of Jehoiakim, as touch-

(a) Dan. i. 2.  (b) And Pharaoh Necho by name Josephus hath here mention'd: Which is perfectly agreeing with the Scripture 4th of Jeboiam and the first of Nebuchadnezzar the Son. Jer. xxv. 1.  (c) lib. i. con. Ap. in loc. sup. cit.  (d) 2 Kings xxiv. 1.
containing exactly four hundred and ninety Years.

Therefore all that follows after in Josephus, as just now quoted [after the word Power] are not the words of Berosus, nor indeed the sense of them: but they are the words either of Josephus, or rather, as we shall see cause to conclude, the words of some or other of his Corruptors, who have here given a most mistaken and confounded sense of Berosus, in no wise consistent either with the Scripture, or Berosus, or even with Josephus himself, whose first of the LXX Years Babylonish Captivity preceding the first of Cyrus must also according to him no less than according to Scripture, and Berosus have begun from the fourth of Jehoiakim, however Mr. L. hath placed his 11th of Zedekiah as Josephus his beginning thereof, and at 70 years distance from his first of Cyrus: for which he hath given us his second, and third Quotations as above, but in both with his own Inferences also as above, of the said 11th of Zedekiah. But as to the said

Second Quotation, leaving out Mr. L.'s insertion, that is evidently as general as is the former. And it can no otherwise serve Mr. L. than as he hath thrust in that insertion: for this is the testimony as it stands in Josephus, viz. The first of Cyrus was the seventieth year after that the Jews were carried captive into Babylon (a). But by Josephus's appealing to the Prophet there presently after, as he tells us that the Restoration of the Jews by Cyrus hapned according to the divine prediction, even as God had foretold them BEFORE the Destruction of the City, that after they had SERV'D Nebuchadnezzar and his posterity for 70 years, he would again restore them to their Country wherein they were born, his seventieth Year here spoken of as at that distance preceding the first of Cyrus, and being therefore necessarily the first of the Jewish Vassalage to Babylon, must consequently be coincident with the Scripture 4th of Jehoiakim, as that is at 70 years distance from the first of Cyrus. For otherwise wherefore did Josephus refer to Scripture here, in the Prediction? And what prediction was it but of the Prophet Jeremiah (b)?—And when did the Prophet declare it, but in the fourth year of the reign of Jehoiakim, which was the first of Nebuchadnezzar (c), in which very Year this Vassalage began? As by the Prophet's account it evidently did, as I have above shewn (d) beyond all contradiction. What must we say then in this case of Josephus's referring to the Prophet here, but that he hath either followed the Prophet in his reckoning the years of this Captivity of Judah, or he hath not?—If he hath followed the Prophet, he is in the right, and Consequently Mr. L. is in the wrong, and quite mistaken in making Josephus to begin the 70 years of the Captivity

(a) Jos. Ant. xii. c. 1. p. 468. (b) Jer. xxv. and xxix. (c) Jer. xxv. 1. (d) See above, where I have proved from Jeremiah's Letter, and from the Years of Jeconiah's Captivity, that that of Judah cannot possibly have its beginning any where but in the 4th of Jehoiakim.
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iry in the 11th of Zedekiah. But if Josephus hath not followed the Prophet, Mr. L. will surely own him in the wrong. And so must Every man else, if not merely out of reverence to God's word, as such, yet unquestionably in this case, as the word of God by his Prophet is the very Authority here cited. But herein Josephus cannot be found agreeing otherwise than as his first year of the reign of Cyrus, which, faith he, was the 70th year after that our Nation was translated from Judæa to Babylon, must have been the 70th from the fourth year of the reign of Jehoiakim. And if it was not so in Josephus his Account, we must then give him up to a gross, and most unpardonable mistake here. And indeed so we must as to Mr. L.; however it were with Josephus. But he may get off, for anything that Mr. L. hath urged in his

Third Quotation from him; the words whereof, Mr. L's usual infention taken out, are only these, viz. that after the spase of 70 Years Cyrus released the Jews from their Captivity. But for any thing here to the contrary, Josephus's first of these 70 years might be from the fourth of Jehoiakim. No, faith Mr. L. here; not so, but from the Temple's being burnt by Nebuchadnezzar, or which is all one from the 11th of Zedekiah, when that hapned. To which my reply is

First, that Mr. L. can have no other ground for attributing such mistaken reckoning here to Josephus, than as he had indeed then been speaking of the Temple; but that however no otherwise than as he was giving a general account of the Priesthood from Aaron downward to the burning of it, when as he tells us the then High-Priest Jozedek was carried captive. And

Secondly, However afterwards we read the following words of Josephus, viz. that, After the taking of Jerusalem by the Babylonians until such time as Cyrus dismissed the Jews, &c. with permission to rebuild their Temple there are Seventy Tears, yet Mr. L's Conclusion here that this taking of the City must have been that in the 11th of Zedekiah, is in no wise necessary, because it is possible that Josephus's meaning might be of that taking of the City which was in the fourth of Jehoiakim:

Had indeed Josephus in the end of those words of his, After the taking of the City, added also, and after the burning of the Temple, then indeed Mr. L's sense of Josephus here had been necessarily deducible, as his undoubted sense of them. But as the words now stand at large, it is possible that Josephus might have no other meaning in them than that of the Temple's being begun to be rebuilt by virtue of Cyrus's Decree issued forth in the first year of his reign at the distance of 70 years from the first taking of the City by Nebuchadnezzar in the fourth of Jehoiakim, when was the first carrying away of the Jews to Babylon by the said King thereof.

But
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But if after all, Mr. L. will have it his way according to this, and especially according to his

Fourth Quotation, as Josephus is there said by him to assert the same from Berosus's Chaldaic History (a), as the words of Josephus, or of those who have corrupted him there most egregiously, are that in OUR WRITINGS we find that Nebuchadnezzar in the 18th year of his reign did destroy our Temple, and that is so remained three score, and ten years (b), my reply is not only that this testimony pretended to be agreeing with Berosus is absolutely inconsistent with it, as I have already shewn (c), but as I here add, it also carries in it its own confutation in a mistaken appeal to the holy Scriptures, for the fact of that which according to them was evidently otherwise, as agreeably to them Jerusalem was taken, and the Temple burnt not in any 18th of Nebuchadnezzar, but expressly in the 19th (d), and that necessarily of the son in their (e) reckoning, and in the 17th of the Babylonish Account (f), with which is coincident their 11th of Zedekiah, only at 52 years distance from their first of Cyrus (g). But Josephus in his 18th of Nebuchadnezzar here accords not with those Writings, to which he here appeals. And he is no otherwise reconcilable with them than by laying that he hath been corrupted here, of which I shall have occasion to speak more hereafter. But Mr. L. hath here (b) corrected him to our hands, as to this mistaken year, and therefore made it the 19th of Nebuchadnezzar, as it truly was, in which the Temple was burnt. But as he hath still confined his 19th to the 19th of Nebuchadnezzar the father upon the authority of Josephus, he hath herein put him at the greatest distance of reconciliation that can be, not only with the holy Scriptures, but also with himself in other sure Historical passages of him, and grand Characters of these times evidently agreeing with the holy Scriptures, which I shall therefore now particularly consider. And by such consideration we shall reap this benefit however, that if we cannot clear Josephus of all his seeming mistakes, or rather notorious corruptions of him, We shall however clear him in the main, as we shall evidently discover a twenty years difference between Josephus and Mr. L.. And this will go a great way also towards reconciling Josephus with Scripture, and Berosus, and even with himself: Allowing such other passages as they at present stand in his book, and are absolutely inconsistent with him in his certain dates of time fixed by him in exact, and full accordance with Scripture, to have been not his, but corruptions of him. And

(a) Jos. con. Ap. lib. i. p. 134a. Ed. Huds. (b) i.e. η τη περιποιησε ακ Εμφυλιος, & Synclls legit Judionius. According to which reading Josephus very truly expresst himself in a round number, as to the Temple's lying desolate from its destruction in the 11th of Zedekiah to the rebuilding thereof in the 1st of Cyrus: tho' the term thereof strictly, and exactly be 52 years: as is evident from Josephus his own numbers as we shall soon see. (c) viz. Occasionally under Mr. L's first Quotation from Josephus. (d) 2 Kings xxv. 8. (e) viz. as the 4th of Jehoiakim is equal to the 1st of Neb. Jer. xxv. 2. (f) See the Table annexed. (g) See ib. (h) p. 33. of Mr. L.
therefore where he is either mistaken, or corrupted in lesser numbers, or in gross and self-evident falsities whether genuine, or spurious, in them he is to be corrected, and amended by being brought into conformity with himself in those particulars, wherein he is certainly in the right. And of these the

First that I shall mention is his first of Cyrus. And that I look upon as most proper to fix in the first place: As whereby we shall also fix Josephus his ending of the 70 years of the Babylonish Captivity: and thereby we shall be enabled to come at the knowledge also of his beginning of them.

And for Josephus’s first of Cyrus, we must surely go to his own Quotation from the Punician Annals. As according to these Annals cited (a), In the 14th of Hirom King of [new] Tyre, Cyrus was made Emperor of Persia. But this 14th of King Hirom, as I have already had occasion to shew (b) falls in exactly with the second year of Darius the Mede (c) or the year wherein he died, and Cyrus succeeded him in the whole Empire. And so the year following becomes his first according to these Annals, no less than I have above shewn it to be according to the holy Scriptures, and Xenophon.

And the same must Consequentially have been Josephus’s first of Cyrus also, if he knew any thing of those Annals which he hath here quoted: And if he did not, to what purpose did he quote them? But this is by no means to be supposed here. And therefore Josephus’s first of Cyrus is the 70th Year from the beginning of the Captivity in the very same respect, or manner as the Scripture first of Cyrus is so; viz. from the Scripture 4th of Jehoiakim.

But by Mr. L’s telling (d), this was not Josephus’s first of Cyrus: for his was about 18 or 19 years earlier, viz. in the year of the J. P. 4154, or 4155 (e) as being the first year of the 55th Olympiad, whence there is indeed a computation of a thirty years reign of Cyrus from the time of his being General over the confederated Army of Medes, and Persians against the Babylonians (f). But that this should have been Josephus’s first of Cyrus it is in no wise probable. For in truth it hath no other foundation than that of Mr. L’s pure imagination here taken up merely for the sake of serving his purpose in his before noted mistake of the beginning of the 13 years Siege of Tyre, as he hath placed that in the 7th of Nebuchadnezzar the son reigning in conjunction with his father, and that also upon the mistaken authority of Josephus in this particular, as I shall shew presently. But this is the foundation of Mr. L’s making Josephus’s first of Cyrus to have been his first in that 30 years computation of his reign as now mention’d.

As

(c) See the Table annexed.  (d) p. 40. of Mr. L.  (e) Of the year before A. D. 560, or 559.  (f) See Prol. Com. Hist. p. 109. & 129.
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As to which conceit of Mr. L. I observe

First, that here surely He hath acted in the greatest inconsistency imaginable both with Josephus, and also but especially with himself.

For upon the testimony of Josephus also he hath industriously made the first year of Cyrus the seventieth from the burning of the Temple in his therefore raised 11th of Zedekiah. It is the very life of his Hypothesis. But this he destroys absolutely by telling us here for the sake of justifying his mistaken Siege of Tyre, that the first year of the 55th Olympiad was Josephus's first of Cyrus: for even from Mr. L's raised 11th of Zedekiah as falsely made equal to the year of the J. P. 4106, down to the first year of the 55th Olympiad, and the year of the J. P. which according to Mr. L. himself answers to it 4154, or 4155 there are no more than 48 or 49 years. What becomes then of Mr. L's 70 Years Captivity of the Jews from the burning of the Temple to the first of Cyrus in his pretended testimony of Josephus here?——If this were Josephus's first of Cyrus, then necessarily Mr. L. is left here as to this point of his beginning and ending the Captivity upon the testimony of Josephus.

But if that other in Mr. L's reckoning of it was it, as being the 70th from his raised 11th of Zedekiah, then Mr. L. is left on the other hand as to the authority of Josephus for his mistaken siege of Tyre.

Otherwise Josephus must have had two reckonings of the first year of Cyrus. And so truly Mr. L. (a) hath told us.——But hath Josephus told us so?——He hath not, that I know of. And Writers that are consistent with themselves usually have but one. At least they are so kind as to tell us so, when they have more: And of Josephus, it is to be presumed that he would have done so likewise. 'Tis therefore also to be presumed that he had but one and the same first of Cyrus.

But neither of these after all could have been his first of Cyrus, for neither of them is the first of Cyrus according to the Phoenician Annals, or the holy Scriptures; whose first according to them, and therefore according to Josephus also, as before noted, is the 70th necessarily, and only from the fourth of Jehoiakim.

But Secondly, Mr. L. hath equally mistaken Josephus in the very foundation of such mistaken first of Cyrus. That is as he hath made the siege of Tyre to have been begun in the seventh of Nebuchadnezzar from the following history in Josephus (b, viz. In the reign of King Ithoba, Nebuchadnezzar besieged Tyre 13 years; Baal reigned 10 years. After him others (c) 32 years, and 3 months. So that this whole time is 54 years and 3 months; [as the words stand here

(a) p. 49 of Mr. L. last line but 5, where he says that Josephus in the first of Cyrus there mention'd followed the generally receiv'd Opinion, &c. (b) Jos. con. Ap. lib. 1. p. 1344. 1345. (c) See them before particularly named.
That the Seventy Weeks of this Prophecy

Here at this time:] for Nebuchadnezzar began to besiege Tyre in the SEVENTH year of his reign, and in the fourteenth year of King Hirom's reign Cyrus was made Emperor of Persia.

Here the distinguished SEVENTH year Mr. L. hath in a mistake applied to Nebuchadnezzar, as the seventh of his reign; whereas without all question Joséphus meant it of the seventh of the Tyrian King Ithobal, whose seventh here mention'd was the seventh of his 19 years reign (a), and consequently the first of Nebuchadnezzar's 13 years siege of Tyre. For Joséphus in the beginning of the Paragraph had said only in general that in the reign of King Ithobal, Nebuchadnezzar besieged Tyre 13 years. Here he adds particularly that he began the said siege in the 7th year of his reign:— of whole reign, not the Tyrian King Ithobal's? So that according to Joséphus here, as it was in the 14th year of a Tyrian King, viz. King Hirom that Cyrus was made Emperor of Persia, so according to him also in the 7th of a Tyrian King, viz. King Ithobal, it was that Nebuchadnezzar laid siege to Tyre. For in all reason the Tyrian Observation ought equally to hold in both respects, viz. to the 7th of Ithobal, as well as to the 14th of Hirom, because Joséphus is here designedly quoting the Phœnician Annals, in adjusting these times by them, and therefore doubtless as well the time of Nebuchadnezzar's laying siege to Tyre in the reign of one of these Tyrian Kings, as the time of Cyrus's being made Emperor of Persia also in the immediate date of a Year of one of thole Kings.

And from the 7th of the said Tyrian King Ithobal to the last, or 20th of King Hirom there are here said to have been 54 years, and 3 months, viz. as the 7th of Ithobal is exclusive of this number. But if that 7th be added to the reckoning, as therein the siege of Tyre was begun, and was therefore one of its 13 years siege, the whole number of years thus becomes 55 years and 3 months; to which the full number of years here mention'd doth really amount. It must have been in the former respect therefore, that the other general sum, if that was the true original sum, and not this was here ned by Joséphus.

But Thirdly, It is by no means likely either that Joséphus should have quoted the Phœnician Annals with any the least relation to such a foreign first of Cyrus, as is this here pretended by Mr. L. to have been referred to by him, or even that the Phœnician Annals acknowledged such a first of Cyrus, with which the Jewish Writings here referred to by Joséphus in their agreement with them is in no wise concern'd. For Joséphus is here expressly appealing to these Annals for their agreement with Jewish History. But such a first of Cyrus is vastly remote from the first of Cyrus of the Scriptures (b); which are the Hebrew Histories of Joséphus; the Holy Books, as he (c) calls them, which according to his protest there, his design was faithfully to trans-

(a) He was most likely kill'd in the end of the siege. See above. (b) The Difference is about some 23 years, as much as is between 539 before A. D. and 536. (c) Ant., lib. x. ch. x. sub line.
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translate into the Greek tongue. And therefore in whatsoever he hath
manifestly varied from those sacred Records of those times, he must
be concluded to have been either grossly mistaken, or exceedingly
corrupted; which latter seems to have been his fate very much in
this part of Jewish History (a).
However it having been Josephus's professed design to give the History
of the holy Scriptures in another tongue, we ought to allow him ev
every thing that we can wherein he is reconcileable with them. And
therefore in the case before us of his first of Cyrus, and of his re
ferring to the Phoenician Annals for the siege of Tyre, by all means
we ought; for it is but justice to him as well as to the truth, to take
it for granted that his meaning in all this was such as is perfectly ag
greeing with the holy Scriptures.
And so taking his 7th year as above-mentioned to have been the
7th of Ithobal, which as I have shewn the Text perfectly allows,
and indeed justifies, he will be found to be exactly agreeing with the
holy Scriptures in his first of Cyrus, and also in the 13 years siege of
Tyre begun according to them (b), and also according to the Phoenici
an Annals at about some 49 years distance from their first of Cyrus,
as well as from the same also of the holy Scriptures. And thus they,
and the Phoenician Annals, and Josephus are all found to be perfectly
agreeing. And therefore this must necessarily have been the truth
here. And consequently Mr. L. as he hath placed the siege of Tyre
(as it hath been above. (c) shewn) in an utter inconsistency with the
Prophet Ezekiel's Year of it in his Æra of the Captivity of Jeconiah,
so he hath on that account evidently perverted both the Phoenician
Annals, and also Josephus as to their account of that siege, and their
first of Cyrus; and all because Josephus's 7th of Ithobal is by Mr. L.
erroneously made the 7th of Nebuchadnezzar the son reigning in
conjunction with his father. Against which, that it could never pos
sibly have been Josephus's meaning, I add
Fourthly, because Josephus hath not giv'n us any the least foot
steps that I can find of Nebuchadnezzar the son his reigning in con
junction with his father, than that one only from Berosus already men
tion'd (d). But that evidently excludes all farther imagination of
any conjunctive reign beyond that of about some the two last years of
Nebuchadnezzar the father's life, as I have also shewn (e) from the
compar'd testimonies of Scripture, Berosus, and Josephus in their 4th
year of the reign of Jehoiakim: which must therefore have been equiva
lent to, or corresponding with the first of Nebuchadnezzar the
son so reigning, even according to Josephus also, as well as Scripture,
and Berosus.
For this I will lay down as a certain, or undeniable truth here, that
the fourth of Jehoiakim of Josephus must necessarily be coincident
with the first of Nebuchadnezzar, either of the father, or of the

(a) In the tenth book of his Antiq. no less than in his eleventh, of which Dr. Prid.
hath particularly animadverted. [Con. Hist. p. 501, &c.] (b) See the Table annexed.
(c) See above. (d) See above. (e) See above.
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It can be proved from Josephus, that his fourth of Jehoiakim cannot be coincident with the first of the father, it must then follow that it is the first of the son, with which the said fourth of Jehoiakim was surely coincident according to him also, as well as according to the holy Scriptures, and Berofus.

And this will be made to appear from those other unquestionable Characters, and Dates of time which we meet with in his book, and are yet behind to be considered, which do evidently clear up these matters, and shew as well where Josephus hath been most probably corrupted, as also his real agreement in the main, even as we now have him, both with the holy Scriptures, and with Berofus. And these fixed Characters, or Dates of time of Josephus we therefore shall now go on with.

And the second that I shall mention though not coming next in regular order of time, yet in weight, and point of certainty, and also in respect of the great service it will be to the settling other points, deserving the first notice, is that of Eulmerodach's releasing Jeconiah out of prison.

Now that this hap'ned in the 37th year of Jeconiah's Captivity, we are informed expressly in the holy Scriptures (b).

And therefore Mr. L. also to make some shew of agreement with them, though in this very matter he really differs from them in no less than a 20 years difference, yet He hath placed this Historical fact accordingly in his mistaken 37th of Jeconiah; in his raised succession of time [from the fourth of Jehoiakim by him made coincident with the first of Nabopolassar, or Nebuchadnezzar the first, or the Father.] in the year of the J. P. 4132 (c). Now this same year of the J. P. is evidently 20 years before Nebuchadnezzar the son's death, and his son Eulmerodach's succeeding him in the year of the J. P. 4152 (d). And so according to Mr. L. the release of Jeconiah was 20 years before Nebuchadnezzar the son's death, and so of course equal to his 20 years raised 37th of Jeconiah's Captivity.

Now if Josephus's 4th of Jehoiakim be equal to Mr. L.'s first of Nebuchadnezzar, or of Nebuchadnezzar the father, it must here unavoidably follow that according to Josephus also, as well as Mr. L., Eulmerodach released Jeconiah 20 years before the death of Nebuchadnezzar the Son.

But it is so far from that according to Josephus, that by his express testimony here, Jeconiah was not released 'till actually after those 20 years, soon after the death of the said Nebuchadnezzar. Josephus [Ant. lib. x. c. xi. initio] tells us thus expressly, AFTER Nebuchadnezzar's death, his Son Eulmerodach obtained the Kingdom, who INCONTINENTLY delivered Jeconiah King of Jerusalem out of prison. But Eulmerodach did not obtain the Kingdom 'till after the death of his father a little before the conclusion of the 37th year of the Captivity of Jeconiah, and exactly at 20 years distance from Mr. L's mistaken 37th thereof: as may be seen in the Table annexed.

(a) For to the first of Nebuchadnezzar we are tied down by Jeremiah xxv. 1. (b) 2 K. xxxv. 27. Jer. lii. 31. (c) Or before A. D. 582. (d) Or before A. D. 562.
I know indeed that Mr. L. hath giv'n us another account of Evilmerodach's obtaining the Kingdom 20 years before (a). But that is only as he hath there made Nebuchadnezzar to go distracted at that time, merely to favour his mistaken Hypothesis here in his rais'd 37th of Jeconiah, by his advancing the Distraction of Nebuchadnezzar purely as a handle for his giving the Government to Evilmerodach for the sake of his imagin'd release of Jeconiah 20 years before the death of Nebuchadnezzar. But this is all Imagination of Mr. L. and before him also of Sir John Marsham, whom he hath here therefore cited in his favour. But if Authorities would serve in this case of the time of Nebuchadnezzar's Distraction, the time whereof is only conjectural, then those of the late Primate Usher, and Bishop Lloyd, and Dr. Prideaux, would surely more than balance here, who are all of a contrary opinion herein, and have placed the same, the two former in the 7 last years of his life, the latter only in one year's difference, as he hath suppos'd Nebuchadnezzar to have liv'd one year after his being restor'd to his senses (b).

And these great men had all of them certainly better reasons than I can take upon my self to give here for their opinion in this matter. But as it is a point merely of conjecture, we need not much to concern our selves about it. For after all, it doth in no wise affect the present dispute, as we shall see presently.

However we may occasionally say thus much to it, as we think it much more probable than not, that this surprizing disater should have befal'n that great King rather in the clofe of his life, than 20 years before according to Mr. L. For it is not likely for reafons which might be here assign'd to the contrary, that he should have surviv'd such a miraculous change of nature for 13 years after; as Mr. L. hath here imagin'd. It was much methinks if he surviv'd one year, as the learned Dr. Prideaux hath assign'd him after his senses were restor'd to him (c). It was the great Primate's Opinion that he died in a few days after.

But however that were, still Mr. L's 20 years rife of the 37th of Jeconiah, or his release by Evilmerodach in his first as being the first of his reign during his father's madness, can never be prov'd from that, because the time thereof depends wholly upon conjecture.

And therefore the Jewis'h Tradition from St. Jerom (d) urg'd here by Mr. L. (e) of Evilmerodach's reigning twice, even if that were true, proves nothing at all in this case. For supposing that this fable (f), for so St. Jerom, calls it, were true in this part of it, viz. that Evilmerodach had reign'd twice, once in the time of his father's distraction, and a second time after his father's death, yet this will signify nothing at all, unless the same fable, or some other Authority hereunto sufficient prov'd withal, and that of a certainty that the Year of Nebuchadnezzar's going mad fell in with the 37th of Jeconiah's Captivity; or in other words, that Evilmerodach releas'd Jeconiah in the year of Nebuchadnezzar's going mad, as reigning thereupon 20 years before his father's death.

(a) P. 41 of Mr. L. (b) Con. Hist. p. 106 initio. (c) In loc. sup. cit. (d) In Esai. ch. xiv. 19. (e) P. 41. (f) NARRANT HEBRAI HUJUKREMODI FA-BULAM.
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But neither the one, nor the other of these points is prov’d by this Jewish fable. Nor could the Jews have said any thing like it, but in direct contradiction to their own Scriptures, as their 37th of Jeconiah (a) is necessarily equal to the first (b) of Evilmerodach after his father’s death.

And there being nothing in the fable of the 37th of Jeconiah, or of the time of Nebuchadnezzar’s madness, it is absolutely incapable of proving any thing as to the matter in hand, even upon supposition that the fable were true in its assertion of Evilmerodach’s reigning twice.

But secondly the Tradition is false, and so really becomes a Fable, if Mr. L. will believe Josephus in this case. And him he would have to be his darling friend throughout his Hypothesis. But his testimony as elsewhere, so here especially, we have in the strongest, and most express terms against Mr. L. and his Jewish fable. For by Josephus’s telling (c), During Nebuchadnezzar’s 7 years madness in the Desert, NO MAN DURST intermeddle with the AFFAIRS of STATE. Therefore thus expressly according to Josephus, Evilmerodach could not have now reign’d: and Consequently he could not now have released Jeconiah out of prison. But after all, however the Affairs of Government stood during Nebuchadnezzar’s Distraction, and whether Evilmerodach his son reign’d then, or not, we are in no wise concern’d as to the main point in hand, because as to that, we are affur’d from the plain and direct testimony as above (d) from the same Josephus, that AFTER [and therefore not 20 years BEFORE] Nebuchadnezzar’s death, Evilmerodach released Jeconiah King of Jerusalem out of prison.

And thus Josephus is herein most exactly according with the Prophet Jeremiah, or whoever writ that last Chapter in his book, as his first of Evilmerodach (e) is expressly the first of his reign as equal to the 37th of Jeconiah, in which he is lifted up the head of Jeconiah, and brought him forth out of prison. But this Equality could be in no other respect either according to the holy Scriptures, as we have formerly (f) seen, or according to Josephus, as we now see, than as being Evilmerodach’s first AFTER his father Nebuchadnezzar’s death: when he fully obtained the Kingdom, and reign’d 2 years (g).

And herein also Sir John Marsham’s notorious mistake no less than Mr. L’s is evidently apparent. And their 20 years rise of the 37th of Jeconiah is entirely cut off even by the testimony of Josephus, no less than by the sure authority of the holy Scriptures.

And finally, the 37th of Jeconiah of the Scriptures, and the 37th of Jeconiah of Josephus being one and the same Year necessarily, as the first of Evilmerodach after the death of Nebuchadnezzar, it thus follows also of course that the fouth of Jehoiakim, and also the first of

(a) See the Table annexed. (b) See ib. (c) Ant. lib. x. ch. x. sub fine. (d) Viz. Ant. lib. x. ch. xi. init. See p. 460. (e) v. 31. (f) Viz. in the Scripture reckoning of the Years of that Captivity. See above, and also the Table annexed. (g) As in Psal. Can. and in the Table annexed.
contain exactly four hundred, and ninety Years. 69 of Zedekiah must respectively answer to the same years of Nebuchadnezzar in both. And therefore the 47th of Jehoiakim of the Scriptures is undeniably the 47th of Jehoiakim of Josephus; and the 11th of Zedekiah of the Scriptures is the 11th of Zedekiah in Josephus. As is farther evident from the agreed numbers of both in their years of the reigns of those Kings.

For did Jehoiakim reign 11 years according to the holy Scriptures (a)? — 60 he did according to Josephus (b). Did Jeconiah reign 3 months, and 10 days according to the former (c)? — — He did so likewise according to the latter (d). Was he soon after carried captive to Babylon together with the royal family, and upwards of 10000 Captives according to Josephus (e)? — So also according to the holy Scriptures (f)? Finally according to them did Zedekiah after him reign 11 years (g)? — So he did also according to Josephus (h). And in the 11th of his reign according to both the City was taken, and the Temple burnt (i).

And this say the Scriptures (k) was in the 19th of Nebuchadnezzar, and in Mr. L’s correction of Josephus (l) here, it was in his 19th also; as indeed it must have been in his account thereof, as it will appear presently from a following number of Josephus’s of that King’s reign.

But by all our preceding Accounts from the holy Scriptures, and from Berosus, and Josephus also it is evidently the 19th of Nebuchadnezzar the son. For he having reigned 43 years according to Ptolemy’s Canon, and according to Berosus in Josephus after his father’s death, and 45 years in the Scripture reckoning as his father took him into partnership of Government with him (as above) two years before his death, and his father dying in the 37th (m) of Jeconiah’s Captivity, after whose death, and not before according to Josephus (most expressly as above) Jeconiah was released, it undeniably follows that all the years of Jeconiah’s Captivity must fall in with
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(a) 2 Kings xxiii. 36. 2 Chron. xxxvi. 5. (b) Ant. lxx. c. 6. p. 443; (c) 2 Chron. xxxvi. 9. (d) In loc. sup. cit. (e) ib. (f) 2 Kings xxiv. 12-16. (g) v. 18. 2 Chron. xxxvi. 11. Jer. lii. 1, &c. (h) Ant. lxx. c. 8. p. 449. (i) ib. (k) 2 Kings xxv. 8. Jer. lii. 12. (l) *Is the 18th in Josephus, but Mr. L. hath of course here corrected him for us as to his number, by making it to have been the 19th of Neb. wherein the Temple and City were burnt; [p. 33 of Mr. L.] though most erroneously of the father, as we are now shewing. (m) As the list of Nebuchadnezzar was corresponding with the 37th of Jeconiah’s Captivity, (for which see the Table annexed) as well as the first of Esdmerodach was coincident with the said 37th of Jeconiah, It may be of use to the Reader if we here shew how that matter stands. And as Dr. Prideaux hath shewn it to our hand, I do therefore beg leave to transcribe his words here, which are as follows, In the 7th Year of the reign of Nebuch. in the Bab. Account [which was the 9th in the Jewish] in the beginning of the Jewish year, that is in the month of April according to our year, Jehoiachin was carried captive to Babylon. And therefore the first year of his Captivity beginning in the month of April in the 7th Year of Nebuchadnezzar [viz. in the Bab. Account, and 9th in the other Account] the 37th of it must begin in the same mouth of April in the 43rd year of Nebuchadnezzar, [viz. in the Bab. Account, and in the 45th in the Jewish] towards the end whereof that great King dying, with the beginning of the next year began the first year of the reign of Evilmerodach, And the March following, that is on the 27th day of the 12th, or last month of the Jewish year [2 Kings xxv. 37. Jer. lii. 31.] Jehoiachin was by the great favour of the new King released from his Captivity about a month before he had fully accomplished 37 years in it. [Frid. Con. Hist. p. 107.]
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with the 37 last years of Nebuchadnezzar the son. And so the reign of the said Nebuchadnezzar necessarily takes in all Historical Events both of the Scripture, and of Josephus, as are related under the name of Nebuchadnezzar in both. And consequently the first of his eight years in the Scripture-Account, preceding those 37 years, in the account thereof already giv'n from Berosus, could not be otherwise than corresponding also with the fourth of Jehoiakim of Josephus, no less than it is with the fourth thereof according to the Scriptures.

Mr. L. therefore hath highly wrong'd Josephus in bringing him into his 20 years rise of his 4th of Jehoiakim mounted up to an equality with the first of Nebuchadnezzar the father, in downright contradiction to Josephus his express testimony here of the release of Joniah upon the death of Nebuchadnezzar, and not before, no less than in utter irreconcileableness either with the holy Scriptures, or with Berosus.—We have

Thirdly, another express Character or Date of time in Josephus to the proving his agreement with the holy Scriptures, and against Mr. L's 20 years rais'd 11th of Zedekiah as it is by him made to be corresponding with the 19th of Nebuchadnezzar the father by Josephus's testimony for it: And that is the twenty third year of Nebuchadnezzar. And of this Josephus hath told us most expressly (a), that it was the FIFTH Year after the Destruction of Jerusalem.

Of necessity therefore in Josephus's Account Jerusalem must have been destroyed in the 19th of Nebuchadnezzar the son, the fifth year from the Year inclusive of which destruction was his twenty third. For this twenty third could not possibly be so of the father, as for other undeniable proofs already giv'n, so also because he reign'd but 21 years according to Ptolemay's Canon, and even in Mr. L's note upon it (b) at the most but 21 years, and a half.

This 23d Year of Nebuchadnezzar in Josephus therefore could not possibly have been any other than the Scripture twenty third of Nebuchadnezzar the son, in which his General Nebuzaradan carried away captive of th: Jews 745 persons (c).

And therefore that is most surprizing, as well as contrary to all truth, which we meet with in Mr. L's book (d) of this being the 23d of Nebuchadnezzar the father. Especially as the assertion is backt with the testimony of Scripture, as Mr. L. hath there father'd this his great mistake upon the Writer of the LIIIrd Chapter of Jeremiah, in this very passage of it. But such an absurdity as this of making a man reign 2 years confessedly after his death, no Human writer could easily have been guilty of. Mr. L. therefore should by no means have suppos'd it of an insip'rd Writer: Especially in this case where the fact proves the contrary of the suppos'd foundation of it. For Nebuchadnezzar the father died in

(a) Jos. Ant. lib. xvi. ix. p. 474. (b) p. 35. of Mr. L. (c) Jer. iii. 39.
(d) p. 37. of Mr. L.
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in the year of the J. P. 4109 (a) according to Mr. L. himself.
And it was impossible but that by immediate dispatches and expres-
ses from Babylon the son now upon his Expedition must have for-
thwith heard of it, and thereupon have made all the haste he could
home. And that he did so, we have the express testimony of Be-
rosus for it (b). Whereas Mr. L. in evident contradiction thereun-
to brings him not home 'till two years after (c). And therefore
forsooth the Writer of the LIId Chapter of Jeremiab called that
year the 23d of Nebuchadnezzar the father; Which as I have shewn
occasionally by all the Accounts of Jeremiab could not possibly be
any other than the 23d of the son. Upon all accounts therefore
'tis unpardonable in Mr. L. to have thus perverted Scripture no
less than Jospehus for the sake of his Hypothesis. I add also especi-
ally as Jospehus is directly against Mr. L. in this testimony.

For Jospehus hath here told us expressly that in his 23d Nebu-
chadnezzar in his own person led his army into Coelezria, &c. (d).
But unless Nebuchadnezzar the Father led his Army now two years
after he was confessedly dead, the 23d year here mention'd could ne-
ever have been his. Mr. L. must fetch him out of his grave to prove
this. Therefore this 23d year of Nebuchadnezzar spoken of by Jo-
spehus must necessarily remain to Nebuchadnezzar the son (e).

And so to leave this great Absurdity, this having been his 23d,
and the fifth year also from the Year inclusive of the burning of the
Temple and the Destruction of the City, the said fifth year prece-
ding this 23d of Nebuchadnezzar the son must have been his 19th
also, according to Jospehus, no less than it is so according to the
Scriptures.

And though we do not find that year of Nebuchadnezzar, but the
18th in our present Jospehus equal to the 11th of Zedekiah, when
according both to the holy Scriptures, and Jospehus the said Cala-
my befell Jerusalem, yet 'tis plain by this account it must have
been the 19th, for if Jospehus's 23d of Nebuchadnezzar was the fifth,
as by his testimony it was after the destruction of Jerusalem, then
the first inclusive of those five years from whence the 23d was the
fifth must have been the 19th.

And as I before noted, Mr. L. hath abandon'd Jospehus as to his
18th, as he hath placed the burning of the Temple truly in the 19th
of Nebuchadnezzar. But as he hath made it the 19th of the father,
he hath groundlessly drawn in Jospehus into such an errand mistake,
which is utterly inconsistent with all his Accounts now giv'n; and
which it is therefore not credible that he could have run into it.

F 4  

(a) Or in the year before A. D. 605.  (b) In Jos. Ant. lib. x. c. xi. p. 459. and
con. Ap. lib. i.  (c) p. 35. of Mr. L.  (d) Ant. lib. x. c. ix. p. 454.  (e) I
add here occasionally that the Scripture 23d of Neb. and Jospehus's 23d of him being the
same, the first of Neb. from whence this is the 23d must also be the same in Jos-
pehus, as in the Scriptures, viz. the first of Nebuchadnezzar the son equal to the 4th of
Jehoahaz, when the said Nebuchadnezzar smote Pharaoh Necho according to Jospehus,
as well as the holy Scriptures.
That the Seventy Weeks of this Prophecy

But in case that Josephus had meant, as Mr. L. doth, and as he hath concluded him to do also, viz. that Jerusalem was destroyed in the father's life-time, Mr. L. ought then to have kept to Josephus's 18th of Nebuchadnezzar: because if that were the truth, Josephus was certainly in the right in placing it in the 18th, and not in the 19th of Nebuchadnezzar. For from the 18th of Nebuchadnezzar the fathe:r to the taking of Babylon by Cyrus, there are but 70 years exactly according to Ptolemy's Canon (a). But as to that Josephus's other certain dates of time here noted thev his contrary meaning. And therefore in this, and some other of his lesser numbers, he hath been corrupted: or otherwise he was less accurate in his copying of them from the Scriptures.

But still here we have Mr. L's authority for the 19th of Nebuchadnezzar being the Year of that King of Babylon so called, equal to the 11th of Zedekiah when the Temple was burnt. And not for this reason only as Mr L. hath here corrected the number; (tho' he hath misapplied the King) but also because Josephus's fifth year from hence was the 23d of Nebuchadnezzar, it remains that his Year of the Destruction of Jerusalem truly was the nineteenth. And for the sure reasons before giv'n, it was the 19th not of the father, but of the son.

And thus, Finally, according to Josephus, as well as according to the holy Scriptures the Destruction of the City, and Temple of Jerusalem was in the 11th of Zedekiah coincident with the 19th of Nebuchadnezzar the Son, in the Jews' reckoning thereof (b), which was the 17th in the Babylonian (c).

But from all these respective accounts, as it may be seen in the Table annexed, there are no more than fifty years downwards to the taking of Babylon by Cyrus, where Mr. L. hath ended the Jewish Captivity, in his mistaken first of Cyrus. And to come down two years lower according to the truth, viz. to the first of Cyrus of the Scriptures, and Josephus's first of Cyrus from the Phenician Annals, which was not till after Darius's two years reign, when he died, there are still but 52 Years only from the burning of the Temple by Nebuchadnezzar the son, in his 19th, and in the 11th of Zedekiah: when, and not before the Desolations of Jerusalem were accomplished: Or in the words of Josephus (d), when Jerusalem, and the Temple lay desolate. But not possibly could they lye so 70 years in any consistency with Josephus, as Mr. L. hath misapplied these 70 years to them, which by all Josephus's reckonings it appears that he could mean only of Judea first mention'd there, (as it may be seen more particularly above under Mr. L's first Quotation from him;) As the whole time of the Calamities, and Desolations of that Country from their first beginning of them in the fourth of Jehoiakim in

(a) See the Table annexed. (b) viz. of his reigning 2 years in conjunction with his father before his death. (c) Where the years of his reign are reckon'd after his father's death. (d) Ant. lib. x. c. 9. p. 474.
contain exactly four hundred, and ninety years. As all the several passages, and occurrences related by Josephus downwards to the first of Cyrus do evidently contain a history of no more than 70 years: As I think I have proved beyond all contradiction from Josephus's grand characters of time, or certain dates of years of the reigns of Kings in those times both Jewish and Babylonian.

And therefore unless we will wilfully mistake, and confound Josephus here, we must thus interpret this less accurate expression of his (a), if it really were his; and we must necessarily understand by it no more than this, viz. that whereas there was a 70 years' vassalage of the Jews to the king of Babylon, begun (according to himself, in consistency with himself) in the fourth of Jehoiakim, this was the actual beginning of those desolations of Judæa, which as yet only in part befell her, and which 18 years after, viz. in the 11th of Zedekiah were wholly completed in the destruction of her Metropolis, and with the burning of the House of God in it: Both which, viz. Jerusalem and the temple thus and then destroyed, did so remain, or be desolate to the end of these LXX years of the desolations of Judæa begun as above, viz. in the 4th of Jehoiakim, at 18 years distance before the burning of the Temple, and city in the 11th of Zedekiah, and the Land's then, and not before, coming to be wholly desolate; and so remaining till the first of Cyrus.

Thus truly and exactly are these things determined by the holy Scriptures, and by the accounts agreeably thereunto given by Berosus, and Josephus in their several preceding testimonies.

At length therefore to come home to the point, which hath occasion'd our having recourse to these testimonies, since it is thus fully evident from all of them, that the 70 years' captivity of the Jews began in the 4th of Jehoiakim, equal (not possibly to Mr. L's first of Nebuchadnezzar the father, which is at 90 years distance from the first of Cyrus's 9 years reign after his taking of Babylon, but necessarily equal) to the first of Nebuchadnezzar the son, at 70 years distance from the first of Cyrus's 7 years reign according to the holy Scriptures, and Xenophon (b) after the death of Darius, when ended the captivity of the Jews in their release, and return by virtue of Cyrus's decree; and since consequently the (c) earliest date of the Land's lying wholly desolate was not, could not possibly be sooner than the year of the burning of the temple, and of Jerusalem's utter destruction 18 years after in the 11th of Zedekiah equal (not possibly to Mr. L's 19th of Nebuchadnezzar the father, at 70 years distance, as he hath extravagantly made it from his first of Cyrus's 9 years reign after his taking of Babylon, but necessarily equal) to the 19th of Nebuchadnezzar the son, which was only at 52 years distance from the first of Cyrus's 7 years reign accord-

(a) viz. the passage which Mr. L. hath taken hold of under his first quotation from these words of Josephus—JUDEA, Jerusalem, and the Temple lay desolate 70 years.
(b) As formerly shown.
(c) For strictly speaking, the Land was not wholly desolate, till 4 years after, when was that carrying away by Nebuchadnezzar. Jer. iii. 30. 
That the Seventy Weeks of this Prophecy according to the Scriptures, and Xenophon, It hence undeniably follows upon the sure authority of all these concurring testimonies, that the Captivity of Judah did actually commence 18 years before the time came when with any truth the Land could be said to that lain WHOLLY Desolate, or to have rested from tillage, and herein to have enjoyed her Sabbath.

For in fact the Jews still remaining in their country from the fourth of Jehoiakim (when commenced their 70 years vassalage to the King of Babylon, their King then becoming tributary, and their Nobles (the sons of the royal family (a) not excepted) and people captivated at pleasure from time to time afterwards) till the 11th of Zedekiah, when was their final subversion in those times, here was thus 18 years necessarily continued tillage of the Land after the actual commencement of the Jews Vassalage, or Captivity. Therefore no more possibly than two and fifty years remained for the Land to have lain WHOLLY desolate therein; and so to have kept Sabbath.

AND therefore Mr. L is absolutely mistaken in what he hath asserted of the Land's having lain WHOLLY desolate during the 70 years of the Captivity; and therein enjoying 70 Sabbaths; as being 70 Sabbatical years of 70 Weeks preceding the Captivity groundlessly supposed to have been neglected to the occasioning 70 years Desolations of the land, equal to the said Captivity. And therefore

Finally, Mr. L's Hypothesis in this part of it of a period of LXX Weeks fancied to consist of 570 Years by the groundless addition of the 70 years of the Captivity from his mistaken END, OCCASION, and NATURE of those 70 years, as if the LAND had WHOLLY lain DESOLATE all that time, whereas as we have seen in fact it did not, dropeth of course; as being void of all foundation in evident failure of the supposed fact.

Nor otherwise hath it any, however by Mr. L's telling (b) it should have, even in the nature of Weeks consider'd according to the Law, as attended by their Sabbatical Years, and Years of Jubilee. For by the Law Mr. L would justify his supposed numbers of Years in seventy Weeks, as by his telling us they make according to that in respect of Jubilees 500 years; and in respect of Sabbatical Years, 570. But as to the latter, that according to the Law is wholly impossible; and as to the former, that is absolutely uncertain. For

First, as to the nature of seventy Weeks among the Jews, consider'd with their Years of Jubilee, the included number of Years in such a giv'n period, and in such relation is most uncertain. For it hath ever been, and still is a disputed point (c), whether the fiftieth

(a) Dan. i. 3. (b) p. 66, 67, 69. (c) See the learned Dr. Prid. p. xiv. of his Preface to Con. Hift. where he most justly explodes the Reckonings by Years of Jubilee, and Sabbatical Years, as most uncertain, and therefore most useless. And in truth however Mr. L. hath magnified these Computations [p. 31, 72.] and hath at pleasure accounted some Years mention'd in Scripture as having such relation, which perhaps had none, [as particularly [p. 31.] in his making his mistaken 10th of Zedekiah a Sab-
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36th Year, or the forty ninth was the Year of Jubilee belonging to seven Sabbatical weeks. And therefore we cannot be certain of the Years of this first period consider'd with its Jubilees, because we know not if 70 Weeks according to the Law in this respect make 500 years, as they should do, if briefly (a) Every fiftieth Year was the Year of Jubilee, or only 490 Years, as they do in case that the 49th was it (b). And there are who have declar'd for the latter, even against the testimony of Maimonides. Thus this first Period of Mr. L. of 500 Years in Seventy Weeks, in respect of their supposed Jubilee is most uncertain. But

Secondly, As to the other period, which is the main foundation of Mr. L's Hypothesis, and which with the 70 years of the Captivity engraven upon it becomes a period of 570 years, and yet is said still to be remaining a Period of 70 Weeks, the suppos'd Subsistence of that according to the Law is absolutely impossible: as being in no wise justifiable by, nor reconcilable with the Law in the original Institution of Sabbatical Weeks. For by it (c) a Sabbatical week necessarily consists of 7 years, and no more, as the 7th year is Sabbatical. And 490 Years proportionally give 70 weeks, as 7 times 70 is surely contained in the number 490. But in Mr. L's period before us of 570 Years said to be equal only to 70 weeks, there is found 7 times 81, that is 81 weeks, besides the remaining three Years. Therefore Mr. L's period of 570 Years consider'd in the legal relation of Sabbatical weeks of Years is necessarily equal not to 70 weeks, as it is mistakenly affirm'd, but to 81 Weeks besides the remaining Years. But we have not to do in the Prophecy with any such period of Weeks; and consequently with no such Period of Years.

Nor doth that avail Mr. L. for him to have said here (d) by way of proof that there were no more than 70 weeks in 570 years, viz. As the 70 Years of the Captivity by him added were only the

sabbatical Year, from Jer. xxxv. 8, 9, 10, wherein is said infers neither a Sabbatical year, nor a Jubilee neither, because the Release of Servants there spoken of might inter only their legal Release [Exod. xxxi. 2.] As every Hebrew servant was to be released in the 7th year of his Servitude.] Yet after all, for any service that they have done him, or any credit that he hath giv'n them in his suflower Hypothesis, All manner of notice of them might have been omitted. (a) Levii. xxv. 10, 11. But in this case (as faith Dr. Prid. ib.) if the Year after the seventh sabbatical Year were the year of Jubilee, then it becomes a Question, whether that, or the next year after it was the first of the next Shemitah, or week of years. If the Jubilee Year were the first year of that Week, then there would have been but 5 years for the Jews to fow, and reap in between the Jubilee (which was also a Sabbatical Year) and the next Sabbatical Year after; whereas the Scripture [Levii. xxv. 3.] faith they were to have six. And if the first Year of the next Shemitah, or week of years were the next year after the Jubilee, then the Shemitahs would not always succeed in an exact Series immediately one after the other, but after the seventh Shemitah, the Year of Jubilee would intervene between that and the next, which disgree with the Opinion of Many, &c. See more p. xv. ib. (b) See Comans (de Republica Hebraeorum Cap. 6.) whole following words being much to our purpose, I therefore transcript, viz. Whether justly the 50th Year, or the 49th was the Year of Jubilee, 'tis made a QUESTION. We join with those INCOMPARABLE MEN of our time that hold the 49th: Nor can we affix note Maimonides in this, though for the most parts, we religiously embrace his judgment. Whereupon Comans gives his reasons for differing from him; which we need not here infer; but the Reader may consult at pleasure. (c) Levii. xxv. 3. 4. (d) p. 67. of Mr. L.
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the sabbatical Years of 70 preceding Weeks, which the land should have had in them, but by the Jews Transgression of duty had not, and that therefore these years do not increase the number of Weeks, as Weeks (a); For

First, the Jews are out of the controversy in this particular: because their Observance of Sabbathial Years, or their Neglect of them is equally exclusive of the nature of Sabbathial Weeks. For any giv'n Period of Weeks of Years is incapable of alteration either in their nature, or number on that account. For what if the Jews had never kept any Sabbathial Years?—Still God's legal Institution of them remain'd the same. Every Sabbathial Year notwithstanding went on in course by God himself regularly appointed for it. Consequently any number giv'n of Sabbathial Years ever gives the same certain number of Sabbathial Weeks. And to many known Sabbathial weeks ever contain its certain proportionate number of Years. The number once ascertained in its plain legal Institution ever necessarily remains the same in both. And therefore the number of weeks before us preceding the Captivity being ascertained to the number 70, as that always continues the number of weeks certain as the real number of Weeks of that period, as a period of Weeks, so in their legal institution there being no more than 490 years in the said period of weeks, consider'd as a period of Years, that number of years ever necessarily remains the same, as the certain or only number of Years in that period of Weeks.

Otherwise Any giv'n period of Weeks no longer remains it self. And so that which before was certain, as being both in nature, and number of years fully ascertained, is otherwise necessarily rendered most uncertain. And therefore Mr. L's Additional 70 Years of the Captivity to his 70 preceding to the making it a period of 570 Years, and yet a period of 70 Weeks said to be consider'd according to the Law in this respect, or relation of Sabbathial Years, is so far from being legal, that it is truly most illegal, and therefore most unjustifiable. I add to this

Secondly, that it is also most groundless: as I have largely shewn from the failure in fact. For this hath been made to appear as a certain truth, that at the most only 52 years of the Captivity could be such Sabbathial Years, as Mr. L. hath supposed the whole 70 thereof to have been, in the lands lying wholly desolate, or uncultivated all that time.

So that at length this imagin'd period of 570 Years said to be equal to 70 weeks cometh thus really, and truly to be no such period. As in the nature of Weeks there cannot be, so in fact there was no such Period of Weeks before the Babylonish (b) first of Cyrus, as Mr. L. hath imagined, and there also ended the said Period together

(a) p. 67. of Mr. L. (b) viz. the first of his 9 Years reign giv'n him by Ptolemy 3, As he hath giv'n the Scripture two years reign of Davius to that of Cyrus, who otherwise reign'd but 7 years.
contain exactly four hundred, and ninety Years. And yet from this groundless, and mistaken preceding period Mr. L. would fain argue us into another such like period after the said first of Cyrus, equal to the LXX Weeks predicted in the Prophecy of Daniel. But that which in fact was not, cannot be the cause of another like it. And 'tis no otherwise pretended to have been the cause than as its actual pre-existence also was supposed: tho', as I have shewn, in fact it was not. But However, as I am yet to shew

Finally, Even were there foundation for this imaginary preceding period, yet after all there is not, there cannot possibly be any manner of room for arguing from thence as Mr. L. hath argued to a subsequent period in the 70 Weeks of the Prophecy of Daniel, in his twofold like periods of Years in these Weeks also, as in those his imagining preceding Seventy Weeks. For the very great unreasonableness, and groundlessness of the parallel here will be demonstrably apparent if it be consider'd

First, with respect to the 70 Weeks of this Prophecy made equal by Mr. L. (a) to 500 Years, as 'tis pretended here by reason of 10 years added for years of Jubilee, that even by Mr. L.'s own telling there is no manner of ground for this; forasmuch as upon the testimony of Maimonides (b) by him here cited, there was no Jubilee under the second Temple. Add also the testimony of Cuneas (c). But Daniel's 70 Weeks are evidently a Period of Weeks under the second Temple. And Confessedly now there was no Jubilee. And that is the pretended cause of throwing in ten years here into the 70 Weeks of this Prophecy to the making them in respect of Years, a period of 500 Years. But sublatâ causa tollitur effectus.

Otherwise, If as Mr. L. hath explained Maimonides, the Jews did however account and hallow the fiftieth year by proclaiming it as the year of Jubilee (d) throughout the land, but did NOT KEEP it by letting the land lie FALLOW, as according to their law they ought likewise to have done; yet in this case still it will be evident against Mr. L.'s additional reckoning of 10 Jubilees, that the same is here no less groundless; forasmuch as that hallowed but not kept fiftieth year must necessarily have been the first of the six years following, before the next Sabbatical Year return'd. For the 49th being Sabbatical; the 7th year from thence was now in course the next Sabbatical Year, and therefore (not the 57th, as otherwise it must have been in Mr. L.'s Hypothesis, but) the 56th Year.

(a) p. 60. of Mr. L. (b) p. 70. ib. (c) Who [in his book de republica Hebraeum, cap. 6. initio.] tells us, that after a 70 Years Captivity the Jews returned to their ancient Habitations, and the Temple was built anew, but NEVER were the JUBILEE Solemnities celebrated any more. (d) And yet whether the 50th, or the 49th was the Year of Jubilee was more than Maimonides could tell. For what could he know certainly, who writ in the 11th Century after Christ?——But even here He is against Mr. L.——.
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Year must have been it: because the Sabbatical Year being still observed or kept, the Land could be cultivated but six years together, and the 49th year being sabbatical, therefore the 50th following, or Mr. L's number'd, or counted, but not legally kept Year of Jubilee could not possibly be otherwise than the first Year of another sabbatical Week. And thus the 56th year being the next sabbatical year after the 49th, it of course follows that the 98th year was the last sabbatical Year in the first centenary of years of 70 Weeks of Years, the 196th the last in the second Centenary, the 294th in the third Centenary, the 399th in the 4th Centenary, and in the remaining 91 years or 13 Sabbatical Weeks of Years, the last or the 490th was sabbatical. And yet all this time though according to Maimonides Proclamation might be made by the Jews every fiftieth Year, as according to him that was the Year of Jubilee; that is, it should have been so, or kept as such, if the Jews had now thought themselves under equal obligation of keeping the year of Jubilee after their return, as before their Captivity; yet at the same time it made no alteration in the successive, or continued reckoning of the now only kept Sabbatical Years, as it necessarily must have done, if the Year of Jubilee had been now legally kept, and the fiftieth year also had been it. In which case every Sabbatical Year in the giv'n period of 70 Weeks had been still postponed one year in every fifty to the giving Mr. L. his ten Jubilees; provided withal that the 50th Year according to Maimonides was surely it; but as I before observed that is denied by Others, and is still a Point of great Uncertainty. But here professedly the Year of Jubilee being not kept, but only noted among the several years of a giv'n period of Sabbatical Weeks consider'd in this their legal relation, those several noted Years of Jubilee in that giv'n period did no more increase that giv'n period in the Years of it, than every noted Olympic year among the Greeks did antiently increase the years in any giv'n number of Olympiads, or the noted Bissextile at this time is capable of increasing any giv'n period of Years among us. And so in this the truth of the matter it cometh to pass that in a Period of 70 Weeks of Years, even sabbatical Weeks of Years under the second Temple, when the Years of Jubilee are said to have been still noted in their order, tho' not kept, there cannot possibly be more Years in them when consider'd as a period of Years, than 490 Years.

And therefore that can be of no force here which Mr. L. hath farther told us in this matter, as this his period of 500 years, by his making it so in his Hypothesis, is to be reckon'd from his Year of Ezra's going up to Jerusalem in his (a) 7th of Artaxerxes, the Year of his assign'd beginning of these weeks; from which

(a) I call it, His 7th of Artaxerxes. For truly so it is. *Tis not Ptolemy's. For his 7th of Artaxerxes is here rejected, because it would not serve Mr. L's Hypothesis. But it will be return'd hereafter in the beginning of the LXIX weeks, when it will assuredly appear who is in the right; Ptolemy, or Mr. L.
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which Year, by his telling the Observation of Sabbatical Years and Years of Jubilee was most exactly resettled by Ezra. For what tho' upon the testimony of Seder Olam Rabbah, we are told (a) that the Jews were as much obliged to the keeping years of Jubilee, and Sabbatical years in the days of Ezra, as they had been in the days of Joshua.

Did this Author know more of these matters than his Cotemporary Maimonides?————But by his express testimony the Jews acknowledg'd no such Obligation in the days of Ezra as to Years of Jubilee, but only as to Sabbatical Years. They religiously observ'd the latter: but had no regard to the former any otherwife than as above, by making bare proclamation of them: or by noting them, as we do our Bifextiles.

Therefore to have done with this matter, if any credit be to be giv'n to his testimony and also to the authority of Cuneas, as above, that there was no Jubilee under the second Temple, then by these testimonies there could be no such period of Years, as that of Mr. L's period of 500 Years equal to 70 Weeks under the Second Temple.

And yet after all, the imagin'd 500 Years from the first of Ezra, or the going up of Ezra to Jerusalem in the 7th of Artaxerxes, where Mr. L. begins his Calculation of the 70 Weeks of the Prophecy to his assign'd ending of them, fall six years short of their number, as he hath industriously left Ptolemy's 7th of Artaxerxes for the sake of his NEW Hypothesis, which in truth hath no more agreement with the letter of the Prophecy either in beginning, or ending of these Weeks, as I shall shew hereafter, than it hath now appear'd to have with their true nature, or real number of years in them.— But I am yet to speake.

Secondly, to his other imagin'd period of Years in these Weeks, as in respect of Sabbatical Years he would perswade us that they are equal to 570 (b) Years. For of such a preceding period of Years in 70 Weeks ending in his first of Cyrus we have formerly heard. And that is the foundation of the like subsequent period from the said first of Cyrus to the 22d of Tiberius, where Mr. L. ends it.

But did the nature of Weeks in any giv'n period of Weeks admit of any such extravagant number of Years in 70 Weeks, to their remaining still the same giv'n number of Weeks, which as I have shewn in their legal institution is impossible, yet here waving that, and supposing even the fact in the preceding period, which I shew'd to be otherwise, and indeed without all foundation, Yet were these impediments remov'd, there is no room for running the parallel, no manner of ground for arguing from that to this; because confessedly (c) the REASON doth not equally hold here, as there.

For

(a) p. 70. of Mr. L. from Seder Olam Rabbah, c. 30. p. 89. (b) p. 69. of Mr. L. His number of Years there is 572: but we do not trouble the Reader nor ourselues, with the odd years here. (c) ib. line 21. ——Not for the same Reason. But there was no reason even in the former period, as I shewed: for there was no FACT,
That the Seventy Weeks of this Prophecy

For the 70 Years there added were therefore professedly added on account of the Jews imagin'd tho' mistaken neglect of 70 Sabbatical Years before the Captivity. The 70 Years added here (a) are those immediately following after the Captivity was ended, or the 70 Years from Mr. L's first of Cyrus to his imagin'd 7th of Artaxerxes; from whence follow his other 500 Years.

Now if there were any reason for the prefixing 70 Years in this latter imagin'd period of 570 Years under the 2d Temple to the making the 70 Weeks of the Prophecy of Daniel equal to 570 Years, as formerly in such imagin'd period of Weeks as was preceding Mr. L's first of Cyrus for the annexing thereunto the 70 Years of the Captivity, the Jews must now after their return, and especially from the time of Ezra's coming up to Jerusalem have neglected the Sabbatical Years of 70 Weeks, or of Mr. L's 500 years from His 7th of Artaxerxes. But the fact hereof is not so much as supposed here, as it was mistaken suppos'd there. And Mr. L. himself hath taken away all ground of such Supposition here from his now cited foregoing testimonies: whereby 'tis agreed that the Observation of Sabbatical Years was certainly reviv'd by Ezra upon his coming to Jerusalem. Therefore there being no such reason here for the adding of 70 Years, as it was pretended there, the Addition here is still more groundless. And a Period of Seventy Weeks under the second Temple consider'd even in this relation as attended with Sabbatical Years, necessarily remains a Period only of 490 Years.

So that upon the whole Mr. L. is quite beside the mark in all that he hath said from the beginning to the end on this occasion, as in order to overthrow the abstracted Nature of the Weeks of this Prophecy or of 490 years he hath sent us to the Law, and to the Seventy Years (mistaken) Desolations of Jerusalem, and to Jubilee Years, and Sabbatical Years, as if the weeks of this Prophecy had any relation to them, whereas were there any reason to conclude that they had any such relation, yet even that Relation fails him, as we have now seen in a giv'n period of Sabbatical Weeks under the second Temple.

But even such Relation is only imaginary here, and hath not any the least foundation for it, other than that of the word Weeks being us'd here (b).

For wherefore should this predicted period of God's determined time for Grand Events to fall out in them become a Sabbatical period of Weeks?

Had any of their predicted Events to do with Sabbatical Years?—They had not. Nor hath Mr. L., nor no man else said it that I know of: Where then is the Sabbatical Relation? There must be some such relation first prov'd, to prove the Sabbatical nature of the Weeks, or Years of this Prophecy. And 'till this be done, Mr. L. must give us leave to look upon the word WEEKS here to

(a) p. 69. of Mr. L.  (b) Dan. ix. 24. Seventy WEEKS are determined.
to denote nothing else but an Eastern way of expressing so many Septenaries, and those as I have formerly prov'd (a), of Years in this Prophecy.

And therefore to apply the words of the learned Dr. Prideaux (b) here, who hath spoken incomparably well on this occasion, as having shewn the very great uncertainty of fixing the nature, and certain succession of Years of Jubilee, and of Sabbatical Years, He most truly, and properly adds in the following words, that they are most out of the way in this matter, who would confine Daniel's Prophecy of the Seventy Weeks to so many Shemitah's, as if thefe Seventy Weeks fell in exactly with seventy Shemitahs, that is, that the first week began with the first Year of a Shemitah (c), or Sabbatical Week, and ended with a Sabbatical Year, which was the last of a Shemitah, and so all the rest down to the last of the whole number. And to this end some have PERPLEXED themselves in VAIN to find out Sabbatical Years to suit their Hypothesis's, and fix them to TIMES, to which they did NEVER belong; whereas the Prophecy means no more than by the Seventy Weeks to express SEVENTY TIMES SEVEN YEARS, that is 490 in the WHOLE, without ANY RELATION had either to Shemitahs, or Sabbatical Years.

And this great Chronologer and Historian having thus giv'n us the truth of this matter, I need not to say any more to the farther proving that these Weeks are purely of an abstracted nature. For therein they necessarily do, and must remain for any thing that Mr. L. hath advanced for their different nature in his New Hypothesis of these Weeks. Of which Hypothesis even all the ground-works, or foundations, as we have seen, are absolutely mistaken, and utterly inconsistent not only with his other pretended testimonies, but also with the holy Scriptures.

And thus much may suffice to have been said of the nature of these 70 Weeks, or to the shewing that they contain in respect of Years 7 times 70 Years, and as a period of years they are a Period absolutely of 490 Years.

I am yet to speak a few words to Mr. L's Division of these Weeks, before I put an end to this Chapter.

I formerly observ'd (d) that Mr. L's deduced Division of them is truly made up of nothing but Inconsistency, and Mistake. I need therefore to do no more here than to make good that charge. And,

First, as to the Inconsistency, that is evident from Mr. L's twofold different sense of Ezekiel's (e) bearing the punishment of the iniquity of the House of Israel, and of the House of Judah.

G

For

(a) See above, p. 10, and 81. (b) Pref. to Coni Hist. p. xv. (c) And this is the very thing that Mr. L. most groundlessly hath done here, as [in p. 72. of his book] he hath made the year of Ezra's return, the first Year of a second Ezra of Weeks among the Jews, in his mistaken 7th of Artaxerxes differing no less than six years from the true 7th thereof in Pselemy's Canon. (d) See above, p. 11, note b. (e) Ch. iv. 41, 55, 65.
That the Seventy Weeks of this Prophecy

For in one place (a) we are told, and that very truly, that by that Prophet's bearing the Punishment, &c. is meant God's forbearance, &c. But afterwards (b) for the sake of deducing the Division of these Weeks from the Years of Ezekiel, we are told that this bearing of Ezekiel is a representative bearing of that 390 Years Punishment [not which as in the other place God had forbore, but] which Israel should bear for their having neglected the Sabbath Years of 390 preceding years, and in like manner of the 40 Years punishment [not which as in the other (c) place God was yet forbearing (d) but] which the House of Judah should bear for their having neglected the Sabbath Years belonging to 40 Years. And this may suffice as to the Inconsistency.

Secondly, As to the mistake, that is also evident from the falsity of Calculation here as in Israel's 390 Years Iniquity they are said by Mr. L. to have neglected 63 Sabbath Years. Whereas if they had neglected to keep Sabbath Years that whole time, viz. 390 years, they could have neglected but 55 Sabbath Years during that time: forasmuch as in the number 390 there are found but 7 times 55, and 5 years over. And as to the Calculation in the House of Judah, there is also a mistake, as in their 40 Years they are said to have neglected 6 Sabbath Years. But viewing this neglect only in this number, they could have neglected only 5 Sabbath years completely in that time, as only 5 times 7 is to be found in 40; and 5 over.

But in another view of the House of Judah's having neglected Sabbath Years, it is evident from Mr. L. himself that they must necessarily have neglected a great many more Sabbath Years, and those also separate from the House of Israel (for that is what Mr. L. here (e) also inflicts upon) forasmuch as between the carrying away of the one House and the other, there is an interval of 130 Years in Mr. L.'s chronology hereof. And to that we may go in the case before us, thou hast taken the true year of Saltanefer's carrying away the 10 Tribes, as he hath made (f) that fact to have hapned in A.P.J. 3976 (g) which in the truth thereof fell out in A.P.J. 3993 (h); but to stick to that at present, and to go also to his mistaken 11th of Zedekiah, in A.P. 4106 (i) as we are at present concern'd immediately with Mr. L.'s Calculation, the Interval for Judah's having separately neglected Sabbath Years after Israel's carrying away, is as 1 said before 130 Years.

Now did the House of Judah neglect all, or only some of the Sabbath Years of that period, because Mr. L. tells us of six only for the 40 years of Ezekiel?—Why truly, this notwithstanding, they must have neglected all the Sabbath years of that Interval by Mr. L.'s own telling elsewhere (i). For he hath there expressly said that the Land

(a) p. 30 of Mr. L.'s book.  (b) p. 133 of Mr. L.'s book.  (c) p. 30.
(d) That God did yet forbear their utter Expiration, is evident from their possibility of still abiding in the Land even after the 11th of Zedekiah [Jer. xxxii. 1--12.]. But 4 Years after the Desolations of the WHOLE Land being finally completed, no more of its former Inhabitants being then left therein, God's forbearance was then utterly at an end.
(e) p. 134 of his book.  (f) p. 145 of Mr. L.  (g) Or in the year before A. D. 738.  (h) Or in the year before, A. D. 721. See Dr. Pride, Con. Hist. p. 167.
(i) Or in the year before, A. D. 608. (k) p. 68 of Mr. L.
contain exactly four hundred, and ninety Years. 83
Land had no more Sabbaths in 570 years preceding his first of Cyrus,
where he ends the Captivity of Judah, even for that very reason, then,
it should have had in 500 Years preceding the Captivity. Therefore the
House of Judah in this Mr. L’s own view of neglected Sabbatical
Years, instead of six only, according to himself in one place must
necessarily have neglected no less than 18 Sabbatical years, according
to himself also in another place, after that Israel was carried away by
Salmanasar. For in the number 130 there is evidently 7 times 18,
and 4 remaining.
Alas! therefore what palpable Inconsistencies, and Mistakes here
are?—And all of them are foreign to the purpose.
For what can these Years of Ezekiel have to do with the Division
of these Weeks of Daniel?—Where is any ground for the imagin’d
Allusion in numbers?—Where is the conformity of them?
Here are from the Prophet Ezekiel’s Years, deduced by Mr. L. the
numbers of Weeks 63, and 6, (All mistaken numbers) giv’n us by
Mr. L. upon Israel, and Judah’s foremention’d Account, and one Week
more arbitrarily thrust in after to the making the said number 6 be-
come number 7. And so from Ezekiel we have at length 63 Weeks,
and 7 Weeks: And whereas 7 Weeks, and 63 Weeks make 70
Weeks, therefore Mr. L. thinks that he hath thus accounted for the
division of the seventy weeks of the Prophecy of Daniel.
But alas! what are these Mr. L’s numbers of Weeks, viz. of 63
Weeks, and 7 Weeks to the most solemn, most distinct, and order-
ly, or regularly proceeding numbers of Weeks of the said Prophecy,
viz. to the numbers first of 7 Weeks (a), then of 62 weeks (b), and
after that of 1 (c) separate, or single week attended also with its
more distinguished one Half thereof?
And therefore after all, where is the leaft occasion for such ground-
lessly deduced Division of these Weeks, which in the express letter of
the Prophecy have their own sure division in the severals, and distinct-
ly applied grand Events to the severals, and distinct periods of it?
I have above (d) curiously noted those distinct periods. I must
necessarily speake more fully to them hereafter in their respective
order.
But this may suffice to have been saide here at present, as well in
general concerning the Division of these weeks, as in particular to
this foreign Division of them.
And having before fully spoken to the nature of these Weeks,
and now having occasionally saide thus much as to the Division of
them, I may put an end to this Chapter.

(a) Dan. ix. 25.  (b) Ib. and v. 26.  (c) v. 27.  (d) In the Introduction, p.10, &c.
**True Chronology**

Of Events mentioned in the foregoing Chapter, for 90 (†) Years preceding the Scripture first of Cyrus: according to the holy Scriptures; the Phcenician Annals; Berosus, and Josephus; and Ptolemy’s Canon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kings of Bas.</th>
<th>Kings of Judah</th>
<th>Years before Christ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jecohiah</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoiakim</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebuchadnezzer (a)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>624 (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebuchadnezzer the first, or the father.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebuchadnezzer the second, or the third, or the son of the first</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebuchadnezzer the third, or the son of the second</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebuchadnezzer the fourth, or the son of the third</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebuchadnezzer the fifth, or the son of the fourth</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebuchadnezzer the sixth, or the son of the fifth</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebuchadnezzer the seventh, or the son of the sixth</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>617 (b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebuchadnezzer the eighth, or the son of the seventh</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nabopolassar</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>615</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Hence are to be reckon’d the Forty Years of God’s Forbearance of the Iniquity of the House of Judah. Ezek. iv. 6.

(b) Died Psammitichus King of Egypt; next his Son Neco reigned, or the Pharaoh Necho of the Scriptures. [Prid. Cons. Hist. p. 47 from Herodotus lib. i.]

(†) Viz. from the 15th of King Josiah, as Mr. L. hath brought us up so high by his 20 years raise’d 11th of Zedekiah, and thereby made the fourth of Jehoiakim equal to the first of Nebuchadnezzar the father; and so hath got the fourth of Jehoiakim really into the place of the 15th of King Josiah.
Mistaken Chronology

Of Mr. L. occasioned by his 20 years raised Eleventh of Zedekiah: which for the sake of his Hypothesis of the 0 Weeks be hath placed at 70 Years distance from the taking of Babylon by Cyrus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Julian Period</th>
<th>Kings of Judah</th>
<th>Nebuchadnezzar, Nebu-</th>
<th>Nebuchadnezzar the first, or the father.</th>
<th>Kings of Babylon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4088</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4089</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4090</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4091</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4092</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4093</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4094</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4095</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4096</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4097</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4098</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4099</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fourth of Jehoiakim made equal to the 1st of Nebuchadnezzar the father, who is therefore now said to smite Pharaoh Necho's Army.

Juda invaded by Nebuchadnezzar.

Jerusalem taken, and Jehoiakim slain.

Upon the taking of the City 3023 (1) Persons [Jer. lii. 28.] were carried captive to Babylon: among whom was Daniel.

-----Jehoiakim made King.-----After 3 months and 10 days He was sent Prisoner to Babylon, with his mother, &c. [2 Kings xxiv. 12.] Among other captives was the Prophet Ezekiel.

-----Zedekiah was made King by Nebuchadnez.

(1) Note that the Years of the Julian Period here answer exactly to the years before Christ on the left hand Column: and so throughout.

(*) But see 20 years lower in the left hand Column. So likewise generally in all other matters here set down.
### Scripture Chronology, &c.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year before</th>
<th>Kings of Babylon</th>
<th>Captivity of Judah</th>
<th>Scripture rec. Koning of Judah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>614</td>
<td>Nebo. the son reigning in conjunction with his father.</td>
<td>Nebuchadnezzar the first, or the father.</td>
<td>(a) Pherai. Necho going up against the Assyrians, and marching through Palestine, Tophah fought him at Megiddo, and was killed. [2 Kings xxii. 29, 30. 2 Chron. xxxv. 20.] the People set up his son Shallum, or Jehoiakim. After three months, Pherai. Necho took him into Egypt, setting up his elder brother Eliakim or Jeboiah. [2 Kings xxiii. 33–36. 2 Chron. xxxvi. 1–8.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>613</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>(b) [Dan. i. 1.] Nebuchad. the son was sent by his father against Ph. Necho; his father taking him into Copartnership of Government with him. And this being in the end of the third of Jeboiahim, his fourth comes to be equal to the first of Nebuchadnezzar. [Jer. xxv. 1.] See above, p. 46, &amp;c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>612</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>(c) Neb. now smote Ph. Necho at the river Euphrates, and retook Carchemish, [Jer. xlvi. 2.]—Jeremiah prophesied of the 70 Years Captivity of Judah. [ch. xxv. 8—12.] Which accordingly began in this year (†) at 70 years distance from the Scripture first of Cyprus; Jerusalem being now taken by Nebuch. the son, and Jeboiahim put in irons, but after release, and left King under Tribute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>(d) Towards the end of Jeboiahim's 5th, died Nebuchadnezzar the father. ——His son now in Egypt, hearing of his father's death, made all the speed he could to Babylon. [See p. 59, and 71.]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 610         | 16               | 604                | (†) Viz. in November, when Nebuchadnezzar first took Jerusalem, after his having taken Carchemish, as above related, (viz. in p. 47.) and caused many captives, especially those of the better sort, to be sent to Jerusalem.
### Rais'd Chronology of Mr. L.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capitvity of Zedekiah</th>
<th>Kings of Tyre</th>
<th>Kings of Babylon</th>
<th>Kings of Zedekiah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 30th, 698 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 30th, 697 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of Nebuch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 30th, 696 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>deposed, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the kingdom of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Judah is taken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>by Nebuch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nebuch. lays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>siege to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jerusalem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nebuch. the son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of Nebuch.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Ezekiel enter'd on his Prophetick Office.
3. Nebuch. the son of Nebuch. heard of his father's death.
5. Nebuch. lays siege to Jerusalem.
6. Ezekiel prophesieth against Pharaoh [ch. 29.1.].—His Army cometh to assi if Zedekiah now shut up in Jerusalem by the Chaldeans: who thereupon leave the siege, and fight, and overcome the Egyptians, according to Jeremiah's Prophecy, [ch. 34, 10, 10].
7. Pharaoh's overthrow revealed to Ezekiel [ch. 30, from v. 20 to the end.]
8. The Siege of Jerusalem renewed by the Chaldeans, and the City taken.
9. Ezekiel prophesieth against Tyre, [ch. 26]
10. The fall of Judah by Ishmael. The remnant of Judah flees into Egypt. In this, (*) or the next year Nebuch. laid siege to Tyre.

(*) Fiz. In this Seventh as to which great mistake see above, p. 65.
(a) Daniel interpreted Nebuchadnezzar's dream in the 2d of Neb. [Dan. 2. 1.] viz. in the Bab. Account of Nebuchadnezzar's reign by which he reckon'd [See p. 47.]—After 3 years obedience Jeboiam rebellion. Whereupon he was harra'd by Neb. his Lieutenants, and Governours of provinces [2 Kings 24. 2.] for 3 years together, till at length [See (b) below.]

(b) He was taken, and kill'd, and buried according to the word of the Lord by the Prophet Jerem. [22. 18, 19. and 36. 30.]--His son Jeboiam call'd also Jeconiah and Coniah reign'd in his stead, [2 Kings 24. 6. 2 Chron. 36. 9.]---After 3 m. and 10 d. He yielded himself Prisoner to Nebuchadnezzar now closely besieging Jerusalem, who sent him, and his mother, &c., and a vast number of captives from the City of Jerusalem to Babylon [2 Kings 24. 13—16.] now in the 8th year of his reign [v. 12.] besides 3923 Prisoners, which in his 7th [Jer. lii. 28] viz. either in the end of the last Year, or beginning of this he had caus'd to be carried away out of the open Country upon his marching in person to Jerusalem. [See Prid. Con. Hist. p. 68.]--NB. In this Captivity of Jeconiah, in the 8th of Neb. [2 Kings 24. 12.] was carried away to Babylon the Prophet Ezekiel: and therefore he all along in his Prophecies reckon's by this Era.

(c) Jeremiah writes to the captives at Babylon [ch. 29, 1, &c.]

(d) Ezekiel enter'd on his Prophetic Office [ch. i. 2.]

(e) Daniel at this time (probably about 30 years of age) fo eminent for his holiness and righteousness of life, as by God himself to be equal'd with Noah and Job [Ezek. 14.]

(f) Zedekiah rebels against Nebuchadnezzar.

(g) Neb. besiegeth Jerusalem [2 Ks. 25.]

(h) Pharaoh's army coming to the relief.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kings of Babylon</th>
<th>Kings of Judah</th>
<th>Captivity of Nebudadnezzer</th>
<th>The men alone after his father's death, Nebudadnezzer, the son coming to the Empire, Made King, over all the Empire. Therefore, his father's death, and his being made King is aligned in the 37th of Jeremia, not to the son but to the father.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ezr. 4:18-12.17</td>
<td>Hence Ezra was taken to Yerusa for 13 years, Daniel interprets Nebudadnezzer's dream.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ezr. 4:18-12.17</td>
<td>Hence Ezra was taken to Yerusa for 13 years, Daniel interprets Nebudadnezzer's dream.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ezr. 4:18-12.17</td>
<td>Hence Ezra was taken to Yerusa for 13 years, Daniel interprets Nebudadnezzer's dream.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year before</td>
<td>Captivity of Kings of Judah</td>
<td>Captivity of Zedekiah</td>
<td>Captivity of Nebuchadnezzar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>588 (a)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Ezekiel prophesied against Tyr. [Ch. xxvi and xxvii.] He upbraided the then King, [Ithobal] Ch. xxviii. 10. --- He prophesied against Zidon. [ver. 21.] also against Pharaoh and the Egyptians. [Ch. xxx. and xxxi.] --- N. B. DANIEL’s Willom was now famed, as to be proverbially spoken of. [Ch. xxviii. 2.] --- Now in the 11th of Zed. the city was broken up. [2 Ks. xxv. 4.] And 7th. The Temple and City were burned. [ver. 6.] --- Gedaliah was left Governor. But soon after he was kill’d by Ishmael; who fled for it. The residue of the Jews fearing the King of Babylon because of the murder of Gedaliah flewe away into Egypt, against the word of the Lord to them by Jeremiah: [ch. xxxii.] to their utter destruction there after. And as for the very few that still kept in Judah, to them in this,

(b) Or in the year after Ezekiel prophesied of utter destruction. [Ch. xxxiii. 21—29.] --- He now also prophesied against Pharaoh Hophra, and the Egyptians. [Ch. xxxii.] --- Jeremiah prophesied against the Jews, which were gone into Egypt. [Ch. xlv. 1.] By a Prophecy of Ph. Hophra’s destruction, He giveth them a sign of theirs. [ver. 29, 30.]

(c) N. B. Now in the 7th of Ithobal King of Tyre, Jof. Ant. lib. x. c. 11, and con. Ap. lib. 1. [but not in the 7th of Nebuchadnezzar, as Mr. L. would have it] the 13 Years Siege thereof was begun by Nebuchadnezzar. [See above, p. 64.]

(d) While Nebuchadnezzar lay at this siege was the last carrying away of the Jews by Nebuzaradan. [Jer. iii. 20.] The Defolation of the Land being now fully completed, therein were fulfilled the Prophecies of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, relating thereunto: in particular that of Ezekiel ch. iv. 1—8; God’s Forbearance of the Houes of Israel, and Judah being now absolutely at an end.] See Fruel. Con. Hift. p. 88. See also above p. 70, &c.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kings of Judah</th>
<th>Captivity of Judah</th>
<th>Captivity of Belshazzar the Son after his Father's death</th>
<th>Kings of Israel</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4126</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4127</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4128</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4129</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4130</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rais'd Chronology of Mr. L.**
(a) Pala-Tyres, or old Tyre after a 13 Years siege was now taken by Nebuchadnezzar, in the 19th of King Ishobal, who was slain in the conclusion of this War. [Ezek. xxviii. 8—10.] The inhabitants removing to an Island about half a mile distant from the Shore, built there the City afterward so famous by that Name.

(b) Nebuchadnezzar now ravageth Egypt: God having giv'n him the spoils thereof by the Prophet Ezekiel. [Ch. xxix. 18—20. xxx. 1—19.] ---The Jews which had flung into Egypt for fear of the Chaldeans after the murder of Gedaliah, [See 588 before Ch. iv.] during the now ravage there were taken, and some slain, others carried to Babylon. [Jer. xlv. 27, 28.] ---Pharaoh Hophra was now forced to flee into upper Egypt, towards the borders of Ethiopia, by reason of the revolt of the Egyptians, who had now declared Amasis King. ---Nebuchadnezzar also made him his Vice Roy.

(c) Nebuchadnezzar being gone out of Egypt, Pharaoh Hophra fighting Amasis was beaten, taken Prisoner, and strangled. N. B. Then were completed the Prophecies of Jeremiah [ch. xviii. xlv. [ver. 30 in particular] and xlv.] and of Ezekiel [Ch. xxix. xxx. xxxi. xxxii.] ---Nebuchadnezzar now at rest from his wars goes on with his great Buildings at Babylon. [See Prid. Com. Hist. p. 94, &c.]

(d) ---He proudly boasting of his great works, was by God depriv'd at once of his enemies, and his kingdom, being driv'n from among men for seven Years. [Dan. iv. 30—32.]

(a) At the end of 7 years God restored Neb. to his Senes, and his Kingdom, [Dan. iv. 34.] some time before his death in this Year.

(b) Next his Son Evil-merodach reigned. N. B. In the 37th of Jeconiah's Captivity, in the twelfth month, the 27th day of the month. [2 Kings xxv. 27.] whereby we are brought down into this year being the first of Evil-merodach, he releasing Jeconiah out of prison shew'd him singular favours. [ver. 22.] See above p. 63, &c. where it is shewn from the express testimony of Josephus that now [and not 20 years before, as Mr. L. hath imagin'd, but] AFTER Nebuchadnezzar's death, Ev-mer. forthwith gave Jeconiah his Enlargement.

(c) Astyages King of Media being dead, his Son Cyaxares the second, now 41 years old [See Prid. Con. Hist. p. 108.] succeeded in the civil Government, and Cyrus his Grandson in the military, now 40 years old. [ib.] –—— N. B. Hence begins the Computation of the years of his reign in those Authors who reckon to Cyrus a thirty years reign [As to which See above p. 62, &c.]

(d) Died Nisirassolassars, or Nergilisar bravely fighting with victorious Cyrus. ——- His Son Labujojarach, succeeding reigned 9 months from his father's death in the beginning of Spring: But these 9 months being after the Teth of that Year, and having their end, before another Year began, the whole of that year is reckoned in to the last of Nergilisar, and therefore Labujojarach is not in the Canon of Ptolemy. [it being the way in that Canon not to give any King a place in it, who had no rift of Teth (*) but to give it to his Predecessor.]

(e) Nabonadius the Belshazzar of the Scriptures succeeded Labujojarach. ———-Daniel had the Vision of the four Empires. [ch. vii.]

(f) ———- of the Ram, and He-Gor, [ch. viii.] or the overthrow of the Persian Empire by At. M. and the perfecution of the Jews by Ant. Epib.

(*) N. B. The first month of the Egyptian Year was called Teth: from whence as the beginning of the Egyptian Year Ptolemy dates the beginning of Kings reigns.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Cyrus made Emperor of Persia. [See page opp. (c).]</th>
<th>Kings of Babylon.</th>
<th>Captivity of Nebuchadnezzar</th>
<th>Captivity of the Ten Thousand.</th>
<th>Captivity of those who went with Zerubbabel.</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4147</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4148</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4149</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4150</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4151</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4152</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4153</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4154</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4155</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4156</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4157</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4158</td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4159</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4160</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4161</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Scripture Chronology

| Captivity of Judah | Kings of Babylon | Kings of Media, Persia, 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The Egyptians after 40 years dispersion [See above 589 before Christ] returning to their own Land. Many of them went the next year to the assistance of Croesus. [Xen. Cyrop. lib. 6. § 14. See above, P. 34.]
- Sardes taken by Cyrus, and Croesus King of Lydia in it. So an end to this Kingdom.

(c) Daniel interpreted the hand-writing on the Wall, [ch. v. 25, c. c.].—Babylon taken by Cyrus, and Belshazzar slain. Therein an end of the Babylonish Empire.

(d) After the taking of Babylon by Cyrus, and the death of Belshazzar, Darius the Median took the kingdom being about 62 years old. [Dan. 5.30, 31.] For the kingdom was given to the Medes, as well as to the Persians, [v. 28.] And though Cyrus the Persian was the sole Actor in this conquest, yet as he fought for his Uncle Darius the Mede, therefore he took the kingdom, as above; or as are the words of Daniel, [ch. 9. 1. He was made King over the realm of the Chaldeans; and so he reigned wholly and solely after, during his life, viz. about 2 years, [See above p. 40, c. c.].—Therefore it pleased Darius to make Daniel chief of the 3 Presidents over the Kingdom, [ch. vi. 1.]—Through envy Daniel was cast into the den of lions, but God was with him, [v. 10—23.]—Now, viz. 10 Daries [Dan. ix. 1.] He had the Vision of the SEVENTY WEEKS, [v. 24—27.]
- Cambyses father of Cyrus being dead in Persia, and Darius before the end of this year dying also, Cyrus succeeding in all their dominions became sole Lord over the Persian Monarchy, and so reigned 70 years, [Xenoph.] 14537 (e)

* In whose 14th [according to the Phanician Annals Cyrus was made Emperor of Persia. [See above p. 63.]*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cyrus</th>
<th>Ks. of Bal.</th>
<th>Captivity of Jeconiah</th>
<th>Captivity of Judah</th>
<th>of Judah</th>
<th>of Natanael, or the Bellahzar of the Scriptures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4166</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4167</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4168</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4169</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4170</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4171</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4172</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4173</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4174</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4175</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) NB. Thus in this 20 years rais’d Hypothesis of Mr. L., of the 11th of Zedekiah, they of Jeconiah’s captivity were 80 years in captivity, whereas Judah was to serve the King of Bab. but 70 years [Jer.xxv.11.] and after that God promised to visit them, [ch. xxix. 16.]

NB. This Mr. L. makes to be the Scripture first of Cyrus, which was truly the first of Darius the Mede.

[See Note (d) on the left hand page. See also more largely above, p. 39, &c.]
SCRIPTURE CHRONOLOGY, &c.

Cyrop. lib. 8. See above p. 43. — And now in his (†) first, [Ezra i.] as to reigning, went forth his Commandment or Decree for the return of the Jews, and for their rebuilding the TEMPLE, after a Captivity of 70 (*) years.

(a) The Jews being released in November of the last year (viz. 537 before A.D. after the death of Darius, by virtue of Cyrus’s Decree then going forth) and marching homeward in the December following, got to Jerusalem in their Nisan, our March or April, of this Year, after a four months march: For this we may reasonably suppose from Ezra’s(†) having after performed the like march from Babylon. And the first time the Jews are found at Jerusalem after their return by virtue of Cyrus’s Decree was in their first month (which answers partly to our March, and partly to April). And the second month (†t) of the next year (viz. of the year before A.D. 535) when they laid the foundations of the Temple, was the second month of the second Year.

[†] Viz. towards the end of the Year before A.D. 537; for then his first must necessarily have begun upon the deaths of those two Princes before the end of this Year, and as Darius’s first of his two years reign began strictly in the end of 539 before A.D. equal to the 17th of Belshazzar. (†) Chaldee Years, or years of 360 days to a year; the vulgar year of the Country wherein the Jews had been captives for so many years: as it will be hereafter more particularly shown. (††) Ezra vii. 9. (†t) Ch. iii. 6, 9, 10.
PART the FIRST,
CONTAINING

An ACCOUNT of the First Seven Weeks of this Prophecy: both in the Beginning, and also in the Ending of them.

CHAPTER I.

In general concerning the Beginning of the Seven Weeks.

Having in the premises consider'd the nature, and division of these Weeks; I am now to treat of the first VII Weeks of this Prophecy: And I am in the first place concerned to set forth the true Scripture Beginning of them.

Now that the said VII Weeks must of necessity take their Beginning from the Commandment which went forth to restore, and to build Jerusalem, (or to rebuild Jerusalem, for this is the true meaning of the Hebraim) here thus translated, and therefore I shall thus once, and always express myself on this occasion) even to rebuild Jerusalem WALL and STREETS, The EXPRESS CHARACTER in the Text makes it evident beyond dispute.

We

(4) לְשׁוֹנַיְתִי יִבְנֵי to restore, and to build according to our Translations

but it might have been much more properly translated, to rebuild, or to build again. And that this latter is the much truer version is evident from the use of the very same word afterwards in the same verse, viz. where it is said concerning the Street of Jerusalem, לְשׁוֹנַיְתִי יִבְנֵי It shall return and be built. So verbally. And yet our Translators have rendered it truly and properly, it shall be built again. It should have been therefore so rendered in the former use of the word. There are many instances of such use of the word in Scripture: particularly in Psalm vi. 10. Let them return and be ashamed, The like also may be seen in Psal. lxxi. 20. and lxxviii. 41. See also Gen. xxvi. 18.
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We are in ver. 25 immediately pinned down to such Beginning. For so we there read expressly, viz. That from the going forth of the Commandment to rebuild Jerusalem shall be VII Weeks, &c.

But whereas there were four COMMANDMENTS, or DECREES which at four different times went forth from the Kings of Persia in favour of Jerusalem, it hath therefore been a point disputed among learned men, And it is indeed the grand question now before us, which of the four it was that is here intended in this Prophecy.

That there were but four such Commandments is evident from the account we have of them, and of those only in holy writ. Of these we learn either from Ezra or Nebemiah, those holy men who themselves were immediately concern’d in two of them, that they were as in order they here follow, viz.

First, That COMMANDMENT which went forth in the first year of Cyrus.

Secondly, That which went forth from Darius, in his second according to some, in his third as some have reckon’d, in his fourth according to others.

Thirdly, That which went forth in the 7th of Artaxerxes Longimanus. And

Fourthly, That which went forth in the 20th of the said Artaxerxes.

One of these four COMMANDMENTS was certainly refer’d to, or spoken of, in this Prophecy by the Angel, in what he told Daniel expressly here, ver. 25 concerning a Commandment that was to go forth to rebuild Jerusalem.

Here then lies the Question: namely Which of all others is the most likely to be that very COMMANDMENT here mention’d in this Prophecy.

The Answer is very easy in general, that it must be that, no doubt of it, which most nearly and exactly answers to the EXPRESS CHARACTER in the Text, namely that of REBUILDING JERUSALEM.

But whereas there are two different senses in which this EXPRESS CHARACTER of rebuilding Jerusalem hath been taken by learned men in their various Expositions of this Prophecy, some (particularly the late learned Bishop Lloyd for one) having taken the same in a literal sense, as denoting the rebuilding of the City of Jerusalem; others, (the reverend and learned Dr. Prideaux in particular) in a figurative sense, as denoting the Restoration of the Jewish Church, And whereas consequently there is much depending upon the true meaning of these words of the Commandment, (viz. to rebuild Jerusalem,) in order to ascertain which of the four general Commandments it was here in the Prophecy before us particularly intended, or refer’d to, the former of these two great men beginning his Exposition of this Prophecy from the 20th of Artaxerxes Longimanus upon his literal acceptance of the words thereof, the latter beginning his from the 7th of the said Artaxerxes, upon his figurative interpretation of them, It is therefore become necessary for us,
Of the true meaning of those words of the
before we proceed any farther, to enquire into the true nature of
this EXPRESS CHARACTER as contain'd in these words
of the Prophecy of REBUILDING JERUSALEM.
I shall accordingly in the first place consider this expres Character
in this twofold sense of it, in order to the shewing in the next place
which of the four Commandments is that, between which, and the
Prophecy before us there is the greatest Agreement. And this shall
be the Contents of the following Chapter.

CHAP. II.

Concerning the true sense, or meaning of those words
of the Commandment, the REBUILDING
Jerusalem.

I am now to treat concerning the expres Character of the Begin-
ing of the VII Weeks, viz. of the COMMANDMENT
which went forth to rebuild Jerusalem: And I am to set forth
the same in the twofold sense of it before-mention'd, viz. in the
figurative, and the literal sense of it.

The late learned Bishop Lloyd in his Exposition of this Prophecy
taking every thing in the Prophecy as it lay before him in the plain
sense of the words of it according to the expres Letter, took these
words of it also of rebuilding Jerusalem in the same literal sense, viz.

That whereas Jerusalem the royal and holy City had been destroyed,
and made desolate, being laid even without the ground by the Babylonians,
the should however in process of time be built up again, as
in the former days, the days of her Prosperity. That she who in
the language of David, (P/s. xlviii. 1.) and of Daniel also (ch. ix. 16.)
was the holy Mountain of God, called so even by God himself (Zech.
viii. 3.) And yet at the time of the giving of the Prophecy before
us, was as it were only a mountain of Rubbish without either
STREETS, or WALLS, she should however have them rebuilt
as at the beginning. For to this purpose there was to go forth a
Commandment (from a King of Persia) even to REBUILD Jerusalem.
So that however she now lay naked, and defenceless, and open
to all her enemies round about her, for want of her WALLS, which
now lay in ruins as left by the Babylonians upon their dismantling
her, and was therefore become, and as yet continued a Reproach,
the time however should come when that her REPROACH
should be taken away. For by virtue of the COMMANDMENT
which was to go forth for that very purpose, Her WALL was to be
again set up. Her STREETS were to be rebuilt, she should be
yet replenish'd, and adorned with Houses; Her Inhabitants should
again flock in unto Her; and so she should be re-peopled, and in-
habited,
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habited, as in ancient times. In this sense did the late Bishop Lloyd take these Words, as the true literal meaning of them, as they lie before us in the Prophecy.

And what should hinder why these Words should not be taken in this same literal sense, as the real and very sense here intended in them by the Angel? Wherefore should the Letter be rejected here, or in any other part of this most solemn Prophecy, this important, this very important Prophecy, as Dr. Prideaux (a) truly calls it?

It is truly fo. It is indeed of the greatest importance: as being the only Prophecy in Scripture which directly points out Christ the Messiah; and what is more than that which (as we shall particularly see hereafter) setteth forth the precise time of a suffering Messiah; and therein demonstrates him to be the true Messiah, the ANOINTED of the Lord, to be our great Sacrifice, and Expiation for Sin in dying for us, and in our stead. And therefore so important a Prophecy as this is in the letter of it ought by no means to be explain'd away in a figure; no, not in any one part of it: Especially considering that every part of it, in the letter thereof had its most exact completion, as will be hereafter particularly shewn. And therefore in the explanation of it to run it, or any part of it into a figure, is not a little derogating from the solemnity, and very great importance of it.

And yet this notwithstanding, some Expositors of this weighty Prophecy rejecting the literal sense of the words of the Commandment to rebuild Jerusalem, have been very fond of the figurative sense of these words. In particular the learned Dr. Prideaux hath declar'd against the former, and for the latter. And to this purpose he hath expressly told us (b), that the Words in the Text to restore and to build Jerusalem, are not to be understood literally, but figuratively, for the restoring of the State of the Jews, as well the Political, as the Ecclesiastical, &c. And to like purpose elsewhere (c).

In confirmation of which figurative sense of these words, and by way of objection to the literal sense of them, Mr. Dean there gives his reasons: and supports the same with other figurative Interpretations elsewhere (d). But of what force and efficacy those reasons are, will appear by giving them a particular consideration, either as we find them here (e), or as we shall have more proper Opportunities of speaking of them, as they lie elsewhere, and as they come in under other considerations.

First, faith Mr. Dean here (f), What is more usual in Prophecies than to be giv'n out in figurative Expressions? But with all due sub-mission, Doth it hence follow that because Some Prophecies are so giv'n out, that therefore All are, or that this in particular is so giv'n; or

(a) Con. Hist. p. 106, l. 29 and 47. (b) p. 266, l. 3. (c) Particularly p. 289, l. 28. Mr. Dean makes the Church, and State of Jerusalem to be figuratively expressed by the Streets of the City, and good Constitutions, and Establishments, to be figuratively expressed by the Ditch: Of which the Reader will hear in its proper place. (d) p. 287. (e) p. 266. (f) ib. l. 7.
Of the true meaning of the words of the
or if so giv'n that it must however necessarily be giv'n in Mr. Dean's
figurative sense of it?

But addeth Mr. Dean there (a), What is more common in Scrip-
ture than by Jerusalem to mean the whole political, and ecclesiasti-
cal state of that people, viz. the Jews?

Now with like deference to the learned Mr. Dean's judgement. Doth
it hence follow that the word Jerusalem tho' in some places of Scrip-
ture so taken, must therefore be so taken in this? Where is
the consequence here? It is, faith Mr. Dean, common in Scripture,
for Jerusalem to be taken in this figurative sense. I do allow it. But
I beg leave to add also that it is most common in Scripture likewise
for Jerusalem to be taken in a litteral sense. Were we to be at
the trouble of reckoning up the places in Scripture where the word Je-
rusalem is found, we should certainly find it in many more places in
the sense of the letter, than in that of a figure. Where then is the
consequence of thus arguing? Mr. Dean doth not say that it is al-
ways so: but commonly so. And yet upon examination it would be
found most commonly otherwise. And therefore since it is not so in
all places of Scripture, it is possible surely that it may not be so in
this. Therefore in truth this argument of Mr. Dean proveth no
more than the former. The same in favour of the litteral sense
turn'd upon Mr. Dean would prove equally against his figurative
acceptance of the words. But such an argument as this proves to
very little or no purpose of either side. Therefore we may dis-
miss it without any farther trouble to the Reader about it.

But

Thirdly, Mr. Dean gives one other reason in favour of his figu-
rative interpretation of the words of the Commandment for to rebuild
Jerusalem, by telling us (b) that this figurative Interpretation of the
words, and NONE OTHER must be the true meaning of them, as
appearing from hence, viz.. That they CANNOT be underfoold in a
LITTERAL SENSE. And this is a decisive argument indeed, if
this Assertion could be made out. But sure I am that this can
never be made out from the reason on which Mr. Dean founds it,
viz. a very forced, and groundless consequence which he hath hence
urged, in the following words, (c) that if they (the words of the
Commandment) are so to be understood, (viz. in a litteral sense) they
can be applicable to no other restoring, and rebuilding of Jerusalem than
that which was decreed, and commanded by Cyrus. I shall hereafter
give this a particular consideration, and I shall then shew that there
is not any sufficient ground for such inference: and that it makes not
in the least against these words being taken in a litteral sense: for
that tho' so taken, there is not any the least necessity for their being
so applied. In the mean time I shall establish the litteral sense of
these words by such Arguments, as will, I hope, prove sufficient for
that purpose: even to the proving the very reverse of Mr. Dean's
assertion.

(a) L. 8.  (b) p. 257. l. 9.  (c) i. 12.
assertion, namely this, that the LITERAL Interpretation of these words, and no other must be the true meaning of them; for that they cannot be understood, I mean rightly understood, according to the true intent, and meaning of this Prophecy, in a figurative sense. And however Mr. Dean hath affirm'd (a), that the Understanding in a LITERAL sense, what is in the Prophecy, (viz. according to Mr. Dean's Hypothesis thereof) meant in a figurative sense hath been an occasion of Perplexities, which many learned men have run into, in their explications of this Prophecy, yet in truth Mr. Dean's understanding the same in a FIGURATIVE sense, which in the Prophecy (as I hope fully to make appear) is certainly meant in a LITERAL sense, hath been the occasion of his falling also into Perplexities; as we shall see hereafter.

We do indeed readily grant with Mr. Dean that many Expositors of this weighty Prophecy, who have taken the words thereof now before us in a literal sense, have run into many and great Perplexities in their several Expositions of it: But such their Perplexities were not owing to their taking the Prophecy in a literal sense, but to some other their mistakes in their several explications of it, viz. either to their dating these weeks from a wrong Beginning, or to their reckoning the whole LXX Weeks as so many current weeks, or else to their making use of a wrong year in their computation of them, &c.

And yet as certain it is also that Mr. Dean is not without his Perplexities in his figurative Exposition of this Prophecy: tho' with this difference, that whereas their Perplexities proceeded from some or other of the causes now assign'd, Mr. Dean's Perplexities are in truth owing to every one of these Causes, either as happily fusing to his figurative Hypothesis; Or else immediately to his figurative Exposition, as necessarily productive of such Hypothesis: as will hereafter appear.

At the present we are immediately concern'd with these words of the Prophecy, to restore and to build Jerusalem, as in our Translation, or as we have before noted in the true sense of the Hebrew to rebuild Jerusalem, the Wall, and Streets thereof.

And we are to shew that the literal sense of these words, and no other must be the real, or true meaning of them: For that they cannot be rightly understood in a figurative sense. And that

First, Because the words before us of rebuilding Jerusalem, the Wall and Streets thereof will not properly bear any figurative Interpretation, they do evidently in the natural sense of them point out not a figurative, but a literal sense.

For they are spoken concerning a City which as it had been laid in ruins by the enemies of the people of God, so now continued desolate, but was however in due time to be REBUILT, express assurances hereof being giv'n from God in this Prophecy. That
That Jerusalem the holy City was at the time of the giving this prophecy more than in a figurative Desolation, it will I doubt not, be readily granted. She was surely now LITERALLY desolate. If so, Consequently this EXPRESS CHARACTER in the Prophecy of her REBUILDING naturally pinneth us down likewise to a LITERAL Rebuilding. That the which was now literally in ruins was therefore in process of time to be literally rebuilt is I think beyond all controversy evident from the natural sense of the words. It were therefore unreasonable to take them otherwise than in such literal sense.

For it favours surely not a little of Partiality for to take the words of Jerusalem’s Desolation only in a literal sense, and not the words of her Rebuilding also in the same literal sense. Both are spoken of in this chapter; and on one, and the same occasion; and with respect indeed to each other, as will particularly appear presently under my second argument for the taking the words before us in such literal sense.

But we are at present immediately concern’d about the plain, and natural sense of them. And the natural sense is always best, and what always ought to be followed without; especial, and very convincing cause to the contrary, especially in expounding the holy Scriptures. And according to our second rule laid down for us to go by, in explanation of the Prophecy before us, Express Characters in the Text ought to be closely adher’d to, and not to be interpreted at large, and expounded away in a Figure for the sake of an Hypothesis. This is unpardonable in itself; much more so, when the words will not bear such interpretation: which is the case of the words now, before us of rebuilding Jerusalem Wall and Streets. The STREET shall be built again, and the WALL: as in our Translation.

Let any unprejudiced Reader knowing the present Desolation of Jerusalem but read these words: And upon reading them would he not certainly conclude a literal meaning in them, and gather from them that Jerusalem now in ruins should be again repair’d, or restor’d out of her ruins?

The STREET shall be built again, and the WALL, as in our Translation. The Streets, or streets (a). The יִתְנָה in the Original: The Area of Jerusalem or broad space; or Spaces now void of Houses, the same having been laid in ashes by the Babylonians, and also the יִתְנָה the WALL, of which she had been by them dismantled, and was now only a heap of ruins, should be built up again. This is the plain, and natural sense of these words: And in this sense our Translators have accordingly taken them.

But to this replies the learned Dr. Prideaux, here the Translation is faulty. Our Translators have not done justice to the text in rendering the original word יִתְנָה by the English word WALL. For faith Mr. Dean (b), There is no such word as the word WALL to be found in the original

(a) Plarea pro Plateis pluribus per Synecdo. (Gejerus in l.) (b) p. 287. l. 38.
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original text of the Prophecy. For what we there render in our English Translation the WALL, is in the Hebrew Original the DITCH.

But, with all humble submission, why so much fault to be found here with the Translation? Why so heavy a charge as this upon our Translators, as if they had put in a word contrary to the true sense, and meaning of the Original?———I am indeed apt to believe that they did not understand the word in a figurative sense. They did not probably so much as think of it. Hence indeed according to Mr. Dean they are blame-worth. But how far they are really so: or whether in the least so, or not, we shall soon see by considering how far the original Word will bear them out in this their translation.

The Original word is, as we have noted, יָדָעַת. This faith Mr. Dean in the true signification thereof is not a WALL, but a DITCH. Now allowing this in the general sense of the word, yet surely in the sense in which it lieth before us in the Prophecy (and by this without all controversy we ought to be guided herein) It must necessarily signify somewhat more than barely an ORDINARY or COMMON DITCH. For otherwise what sense can we make of these words of the Prophecy, The STREET shall be built again, and the DITCH?

Now putting these two together, as in all reason we ought to do, as they lye together here in the Prophecy, what could be this יָדָעַת in the Original, this WALL as in our Translation, this DITCH as in Mr. Dean’s Translation?———What but that which our learned Mr. Mede hath told us it was in his excellent explanation of the word. And therefore I give the meaning of it here in answer, to the Reader in general, and to Mr. Dean in particular, in Mr. Mede’s words, as we find them in that learned man’s book (a), as here followeth, viz. By יָדָעַת (faith he) here I understand properly that CIRCUIT, (that DITCH, if Mr. Dean pleaseth) bounding out the limits of the City, whereon the WALL was builded, and antiently as’d to be marks out with a plough earing a furrow round about.

Now such a יָדָעַת as this there had been surely at Jerusalem before its Desolation. A Circuit, or furrow (as Mr. Mede here call’d it:) a Ditch, (as Mr. Dean of Norwich calls it) made about Jerusalem, encompassing, and begetting her with a WALL upon the said Circuit, Furrow, or Ditch builded for her defence against her Adversaries, but afterwards by those from Babylon thrown down, and level’d with the Ground.

Concerning this same יָדָעַת as in the Original, this WALL in the language of our Translators, this DITCH in Mr. Dean’s translation, It is in the Prophecy before us predicted that it should be again restor’d to Jerusalem.

And now with Mr. Dean’s leave, I put it to the impartial Reader whether there be herein any the least room for finding

(a) p. 700. l. 8.
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ing fault with our Translators? Let the reader judge in this case;
Is the word WALL as in our Translation to be found in the
Original, Or is it not?

Nay I beg leave to put the question if the Original word מִיַּמָּה could have been better rendred than by the very word WALL? Which word Our Translators pitched upon as the fair, and plain, and natural, and indeed the only true Prophetic sense of the word, in the letter thereof, and not in a figure, as we shall have sufficient cause to see anon.

Nor have our Translators been singular herein. For others (a) also have so translated it before Them.

So that however the learned Mr. Dean may find fault with the very word WALL as in our translation, yet calling it in his Translation DITCH, still the Original Word can truly be understood of no other Ditch, (as I have shewn from Mr. Mede,) than that on which the wall of Jerusalem stood before its being laid in ruins by them of Babylon. Call we it Ditch or Trench, or what we will, it is still the WALL of Jerusalem which was antiently founded, and built upon that Ditch or Trench, which is here prophesied of, that whereas it was now in ruins, yet the time was coming when it should be restored to her.

But after all, to this Mr. Dean will reply that this Translation of his by the word DITCH is not thus meant by him. Nor is it so to be understood, as if it signified such a Circuit, or Trench, whereon stood a WALL; for this were still to take it in a literal sense: And then the word WALL as in our Translation might as well stand as the word DITCH. But Mr. Dean's favourite word DITCH is to be taken in a figurative sense, and in this sense faith Mr. Dean (b), by the word DITCH must be meant GOOD CONSTITUTIONS and ESTABLISHMENTS. Mr. Dean had there just before told us that by the STREET or STREETS of the CITY must be meant CHURCH, and STATE. This is Mr. Dean's figurative interpretation of these words in the Prophecy the STREET, and the WALL: Of which street and wall It is therein predicted that they should be rebuilt.

But if this be not a forced, and arbitrary interpretation of these words, as they lie before us in the Prophecy, I leave entirely to the Reader: Especially Considering (as I now beg leave to shew) that in their natural sense they cannot admit of such interpretation.

For First, as to the word מִיַּמָּה, what impartial Reader looking upon that original Word either in its own proper sense, or as it lies

(a) So the LXX πλαταια, Αγείων, or πετροποοΐα. MS. AL. So the v. L:\nPlatae & Muri. So also the Syriac, and Arabi versions. And among Commentators, Fischart, and Calvin, and Patahias have so interpreted it. (See Pale's Synop., in 1.)
(b) p. 289. 1. 31.
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lies in conjunction with the word יִזְדַּע in the Prophecy, could
have deduced such a far-fetch'd sense, as Mr. Dean here gives us
of it, as this of CHURCH, and STATE: both together here in-
tended by this one word, in Mr. Dean's interpretation of it?
Indeed one would not easily have thought of such sense of the
word, had not Mr. Dean here thus inform'd us.

The word in its ordinary signification denotes a broad place,
or space, or street. To give it in Mr. Mede's language, that learned
Man very well understanded by it, the Area, or Plot of Ground
within (Jerusalem) wherein the HOUSES were to be builded (a).

And by בִּגְרוֹב faith Mr. Dean also must be understanded the
STREETS of the City (b). And yet after all by the STREETS
of the CITY (as before noted from p. 289. of his book) we
MUST understand CHURCH and STATE.

Now as to any ground for such Exposition, in truth I cannot
see it. For supposing that the CITY were to denote the STATE,
yet why the STREETS should denote the CHURCH I see not,
How they should I know not. Yet faith Mr. Dean, The STREETS
of the CITY denote the CHURCH and STATE.

Well——But Secondly, as to the other word here, the word
WALL, or in Mr. Dean's language the word DITCH, what are
we to understand by that in the Opinion of Mr. Dean?—Why?
—As we have seen above, GOOD CONSTITUTIONS.

But surely here is an interpretation giv'n us of the Original word
בִּגְרוֹב as constrain'd, and unnatural as was that of the other word
ברונ. We have before giv'n the true natural sense of the word
ברונ, and also the proper sense of it in this Prophecy according to
the letter of it, in the words of the judicious Mr. Mede.

We are not to wonder that Mr. Dean hath giv'n us so different a
sense of this word. For as was the other, so must this word of
course be taken by him in a figurative sense. Both with equal
reason: There being in truth no better ground for such interpreta-
tion of this word, than there was for the former. For, where, I
beg leave to ask the question, is this word בִּגְרוֹב us'd in such forced
figurative sense either in Scripture, or indeed elsewhere?—It is no
where in the former. Where else is it to be met with? Mr. Dean
gives us no manner of instance. He hath indeed said (c) something
by way of Comment on his word DITCH, shewing it to be near
of kin to the word HEDGE in that sense, in which he takes both
those words; viz. in favour of his GOOD CONSTITU-
IONS, as the word Hedge is there (d) taken in his quotation from
Pirke Aboth (which is one of the Jews tracts in their MS./HNA) deno-
ing that the Constitutions of their Elders are an Hedge to the Law:
But this proves nothing in the least as to either of these significati-
ones

(a) p. 700. (b) See the word more largely explain'd towards the end of the next chapter. (c) p. 289, loc. sim. (d) ib.
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Ons being the true and proper sense of the original word יִלָּד either in itself, or as it lies before us in this Prophecy. This quo-
tation proves not in the least that the said word ought to be rendered
here Hedge, or Ditch more significantly than WALL; much less
doth it prove any thing towards the sense in which Mr. Dean renders
it, viz. Good Constitutions.

If then after all, there be not any authority from the holy Scrip-
tures, nor elsewhere for such figurative, such forced figurative tran-
slations of the words before us, if the natural signification of the
words do in no wise justify such figurative interpretation, but evi-
dently point to us a literal meaning, then most certainly such
figurative Interpretation is in no wise the true Scripture sense of
them.

And thus we might have done with the Hebrew word יָלָד and
our English Translation thereof the word WALL, (Having here
shewn it to be originally in the Prophecy, in the true literal sense
thereof, (as Our English Translators have taken it) however Mr. Dean
hath asserted the contrary;) had not He, just before his casting out the
said English word in p. 287, one other argument there for its being
taken in a figurative sense, which though really of no force in it
self, yet in good manners to Mr. Dean we ought not to pass over
unobserved. It is this, namely that the said English word WALL
happens to be use'd in Ezra [ch. ix. v. 9.] in a figurative sense: And
therefore Mr. Dean puts the question (lin. 36. of that page) why may
not the word WALL in the Prophecy (viz. in the Prophecy before
us) be taken figuratively also?——

To which I beg leave to reply, that there is not any the least rea-
son for it. For where is the consequence of this arguing?——It is
so in Ezra faith Mr. Dean. And I will add also, It is so in many
other places of Scripture. But doth it therefore necessarily follow
that because it is so in some, therefore it is so in ALL. Or that
therefore it is so in this?——Because it is so in Ezra, must it there-
fore be so in the Prophecy before us?——Yes, faith Mr. Dean in
what follows (there in that page) viz. there being as much reason for
it in the one place, as in the other.

——But with all due submission, surely there is not as much rea-
sion: there is indeed none at all. For the Context which in such
cases always must be consider'd, plainly shews the contrary. As
will be presently, and more immediately shewn under my second
Consideration. However here we may not improperly note the
following particulars: viz.

First, That in the Prophecy before us the word STREET is
join'd with the word WALL: which is an evident confirmation
and strengthening of the literal sense, as Jerusalem was to be rebuilt
Wall and Street.

2dly. According to the very express Text here, a Royal Com-
mandment was to go forth for such very purpose, even for such re-
building
Commandment to REBUILD Jerusalem. But no such Commandment went forth in Ezra's time: As will be hereafter shewn. Nor when he spake of a דלת (in our Translation a Wall) was there any such Wall built by him: but afterwards when the Commandment went forth according to this Prophecy for such דלת as is there expressly spoken of, such WALL as in our Translation, there was a Wall accordingly rebuilt, or repair'd by the Tirshathah, or Governour Nebemiah, as will be hereafter shewn.

But farther with immediate respect to our English word Wall, our Translators word as well for the דלת in this Prophecy, as the דלת in Ezra, the difference of sense in the two original words makes a difference also of sense in the one Word whereby they are translated. The word דלת indeed signifies a Wall, or a Hedge. But yet it is far from coming up to the signification of the word דלת in the Prophecy. Even supposing the said דלת to signify a Ditch, as in Mr. Dean of Norwich's translation of the word, yet in such translation thereof the word דלת comes not up to the signification of the word דלת. For we have already shewn what kind of Ditch such Translation of the word דלת here must necessarily denote, viz. a Ditch, on which is built a wall. And however the word דלת in Ezra be in our Translation render'd wall, yet it might have been as properly translated Hedge, and in one and the same sense. For God was both alike to his people at that time, as He was their Defence against their Adversaries, when they were as yet without their Wall in the literal sense of the word, of which it was here however in the Prophecy predicated that they should in due time have it set up again. So that thou the English word be the same in both places, viz. in Ezra, and in the Prophecy before us One and the same Word wall, yet the original word in those two places is not the same, nor is the signification, and importance of the two words in the two different places the same; there is as we have seen a manifest difference in the sense of the one, and of the other; And therefore with Mr. Dean of Norwich's leave, there is not as much reason for it (for a figurative sense) in the one place (viz. in the Prophecy before us) as there is in the other: (viz. in Ezra.)

And yet tho' Our Translators have rendred the word דלת in Ezra by our English word wall, I am by no means for finding fault with this their Translation, tho' they have done no more by the word דלת in the Prophecy before us, and Mr. Dean of Norwich hath found fault with them for that their Translation. Tho' the sense be different in both places, yet the Translation in the respective sense of each place is just, and accurate in both. And so the figurative sense in Ezra which is the true sense there may serve to enforce the literal sense in the Prophecy before us, as being
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ing the true sense thereof. And so the sense will run thus in
those two places: viz. that God was himself immediately a WALL
(a) in Ezra's time to his People, when at that time Jerusalem be-
ing without a wall they were a people naked, and defenceless;
but yet they were not so to continue long, for the same God in
his good time would give unto them a WALL in the literal
sense of the word, as here predicted, and promis'd to Daniel in
this Prophecy.

And so I pass on to a second argument shewing the literal
sense of this, and the other words now before us in this Prophe-
cy, and that is

2dly. That the very Intention of the Angel in these words of re-
building Jerusalem Wall and Street, as therein containing an answer
from God to Daniel, the said answer being founded doubtless upon
Daniel's prayer which immediately respected the literal Desolation
of Jerusalem, as it can therefore properly have no other than a liter-
tal meaning, is a convincing argument that these words must not
be taken in a figurative, but in a literal sense. For here is plain-
ly intended the building of a City, which was formerly destroyed,
as it is evident as well from the immediate words of the Com-
mandment, as from the whole Scope of the Prophetic Text.

For full satisfaction in this matter, Let us here lay before us
so much of this holy Prophet's prayer, as is necessary on this oc-
casion. We have it in this (c) Chapter from the third to the 19th
verse inclusive.

It is in general a Prayer for the Restoration of Jerusalem. The
greatest part of it is taken up by Daniel in a general confession
of the sins of his People: Those their manifold Sins which there-
in he confesseth were the cause of God's just judgement upon
Jerusalem. These are the Contents of it from verse 3 to verse 16.
Then in that verse Daniel more immediately begins to call upon
God in behalf of Jerusalem in the following words, ver. 16, I be-
seech thee let thine Anger, and thy fury be turned away from thy City
Jerusalem: thy HOLY Mountain (b), because for our Sins, and for
the iniquities of our fathers, Jerusalem, and thy people be become a
REPROACH to all that are about us. ver. 17. Cause thy face to
shine upon THY SANCTUARY that is DESOLATE, ver. 18.
Behold our DESOLATIONS, and the CITI which is called by
thy name.

Ver. 19—THY CITY and THY PEOPLE are called
by thy name.

Whoever reads what I have here transcrib'd. cannot but see
the then desolate state of Jerusalem in the very express letter of
it.

The same is in what followeth immediately made the subject of
Prayer to God by Daniel, that he would regard, and raise her

(a) So Zech, vi. 8. (b) So again, ver. 20. (c) Dan. 13.
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Out of this her Defolation; that is, that he would give Commandment for her Rebuilding. For in all this he was presenting his Supplication before the Lord his God, for the HOLT MOUNTAIN of his God, as we read ver. 20, that as it was now in ruins, it might be rebuilt. God accordingly heard his Supplications. He heard them, and withal gave signal testimony that he did hear them. He sent the Angel Gabriel, (the man Gabriel as he is call'd ver. 21, probably so call'd from his having put on a human appearance) to inform him, and to talk with him, as it is said ver. 22; and as it is said there also, to shew him; to shew him that his prayer was heard; God by him sending a vision, which he was now to reveal unto Daniel by way of answer to the matter of it.

The Vision followeth in ver. 24, &c.

Therein God was pleas'd to let Daniel know in general that He had consider'd his People, and his holy City; and that LXX Weeks were determined on them for many grand Events relating to them, which are mention'd in that verse.

And ver. 25. more particularly God was pleas'd to let Daniel know by way of immediate comfort, and satisfaction to him under those his great concerns signified as before in his prayer in his affliction view of Jerusalem's literal Desolation, and therefore poured forth unto God for her recovery out of that her desolate State, that she should not long continue in a Desolation: For he should be again REBUILT. A COMMANDMENT should go forth for that very purpose. A royal Commission should be granted to God's people from a King of Persia giving them full licence, and authority to rebuild the now desolate Jerusalem. By virtue of this Commandment her STREET should be built again, and her WALL. And with immediate respect to the time when, that also follows, viz. that it should be built even, in the lesser of the two periods of time there mention'd: as the words have been above explain'd.

This is the Answer which God was pleased to give unto Daniel by his Angel in this Prophecy. And the words of the Angel as they are founded upon, and given immediately by way of answer to the subject matter of his prayer, they must undoubtedly be taken in the same sense with that. But it is as plain as any thing of this nature can be from the places above quoted out of Daniel's prayer, that as to the Subject matter thereof, viz. the then desolate state of Jerusalem, he spake of her not in a figure, but in the letter, even in the letter of her Desolation, her literally lying waste. And he prayed to God for her in this immediate view, viz. that God would look on her, and bring her out of those her ruins; that is, that he would cause her to be rebuilt. So particularly, ver. 18, Behold our Desolations, and the City: that is, our Desolate City. God, as we have seen, did behold her: And in testimony thereof he sent his Angel to Daniel with a Revelation of this Prophecy.

I
Therefore as this was Daniel's sense in his prayer; As he spake litterally of the Desolations of Jerusalem, so doubtless the Answer giv'n him from God by the Angel was return'd in the same sense.

Indeed had the sense of Daniel's prayer lamenting the desolate state of Jerusalem been figurative, then the words of the Prophecy before us ought also doubtless to be taken in such figurative sense; for both ought to be taken in one and the same sense: because the one is founded upon, and occasion'd by the other; the words of the Angel in the Prophecy, as I have here noted, immediately answering the drift, and purpose of Daniel's prayer. But the meaning thereof with respect to Jerusalem was, as we have seen, not figurative, but litteral. Therefore this Prophecy which thereupon follow'd as touching Jerusalem, and which was giv'n to Daniel, by way of immediate answer from God to him for his comfort, and satisfaction under his then great trouble and affliction for her ought, and must therefore necessarily be interpreted in the same sense, viz. not in the figurative, but in the litteral. It were indeed preposterous, and absurd to imagin otherwise.

I hope therefore that Mr. Dean will not take it amiss, if I give my self the liberty to return his words upon him, that whereas he hath affirm'd (as above) that the figurative interpretation of the words, and none other, so on the other hand I affirm that this litteral sense and none other can be the true meaning of them.

And so upon the whole, I conclude that the here predicted Commandment for the rebuilding of Jerusalem, even the Wall and the Streets thereof can be no other than a Commandment for her rebuilding in a litteral sense.

And withal I beg pardon of the Reader for having so long dwelt upon the sense of these words: Which I hope that he will be the more ready to grant me, when he shall consider that our farther proceeding absolutely requir'd this the true state of the meaning of these words in order to our true explication of the Weeks of this Prophecy: As this Explication, and every other likewise is in the first place depending upon the true previous sense of them.

But the litteral sense being thus establish'd as the true sense, I am now to fix the Beginning of the first 7 Weeks of this Prophecy. And in order to that I must in the next place consider when the Commandment to rebuild Jerusalem the wall and the streets there of taken in such true litteral sense did actually go forth. And this I shall do in the following Chapter.
CHAP. III.

Shewing the four several Commandments, or Decrees which in their appointed seasons went forth in favour of Jerusalem; and also which Commandment of the four it was, which in the literal and true sense thereof was the Commandment mention'd in the Prophecy before us to have gone forth to rebuild Jerusalem Wall and Streets: which Commandment was consequently the Commandment from the Going forth of which the first VII Weeks of this Prophecy take their BEGINNING.

Having in the former Chapter established the literal sense of the words of the Commandment which went forth to rebuild Jerusalem, our next business is to enquire what Commandments, and when such Commandments did actually go forth; and then to shew as we go along what agreeableness there is between them, or any of them, and the express Character of the Commandment spoken of in the Prophecy as setting forth such literal Rebuilding as therein predicted.

As therefore there were four, and no more than four solemn Commandments to this purpose, (as it hath been before noted) we will consider each of them at large in the order as they were granted, and their Agreeableness, or Disagreeableness in their respective turns with the Commandment mention'd in the Prophecy before us.

From which particular Consideration, and Enquiry it will appear,

First, negatively, which was not such Commandment, or in other words, which three of the four Commandments mention'd in the holy Scriptures at any time to have gone out from the Kings of Persia in favour of Jerusalem, could not possibly be the Commandment meant in this Prophecy. And

Secondly, Affirmatively, which was really and truly that very Commandment here predicted that it should go forth to rebuild Jerusalem, and when such Commandment did actually go forth.

First, It is here to be shewn negatively which three of the four Commandments that are mention'd in Scripture to have gone forth in favour of Jerusalem could not be that Commandment here immediately predicted that it should go forth to rebuild Jerusalem, the Wall and the Streets thereof.

And
And these three Commandments, which were not any of them the Commandments intended in this Prophecy, were in general the three first of them; there being no manner of Agreeableness between the EXPRESS CHARACTER of the Prophetic Commandment, and the respective Matters, or several Commissions granted in any of them: As will appear by considering them particularly in their order.

First then of that Commandment, or Decree which went forth in the first year of Cyrus King of Persia. That was not the Commandment refer’d to in this Prophecy, as is evident from the substance of that Decree, which I shall therefore here give at large, as we find it in holy writ: even in the book of Ezra: which in his account thereof, in the first chapter of his book, is as followeth, viz.

(Ver. 1.) In the first year of Cyrus (that the word of the Lord by the mouth of Jeremiah (a) might be fulfilled) the Lord stirred up the spirit of Cyrus King of Persia, that he made a Proclamation throughout all his Kingdom, and put it also in writing, saying,

(Ver. 2.) Thus saith Cyrus King of Persia, The Lord God of Heaven hath given me all the Kingdoms of the earth, and be hath (b) charged me to build him an House at Jerusalem, which is in Judah.

(Ver. 3.) Who is there among you of all his people? His God be with him, and let him go up to Jerusalem, which is in Judah, and build the House of the Lord God of Israel.

(Ver. 4.) And whatsoever remaineth in any place where he sojourneth, let the men of his place help him with silver, and with gold, and with goods, and with beasts, besides the free-will offering for the House of God that is in Jerusalem.

We read the like words in 2 Chron. xxxvi. 22, 23. so far as the words GO UP in the middle of the 3d verfe.

This is the Proclamation of Cyrus King of Persia in favour of the Jews. But it evidently hath regard to the TEMPLE at Jerusalem; and the TEMPLE only.

Cyrus himself here takes nothing more to himself than what immediately, and only regards the TEMPLE. So ver. 2. The Lord hath charged me to BUILD Him an HOUSE at Jerusalem.

His immediate Licence to the Jews to return to Jerusalem respects only their building the TEMPLE, ver. 3. to build the HOUSE of the Lord, &c.—And so likewise, ver. 4. Provision is made for no other building than that of the HOUSE of GOD.

And in the record of Cyrus which was laid up at Ecbatana, and sought for after, and found by Darius, of which Ezra gives us an account (Ch. vi. 3.) there is no regard had to the building of the City, only the TEMPLE at Jerusalem. For so we read, In the first year of Cyrus the King, the same Cyrus the King made a Decree concerning the HOUSE of GOD at Jerusalem, Let the HOUSE be builded, the place where they offer’d Sacrifices, and let the foundations thereof be strongly laid, &c.

(a) Ch. xxv. 12. and xxix. 10. (b) Haiah, ch. xlv. 28. and lv. 12, 13.
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So that by Cyrus here was only a solemn Commandment or Decree issued forth for the rebuilding the Temple at Jerusalem. As God by his Prophet Isaiah had foretold of him, so he being God's Instrument (his Shepherd as he is called by God himself, If. xlv. 28.) did accordingly take it upon him to conduct God's people home, as a Shepherd doth his flock; that they might build an House for God(a).

So that this COMMANDMENT of Cyrus respecting only the Temple at Jerusalem, could not be the Commandment immediately referre'd to in this Prophecy, the EXPRESS CHARACTER whereof is to rebuild Jerusalem, (not the Temple, as was the whole and sole Purpose of Cyrus's Decree, as we have now seen from the Contents of it, but) the City of Jerusalem, even the wall and streets thereof, as are the EXPRESS WORDS of the COMMANDMENT in the Prophecy. Besides, as the first seven Weeks of this Prophecy are in the (b) second Period of these Weeks reckon'd in a continued reckoning upon the LXII Weeks, after which the MESSIAH was to be CUT OFF. And whereas the said 7 Weeks, and 62 Weeks must necessarily take their BEGINNING from the Going forth of the COMMANDMENT to rebuild Jerusalem WALL and STREETS, this being the EXPRESS CHARACTER whereunto we are pinned down in the Prophecy for such BEGINNING. It is evident from hence also that the COMMANDMENT which went forth in favour of Jerusalem in the first year of Cyrus, (viz. in the year before the V. Æ. of Chríst, 536.) can never be the COMMANDMENT referre'd to in this Prophecy; forasmuch as no Reckoning of the 7 Weeks and 62 Weeks, or 483 Years by any kind of year whatsoever from that COMMANDMENT or DECREE of Cyrus can ever be brought to reach this great EVENT of Christ's Death in the year of the V. Æ. of Chríst 33.

Neither can the Computation of these Weeks be begun from the going forth of that Commandment, or Decree which was granted in favour of Jerusalem by Darius King of Persia.

Now whereas there were three Kings of Persia of that name, viz. Darius Hystaspis, Darius Notthus, and Darius Codomannus, It might here be enquir'd which of the three he was who granted this Decree. But this being of very little purpose to us in the case now before us, And whereas the learned Dr. Prideaux hath sufficiently proved (c) that it was Darius Hystaspis, and that it could be no other who granted this second DECREE in favour of the Jews, the Reader may therefore be pleased to acquiesce in it. And any one that desireth farther

I 3

(a) As for that other Text in Isaiah, ch. xlv. 13. wherein it is said of Cyrus also, that he shall build my City, I shall have occasion to speak particularly to that hereafter; as it was no other than consequential upon building of the Temple. And Cyrus took no manner of notice of it therefore, as his great and principal concern was only for the Temple, or House of God. (b) See above. (c) Con. Hist. Vol. 1. p. 270, 60.
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satisfaction herein I refer him to Mr. Dean's excellent book of the
Connection of History, &c. in the place before noted.

Now that this DECREE granted by Darius Hystaspis (in the 2d
of his reign according to some, in his 3d according to others, and
in his 4th according to others) could not be the COMMAND-
MENT or DECREE refer'd to in this Prophecy, is evident from
the same reasons whereby it was just now shewn that the former
Commandment or Decree granted by Cyrus could not be the Command-
ment of the Prophecy. For

First, The substance of this Decree was the same with the former.
It related only to the TEMPLE, the continuation of the building
thereof: not as doth the COMMANDMENT in the Prophecy to
the building Jerusalem, the WALL and STREETS of it.

This evidently appears from the DECREE it self, which as we
find it in the sixth chapter of the book of Ezra is as followeth,
(Ver. 7.) Darius the King made a DECREE—[Here is giv'n an ac-
count of his search after Cyrus his Decree, and of that Decree also, ver.
2, 3, 4, 5. And next his order thereupon to the Jews Adversaries, to
give the Jews no farther disturbance, ver. 6. which is the Introduction
of this DECREE: Then followeth the DECREE it self.]

(Ver. 8.) Let the work of this HOUSE of God alone. Let the Go-
vernour of the Jews and the Elders of the Jews build this House of
God in his place.

(Ver. 9.) Moreover I make a DECREE what ye shall do to the
Elders of those Jews for the building of this HOUSE of GOD; that of
the Kings Goods, even of the tribute beyond the River, forthwith ex-
penses be giv'n unto these men that they be not binded. And

(Ver. 10.) That which they have need of, both young bullocks and
rams, and lambs for the burnt Offerings of the God of Heaven, wheat,
salt, wine, and oil, according to the appointment of the Priests, which
are at Jerusalem, let it be giv'n them day by day without fail.

(Ver. 11.) That they may offer sacrifices of sweet favours unto the
God of Heaven, and pray for the life of the King, and of his Sons.

(Ver. 12.) And the God that hath caused his name to dwell there,
destroy all Kings and the people that shall put to their hand, to alter and to
DESTROY this HOUSE of GOD, which is at Jerusalem. I Darius
have made a DECREE, let it be done with speed.

This DECREE was sent by Darius to the Governours beyond the
River (ver. 6.) And in pursuance, and execution thereof, the Elders
of the Jews build; And they prospered through the prophecying of
Haggai the Prophet, and Zechariah the son of Iddo. And they build-
ed, and finished it (the TEMPLE) even the HOUSE of GOD, which
was finished on the third day of the month Adar, which was in the sixth
year of the reign of Darius the King: As we read expressly at the 14th
and 15th verses of this Chapter.

So that here we have the DECREE of Darius in favour of Jer-
usalem from the Beginning to the End of it. But as we see through-
out, it related only to the BUILDING the HOUSE of God at
Jerusalem.
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Jerusalem, and to the making provision for the sacrifices thereof. It concern’d Jerusalem not in the least, as to the rebuilding her Wall and Streets. Therefore it could not be the Commandment, refer’d to by the Angel in the Prophecy before us.

Nor could it be so.

Secondly, Because as in the former Computation as to Cyrus his Decree, so here no Computation of the VII Weeks, and LXII Weeks, or 483 years in continued reckoning, taking the same from the Decree granted by Darius (whether in his 2d, or 3d, or 4th, it matters not here which) can ever reach the Cutting off the Messiah in the year of the V. æ. of Christ 33: As it ought to do in the case before us, that being the Grand Event of the said 7 Weeks, and 62 Weeks, or 483 years, as it will be (a) hereafter shewn. For Darius Hystaspis began his reign in the year before the V. æ. of Christ 521. So that exclusive of the 33 years, from thence (viz. from the æ. V. Christi) till Christ’s death, the said 7 Weeks, and 62 Weeks, or 483 years are already much exceeded.

But should any one think with Scaliger, that Darius Nothus granted this second Decree in favour of Jerusalem, and not Darius Hystaspis, the answer in this case is on the other side, viz. not as to excess, but defect or want of coming up to the precise time of the 7 Weeks, and 62 Weeks, or 483 Years, which according to the Prophecy before us were to intervene between the going forth of the therein mention’d Commandment, and the Cutting off the Messiah. For Darius Nothus began to reign so late as in the year before the V. æ. of Christ 423.

Besides, as the Commandment or Decree granted by Darius was not in his first year, so here would be a farther Defect of one, or two, or three years, just as one shou’d fix the going forth of the said Commandment, or Decree either to the second, or else the third, or otherwise to the fourth year of his reign.

And as to the last of the three Darius’s, viz. Darius Codomannus, it is certain that it could not be He who granted this Decree. For the Defect would be still greater as to him, than we have observ’d it to be as to Darius Nothus: forasmuch as that Darius Codomannus, did not begin to reign till the year before the V. æ. of Christ 335.

Nor

3dly, Can the Computation of the VII Weeks be begun from that Commandment or Decree which went forth in favour of Jerusalem in the 7th year of (b) Artaxerxes (Longimanus) King of Persia. As
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(a) Viz. When we treat of the ending of the 7 Weeks, and 62 Weeks, as the Messiah by this Prophecy was to be cut off precisely after the said 7 Weeks, and 62 Weeks reckoned from the going forth of the Commandment to rebuild Jerusalem. (b) There having been 3 Artaxerxes’s as well as 3 Darius’s, which according to ancient Historians reign’d over the Empire of the Persians, viz. Artax. Longimanus, Artax. Mneemon, and Artax. Othus; it might therefore have been enquir’d here which of the three it was that granted this Decree to Ezra, in his 7th; and another to Nehemiah in his 20th. But the learned Mr. Dean of Norwich, (p. 379) having shewn that the Artax, who granted
will evidently be made to appear from the following Considerations, viz.

First. The Character of the Commission by him granted to Ezra is in no wise agreeing with the Character of the Commandment refer'd to in the Prophecy.

The Character refer'd to in the Prophecy is the rebuilding Jerusalem; but the Commission granted to Ezra evidently respects the Temple: and that only in the Endowment of it: It hath not any the least respect to the CITY of Jerusalem, to the building either the Wall, or the Streets thereof; as witness the Decree it self, as it is here transcrib'd out of the 7th Chapter of the Book of Ezra.

(Ver. 11.) Now this is the Copy of the Letter that the King Artaxerxes gave unto Ezra the Priest, &c.

(Ver. 12.) Artaxerxes King of Kings, unto Ezra the Priest, a scribe of the Law of the God of Heaven, perfect peace, and at such a time.

(Ver. 13.) I make a Decree that all they of the people of Israel, and of his Priests, and Levites in my Realm, which are minded of their own free-will to go up to Jerusalem, go with thee.

(Ver. 14.) Forasmuch as thou art sent of the King, and of his seven Counsellors, to enquire concerning Judah, and Jerusalem according to the Law of thy God, which is in thine hand.

(Ver. 15.) And to carry the Silver and Gold, which the King and his Counsellors have freely offer'd unto the God of Israel, whose Habitation is in Jerusalem.

(Ver. 16.) And all the Silver and Gold that thou canst find in all the Province of Babylon, with the free-will offering of the people, and of the Priests, offering willingly for the House of their God which is in Jerusalem.

(Ver. 17.) That thou mayst buy speedily with this money bullocks, rams, lambs, with their meat Offerings, and their drink Offerings, and offer them upon the Altar of the House of your God which is in Jerusalem.

(Ver. 18.) And whatsoever shall seem good to thee, and to thy Brethren to do with the rest of the Silver and Gold, that do after the will of your God.

(Ver. 19.) The Vessels also that are given thee for the service of the House of thy God, those deliver thou before the God of Jerusalem.

(Ver. 20.) And whatsoever more shall be needful for the House of thy God, which thou shalt have occasion to bestow, bestow it out of the Kings treasure House.

(Ver. granted these Decrees was certainly he who was contemporary with Esdras the High-Priest of the Jews, he being High-Priest at the time (Neh. xii. 10, 22) when Nehemiah came to Jerusalem with his Decree; and whereas this fame Artaxerxes could be no other than Artax. Longimanni who reign'd immediately after Xerxes over the Persian Empire, our Enquiry on this Account is truly needless.—— I only add here that no reasoning upwards from the death of Christ to the going forth of the Commandment in the 20th of Artaxerxes according to the Prophecy before us can possibly meet the said 20th in the reign of any other Artaxerxes, than that of Artax. Longimanni.
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(Ver. 21.) And I, even I Artaxerxes the King do make a Decree to all the Treasurers which are beyond the river, that whatsoever Ezra the Priest, the scribe of the Law of the God of Heaven shall require of you, it be done speedily.

(Ver. 22.) Unto an hundred talents of silver, and to an hundred measures of wheat, and to an hundred baths of wine, and to an hundred baths of oil, and salt without prescribing how much.

(Ver. 23.) whatsoever is commanded by the God of Heaven, Let it be diligently done, for the House of the God of Heaven: for why should there be wrath against the realm of the King, and his sons?

(Ver. 24.) Also we certify you that touching any of the Priests, and Levites, Singers, Porters, Netophim, or Ministers of this House of God, it shall not be lawful to impose toll, tribute, or custom upon them.

(Ver. 25.) And, thou Ezra, after the wisdom of thy God, that is unto thine hand, set Magistrates, and Judges which may judge all the people that are beyond the River, all such as know the laws of thy God; And teach ye them that know them not.

(Ver. 26.) And whatsoever will not do the law of thy God, and the law of the King, let judgement be executed speedily upon him, whether it be unto death, or to banishment, or to confiscation of Goods, or to imprisonement.

This is the DECREES of King Artaxerxes granted unto Ezra in the seventh year of his reign. The same gives full liberty to the Jews to return to Jerusalem, ver. 13.

It exempts all the Priests, and Levites, and the rest mention'd, ver. 24. the Ministers of the House of God from toll, tribute, and custom. It makes immediate provision for the TEMPLE, for the endowment thereof, even for the endowment of the HOUSE of the GOD of Heaven, ver. 23.

This is the main intent, and purpose of it. ver. 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 23.

Ezra himself speaks of it as such.

(Ver. 27.) Blessed be the Lord God of our Fathers, which hath put such a thing as this in the King's heart, to beautifie the HOUSE of the LORD which is in Jerusalem. As therefore the Contents of this DECREES do evidently relate to the TEMPLE: As they do not in the least answer to the EXPRESS CHARACTER of the prophetick COMMANDMENT, viz. the building of JERUSALEM, the WALL and STREETS thereof, as there is not any the least Licence allowed for, nor mention therein made of such Building. It is from hence sufficiently evident that this could not be the COMMANDMENT referred to in this Prophecy. —Nor could it be so.

Secondly, Forasmuch as the Effects of Ezra's Commission consequent thereupon do not in the least answer to the EXPRESS CHARACTER of the prophetick COMMANDMENT, viz. the literal express Character of Building Jerusalem, the Wall and Streets thereof.
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For notwithstanding the great things that He did as a Scribe learned in the law, and as a Priest, after his coming to Jerusalem with this Commission, notwithstanding his reviving, and restoring, and establishing the Jewish law and worship, which had been in a manner extinguished, and lost in the Babylonish Captivity; notwithstanding his mighty regulation of the many great disorders and confusions which he found among them upon his coming to Jerusalem, notwithstanding his zealous Reformation of the manners of God's people. Finally, notwithstanding all that he did either in Church, or State by virtue of this Commission granted him by King Artaxerxes in the 7th year of his reign, yet still in all this the end of the Commandment which is immediately referred to in this Prophecy was in no wise fulfilled. Because notwithstanding all these great and mighty things done by this holy and learned man, notwithstanding all his good Confessions, yet still Jerusalem was without her ʌɪ̯ [Her Wall]; without her ʌɪ̯ [Her Streets] still in Ezra's time in a defenceless condition for want of the former, still in a naked condition for want of the latter. And thus dismanted as she was, the was still a reproach to all her Enemies round about her.

Nor could it be otherwise with her, notwithstanding any thing that could be done by virtue of this Commandment granted to Ezra; there being nothing at all therein enabling or empowering him to take it off by rebuilding Jerusalem, Wall and Streets: forasmuch as we have above shewn from the Letter thereof, that the same immediately respected the Temple only, and the endowment of it.

Nor, Thirdly, Could this Commandment granted to Ezra be the Commandment referred to in this Prophecy, forasmuch as no Reckoning upwards of the VII Weeks and LXII Weeks, or 49 Years, and 434 years [or in conjoined reckoning of 483 years] from the death of Christ can ever be brought by any reckoning whatsoever to find the 7th of Artaxerxes in which year Ezra had his Commission. For that same year, viz. the 7th of Artaxerxes answers to the year before the V. A. of Christ 458 (a): But adding thereunto only 32 full years of Christ, It makes full 490 Years, which is one whole Week, or seven full years above the 7 Weeks, and 62 Weeks, or 483 years.

(a) Truly so according to Ptolemies's Canon, and in Dr. Prideaux's reckoning whole Year of the Julian Period answering to the said seventh of Artaxerxes is therefore the year 4276. And could the whole seventy Weeks of this Prophecy, or any of them date their beginning from the 7th of Artaxerxes, they must certainly be begun with Dr. Prideaux from the said year of the Julian Period, even because it is the year thereof corresponding with the 7th of Artaxerxes according to Ptolemies's Canon. And I do therefore note this here on account of Mr. L. his unreasonable departure from Ptolemies's Canon in his six years difference from it, and Dr. Prideaux, in the said 7th of Artaxerxes. For whereas Dr. Prideaux who ends the whole 70 Weeks in the death of Christ hath begun them in the 7th of Artaxerxes in his Julian year now mention'd thereunto truly corresponding, to Mr. L. who ends only sixty nine Weeks, and one half of the seventieth Week in the death of Christ, hath begun them also in the 7th of Artaxerxes, but for the sake of his Hypothesis, in another Julian year by him made to correspond with the said seventh, viz. the year of the Julian Period, 4250. The Prophecy is evidently against them both in such beginning, and in such ending of their re-
which went forth in favour of Jerusalem.

AFTER which, according to the Prophecy, Christ was to be cut off. But of this more in its proper place, when we come to treat immediately concerning the Beginning of the 7 Weeks, and 62 Weeks. However we cannot but take notice of this just Objection here, because as it is there an Argument against the Beginning of the 69 Weeks reckoned together, so it is here equally against the Beginning the first 7 Weeks of those 69 Weeks from the 7th of Artaxerxes; forasmuch as both those Periods have one and the same Beginning, as it hath been already observ'd by us in our entrance upon this work; and also forasmuch as those two periods, and those two periods only were according to the Prophecy before us to have their End in Christ's death, as it will be fully shewn hereafter.

The Unaptness, and great Uncertainty of which figurative Beginning of these VII Weeks will be yet farther apparent, when I come hereafter to consider their Ending also, even in Dr. Prideaux's own figurative Ending of them in correspondence with this his figurative Beginning of them.

However from what hath been now said on this occasion, it may perhaps be already sufficiently evident that the first seven Weeks of this Prophecy with which we are now immediately concern'd, cannot possibly have their Beginning from the 7th of Artaxerxes.

As therefore it was before shewn that the said VII Weeks cannot possibly take their Beginning from those other Commandments or Decrees which went forth in favour of Jerusalem first by Cyrus, afterwards by Darius, and as we have now shewn that they cannot rightly be begun from that Commandment or Decree which went forth in the 7th of Artaxerxes, the Contents of this, and of those Commissions in no wise answering to the Express Character of the Commandment to which we are pinn'd down in the Prophecy before us, viz. the Character of the Going forth of the Commandment to rebuild Jerusalem, Wall, and Streets, there being not any the least Scripture foundation for the same, nor (as I have also shewn) any other sufficient grounds either from the Sense of the words, or from any thing else thereunto inducing, we may now have done with the first thing propos'd above to be shewn under this Consideration, namely the Negative, or which three of the four Commandments or Decrees mention'd by Ezra, and Nehemiah, by one, or other of them,

specific Periods of these Weeks. But there is this especially lying against Mr. L. his beginning of his period, that he hath evidently departed from Ptolemy's Canon as above, but indeed without any sufficient ground for it: This might be shewn here, now I am treating of the beginning of the first seven Weeks of this Prophecy. But whereas Mr. L. hath taken no notice in his treatise immediately of either the beginning, or ending of the said first seven Weeks, and hath begun his period of sixty nine Weeks, and a half, which he makes to end in the death of Christ from his 7th of Artaxerxes in a groundless presumption of correcting Ptolemy's Canon, I shall postpone what I have to say on this occasion to the second part of this treatise, wherein I am to set forth the Prophetic beginning and ending of the seven Weeks, and sixty-two Weeks of this Prophecy; which sixty-nine Weeks in the express Letter thereof, as they do certainly end in the death of Christ, so they do necessarily begin not in any 7th of Artaxerxes, but really in the twentieth of that King's reign, according to Ptolemy's Canon in the sure account of those times by him therein giv'n us.
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to have gone forth in favour of Jerusalem could not be the Commandment refer'd to in this Prophecy.

I am to shew,

Secondly, in the Affirmative, which was that Commandment or Grant which of all others is most likely to be that expressly spoken of, or refer'd to in the Prophecy: or when was truly the Going forth of the Commandment to rebuild Jerusalem, Wall and Streets. And this from what hath been before said on this matter is self-evident.

For, since as it hath been shewn, there were but four Commandments granted in favour of Jerusalem by the Kings of Persia, from one of which the Computation of these Weeks must doubtless be begun; And since, as it hath been also shewn, they cannot take their Computation from any of the former three Commandments, already mention'd. Hence it necessarily follows that the VII Weeks now before us must have their Beginning from that other Commandment which went forth after those three which preceded it, viz. from that Commandment which went forth to rebuild Jerusalem, the Wall and Streets thereof, in the 20th year of Artaxerxes (Longimana) King of Persia.

And herein we are confirm'd, as there is a perfect Agreement between the Prophetic Commandment and the Commission which by King Artaxerxes was then granted, and issued out to Nebemiab, the Tirithatha, or Governour, beyond what can possibly be found in any of the three other Grants, or Commandments above-mention'd: those Grants, (as it hath been fully shew'd in the opening of them) respecting only the Temple, that of Cyrus the building of it, that of Darius the continuation of the building, that of Artaxerxes in the 7th year of his reign, the Endowment of it; whereas this in the 20th of the said King's reign was the only one which immediately respected the CITY of Jerusalem, and the building of her Wall and Streets: which were accordingly rebuilt by Nebemiab in pursuance of the said Commission then granted to him.

A perfect Agreement here, between the Prophecy and this Commission. Not an imaginary one only, as Dr. Prideaux conceives it to be (a), but a real literal Agreeableness: As the matter of fact in an exact and full completion of the Prophetic Commandment by Nebemiab in the letter of it abundantly demonstrates.

The Prophetic Commandment (as I have largely shewn) must be taken in a literal sense. But taken in such literal sense such Commandment never did go forth before the 20th of Artaxerxes. Then it actually did go forth; to the full empowering Nebemiab to rebuild Jerusalem, its Wall and Streets: As is fully evident from Nebemiab's Petition to the King on this occasion, and the King's free Grant thereupon.

For Nebemiab's Petition was that King Artaxerxes would send him unto Judah, unto the CITI of his father's Sepulchre, that he might

BUILD
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BUILD it. (Neh. xi. 5.) And also that the King's Letter might be given him, unto Alaph the Keeper of the King's forest, that he might give him timber to make beams for the gates of the Palace which appertaineth to the House; and for the Wall of the City; and for the House that he should enter into. And the King granted him according to the good hand of his God upon him, ver. 8.

So that nothing can be plainer than that this Petition of Nebemiah, and the King's Grant thereupon immediately respected the City of Jerusalem, and the building thereof, the depopulated, waste, broad and spacious places or Streets thereof as they had been made by the Babylonians, and so remain'd till Nebemiah's now coming thither, (ver. 5.) and the Wall, the Wall of the City, of which she had been by them also dismantled, and still was; till this great Restorer of both under God now came with a Commandment from the King of Persia for that very end and purpose, ver. 8.

And this is the very substance of the Prophetic Commandment before us. The end of the going forth of that was for the rebuilding of Jerusalem, the Wall, and Streets thereof: The same is here the matter of Nebemiah's Petition, and the King's immediate Grant, or Order thereupon: And this great and consummate Governor fully executed the royal Command. In pursuance thereof he presently went up to the City of his fathers, and forthwith set upon this his desired work of rebuilding it. And with what prudent conduct, with what unusual application, with what astonish- ing dispatch the Wall of Jerusalem was rebuilt, and the rebuilding also of her Streets how effectually it was provided for, and put forward by Nebemiah by virtue of this Order by him obtain'd from the King of Persia, the History thereof as recorded by this faithful Historian, as well as able Statesman, abundantly testifies. And therefore in all reason it is to be hence concluded that the Commandment granted to Nebemiah by Artaxerxes (Longimanus) King of Persia in the 20th year of his reign for the Building Jerusalem, the Wall, and the Streets thereof, is the very Prophetic Commandment now before us. And consequently as such it is the Commandment, from the going forth whereof of the VII Weeks now immediately under consideration are necessarily to date their beginning.

And this being thus settled, I might therefore now according to my propos'd method proceed immediately to consider the Ending of the said VII Weeks, had not Dr. Prideaux here thrown an Objection in the way against this Commandment being the Prophetic Commandment, by imagining (b) and arguing for a twofold different Commission granted to Nebemiah, the one for the rebuilding of the Wall, the other for the rebuilding the City of Jerusalem, and also had he not elsewhere (c) urg'd other Objections against the same. I must therefore a while suspend my farther proceeding 'till I shall have

(a) Neh. ch. iv. vi. vii. and xi.  (b) Con. Hist. p. 367, and 368.  (c) p. 269, 387, 481.
Objections answer'd.

have consider'd, and replied to these Objections; which that I may
do the more fully, and distinctly, I shall throw them together, and
make them the immediate Subject of the following Chapter.

CHAP. IV.

Wherein are consider'd, and answer'd Dr. Prideaux's Objections to the beginning of these Weeks from the twentieth Year of Artaxerxes [Longimanes] King of Persia.

It was shewn in the foregoing Chapter that the first seven Weeks of this Prophecy must date their beginning from the going forth of the Commandment to rebuild Jerusalem; viz. from that very Commandment which in the true literal (a) sense thereof went forth from King Artaxerxes in the 20th year of his reign with his full, and express Licence, Protection, and Authority to Nehemiah for the rebuilding the Walls, and Streets of that City.

But here the learned Mr. Dean hath put a nice, but if I mistake not, a needless and groundless Observation in our way, as if the Commandment granted to Nehemiah by King Artaxerxes for the building Jerusalem, the Wall, and Streets thereof, was not one and the same Commandment: or in other words, as if there were two Commandments for the same, the one for the building the Wall, the other for the building the City of Jerusalem: and as if Nehemiah after that he had built the Wall in the 20th of Artaxerxes, went then back again to the King, and obtain'd a new Commission for the building of the Streets of Jerusalem, and which he did not execute till the next year, viz. the 21st of Artaxerxes.

And this Supposition Mr. Dean hath supported by telling us (b),

First, That the TIME set Nehemiah by the King when he first obtained to be sent to Jerusalem, as expressed in the Text, plainly imports a SHORT TIME, and not that of twelve years (after which he again went unto the King) as some do interpret it.

But as to this, the Reply is easy, viz. that it is certain that this can never be proved from the Text, how PLAINLY soever Mr. Dean may think it there import'd.

The time of 12 Years as Mr. Dean observes some do interpret to be the time set Nehemiah by the King (and here I observe that the Generality of Interpreters are of this opinion) is much more plainly import'd in the Text. For as it is evident (from Nebem. ch. ii. 6.) that upon his petition to King Artaxerxes, the King set him a time, when he was now by his royal permission to go to Jerusalem,

(a) As it was shewn in the last Chapter but one.    (b) p. 367. Con. Hie.
Objections answered.

Jerusalem, so it is certain that from that time set him by the King, he was made Governor in the land of Judah. But this was in the 20th of Artaxerxes. For as we read (ch. v. 14.) He was appointed to be Governor in the land of Judah from the 20th of Artaxerxes: And as it there immediately follows, he was so appointed; even unto the two and thirtieth year of Artaxerxes the King, that is, twelve years. Accordingly He staid out this his appointed time. For not 'till the expiration thereof, and his Commission with it, then, and not before, for any thing that can possibly be found to the contrary in the Text, he return'd to the Persian Court. For thus we read (ch. xiii. 6.) that in the two and thirtieth year of Artaxerxes King of Babylon, He came unto the King. But we no where find that he went back before this time. Nor is it in the least likely that he should go back before, for any thing that there is in Mr. Dean's next reason for the sending Nehemiah back for a new Commission to build the streets of Jerusalem after that he had built the Wall, viz.

Secondly, because He appointed Governors of the City as soon as the walls were built. And this (adds Mr. Dean) EVIDENTLY implies that he went back from thence, and was absent for some time. For had he still continued at Jerusalem, he would not have needed any Deputies to govern the place.

Now as touching this reason, It is certain (from Neb. vii. 2.) that the Government of the City here so much insisted on by Mr. Dean as giv'n by Nehemiah to persons by him thereunto appointed was in truth nothing else but a Charge about watching and opening the Gates of Jerusalem, and the keeping watch and ward on the towers, and walls now set up again by Nehemiah. For to this purpose we read (in the place just now mention'd) that Nehemiah gave his brother Hanani, and Hananiah the Ruler of the Palace CHARGE over Jerusalem: Which Charge was as followeth (ver. 3.) Let not the Gates of Jerusalem be opened until the Sun be set: and while they (a) stand by, Let them shut the Doors, and bar them, and appoint Watches of the Inhabitants of Jerusalem, Every One in his Watch,

(a) While they stand by—ipsis adhibet prefectis (Caf.' Verf.)—Nempe Heman, and Hananiah. (Grot.)

This was indeed a troublesome Office for men of such rank and quality as we may suppose these two here named to be, the One of them being brother to the Governor, the Other the Ruler of the Palace, (Neb. vii. 2.) to see to the daily execution of it in their own persons. But if they did, we should the less wonder, when we consider the present state of Jerusalem, as the strictest faithfulness, vigilance, and carefulness for her Security was full necessary. And it was no disparagement for the most honourable persons under the Tryphatha night and morning to see this charge by him committed to them, duly put in execution.

But the words in the Text of standing by, may be meant of other Officers therunto immediately appointed by Hanani, and Hananiah, as we may very reasonably suppose the Tryphatha to have lodg'd a power in their Hands of appointing such inferior Officers under them: On whose fidelity and care therein, they might depend.

However, in whether of the two Seneses we take the words, there is nothing in either that doth in the least imply, much less EVIDENTLY imply Nehemiah's leaving Jerusalem, even therefore because he made this provision for the security of the City; for surely he might very properly give this charge, and yet he himself still continue at Jerusalem.
Objections answer'd.

Watch, and Every One to be over against his House. But surely this Government or Charge in this particular for a due provision of the Security of the City doth in no wise imply, far is it from EVIDENTLY implying (as are Mr. Dean's words) that Nebemiah now left it for a time, and return'd to Persia in the 20th of Artaxerxes. For what he now did on this account was in truth no more than what as a prudent, and watchful Governour he ought to have done now upon his having set up the Gates and Walls of Jerusalem, and what therefore he doubtless did do even notwithstanding he himself still continued at Jerusalem. For that the Gates of the City should be duly shut and opened, that watch and ward should be kept on the towers and walls, &c. this the common and necessary defence and security of the City did require, whether the Governour himself were there, or not. But it was not for him in person to see to the daily execution of this necessary provision for the Security of the City. It was sufficient for him to commit the oversight thereof to certain chosen (a) and faithful Officers, as he now did, who either in their own persons, or by persons by them thereunto immediately appointed should Effectually see his Orders executed. But Nebemiah's Absence, or Presence is in no wise deducible from this charge: because this Provision for the security of the City, whether the Governour was there or not, was equally necessary in both cases. And therefore nothing as to Nebemiah's return now from Jerusalem to Persia can be truly and properly inferred from his giving this Charge to the Persons above-named: However in Mr. Dean's Opinion the same be here EVIDENTLY implied.—I beg leave freely to expatiate a little upon this matter.

It hath been here already noted that Mr. Dean upon his now sending away Nebemiah to Jerusalem hath actually invested Hanani, and Hananiab with an absolute Government of the City in his absence. Now this Mr. Dean hath done merely of his own authority, for he hath giv'n us none for it. Had he giv'n us any authority from Scripture, It must, I conceive, have been that of Nebemiah (ch. vii. 2.) But there as we have seen only mention is made of a certain Charge giv'n by Nebemiah to Hanani and Hananiab: And what that particular Charge was it follows in the next verse (vix. ver. 3.) As the same consisted of Nebemiah's positive orders, or settled rules concerning the opening, and shutting of the Gates of Jerusalem, &c. Which was doubtless the very Charge, and the only Charge giv'n to Hanani and Hananiab in ver. 2. by Nebemiah before his leaving Jerusalem, were we to suppose him now at all to have left it. But here Mr. Dean by a very particular distinction—

(a) For such these Men were. Nebemiah doubtless knew his brother to be such. And he bears testimony of Hananiab that he was so too: for (as he tells us, ch. vii. 2.) he was a faithful man, and feared God above many. But the nearness of relation might perhaps make the good man forbear saying so much of his Brother: tho' without all question, he was worthy of the like Character. Nebemiah otherwise would not have entrusted him with such a charge.
Objections answered.

An absolute Government of Jerusalem for Hanani, and Hananiah delegated to them by Nehemiah before his sending him back to the Persian Court (which Delegation of such absolute Government in his absence must be founded on the verse last quoted, if founded upon any Scripture foundation at all) hath after that deferred the execution of this one and the same charge in verse 3, 'till Nehemiah's return from the Persian Court, as if such charge had not been already delegated in verse 2 to Hanani, and Hananiah. For to this purpose Mr. Dean hath told us, (p. 368. l. 2.) viz. that the first thing that be (Nehemiah) did (viz. after his return to Jerusalem from the Persian Court) was to provide for the Security of the City, which he had now fortified, by settling rules for the opening, and shutting of the Gates, and for the keeping Watch, and Ward on the Towers, and walls, (Neb. vii. 3.)

So that indeed not a little freedom is here taken with Nehemiah, and with these two verses of his book.

An absolute Government of the City is found out in verse 2 for Hanani, and Hananiah. And a separate Charge given by Nehemiah in verse 3. The former supposed to be delegated, upon his now taking a journey to Persia: The Latter not given 'till his return to Jerusalem. The Absence of the Governor is all this while between verse 2, and verse 3. And yet after all, the latter verse is really and truly but one and the same continued matter with the former, or an Explanation, or giving the particulars of that Charge which had been before but just mentioned or barely named in it. Here is found out a Government in one place merely for the sake of sending away Nehemiah upon his imaginary Journey therefore magnified and enlarged into the Government of the City (in p. 367.) Which however upon Nehemiah's return (in the next page) is again dwindled into certain Rules now, and not before given by him for the opening and shutting of the Gates of Jerusalem, &c. as we read Mr. Dean's words in the page last mentioned. Here is in all this a most improbable Assertion of Nehemiah's leaving Jerusalem, after he had set up the Walls and Gates thereof, without giving those his former mentioned Rules concerning them 'till after his Return.

And do we think it likely that this could be as it is here thus represented—Can we conceive of this great and watchful Governor that he should go away from Jerusalem, and leave this necessary part of his Government thus omitted, and postponed by him 'till after his return?—The Text surely gives us to understand the contrary. It is evident from hence that the Walls and Gates of the City were no sooner set up by him, but he gave an immediate, and full charge concerning them.

For to Nehemiah hath expressly informed us herein, viz. (ch. vii. 1.) that it came to pass that when the WALL was built, &c. then (as it follows verse 2.) he gave his brother Hanani and Hananiah the ruler of the Palace CHARGE over Jerusalem, viz. (as it immediately
Objections answer'd.

Immediately follows in the next verse) the CHARGE of duly shutting, and opening the Gates, and of keeping the necessary watch and ward. So that Nehemiah most certainly made much better provision for the security of the City, than Mr. Dean hath here supposed him to have done, whether he now went from, or stayed at Jerusalem. And as to the former, It is certain that it is no wise to be concluded from Mr. Dean's here assign'd reason for it, to the separation of the Contents of verse 3, from verse 2; to the making verse 2 the last Act that Nehemiah did before his going, and verse 3 the first Act he did upon his return. For both those Verses, as it hath been already observ'd, are doubtless One, and the same Charge: verse 3, being the particulars of the Charge barely mention'd, or nam'd in verse 2.

Nor Thirdly, is Mr. Dean's remaining (a) reason for the proving Nehemiah's return to Persia in the twentieth of Artaxerxes more effectual thereunto, than have been the two former; viz. his imagined Want of a new Commission for Nehemiah to rebuild the Streets of Jerusalem, the building of the Walls thereof (in Mr. Dean's opinion) being ALL for which he prayed his first Commission. For with all due Submission be it spoken, Nehemiah could not now stand in need of a new authority thereunto empowering him, for in truth the building of the Walls of Jerusalem was NOT ALL for which he desire'd his first Commission; the building of the Streets, or Houses being what he also asked for, and obtain'd accordingly at one and the same time. The Text evidently shews it. For, as it hath been before observ'd in Nehemiah's Complaint to the King, and Petition upon such Complaint, and the King's Grant thereupon is fully included the building not only of the Walls and Gates of Jerusalem but of the City in general; and therefore of the HOUSES of the now desolate Streets, as well as the WALL thereof. Consequently here is at once remov'd such Mr. Dean's imagin'd want, or occasion of his imagin'd new Commission for Nehemiah. The Complaint of Nehemiah to the King was (as we read Neb. ii. 3.) concerning the City in general that it lay waste. His Petition to the King was general, for the City of his father's sepulchre; not barely for the Walls and Gates thereof, but for the CITY the City of his father's Sepulchre, that he might BUILD it: (ver. 5.) build all doubtless that was still in ruins, as the far greater part thereof now was. For as we learn from the Text, Not only the WALLS thereof were broken down, and the GATES thereof consum'd with fire, (ver. 13.) but the HOUSES also were not builded (b). The Text therefore fairly and naturally thus including the building of ALL, without exception; every place throughout the City that was now in ruins, Mr. Dean's Limitation of Nehemiah's Petition to the Walls, and Gates of Jerusalem might have been spair'd. The building of those only (exclusive of the Streets, or Houses of the City)

(a) p. 367, Con. Hist. (b) Ch. viii. 47
was we see not all for which be desir'd his first Commission. His Petition to the King as it was in general terms for the CITY, was doubtlesse extensive to its universal Restoration out of its present ruins, in which it had lain from its Desolation by the Babylonians: And the King's Grant thereupon (Neb. ii. 6.) was consequently no less general and extensive. For upon his petition it pleas'd the King to send him to Jerusalem. (ib.)

Nor is there any the least room from the nature, or consequences of such extended Grant to suppose the contrary. For surely it had been no odds to the King of Persia, no prejudice to his affairs, or the State of his Kingdom, to have suffer'd the House now to be rebuilded at Jerusalem, any more than, nor in truth so much as to have the Gates thereof set up, and the walls repair'd. And for all this together One and the same Grant was fully sufficient. By that Nehemias was fully empowered at once to rebuild Jerusalem, wall and Streets, and whatever else he did after Mr. Dean's imagin'd second return of him thither from the Persian Court in the twentieth of Artaxerxes. And therefore it is much more probable than not, that there was no such second Return: even because there was no occasion for any: Mr. Dean's Authority for the contrary Assertion notwithstanding.

Mr. Dean hath not indeed told us his grounds for such Assertion. It cannot be founded on any thing that hath been hitherto quoted from Nehemias's book concerning his Complaint, and Petition to the King, and the King's Grant thereupon. The Contrary as we have seen is either fully expressed, or evidently implied in them. (viz. in Ch. ii. 3, 5, 6.)

If Mr. Dean hath founded such assertion, (viz. that the building of the Walls of Jerusalem was ALL for which Nehemias desir'd his first Commission) on any Scripture Authority, It must be on the Verses immediately following: (viz. on verses 7, 8.) where-in though other particulars of Nehemias's petition, and the King's Grant thereupon be express'd mention'd, and one immediately relating to the Wall of Jerusalem, yet there is not any the least mention made in them of the Streets, and Houses thereof.

But this notwithstanding, It doth by no means hence follow that in favour of Mr. Dean's assertion Nehemias therefore did not make request to the King for the building of the Streets of Jerusalem, as well as the walls thereof, or in Mr. Dean's own words that the building of the wall, was all for which he desir'd his first Commission, because however the building of the Streets be not mention'd in these verses, yet express Petition had been made before for it, and the King's Grant thereupon obtain'd in the verses immediately foregoing: As the same contain the general Petition, and the general Grant for the CITY, as it hath been above fully prov'd. And such general Grant for the rebuilding the Streets, or Houses thereof, for that was surely rebuilding the City, was sufficient without any repetition of the same among these farther, and more
particular requests made to the King by Nebemiab here, (viz. in verses 7, 8,) which requests related either to himself, or to the pubick Security, or grandeur. He had before obtain'd an absolute Grant, upon his general petition for the building of the city of his father's Sepulchre: (as in verse 3, 5, 6.) He now took courage to the enlargement thereof in some few particulars, to the beggimg the royal favour towards himself for the security of his perion in his journey; (as in verse 7.) and for the building of the house that he should enter into at Jerusalem, that timber for the same might be allotted him out of the King's forest, (ver. 8.) also to the beggimg the same royal favour towards the pubick so far as it concern'd the royal (a) Palace, and the wall of the City, that timber might be giv'n him for them also. (ib.) And for this reason these additional Grants are here expressly mention'd; even because they were added to the former general Grant for his building the City. But when Nebemiab had thus far ventur'd upon the royal Goodness of the Periban King, and had obtain'd these necessary favours, and particularly so much of the King's Timber as was sufficient to the ues above requested, It was not for him to go on to the praying the like royal favour of Timber for the rebuilding all the desolate Streets of Jerusalem which now stood in need of being rebuilt also. No.—This would have been too much for him to have asked of the Periban King. And for this reason the royal permission which was (b) before giv'n at large to him for the rebuilding Jerusalem (the Houses, or streets thereof as well as the walls and Gates, as above-shewn) is not here particulariz'd to the express mention of the former, as of the latter: Even because the Additional Grant of Timber out of the King's forest did not extend to them, as it did to the other. Therefore it had been indeed superfluous because needless to have had it repeated in verses 7, 8, when it had been already fully, and expressly signified in those immediately foregoing. (viz. in verses 5, 6.)

Besides, As it ought to be particularly noted here by way of farther illustration hereof, (viz. that verses 7, 8, contain an enlargement of the general Grant before mention'd, verse the 7th is wher'd in with a MOREOVER.—Moreover I said unto the King, &c.—Which plainly shews that this was additional to the general Petition already granted. And from that, and the Grant thereupon before Nebemiab's going to Jerusalem, It hath been sufficiently made to appear that He had full authority giv'n him therein to build Jerusalem, even to build the Streets, as well as the Walls there-of. And therefore however to Mr. Dean It hath seem'd as if Nehe-
miah needed a new Authority for the doing whatever he did at Jeru-
alem after he had built the Walls, and therefore return'd to Perib for such new Authority, yet since as We have seen from the Text, that such imag'nd new Authority was already granted, and confe-

(a) So Groins in locum.  (b) Neh. ii. 3, 5.
Objections answer'd.

Quently there was no such Occasion for Nebemiah's return, It cannot but be most reasonably concluded that there was no such imagin'd return of him in the 20th of Artaxerxes. For the cause of such Return ceasing, the Return it self becomes needless.

And the same is render'd yet more improbable, forasmuch as Nebemiah hath not giv'n us any account, nor even the least hint thereof.—Mr. Dean indeed hath been at the pains to find out an imaginary cause of no such notice taken by Nebemiah in his book of this his suppos'd Return; even this, the SHORTNESS of his Absence. But Nebemiah's utter silence of any such his Absence from Jerusalem in the 20th of Artaxerxes is surely a stronger Argument against his second Return to Persia in that year, than is Mr. Dean's imagin'd shortness of his Absence the cause of such Silence. He would hardly have omitted so remarkable an instance of royal favour in this the King of Persia his second instance of it to Nebemiah, and God's people, had there been any such now repeated. He was doubtless a Person of too much Gratitude in that case not to have recorded it. For most certainly it was for the King's honour to have had it recorded. And it was Nebemiah's Duty accordingly to have recorded it. But questionless he was too good a man, I may add also too great a Courtier to have been wanting in this slender piece of respect, and common instance of duty to him by whom he had been always highly favour'd in his own person, and especially now of late in the King's Grant to him of all that he had begg'd at his royal hands for his City and Country. He hath gratefully and exactly recorded the King's first Commission granted to him in the 20th year of his reign: He hath also recorded another granted to him in the 32d thereof. Why then should it not be suppos'd of him that he would have been equally grateful and exact in recording Mr. Dean of Norwich's imagin'd 2d Commission granted to him by the King in the 20th year of his reign, had there been any such second Commission then delegated to him?

Surely, However Mr. Dean's PARTICULARS EVIDENTLY (a) imply Nebemiah's return to the Persian Court in the 20th of Artaxerxes, and return to Jerusalem also with a new Commission, or However they may have SEEM'D to him SUFFICIENTLY (b) to imply it. Yet after all, from what hath been said on this occasion, It is perhaps most seeming (and I hope I may say it without offence) that there was no such imagin'd Return at all now. Doubtless there was no such imagin'd second Commission for that which the (c) Text hath fully inform'd us was expressly petition'd for, and granted in the first: even in one and the same royal Licence, or Authority for the rebuilding the Wall and Streets of Jerusalem.

To what hath been now said on this point may be added One other Consideration in confirmation of it: And that is taken from the Prophecy before us, Which otherwise had not been fulfilled, had

(a) As are his words. p. 367. l. 27. (b) As in the last line but 4 of that Page. (c) Neh. ii. 31. 5.
had there been two Commandments for that, for the accomplishing
of which the Prophecy plainly speaks but of one. It is therein ex-
pressly predicted concerning One and the fame Commandment,
which should go forth to rebuild Jerusalem Wall and Streets, in the
ture litteral sense thereof, as I have formerly shewn. And such
One Only Commandment did as we have seen accordingly go forth
in the 20th of Artaxerxes. But such never did go forth before as it
hath been above also shewn: Nor could it go forth after; for this
as it hath been also shewn, was the last of the 4 Commandments,
or royal Grants that went forth in favour of Jerusalem. Therefore
the actual going forth thereof in the 20th of Artaxerxes as it proves
against Mr. Dean's twofold Commision of Nehemiah in that year,
so it doth also evidently prove it self to be the very Commandment,
the Going forth whereof is expressly predicted in this Prophecy. And
therefore the holy Prophet Daniel, the man highly beloved of God,
(Dan. ix. 23.) was here to his great comfort inform'd of the going
forth thereof in God's good time. And when that time was fully
come, God was pleas'd to make Nehemiah his blessed instrument in
the execution of this mighty work of his, to the influencing the Per-
sian King to his actual giving out such Commandment immediately
thereunto authorizing, and empowering him.

For unless such royal Commandment had now gone forth, the Jews
enemies would without all doubt have made ule of the act of re-
building Jerusalem as just matter of Complaint against them, as former-
ly they had done under the Magian, and also under Darius, in the case
of the stoppage of the building of the Temple: Of which more here-
after. But notwithstanding all their threatened (a) Opposition, this they
dared not to do now in the case before us, viz. of Nehemiah's re-
building Jerusalem, the Wall, and the Streets thereof. It was not for
them to execute their threatened Opposition against such rebuilding,
because they knew full well, that the royal Commandment was now
actually gone forth for this very purpose. And as such It is therefore
evidently the Commandment, from whence must necessarily be take-
ten the Computation of the VII Weeks of this Prophecy. For as
the Prophecy fixeth the beginning of them to the going forth of the
Commandment to rebuild Jerusalem, even to rebuild the Walls and
the Streets thereof; and whereas the Persian King Artaxerxes did
actually give his express royal Licence and protection to Nehemiah
in the 20th year of his reign for such rebuilding, so such royal Com-
mandment going forth accordingly at that time to the verifying the
prediction before us, doth necessarily determine us to such Begin-
n ing of the said seven Weeks from the going forth of it.

Especially Considering that this our Scripture Beginning of the
7 Weeks from the 20th of Artaxerxes, will be farther confirm'd to be
the true Beginning of them, when we come hereafter to treat of
the beginning of the 7 weeks, and 62 weeks jointly, as they are

(a) Neh. iv. 2.
weeks continued in reckoning, and as such have one, and the same
beginning, as it hath been (a) already observ'd concerning them.

And the same will also be yet farther evident, when we come
to treat of the Ending of the said 7 weeks, and 62 weeks, or 483
Years, the said Sum of weeks, and years duly expiring within the
year before that very Passover in which the Messiah was CUT OFF,
as they were to expire according to this Prophecy, reckoning
the same from such true Beginning, viz. the 20th of Artaxerxes.

And yet after all that hath hitherto been said in vindication of
this Our Beginning of the 7 weeks from the said 20th of Artaxerxes, since there are yet certain Objections which the learned
Mr. Dean of Norwich hath in his book brought against such Beginning,
And also some of them therefore made against it, as the same
is founded upon (b) our literal Exposition of the express character in
the Text of the going forth of the Commandment; viz. the building
Jerusalem Wall and Streets, we cannot in good manners to Mr.
Dean, or in justice to the Reader and our selves also pass them over
without a due and impartial examination. For such they deserve,
and require from us as coming from so learned an Author, and as
they may on this account be justly suppos'd to carry great weight,
and force in them. But of what real force and weight they are,
we shall soon discover by such consideration.

And while we are paying this our due respect to the very learned
Mr. Dean, we hope withal to do our selves the service of farther clearing up,
and supporting, and confirming the late very learned Bishop Lloyd his Hypothesis of reckoning the 7 weeks from
the twentieth of Artaxerxes, as the true Scripture Beginning of the
said weeks. And here may be consider'd

First, Mr. Dean's main (c) Objection against the literal Completition of the Commandment in the Prophecy, grounded upon this
mistaken consequence, that if the words of this Prophecy, to restore
and build Jerusalem are to be taken in a literal sense, then these Weeks
must necessarily take their beginning from Cyrus's Decree, from the
going forth, or issuing out of that Decree. This (d) faith Mr. Dean
is the Sum of the whole Argument. But in truth this Sum turns up
on nothing. Mr. Dean will I hope pardon me for saying so. It is as we
shall soon see, built on a wrong foundation; and therefore it must
necessarily come to nothing. For Mr. Dean hath here all along proceed
ed on this supposition that Jerusalem was actually rebuilded be
fore Nehemiah's coming thither. It is a principle with Him, that
the City was built by virtue of Cyrus his Decree: as we shall see presently.
And thereupon is principally grounded this main Objection.

K 4

(a) See above in the Introduction. (b) We have already consider'd Mr. Dean's Objeotions against a literal sense of the words. We now take into consideration his other Objections which he hath urg'd against a literal completion of the matter of fact, or the literal rebuilding of Jerusalem Wall and Streets, as being the completion, or accomplishment of the express Character of the Prophetick Commandment. (c) p. 267; and 269. Con. Hist. (d) p. 269, 1. 18. Con. Hist.
Objections answer'd.

Now if we can remove the cause of this Objection, the Objection itself must then cease of course. If therefore it can be prov'd from the holy Scripture, that Jerusalem was not rebuilt by virtue of Cyrus bis Decree, if also it can farther be prov'd that the said City was afterwards rebuilt by the immediate virtue of another order, which went forth for that very purpose, then of course it will follow that thee weeks may be taken in a literal sense, and have a literal accomplishment, and yet not take their beginning from the going forth of Cyrus's Decree. Then (however Mr. Dean hath necessarily inferr'd that if the words to restore and build Jerusalem are to be understood in a literal sense, they can be understood of no other restoring, and rebuilding of that City, than that which was ACCOMPLISHED by virtue of Cyrus bis Decree, and therefore the Computation of these weeks must begin from the granting, and going forth thereof; yet after all) it will be thus rendred possible in the first place, that these weeks may have another beginning than that of the going forth of Cyrus bis Decree; And also forasmuch as Jerusalem was certainly not rebuilt till a long time after the going forth of Cyrus bis Decree, and that by immediate Virtue of another, and consequently not by virtue of Cyrus bis Decree, It will then become not only possible, but even necessary that such of these Weeks, which according to this Prophecy were to have their beginning from the going forth of such Commandment, must have their beginning not from the going forth of Cyrus bis Decree, but from the going forth of that other, viz. that in the twentieth of Artaxerxes by immediate virtue whereof, and not before, was actually accomplished such literal Rebuilding.

And thus this main Objection will be immediately taken off under the next particular here to be consider'd, as that is the support thereof, viz.

Secondly, Mr. Dean's positive assertion that Jerusalem was actually rebuilt by virtue of Cyrus bis Decree. And for this He hath partly reason'd, partly pleaded the holy Scriptures (a).

I shall consider Mr. Dean's several reasons, for such assertion, and shew the groundlessness of them in the first place. And here we are told (b)

First, that Cyrus could not grant licence for the Jews to return to Jerusalem, and build the Temple there without allowing them to rebuild that City also.——Now If Mr. Dean herein means no more than this, viz. that by virtue of Cyrus his express Licence to the Jews for their return to Jerusalem, and for their rebuilding the Temple, the Jews who for that purpose did return whether those immediately concerned in the building, the Artificers, and Craftsmen, and Others their necessary Attendance, and All in short of what Denomination soever who went up along with them by virtue of this Decree were thereby authoriz'd to run up for themselves

(a) p. 267, 268, (b) p. 267. in sup
Objections answer'd.

Selves in Jerusalem convenient dwelling places, it is readily granted. But if otherwise he means that by virtue thereof the Jews had full power giv'n them to restore the grandeur, and strength of their City by setting up not only the Houses, but also the Walls and Gates thereof, [which is the very Commandment refer'd to in the Prophecy before us.] We have seen there is not the least ground for it in Cyrus his Decree.

And Mr. Dean himself hath acknowledg'd as much (a); Therefore, however he hath made a question of the possibility hereof, it is yet possible for Cyrus to have granted the Jews licence to return to Jerusalem for to rebuild their TEMPLE there, without giving them licence to rebuild their City also. It is plain from the contents of his DECREES he did so. For therein is express Licence for the one, but not for the other. But surely had there been any for the latter it would have been expressed. For where had been otherwise the Authority? The Commandment or Decree is the proper place for it. But therein, as we have (b) formerly seen, it is not. But

Secondly, We are told by Mr. Dean (c) that the Licence to rebuild the House of God which is in Jerusalem, must either imply a Licence to rebuild Jerusalem also, or else (which faith Mr. Dean, seems most probable,) Ezra gives us in the place mention'd only an abstract of the chief things granted by that Licence, and not of the whole, in which most likely many other things, and among them the rebuilding of Jerusalem, and the other Cities of Judah might be fully and expressly mention'd.

Here we have a Dilemma, in the former part whereof Mr. Dean labours to make good the deficiency of an express Licence from Cyrus for the rebuilding Jerusalem the Wall and the Streets thereof, by finding out for us an implicit Licence for the same. But alas to fly to an implicit Licence here, which also after all is only supposed, is at once to give up this point; because in few words that could never be the Prophetick Commandment which was to go forth EXPRESSLY for that very purpose. And hence perhaps it is that Mr. Dean seems to lay the greatest stress upon the latter part of this Dilemma, which consists of a charge upon Ezra, as if he had not giv'n us a full Copy of Cyrus's Decree. But as to this, 'tis indeed all imaginary and groundless: And it is withal utterly inconsistent with Mr. Dean's own most just Character of Ezra importing his great Abilities (d), viz. as he was a very learned man, and especially as he was very excellently skilled in the knowledge of the holy Scriptures, and therefore is said to have been a very ready Scribe in the Law of God, &c. even (e) so skilfull a Scribe therein as upon his

(a) p. 268, l. 20. Mr. Dean tells us expressly in the following words, that the rebuilding of the City is not expressly included in the Commission of Cyrus. (b) See p. 116. (c) p. 268. l. 24, &c. (d) p. 261. l. 14. (e) See p. 266. l. 27 and 32. and also p. 321, and 322, where Mr. Dean speaks of it as a common opinion among the Jews, as if Ezra were the Prophet Malachi, &c. But as to this opinion of the Jews see it confuted by Dr. Pocock p. 1. Com. on Malachi.
his coming to Jerusalem to have referred the Scriptures, &c.—This being consider'd, wherefore is it that Mr. Dean hath charged Ezra with so much unacquaintance, and want of exactness in giving us a transcript of this Decree of Cyrus which so nearly concern'd the people of God? If neither want of knowledge, nor want of accuracy be chargeable upon this holy man, and from Mr. Dean's just now mention'd Character of him 'tis plain that they are not, wherefore then is it that we should suppose otherwise than that he hath given us this Decree most exactly, and perfectly in its original fulness, without having diminished from it?

But to what purpose after all is Mr. Dean's supposition that he did not so give us this Decree?—Wherefore, but because he would have us to conclude with him that the City of Jerusalem was rebuilt by virtue of such supposed implicit Licence of Cyrus? For this is what is all along pleaded for, and here in particular in what follows (a) the Dilemma now before us, it being certain (faith Mr. Dean) that by virtue of that Licence the Jews had power so to do (viz. to rebuild the City, as well as the Temple of Jerusalem) and accordingly executed it. — But as to this Power which to Mr. Dean seems so certain, that as I have shewn is most uncertain as being altogether imaginary, and groundless: and as to the affirm'd Execution, to what hath been already said against it, I add

Farther, that it was not in the Jews power to have executed it, even if they had had Cyrus his express Licence, and Authority for it.

For if Jerusalem was rebuilt by virtue of that Decree, it must necessarily have been rebuilt by those who made the first return thither from Babylon by virtue of that Decree under Zerubbabel, and Jeshua. And Mr. Dean accordingly makes it to have been built (b) before Haggai prophesied. But of this more hereafter. I mention it here only as being allowed by Mr. Dean: How truly it will be hereafter (c) shewn. But this being allowed, it is consequently suppos'd that the Jews who made the first return were capable of rebuilding Jerusalem. For who but they are suppos'd to have rebuilt it?—But their utter Inability to such an Undertaking is expressly evident from Mr. Dean's own description (d) of that people, in the following words (e). It is a common saying among the Jews that they were only the bran, that is, the dreg of the people that returned to Jerusalem after the end of the Captivity, and that all the fine flower staid behind at Babylon. This opinion Mr. Dean hath there confirm'd with his own following Observation, viz. It is most certain that notwithstanding the several Decrees that had been granted by the Kings of Persia for the return of the Jews into their own Land, there were a great many that wavered taking the advantage of them, and continued still in Chaldea, Assyria, and other Eastern Provinces, where they had been carried, and it is most likely that they were the best, and richest of the nation that did so. We are also told by Mr. Dean elsewhere (f), from the Rabbins,

(a) Pag. 268 last Line but 15. (b) lb. sub line. (c) Viz. in the Scripture Account of the rebuilding of Jerusalem. (d) p. 268 lin. 6, &c. (e) From Talmud Bab. in Kiddushim. (f) p. 138 lin. 22.
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Rabbins, that they were only the poorer sort that returned. And in another place (a) they are expressly spoken of, as a few poor Exiles.

This is the sorrowful, but true account of these returning Jews as giv'n us by Mr. Dean.

And is it in the least likely, or indeed at all possible that the now ruined, but once glorious City of Jerusalem should have been rebuilt by these poor Wretches in number FEW (b), in substance POOR, a few poor Exiles, as here truly call'd by Mr. Dean in the place last quoted?—Had the RICHER and BETTER Sort now return'd by virtue of Cyrus his Decree, then indeed there had been some little more shew of probability for Mr. Dean's so early imagined rebuilding of Jerusalem. But they came not thither upon Cyrus his Grant: As Mr. Dean hath above inform'd us.

'Tis the poorer sort then, even the dregs, and refuse of the people that must be here suppos'd to have rebuilt Jerusalem. A work very likely this to have been accomplished by those who were so equal to the Undertaking.—But

Thirdly, Mr. Dean hath pleaded in favour of his early rebuilding of Jerusalem by virtue of Cyrus his Decree (c), that it necessarily must have been rebuilt by the Jews on their return, because they built their other Cities, and consequently this also, and more especially as it was the Metropolis of their nation, the place where the Temple stood, where all went up to worship, and where three times a year every male appeared before the Lord at the solemn Festivals, and where also the Governor dwelt, where the Council sat, and all matters of Judgement were ultimately decided. The matter is beyond all dispute, (adds Mr. Dean) when the Jews on their return rebuilt their other Cities, they must then most certainly have rebuilt Jerusalem also. The great concourse which the reasons I have mention'd constantly drew thither, must have necessitated this, had there been no other inducement for it. It is easier to suppose all the rest of the Cities of Judah to have been left still in their rubbish after the return of the Jews from their captivity, than that this City alone should remain unbuilt.

Thus Mr. Dean hath argued exceeding rhetorically for his opinion. But 'tis all against matter of fact, as will appear hereafter, when we come to consider the Scripture account of the rebuilding of Jerusalem. But waving that at present, I may content my self barely with shewing the insufficiency of such reasoning. Which hath already appear'd in part from the utter inablity of the riff-raff company of returning Jews (as 'tis plain from Mr. Dean that the generality of them were) to rebuild their once great and glorious City, the Metropolis of Judah. And as their utter impossibility, so also the weakness of Mr. Dean's argument now before us will be yet made to appear if it be here farther consider'd, that by Mr. Dean's own account (d) of these FEW POOR returning Exiles by virtue of Cyrus his Decree, they did not all take up their abode at Jerusalem, but were

(a) p. 142. Lk. 15.  
(b) ib.  
(c) p. 268 in loco.  
(d) p. 142 vs

Mr. Dean there calls them. Their Number was 49697, p. 133.
so far from doing that, that as Mr. Dean also tells us, upon their coming thither they dispersed themselves according to their tribes, and the families of their fathers into their several cities, and there (not at Jerusalem) they betook themselves to rebuild their houses, &c., as Mr. Dean there truly observes from Ezra (b). Hence as there is naturally to be inferred a much greater improbability of such a vast city, as was Jerusalem in its prosperity, to have been now rebuilt by reason of its being thus robbed of those who otherwise have been its inhabitants, for the sake of their going to other cities to which they belonged before the captivity in order to their rebuilding and inhabiting them, so also an equal probability at least, if not a far greater of those other cities of Judah being rebuilt, even when Jerusalem the metropolis still remain'd unbuilt. So that in this view of things the very reverse of Mr. Dean's now recited supposition will be much the more easy of credit, viz. Jerusalem alone still to have remained unbuilt, even after other cities of Judah were rebuilt.

For of those who made the first return, we may reasonably suppose the generality of them, and also of the better sort of them to have gone not at Jerusalem, but in other cities of Judah by reason of their respective inheritances; which doubtless lay more in those lesser cities, and in the country round about them than in, or about Jerusalem.

And it may also be here farther consider'd as highly probable that some few nobles excepted, and the chief of them who made the first return immediately on the account of the temple, as being some way or other concerned in the rebuilding of it, or were otherwise constrained to take up their abode there, very few would by choice have made it their place of settlement; because as it was the metropolis of Judae, as such it was chiefly the envy of the Samaritans (c) and of other neighbouring nations. It was doubtless much more so than other cities of Judah. To those cities therefore was a safer retreat for the returning Jews than to Jerusalem. Hence consequently those cities might be, and doubtless they were sooner repeopled, and rebuilt than was Jerusalem: not only that but even for this very reason, that she was the metropolis of Judae. And so dismissing this argument, we may pass on to another, as we are told by Mr. Dean (c).

(a) p. 137 and 267. (b) Ezra ii. 1. Of those who were carried away captive, and now return'd, 'tis said, that they came again unto Jerusalem and Judah, every one unto his city, Ch. ii. 70. 'Tis said, that all Israel dwelt in their cities. And Ch. iii. 1. At the feast ing up of the altar, the bulk of the company attending the ceremony were doubtless such of the children of Israel who though they were in the cities, yet they gathered themselves together as one man to Jerusalem. And after Nehemiah's coming thither; We read also [Neh. vii. 75.] the children of Israel were in their cities. And to them after all she was in a great measure obliged for her being repeopled and rebuilt, even so far as to have ONE OUT OF TEN of those who dwelt in other cities. As we read expressly, Neh. xi. 1. --So far is it from being a matter beyond dispute, and so easy of belief as Mr. Dean hath here made this to be of their supposed rebuilding of Jerusalem upon their return, as well as of their other cities. It is in truth beyond dispute that it was otherwise.

(c) Con. Hist. p. 283. L. 5. &c.
Fourthly, That the rebuilding, or repairing of the Walls of Jerusalem accomplished by Nehemiah was a work but of fifty two days, and the enlarging of Jerusalem with new Colonies was within a year after, but the restoring and rebuilding of Jerusalem predicted by the Prophecy was to be a work of seven weeks, or forty nine years, and so long first Ezra, and after Nehemiah laboured successively in the work of restoring, and rebuilding the Church, and State of the Jews at Jerusalem. And therefore of this restoring and rebuilding only can the Prophecy be understood.

Thus Mr. Dean hath here concluded in favour of his figurative sense, and accomplishment, and against the literal sense, and accomplishment of the Commandment now before us. But as to his figurative sense, I have (a) formerly shewn that the words will not bear it, nor the Context admit of it. And as to his figurative accomplishment in Ezra, and Nehemiah their labouring successively in the Reformation of the Church, and State of the Jews just 49 years, I shall shew hereafter how very precarious, and improbable that is, when I come to consider the Ending of these seven Weeks, or forty nine years, which is the proper place for it. Wherefore here to reply to the Objection, as it stands immediately against our literal accomplishment of the Prophetick Commandment, as being that by virtue whereof Nehemiah rebuilt the Walls, and Streets of Jerusalem, I beg leave to observe.

First, That the Objection in this respect can be of no force unless the Prophetick Rebuilding in both its parts separately or disjunctively were not to be accomplished but in forty nine years, or in other words that each of them should be a work of forty nine years. But indeed I cannot see any the least reason for such nice application, and distinct accomplishment either out of the Text, or in it: which by the words Street, and Wall doubtless intends nothing else but the building of the City of Jerusalem, or the restoring her by such rebuilding to her prifin state of grandeur, and defence. And therefore what tho' the Walls of the City were set up in the first year of Nehemiah's coming to Jerusalem, and in fifti two days? They were only a necessary part of the City. And even they tho' they were astonishingly run up in fifti two days, yet doubtless from time to time afterwards they received a continued accession of strength by additional, or improv'd works. And fo we know not of a certainty when they had their completion, or finishing streak of reparations, and rebuilding. But still these were but one part of Jerusalem's predicted rebuilding. And tho' she was now thus begun to be rebuilt, and tho' in this or in the year following Nehemiah (b) projected the rebuilding of her other part also, viz. the repeopling, and replenishing with Houlfs her waste places, or naked and ruinous Streets, yet the complete execution of this project in such a manner, and to such a degree as that therein Jerusalem might truly, and properly be laid

(a) See the foregoing Chapter. (b) Neh. ch. xi. 1, &c.
said to be rebuilt, that might really be the continued work of seven
Weeks, or forty nine Years. It might be so for any thing that I
know that appears to the contrary. And I think truly that I may be
bold to say it, that Mr. Dean hath in no wise made the contrary to
appear: and if so, the Objection under consideration is of no force.
I know indeed that Mr. Dean hath elsewhere told us (a) that the
House, as well as the Walls of Jerusalem were again rebuilt, and fully
replenished with Inhabitants in the twenty first year of King Artaxerxes,
or in the second year of Nehemiah’s coming thither. But to this I must
reply that in fact this could not be, it could surely be only in embri,
and no otherwise as yet. Nehemiah, ’tis already granted, had
now projected the repeopling, and rebuilding of Jerusalem (b). But
that such a mighty project, such a vast undertaking could be ac-
complished in a trice, that the now waste places in Jerusalem with-
out number (c) or multitudes of ruined Streets still so now remain-
ing as left by the Babylonians at her destruction should be all com-
pletely set up again, all of them in a twelvemonths time, this is very
astonishing, and if not impossible, ’tis however surely most im-
probable.

For one would beg the favour of asking here in this hafty and sud-
den suppos’d rebuilding, did the Houses now arise out of their rub-
bish?—The Walls indeed might be so in haste repair’d, and set up
again. But it was not likely thus with the multitude of Houses now
suppos’d to have been at once set up together in Jerusalem. Alas!
whence had the Jews so speedily such vast quantities of materials,
and those of all sorts for building?—Nor do Men usually build with
green materials. And how could these possibly be all got together,
and prepar’d for the building, and be all finally set up in one year’s
time to the restoring Jerusalem to her former state of building in the
second year of Nehemiah’s coming thither?—Besides, what a mul-
titude of hands must there have been at once employ’d, which a
considerable Nation could not probably furnish, much less Judea, if
all the Artificers were got together out of all parts of it for the build-
ing such an infinite number of Houses at one and the same time, as
must have been now rebuilt: for to give Mr. Dean any colour for his
assertion now before us? Truly to me this seems altogether in-
credible.

For if we may judge of the largeness of Jerusalem when laid in ruins
by the Babylonians, and consequently of her as fully restor’d by Ne-
hemiah, from what she was when in process of time destroy’d after-
wards by the Romans, (and I do not see why we may not fairly frame
some judgement hence) and Josephus (d) hath giv’n us ground here to

(a) Con. Hist. p. 358 sub medio. (b) Neh. ch. xi. 1, &c. (c) For Ne-
hemiah speaks of Jerusalem as a City גנינג לארשי, (ch. vii. 4.) a City BROAD
in places, or a broad and spacious City, as such she had been before her Destruction, but
now lay naked, and ruinous, her HOUSES being not as yet builded, [ver. 4.]
(d) Jof. de bel. Jad. lib. vii. c. 17, where he gives an account of the number of Obla-
tions at the Passover, wherein at the request of Cefius, the High Priests number’d the
Pachal
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go upon, as he hath told us what a prodigious number of Souls Jerusalem was then capable of containing, and consequently how vast-ly great the number of Houses in her must have been; if I say we consider this, and within remember what Nebemiab (a) himself hath told us in this matter, vix. that at his coming the Houses were not built, and then if finally we return to Mr. Dean's assertion that they were all built in the second of Nebemiab, all these things put-together, what an excessive number of Houses in Mr. Dean's Hypothesis must now at once have been rising up together out of their former ruins?

But not to go so high for the framing a judgement in this matter, Let us only look upon Nebemiab's account of the method by him taken for the repeopling, and rebuilding of Jerusalem. That was as follows, vix. after that he had rebuilt the Walls, and set up the gates of Jerusalem, he perswaded the Rulers, and Great men throughout Judaea to come, and live there (b). Then he proceeded farther to oblige the Commonality also to do their parts on this occasion (c). The number of the former was considerable (d). But that of the latter must have"been exceeding great: As of them it appears (e) that "one in ten was brought out of the other Cities of Judah to dwell in this. Now considering the account which we read (f) of them, who made the first return (the generality of whom probably went to their respective Cities (g), as before observ'd) and considering within them their necessary great increase (h) from that time to the time of Nebemiab's coming, which was above fourscore and ten years(f), these things duly weigh'd, and consider'd, how vastly great must have been the number of Inhabitants, with which Nebemiab was now flocking Jerusalem in order to her being again repeopled, and inhabited? Consequently what a prodigious number of Houses were there now to be set up for the receiving these new Inhabitants? The setting up of these

Pachal Lambe, and found them to be 276000 oblations, or Lambs to be kill'd: so that reckoning to every Lamb ten persons, and to eat a Lamb not fewer were assembled; yea many times twenty were in company; they found the number amounting to 2700000. N.B. Es quasi legis, "Exsorsus victis, victigumque nauiis, qui sunt, exi, viriemo omnino Myriads numeroverunt supra septem, vivere 270000, qui numeros per decem duobus convenit cum eo qui sequuntur Myriamom septiesita & dascentant, & optimo convenit cum eo qui est p. 1078, v. 19, tercentarum Myriamom, vivere 3000000, si accidant imperii Hudson in Jos. p. 1291. (a) Ch. vi. 4. (b) xi. 1. (c) ver. 2. (d) As we learn from Nebemiab's account of them by name, Ch. xi. 3-—19. (e) V. r. (f) Viz. in Exx. ch. ii. and Neb. vii. (g) Ezra ii. 1. and iii. 1. (h) The Number of those who returned under Zerubbabel, and Jesuha was 49697. [Exx ii. 64a. 65.] Of these at least two thirds may be supposed to have been those spoken of in Ex. iii. 1. as being the Children of Israel, which were in their Cities. What a prodigious increase think we must there have been among them in fourscore and ten years time, Which had past between their coming into the Land, and Nebemiab's?—But of these one in ten was by his order to come and build, and take up his abode at Jerusalem. Let any one be at the pains of making a rational computation of increase here, and take one out of ten afterwards for Jerusalem, and he may without much difficulty determine, whether the planting of these new Colonies there was most likely to have been a work of one or two years according to Dr. Prideaux, or not much more likely to have been as we here take it, a work of well nigh half a Century. In such computation the Reader may be pleased to consult Ptolemaüs's [lib. ix. c. 14. de Doct. Temp.] method of calculating the increase of people after the flood. (i) ch. xi. 1.
these must surely have been the continued work of many years. I may I think say safely, that it was impossible to have been done in one.

Add also, that the Nebemiah wrought upon the country people after his having set up the Walls at Jerusalem, which was a greater inducement than they had before to come and settle there, yet it is not credible, because not possible, that they should all have come thither forthwith. For they must necessarily be allowed some time to have cast lots (a) for their coming. They must afterwards also have had some time to make the best of their country effects, and to bring them to Jerusalem, and so to make provision for their building, and future support there. And finally it is much more likely that they should have first got their Houses built at their leisure, and convenience, and so have made every thing ready for their reception there against their coming, than that they should leave all their effects at once in the country, and come away in a hurry to Jerusalem, before they had houses to put their heads in, when they came, as they must have done upon the footing of Mr. Dean's Hypothesis.

Indeed I must be free to say it, for it is what I think truly, that the more we look into this matter as it stands in Mr. Dean's Hypothesis, the more incredible we shall find it. And therefore I shall give the truth of it, as I conceive it to have been, as follows, viz.

Nebemiah came to Jerusalem in the twentieth year of King Artaxerxes. There he presently set about the repairing, or rebuilding the ruined Walls: and run them up for present security by the immediate Providence of God animating, and protecting the Builders (b) in fifty two days (c). He afterwards set on foot a project for the repeopling the yet depopulated (d) and unbuilt (e) City. To that end he ordain'd that one out of ten out of the country of Judah should come to Jerusalem to build, and inhabit there (f). Thus a foundation was now laid for the rebuilding Jerusalem. And henceforward her We Sp acquiesces began to be replenished with Houses and Inhabitants, as their country Affairs would permit their coming in unto her from time to time, till at length by such continued accession of people, and increase of buildings, in about half a Century, or in some seven Weeks, or forty-nine years the Prophetick period for the same, she became absolutely, or completely rebuilt through the wise conduct, and management of Nebemiah the Governour, in pursuance and by virtue of that Authority to him immediately delegated by King Artaxerxes in the twentieth year of his reign for that very purpose, even for the rebuilding the City of Jerusalem, the Wall, and the Streets thereof. This I humbly conceive to have been the plain and real truth of this matter.

Nor

(a) Ch. xi. 1.  
(b) Neh. iv. 6.—The People had a mind to work,—ch. vi. 16—
The Enemies of the Jews are said to have perceived that this work was wrought of God.
(c) Neh. vi. 15.  
(d) Ch. vii. 4.—The People were as yet NEW therein.  
(e) ib.
The Houses were not built.  
(f) Ch. xj. 1.
Objections answered.

Nor is it in the least invalidated by that which Mr. Dean hath told us from Herodotus in a twofold testimony of his concerning a City by him mention'd by the name of Cadystis, which Mr. Dean hath applied in favour of this part of his Hypothesis, as if the Cadystis of Herodotus were the City of Jerusalem suppos'd by him to have been completely rebuilt in the second year of Nehemiah's coming thither, or soon after. But these testimonies being both of them misapplied, as I shall beg leave to prove, cannot have any thing to do in the case before us.

The former testimony applied by Mr. Dean in this case stands thus in Herodotus (a). That Historian making mention of Pharao Necho's expedition in the year (b) when Josiah King of Judah was kill'd by him in the valley of Megiddo (c), hath the following words.

Σαρδας ποιξε ο Ναος συμβαλλων εις Μαγδολον ενωκε. μελε αυτω μεν καθες πολυ της Σωριν ισχυον μεγαλω ετε. i.e. Pharao Necho in a Land engagement with the Syrians (the Jews) at Magdolum (or Megiddo (d) of the Scriptures) there gain'd a Victory over them: and afterwards he took the City Cadystis, which was a great City of Syria.

In the latter (e) that Historian again speaking of a City call'd Cadystis, he hath this observation concerning it, that it was a City in his opinion not much less than Sardes. From these testimonies Mr. Dean hath concluded (f) that the Cadystis twice mention'd by this Historian was the Jerusalem of the holy Scriptures: and hence he hath infer'd that that City was brought to its perfection in building quickly after Nehemiah's projecting the repeopling, and rebuilding of it.

For, faith Mr. Dean (g), Herodotus who travell'd through Judæa a little after this time (b) both in the description which he gives us of it, compare it to Sardes the metropolis of all the Lesser Asia (i). Which (adds Mr. Dean) manifestly proves that by the restoring, and building of the Street and Ditch of Jerusalem mention'd in the Prophecy of Daniel, could not be meant this (the literal) rebuilding of the Walls and void places of that City. For what was predicted by that passage was not to be done but in seven weeks of years, that is forty-nine years.

To which I beg leave to reply, that the said literal rebuilding of Jerusalem, as in the nature of the work (as above shewn) it seemeth not in the least probable, nor so much as possible to have been accomplished, so as I now proceed to observe, in fact it was not fully accomplished in a less period of time than the here predicted period of seven Weeks, or forty-nine years for any thing that there is in the least these testimonies proving the contrary, however to Mr. Dean they may have seem'd MANIFESTLY to prove the contrary.

L

For

(a) Lib. ii. c. 159. (b) Vide in the year before A. D. 610. (c) 2 Kings xxiii. 29. 2 Chr. xxxix. 22. (d) Megiddo Urbis mediterranea præpe quam hoc praebet, videlicet, quod parum abest a Migdo, quo modo Pagnini legit in Exod. xiv. 1. ubi vulgo Magdolum. (e) Vide in not. ad Herod. p. 13 in v. ce. Marv. (f) Lib. iii. 5. (g) Con. Hist. p. 56, 57. (h) Vide p. 568 tab. medico. (i) Vide after the 1st of Artemisium, or the year before A. D. 444. (f) And so Mr. Dean hath observ'd elsewhere, vide. in p. 56, 57.
For not to insist upon the uncertainty of other circumstances here; viz. of the time of Herodotus's travelling to Thurium, and thence into the East, and so through Judea, and there of his seeing the city Cadis, Mr Dean's suppos'd Jerusalem, and accordingly inserting this observation of it in his History, (viz. of its being bigger than Sardes) long after his having recited the same at Athens (a), I say not to urge against the Objection the uncertainty of these particulars, I am content to let the force thereof lie wholly upon the two following assertions contain'd in it, which ought to be certain, or indubitable, otherwise it can be of no weight, viz.

First, that Herodotus saw Jerusalem in his Jewish travels;

Secondly, and consequently that the City by him called Cadis was unquestion'd that City. But

First, it is not only most uncertain whether Herodotus saw Jerusalem in his travels, or not, but it is indeed most probable that he did not for the following reason: viz. that if Jerusalem had been actually rebuilt, and had recover'd its ancient lustre, and was become again a City of great note in those parts at the time when Herodotus is said to have travelled in that country, and if withall he was himself in that City, all which particulars the learned Dr. Prideaux would fain persuade us to have been fact, in that case doubtless that Historian would have given us a particular description (b) of such a glorious City: a City this well worthy of his more immediate notice, and description, being the metropolis of all Judea, and the place where the Temple stood. For his peculiar genius led him curiously to observe things, and persons, and places most remarkable: and his Talent lay much in describing them accordingly. Therefore surely had he ever been at Jerusalem he could not possibly have been altogether silent as to things notable there. If there had been nothing else there for him to have remarked, he could not possibly but have made his Observations of the Temple, had he been there to see it. Here especially there was occasion given him for to have expatiated in his usual way. But not one word hath he said about it. Consequently it is much more probable than not, it is in truth much more than probable that he never was at that City. Nor

Secondly, is it in the least likely that the City by him called Cadis was the City of Jerusalem.

Dr. Prideaux hath indeed so concluded (c) from the likeness of signification (d) that there is between the word Cadis, and the Eastern

---

(a) Viz. in the last year of the eighty third Olympiad, or in the year before, A.D. 445.
(b) Videur urbs Cadis confpecta ab Herodoto: Si ea Jerusalem fuisset, rum neglexisse mentionem Templi, & tot flupendorum operum, quibus illa urbs praedita, euminuit, quam ipse rerum quas vidit in urbibus minus nobilibus mentionem facias accuratam? [Relandus in Palestina in voce Cadis].
(c) Con. Hist. p. 565 57.
(d) Which notion is thus exploded by Relandus. Scio per Cadism urbeam Hierofolymanm a virtis doctis intelligi, & illud vel a tracts Sanetis, vel combusta beocius duci. Sed id meli non probatur: quam uistatimum fuerit nomen Jerusalem & Juivas, & alias, & illud Sanetis, vel combusta non pro nominibus, sed Epithetis Urbis illius haberi polit. Non solent ista apud Histiores Urbes nucleare, fed nomin-
Eastern word Al-kuds the holy City as Jerusalem was call'd. But without dispute this can be of no weight otherwise than the word Cadystis were certainly the true reading in Herodotus. And yet this is uncertain, as there is a various reading here (a) which consequently very much weakens Mr. Dean's argument.

But admitting that Cadystis were the true reading of Herodotus even in both places of his book, where he speaks of a City by that name, yet that he could not possibly mean the Eastern Al-kuds, or Jerusalem in either, is I think pretty certain to be concluded from the following arguments, viz.

First, because the Cadystis of Herodotus in the former (b) passage could certainly be no other than the (c) Carchemish of the holy Scriptures. The very occasion of Herodotus his there making mention of the City Cadystis compar'd with the Scripture account of Necho's Expedition evidently shews it. For he there gives an account of what that Egyptian King did prefectly after his having beaten the Syrians (the Jews) at Magdolum, (or the Scripture Megiddo, as above noted) viz. that he took a (d) great City of Syria call'd Cadystis: not Jerusalem, as Dr. Prideaux would have it; for neither Scripture, nor Josephus hath told us any thing of it, as questionless they would, had this been fact. And from the former (e) it is plain that Pharaoh Necho went not to Jerusalem, but to Carchemish (f) prefectly after his victory at Megiddo. And from (g) Josephus it appears that he went away thence for the Euphrates: which confirms the Scripture Account, as Carchemish was by that river (b). That City he took: and therefore that City, and not Jerusalem was the City of Syria mention'd here (i) by Herodotus under the name of Cadystis. And herein also the following Considerations abundantly confirm us. As

First, it was Pharaoh Necho's intention from his first setting out upon this expedition to go, and lay siege to this City of Carchemish (k). His purpose from the beginning was to fight not the Jews, but the
Objections answered.

Assyrians (a): to go towards the Euphrates to retake (b) what the Assyrian had got from him. What then had he to do with Jerusalem? ——Tis true indeed that King Josiah gave him provocation enough by impeding his passage at Megiddo, where he met with his death. But it no where appears that Necho now any farther heeded the Jews. He only repelled their opposition at Megiddo, and then directly pursued that rout which he was taking towards the Euphrates.

Secondly, It is plain from Dr. Prideaux himself that Pharaoh Necho went directly towards the Euphrates to Carchemish after his victory at Megiddo (c). For 'tis only in his return that he brings him to Jerusalem (d). But the Cadyssis here of Herodotus was certainly the city which he took after his victory at Megiddo, therefore it was not Jerusalem, but Carchemish. But after all

Thirdly, It doth not appear that Necho took Jerusalem at all in this Expedition; nor is it likely that he did; not before his going to Carchemish, for then not the people (e), but he certainly would have appointed a King over them: not after, for he had no occasion for it, as the History plainly shews. For whereas King Jeboabax was King set up by the people after Josiah, him he sent for upon his return from Carchemish to Riblah (f) in Syria, and he submitted himself accordingly, by going thither to him at his command, where he made him his Prisoner (g): as 'tis evident both from Scripture, and (h) Josephus. And there also he put the Land to tribute (i). So that the Egyptians now thus doing what he would with the Jews, confining their King and taxing their Land, he had them plainly under subjection, and consequently there was no occasion for his using violence against Jerusalem to take it. He might possibly (k) call in there in his way home, and there confirm all that he had done before at Riblah, but he did so without the least opposition, or disturbance from the Jews, that we any where read of either in Scripture, or Josephus. So that all this part of Pharaoh Necho's action with the Jews was subsequent to his taking of Carchemish, which was his principal business, as we have seen, from his first setting out from home, and which he took after his victory at the Magdolum of Herodotus, or the Megiddo of the Scriptures: and therefore the Cadyssis of the

---

(a) 2 Kings xxiii. 29. and also Jos. Ant. x. 5. where it is said expressly that Necho with a great army bent his course towards Euphrates, to war against the Medes, and Babylonians. (b) Eam partem Syria sibi vendicabat Egyptus. Ursus Carchemish olim fuerat dictiones illius, sed ceparat illam Rex Assur. & Rex Armen. [Pol. Synopt. in Jer. xvi. 2.] (c) p. 56. 57. (d) ib. (e) as it appears they did, 2 Kings xxiii. 30. and Jos. Ant. x. 5. (f) The Anstich of Syria. (g) 1 Kings xxiii. and 2 Chr. xxxvi. and Jos. Ant. x. 5. (h) in loc. cit. (i) 2 Kings xxiii. 25. (k) For in the 2 Chron. xxxvi. 33 it is said that the King of Egypt put Jeboabax down at Jerusalem. But this may be no other wise than as Egypt under stands those words, viz. that he should not reign at Jerusalem: for it is certain from 2 Kings xxiii. 33. that he had done this before at Riblah. But if he did come to Jerusalem, and there confirm all this as he might do, yet doubtless he came thither without any opposition from the Jews, and consequently He had no occasion given him for making any assault upon it to take it.
the former must have been the Carcbemish of the former. And so it
will farther appear to be, if we consider

Thirdly, that the City taken by Pharao Necho quickly after his
Victory at Megiddo was a City situate near the Euphrates (a). But
this (b) Cadytis of Herodotus was the City so taken by Necho. It
could not therefore be Jerusalem: for what relation is there between
that City, and a City said to be situate by, or not far from the
river Euphrates? Therefore Herodotus his Cadytis here must remain
to the Carcbemish of the Scriptures. And consequently his testi-
mony in this passage of his book is entirely incapable of proving
that for which it is alleged, and which hath given occasion to all
that hath been now laid upon it.———But we are yet to con-
fider

Secondly, the other passage in Herodotus by Mr. Dean urg’d in fa-
vour of his Cadytis being the Jerusalem of the Scriptures, as that
Historian elsewhere (c) speaking of a City by that name, faith of it
that it was not much less than the City Sardes.———And what then,
as I here beg leave to put the question? What tho’ Herodotus speak-
ing of a certain City call’d Cadytis hath given us this description of it?
Surely this proves nothing at all in the case before us. It neither
proves that this Cadytis of Herodotus was the same with his other (d)
Cadytis, nor doth it prove this to have been Jerusalem: however
Mr. Dean hath so concluded in both these particulars. But the con-
trary is I think fully evident from Herodotus himself, as it will ap-
pear by our considering the OCCASION of his making mention
here of a City call’d Cadytis.

That was no other than as he was describing the rout which Cam-
byser’s Army in his war against Egypt took in their march out of
Persia through the Deserts of Arabia to Pelusium. In short, it was
as follows: It seems that a brave warrior, one Phanes by name who
had formerly been an auxiliary to Amasis King of Egypt, but was
now come over to Cambyses King of Persia, put him upon sending to the
King of the Arabians to be afflicting to him in his march through the
deserts of his Country, because (as Herodotus here affirms the rea-
sion) quing non styq faiwai irwotu in "Aegypt. „Apn fDovkiras, &c.
i. e. Cambyses could have a free passage for his army only by that
way into Egypt: even because the Country from Phoenicia as far as
the mountains of the city Cadytis belongs to those Syrians which are
commonly known to us by the name of Palestines. But from Cadytis
which is a City in my opinion not much less than Sardis, the Sea-
Port Towns all along as far as the City Jenyfus are under the jurid-
diction of the Arabs, &c. This being the testimony, and this the
occasion of Herodotus his taking notice of the City Cadytis, and the
mountains of Cadytis, even as Cambyses his Army marching
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(a) 2 Chron. xxxv. 20. Jer. xlv. 2. (b) vix. this mention’d in lib. ii. c. 159; of which only I have been hitherto speaking. (c) vix. in lib. iii. c. 5. (d) vix. that in lib. ii. c. 159.
through the Desarts of Arabia must have gone not far from those Mountains into Arabia Petraea in their way to Pelusium, we are plainly inform'd of the situation of this Caditys, as it lay a great way from Jerusalem, even in the borders of Syria, and South East of Jerusalem, and North West of the Mountains so call'd, (probably from the City) as the Reader may be pleas'd to see distinctly in the map placed before Herodotus in the late learned Dr. Gale's edition of it.

Add to what hath been said on this occasion that Herodotus was here describing the Sea-port Towns (a); but what had Jerusalem to do with them?

For these reasons as this Caditys could not be Jerusalem as Dr. Prideaux would have it to be, (for what had Cambyses his army to do there, or to march by that City which was so much out of their way, as it lay a great distance to their right as they were going to Pelusium?) so neither could it be the other Caditys (b) of Herodotus by Mr. Dean also suppos'd to have been it. For that other Caditys, as it was a great City of Syria taken by Ph. Necho after his victory at Magdolum, according to Herodotus, (or Megiddo;) and as the City so taken according to the Scriptures was a City situate near the river Euphrates, it could not possibly be, as I have shewn, any other than their Carmemish (c). But (d) this Caditys of Herodotus was as far from that river, as was Jerusalem: and consequently could no more be the Carmemish of the Scriptures, than it was Jerusalem, or the Caditys (e) which Necho took.

Whereabout, or how near situate to the Euphrates either the Carmemish of the Scriptures, or that Caditys of Herodotus which Necho took, and which, as 'tis plain, must have been that Carmemish, I will not among the variety of opinions (f) concerning it take upon me to determine (g). Nor need I in the case before us, wherein I apprehend my self to be no farther concern'd than to obviate Mr. Dean's objection against our Hypothesis in this part of it; which I hope that I have fully done, in having shewn that he is

(a) Quid?—quod minus conveniat, hac opinio cum ipso Herodoto. Verfatur in descrivenda ora maritima, in qua non erat Jerusalem.——A Caditys uti; ad Jerusalm region etat ditionis Arabiae, non Syriae.——An Hoc dici potest de Regione quae sit ad Austrum Hierofylma?——Non puto. [Relandius in Palestina in voce Caditys.]

(b) vix. in lib. ii. c. 159. (c) 2 Chr. xxxv. 20. [Ter. xlv. 2. (d) vix. in Herod. lib. iii. c. 5. (e) vix. the Caditys in Herod. lib. ii. c. 159. (f) Hujus ad Euphratem situs arquet, eam esse urbem quam Ammiannus vocat Cercusiam, Zosimus Kiprion. Vide Ostius in Ciceronum. & Caditys.——Opinor Caditys primo vocatur hanc urbem, deinid Carmemishum a clade. Vox enim significat Urbelem debatam. Eam post multa secula Dictatismus munivit. [Gale in Hierodotum lib. ii. c. 159. in voce Caditys in notis p. 13.]

Ego urbem Caditys hoc nomine dictam intelligerem, quin Kadith, aut Kaditys nuncupatus fuerit, si qui furt monent 'Open Kaditys liqueret. &c. [Relandius in Palestina in voce Kadithus.]

(g) And yet I hope the Reader will pardon me should I be mistaken, if I venture to throw in a conjecture here, as if the Caditys which Necho is said by Herodotus to have taken, might be the Hierapolis of Syria. For the Greek Hierapolis is of the same signification with the Eastern Caditys. And there is equal reason to argue here from the sense of the name for the Hierapolis of Syria, as for Dr. Prideaux to have argued from thence for his Abudah, or Jerusalem, which City, as I have shewn, it could never be on many accounts. But there is this farther to be said for its being Hierapolis, that the
is mistaken in the very foundation, or ground of it, as it is entirely built upon a supposition of the Cadytis of Herodotus its being the Jerusalem of the Scriptures. And so I may have done with this Objection. But

Firstly, there is yet another, as Mr. Dean hath been pleas'd to look upon Nehemiah as a Repairer, and Enlarger only of Jerusalem, and not properly the rebuildor of it, and thence to have excluded the rebuilding the walls, and streets thereof by Nehemiah from being the rebuilding predicted in this Prophecy, and consequently to have excluded likewise the express Commandment for the said rebuilding in the twentieth of Artaxerxes from being the prophetick Commandment: the going forth whereof is here predicted, and to which we are pinned down for the beginning of the seven weeks, and sixty two weeks of this Prophecy.

But our immediate reply to this Objection becomes needless here, because it hath been already in part obviated in our occasional account of Nehemiah's rebuilding Jerusalem, and the same will of course be fully removed, by our proceeding to take off those other Objections of Mr. Dean's, which we are yet to look into, as he hath argued from the holy Scriptures, in favour of his Assertion of Jerusalem its being rebuilt by virtue of Cyrus's Decree, and long before Nehemiah's coming thither. And whereas I have now, I think, wholly done with his other Objections, which make up the reasoning part of his Hypothesis, and which I was in the first place to consider, and reply to, I may therefore now proceed,

Secondly, to such Objections which Mr. Dean hath rais'd here from the holy Scriptures. And

First, Mr. Dean hath pleaded the two following texts in Isaiah on this occasion. The one in Chapter xlv. 28, wherein it was prophesied of Cyrus, that he should say to Jerusalem, be thou built, and to the Temple, thy foundations shall be laid. The other in Chapter xlv. 13, wherein it is said of the same Cyrus, that God would raise him up, and direct him that he should build his City, and release his Captives. Here it is observ'd (faith (a) Mr. Dean) that be that released God's Captives, and laid the foundation of the Temple was to be the person that was to rebuild Jerusalem.

Now as Mr. Dean hath here observ'd that Cyrus was to be he who should rebuild Jerusalem, if he means it only consequentially, as Cyrus's releasing of God's Captives, and sending them home, (as he actually did) with his express Licence to lay the foundations of the Temple.

Situation of it answers well upon all accounts, as it was a City finite nor far from the Emphrates, and very well accords to that part of Nehbo's History, as he is said to have gone to Riblah from Carchemish, as the said Riblah is supposed to have been the Antioch of Syria, and lies South West of Hierapolis, or nearer to Jerusalem, from whence Nehbo is said to have sent for King Jehoahaz to Riblah. [2 Kings xxiii.] Add also that the Carchemish of the Scriptures, and the Carchebiff of Josephus might be Carcadish, or Kireath Kedon, which is no other than the greek Hierapolis. And this being in the remotest parts of Syria from Egypt, it is no wonder that all Syria was now reduced to him, as Josephus [Ant. x. 6.] faith that it was, he having been thus successful at the Cadytis of Hierapolis, and the Carchemish of the Scriptures, which we therefore take to have been the Hierapolis aforesaid. (a) Con. Hist. p. 267, l. 29.
ple would in process of time be followed with the rebuilding of the City also, it is readily granted. But if this be all, the Objection is of no weight to the excluding the Commandment in the 20th of Artaxerxes for the rebuilding the Wall, and Streets of Jerusalem from being the Commandment referred to by the Prophet Daniel: because such Prophetick rebuilding of the City, viz. the walls, and the Streets thereof, was the immediate effect not of Cyrus’s Decree, but of King Artaxerxes’s some fourscore and ten years after: as We have already seen.

But if Mr. Dean means as much as this here, viz. that Jerusalem, i.e. the Walls and Streets of that City were rebuilt by the immediate virtue of Cyrus’s Decree, (and so he must mean to give his Objection weight here,) then as the Fact evidently proves the contrary, so the Texts now before us do in no wise warrant it. The Prophet Isaiah could not intend it in the former text (b), because those words of saying to Jerusalem, be thou built are to be understood as spoken not of Cyrus, but of God. The Context evidently shews it (c): and the undercited (d) Authorities abundantly confirm it. Nor could the Prophet intend any such meaning in the latter (e) Text, because however it be there predicted that God should direct Cyrus, that he should build his City, yet

First, if the word City be understood strictly as denoting the walls, and Streets or Houses of Jerusalem which constitute a City, such rebuilding as I have shewn could be only consequent: and so the Objection becomes of no force. And

Secondly, the word City may here immediately denote the Temple, as that made it the City of God, or the Holy (f) City: being the grand, and principal part, the Palladium, the ornament, and defence of it. And so the learned Grotius (g) understands it, from the parallel place (b) where Cyrus himself takes it in charge from God immediately to build (not the City, or the Walls, and void spaces of Jerusalem but) the Temple: even to build God an HOUSE in Jerusalem which is in Judah. And for that only (as I have formerly shewn) his Decree runs accordingly, and in express terms. And Mr. Dean himself (as I have also formerly observed) pleads for nothing more in that Decree for the rebuilding of the City than barely an implicit Licence. But that comes not up to the Commandment referred to by the Prophet Daniel, to which we are pinned down in the text (i) for the beginning of the Weeks now before us, as that was to be EXPRESS for the rebuilding not the Temple (as was that

(a) As Cyrus gave the first occasion, and so may be said to be the Doer of that, which was done some time after. (b) If, xliv. 28. (c) As all from ver. 24. of that Chapter is spoken not of Cyrus, but of God. (d) So the LXX, so the V. L. So the Chaldee Paraphrase. (e) If, xliv. 13. (f) As it is frequently call’d in the holy Scriptures in respect of the Temple. So particularly Isaiah xlviii. 2. They call themselves of the Holy City, or as it is in the Hebrew the CITY of HOLINESS in regard of God’s Sanctuary there seated, and his Name or Worship there setled. Deut. xii. 11.—2 Chron. viii. 12, 16. (g) in Isaiah xlv. 13. Civitatem meam, nempe Hierosolymam, i.e. Templum, partem urbis potissimum. (h) viz. 2 Chron. xxxvi. 23. (i) ch. ix. 25;
that of Cyrus) but the WALLS and STREETS of void Spaces of Jerusalem, (as was that of Artaxerxes long after.) And therefore this latter, and not the former was it, for any thing that can be made to appear to the contrary from the forecited Texts of Isaiah.—Nor doth that make against us, which Mr. Dean hath urged (a).

Secondly, from Ezra, as (b) we there read that the Complaint of the neighbouring nations to the Persian Court against them that were return’d was that they builded Jerusalem that rebellious, and bad City, and had set up the Walls thereof, and joined the foundations of it.

For either this Accusation by the Enemy was true, or not. If it was truth, then it appears that the Jews exceeded the Permission granted them for the building only their Temple, and were therefore hinder’d from going on with their unjustifiable work in building their City, as the Sèquel (c) of the History shews that they were hinder’d. But if the Accusation was not true, then there is no force in Mr. Dean’s argument. And that it was not true, it doth fully appear,

First, from the execution of the King’s answer to their complaint, which was to make the Jews to cease building by force and power. (d): building what?—nothing but the House of God: as it appears from the text (e), viz. then ceased the work of the House of God.—unto the second year of the reign of Darius King of Persia (f).

Secondly, Then upon the Jews attempting this work a second time the same Complaint was renewed by the Enemy (g), but with more modesty, and truth. For now they represented no more to Darius, than that the Jews were building the House of God, and making up the walls of the old Temple (h). The Jews confessed the charge, and pleaded the Decree of Cyrus for their doing this (i): which was to this effect, Let the House of God be builded in its place (k). Since that time, say they, even until now it hath been in building, and yet it is not finished (l). The building the Temple is the only crime they were accus’d of. The building of the Temple is what they pleaded a Decree for: and Darius hearing their report of the Café renewed Cyrus his Decree to build the Temple, and no more (m). But

Thirdly, We find Mr. Dean (n) urging yet one other Text in favour of his early rebuilding of Jerusalem by virtue of Cyrus his Decree, as the Prophet Haggaï (o) hath spoken of some ceiled Houses there, in his rebuke of the Governour and High Prieft (p), as in such ceiled House they dwelt, and at the same time let the House of God lie waste.—But I pray leave to ask here, what of this?—If the Prophet had not told us, we should easily have suppos’d that there were

(a) Com. Hist. p. 268. last line but 13. (b) Ch. iv. 12. (c) v. 21. (d) v. 23. (e) v. 24. (f) ib. (g) Ch. v. 6. &c. (h) v. 8. (i) v. 13. (k) v. 15. (l) v. 16. (m) Ch. vi. 7. &c. (n) Com. Hist. p. 268. last line but 1. (o) Ch. ii. 4. (p) For to them the Prophet addreath himself.
were some few Inhabitants now at Jerusalem, and consequently Houses for them to dwell in.—Possibly some few out of devotion might have settled near the place where God's Altar was erected. Others had run up huts, for themselves to live dry in, while they laboured in the work of the Temple. And no doubt the Governor, and the High-Priest who were distinguished by their allowances by the people as well as by their station had better Houses prepared for them, than the rest of the people.—But what then?——Do three or four ceiled Houses (a), or five or six hundred Huts make a City?———Or much less could the once great City of Jerusalem be denominated rebuilt from a collection of a few (b) Houses, and People?—No.—It appears when God promiseth the rebuilding of the Temple, he meant that it should be rebuilt in its place: and so when he predicted the rebuilding of Jerusalem, he meant that her Walls should be rebuilt, and all her void spaces in that circumference, and be peopled with Inhabitants as formerly. But this in FACT as yet was not accomplished. It was far from it some three-score and fifteen years after (c), when Nehemiah came thither from Babylon with an express Commission from King Artaxerxes for the rebuilding of that City. A City which even then, (Mr. Dean's ceiled Houses spoken of by the Prophet Haggai notwithstanding) in the language of Nehemiah (d) so long after was a City that lay waste; A City whose WALL was as yet broken down, whose Gates were as yet confounded with fire (e); whose People were as yet few, and whose HOUSES were not as yet built (f).

Consequently, Mr. Dean's fore-cited Texts notwithstanding, we cannot but conclude the very reverse of his general Assertion, which hath been so long under consideration; viz. that Jerusalem after its having been destroyed by the Babylonians was in no wise again rebuilt (however Mr. Dean hath affirm'd, and maintain'd that it was rebuilt) by virtue of that Decree which Cyrus granted in the first year of his reign for the release, and restoration of the Jews.

And pray we therefore after all to give Nehemiah the credit of this great, and glorious work, as we are now to do of course, and as we have thus made way for it, in our having shewn the invalidity of the contrary assertion, and as it will appear in justice we ought to do, however Mr. Dean hath told (g) us that all that Nehemiah did in it was only an Enlarging, or repairing of that City, but in no wise the Rebuilding thereof.

For

(a) For many such ceiled Houses there could not be, because the BEST and RICHEST of the Jews, whose condition might have enabled them to have built such dwelling places at Jerusalem, are by Dr. Pride, himself, [Con. Hist. p. 138, 142, and 268.] support'd not to have left Babylon: and 'tis evident, that such as did return from Babylon, did not however go to live at Jerusalem; for the Kueriers and Great Men were in the other Cities of Judah 'till after Nehemiah's coming to Jerusalem: when, and not before they went thither, upon his projected repeopling, and rebuilding thereof. [Neb. ch. xi. 1.] (b) See Neb. ch. vii. 4.  (c) For Haggai prophesied in 2do. Daris, viz. in the year before A. D. 520, and Nehemiah came not to Jerusalem 'till the 20th of Artaxerxes, or in the year before A. D. 445. (d) ch. ii. 3.  (e) ch. i. 3.  (f) ch. viii. 4.  (g) Con. Hist. p. 267. sub fine.
Objections answered.

For that which Nebuchad did for the repopling, and rebuilding of Jerusalem was in truth more than all that had been done for her in fourscore and ten years before (a). As briefly to his honour it may be consider'd

First, that he built the Wall, and set up the gates of Jerusalem. And this one most necessary and useful work as it was, had been of it self sufficient to give him the credit of having rebuilt Jerusalem, had he done no more than this towards either the repopling, or the rebuilding of that City. For this was the taking away that REPROACH (b) from the holy City which Daniel lamented in his prayer (c): and which the Angel satisfied him that, when God's good time was come for it, should be taken away, as it was determined by God that a Commandment should go forth (from a King of Persia) for that purpose, even for the rebuilding her WALL (d). And to what purpose had been the going forth of the three preceding Decrees in favour of the Temple, had not finally this also which immediately respected the security of God's people been also lifted out? How precarious had otherwise been the service of the Sanctuary, the DAILY SACRIFICE and OBLATION in a City naked and defenceless, open to the insults, and perfecution of Idiocrates (e)?—But they were no sooner secure'd by their Wall, than they were also freed from those fears, and rendered secure and easy in the discharge of God's worship. Therein also, even by the setting up the walls at Jerusalem, the foundation was laid of her being further repopled, as her Inhabitants were now effectually seat'd against the insults of Enemies, and the incursions of Thieves, and Robbers: as the learned Dr. Prideaux hath well observ'd (f) on this occasion.—But who under God was the instrument hereof but Nebuchad?—Express we the accomplishment of this work as we will, either by Mr. Dean's lenifying word of repairing (g) or by the word rebuilding, that matters not:

(a) For Cyrus's Decree for the Temple went forth in the year before A. D. 536, and Nebuchad came to Jerusalem in the year before A. D. 445. (b) That the rebuilding the WALL at Jerusalem was certainly the taking away her REPROACH is evident from Nebuchad's use of the same Original word יִנְשַׁק [Neb. i. 3. ii. 17.] as used by Daniel. In the latter place of Nebuchad especially the word is used with immediate regard to the naked, and defenceless state of Jerusalem as bereft of her walls. And this may be urg'd as a farther argument that the word WALL in the Prophecy before we must necessarily be taken in a literal sense, because the taking away Jerusalem's Reproach was literally fulfilled in the building of the Walls. (c) Dan. ix. 16 (d) Dan. ix. 25. (e) Therefore upon the Jews enterprizing their great work of rebuilding their WALL, it was Sambail's ludicrous question with respect to this, as one great consequence thereof, WILL THEY SACRIFICE? (f) Con. Hist. p. 368. (g) Both the words of repairing, and rebuilding are indifferent ly used by our Translators: and the original words are various. But Neb. ii. 17, we read expressly יִנְשַׁק, יִנְשַׁק. Come, and let us BUILD UP: and again, ver. 18. and 10, ch. iv. 3, 10 Or Ch. And then the word יִנְשַׁק be generally used in Ch. iii. and be rendered by our English word repair'd, yet the same was no other than rebuilding. For the Babylonians had so effectually laid the wall in rabbit [Ch. iv. 2. 10.] that it was impossible it should
Objections answer'd.

the fact is still the same. The wall of Jerusalem was not till now restored to her. And the Restoration thereof under God was owing to King Artaxerxes's Grant, or Permission to Nehemiah for the same: and to Nehemiah was immediately owing the actual Execution thereof. In Mr. Dean's own words, He set up the Walls at Jerusalem. And to his additional honour, Let it be also confider'd.

Secondly, that he built the naked Streets (a), or unbuilt broad places, and void spaces thereof to the fulfilling the other part of the here predicted rebuilding of Jerusalem. And what he did of this nature, and to what a prodigious degree of increase both of people, and of Houses for them I have already (b) occasionally remarked. And therefore I need only in few words farther to observe here.

First, that whereas Mr. Dean hath reputed Nehemiah a Repairer only of Jerusalem by his vast enlargement of her, he was however therein most truly, and properly her Rebuilder. For he who in so remarkable a manner enlargeth a City both with people and with Houses, as Nehemiah was the occasion of enlarging Jerusalem with both, was surely in the strictest propriety of speech her Rebuilder: even tho' some few parts of her were inhabited, and after a sort repair'd, or rebuilt before (c). And

Secondly, even Mr. Dean himself, however some time for the sake of his Hypothesis he hath affirm'd that the enlarging, or repairing of Jerusalem by Nehemiah was not a rebuilding of her, yet elsewhere (d) he hath in fact represented it to be so, and in Historical relation hath not stuck expressly to call it so. For there he hath told us the plain truth of this matter after all his early, and so often repeated rebuilding of Jerusalem by virtue of Cyrus his Decree, viz. (e) that Nehemiah upon his coming thither found that City to be but THINLY inhabited. And well might Mr. Dean say this, as Nehemiah on this occasion hath expressly told us (f), as formerly observ'd, that the people were few therein, and the HOUSES were not BUILT.

---How then was the rebuilt by virtue of Cyrus his Decree?---But to remedy

should be repair'd, any otherwise than by being rebuilt. Besides the original word נכרת might be more properly rendered by the English word fortified, than as in our Translation repair'd. (a) The יבש of the Prophecy [Dan. ix. 25.] the יבש of Nehemiah [Ch. vii. 4.] i.e. the City broad in spaces, void of Houses as being yet unbuilt. The like phrase we meet with in other places of Scripture denoting prodigious breadths, or wideness. Particularly in Psalm civ. ver. 25, 's us' of the Sea. So that Jerusalem upon Nehemiah's coming thither was in this respect BROAD or WIDE like the OCEAN. Norwithstanding all her much boasted rebuilding in her hitherto by virtue of Cyrus's Decree, yet her VOID PLACES, and UNBUILT BROAD SPACES were so long after, as it were, without number. (4) See above, p. 144. (c) Thus Jeroboam is said [1 Kings xii. 25.] to have built Shechem in Mount Ephraim, and Penuel: but that was no otherwise than as he enlarg'd, and fortified those places, making the former a place capable of his keeping his Court at it, and placing a Garrison in the latter, for both those places had been inhabited before: as it appears of the former, in ver. 15; and of the latter, from Judges viii. 9, 17. (d) Con. Hist. p. 568. (e) ib. li. 6, &c. (f) Neb. vii. 4.
remedy this present nakedness of Jerusalem, as Mr. Dean there goes on to tell us concerning Nehemiah, he projected the THOROUGH repeopling of that place, &c. And truly in fact it was such a thorough repeopling, and rebuilding of her by him projected, as is evident from the number (a), and quality (b) of persons by him allotted to be brought into Jerusalem to become her Inhabitants, and consequent-ly of Houes and even of CEILED HOUSES now to be erected for their reception, as puts it beyond dispute (c) that as she was not rebuilt by virtue of Cyrus his Decree, so it was owing immediately to the going forth of another Decree, viz. that granted by King Artaxeryses (Longimanus) in the twentieth (d) year of his reign to Neh-emiah the Tirshatha (e): to whom therefore as God’s immediate in-trument herein, must necessarily remain under God the glory of his being not barely an Enlarger, or Repairer only of Jerusalem; but most truly, and properly the Rebuilder of that City: to the fully proving the Grant or Commandment given to him by the said King Artaxeryses to be the very Commandment for the rebuilding the Wall and Streets of Jerusalem immediately referred to by the Prophet Da-niel in his Prophecy of the Weeks now before us; and the Going forth whereof is expressly set down as the Characteristic, or sure and fixed Date of beginning the seven Weeks, and sixty-two Weeks also of the said Prophecy (f).

And having thus settled the beginning of the said Weeks, I shall only beg the Reader’s patience while I shut up the whole with the short following Character of the Tirshatha, or Governor, whose favour with the Persian King under God laid the foundation of this grand Epoch: and who in all respects, (God enabling Him thereunto) approved himself equal to the undertaking. He was truly a person highly valuable: and was therefore deserving of the great honour, to which he was advanced in the Persian Court. He had by his immediate office there (g) the privilege, and opportunity of being much in the King’s presence, and also in his royal favour: And of this he had no small share, as his History abundantly shews. But still all the Honours, and Pleasures, and Favours of the Court of Persia could not make him to forget Jerusalem (h). He was one of those, of whom the Psalmist (i) spake on this occasion: for he sat down and wept (k) when he remember’d Zion. And his Countrymen upon their coming to him to Babylon (l) had no sooner giv’n him a representation of the then miserable condition of Jerusalem in her still demolished, and defenceless state (m), but the religious Courtier be-

(a) Viz. ONE out of TEN out of the other Cities of Judah to come, and build at Jerusalem. [ch. xi. 1.] (b) Viz. The RULERS, and GREAT MEN of the Nation. [ib.] (c) However Dr. Prideaux [p. 268. l. 12.] hath made it a Matter beyond all dispute that Jerusalem was rebuilt by virtue of Cyrus’s Decree, and as soon as other Cities of Judah were built. (d) Neh. ii. 2. (e) Chr vii. 70. (f) Dan. ix. 25. (g) As being Cup-bearer to the King, Neh. i. 11. (h) Any more than the treasures of Egypt. [Heb. xi. 26.] could allure Moses to the making him to forget his afflicted Brethren. (i) Pf. 137. 1. (k) Neh. i. 4. (l) ver. 2; 3. (m) ib.
betook himself first in fasting, and in prayer unto God (a), and next in an humble tone to the King of Persia for his royal licence, countenance, and protection, in order to his restoration, and re-establishment. God heard his prayer, and the King granted his petition (b): to his issuing forth his royal Commission for rebuilding the Wall, and Streets of Jerusalem. And our wise, great, and good Governor executed the same with the greatest prudence, and conduct, and with an unparallel'd application, and constancy, and bravery (c). For as God had raised him up for this his work, so he inspired him with a Soul suitable thereunto. And herein he was under God a Restorer of the Jewish State: even in restoring unto Jerusalem first her Walls, and Gates, and after that also her Houses, and Inhabitants (d) as before her Defolation. He was in all this most truly, and properly her Rebuilder. During his whole Government he approved himself as in other qualifications requisite for a due, and honourable discharge of so high a trust as was committed to him, so particularly, as he himself tells us (e) in a generosity of spirit entirely devoid of all private interest, and wholly devoted to that of the publick: a quality this at all times, and in all places highly recommending Governors (as principally, and primarily to God the Supreme Governor, so also) to the esteem and love of the people by him committed to their Charge.

Nor was this wise, good, and great Governor less concerned for the spiritual, than he was for the temporal good of God's people. His care and concern reached not only to the bodies, but also to the souls of his Country-men. For as he was thus active, and useful in the state, so he was no less zealous for the Reformation of God's Church. He could no more away with the horrible abuses, and corruptions in the latter, than before his appointed administration he could with the distress, and disconsolateness of the former. It was therefore his equal care upon his coming to Jerusalem to redress all things that were amiss in both. Witness those his several Reformations of which we read in the fifth, and thirteenth Chapters of his book.

In few words, He was a most pious Reformer, and a most able Statesman. His great Endowments render'd him equal to a care and government of both Church, and State. Therefore was it committed to him of God. And as God was pleas'd to make this excellent person his immediate instrument in the execution of the royal Commandment refer'd to by the Angel in the Prophecy before us; and as the going forth thereof gives rise, as we have seen, to the beginning of the two first periods of these Weeks, so in our foregoing proofs of the same, and with this short but imperfect Character of God's immediate Agent, or Transactor herein we may put an end to this Chapter.

CHAP.

(a) Ver. 4. (b) ch. ii. 8. (c) ch. iii. and iv. (d) ch. xi.
CHAP. V.

Concerning the ENDING of the Seven Weeks of this Prophecy.

Having in the foregoing Chapter fixed the beginning of the Seven Weeks, we come now to consider their ending; and that according to the several Hypotheses of these Weeks now before us (a).

The late Bishop Lloyd, he assign'd the sealing up of Vision and Prophecy spoken of in the text (b), for the ending of these seven Weeks. This he suppos'd to have been fulfill'd in Malachi the last Prophet of God to the Jews his writing his book.

Mr. Dean of Norwich, He assigns the last act of Reformation by Nebemiah (c) for his ending of the said seven Weeks.

Both these Endings are indeed arbitrary, and consequently they carry no grounds of Certainty in them. However,

To consider Mr. Dean's in the first place; That is the last Act of Nebemiah's Reformation of the Jewish Church by him placed at the end of these seven Weeks, or forty nine years in the fifteenth of Darius Nothus. For then, as we are told (d) the Restoration of the Church, and state of the Jews in Jerusalem, and in Judæa was fully finished, in that last act of Reformation, which is recorded in the thirteenth Chapter of Nehemiah, from the 23d verse to the end of the Chapter, just forty nine years after it had been first begun by Ezra in the seventh year of Artaxerxes Longimanus.

But against such ending of the first seven Weeks of this Prophecy, there lie the following Objections rendring it void of any probability of truth.

First, the same is founded on a mistaken sense of the EXPRESS CHARACTER of the seven Weeks.

Secondly, and Consequentially Dr. Prideaux his beginning of these Weeks in the seventh of Artaxerxes, his figurative beginning of them being a mistaken beginning, his figurative ending of them as taken from such beginning is also necessarily a mistaken Ending of them.

But waving these general Objections, Dr. Prideaux his ending of these Hours in the fifteenth of Darius (Nothus) cannot possibly be a truly assign'd Ending of them: forasmuch as to his timing the last act of Nebemiah's Reformation in that year there evidently lies this main Objection, viz. that the Scriptur

(a) Mr. L. having said nothing concerning the Ending of these Weeks, we are not concern'd with him here. (b) Dan. ix. 24. (c) ch. xiii. 23-31. (d) Con. Hist. p. 410. l. 10. &c.
Concerning the ENDING of Scripture Account in the last Chapter of Nebemiah, doth not in the least countenance such forty-nine years extended reckoning, or the so late fixing the last act of Reformation by Nebemiah, but on the contrary gives us ground for supposing the said Reformation to have hapned much earlier: as will evidently appear by looking into particulars.

For to give Mr. Dean his thirteen years from the seventh of Artaxerxes to the twentieth, there will remain thirty six years of the forty-nine now before us allotted to Nebemiah for his administration. Of these thirty-six years twelve of them certainly ended in the thirty second (e) of Artaxerxes (f). And of these twelve years we are sure, and no more. However in Mr. Dean's reckoning there are thus elaped twenty-five years of the forty-nine now before us. The remaining twenty-four he hath made up out of the thirteenth Chapter of Nebemiah, First by accounting for five years of Nehemiah's staying at the Persian Court in the execution of his former Office, after which he obtained of the King to be sent back again to Jerusalem with a new Commission (g): viz. in the thirty seventh of Artaxerxes (b).—Then cefoward, we hear no more of Nebemiah from Mr. Dean, till in the fifteenth year of Darius Notbus (i), when Secondly, his remaining, nineteen Years are accounted for, in one single act of Nebemiah's suppos'd Reformation in that Year (k) separated from all the rest at so long a distance, as is this whole Interval.

These are the two last steps, or stages therefore of the forty nine years now before us. And these we must consider distinctly, and apart, the better to shew the very great improbability of this part of Mr. Dean's Hypothesis in these particulars of it.

First, as touching the five years which he makes Nebemiah to tarry at the Persian Court, after his return thither from Jerusalem in the thirty second of Artaxerxes; there lie against the said Supposition the following Objections.

First, as it was formerly observ'd, the generality of Chronologers, and Commentators are against Mr. Dean by his own confession (l) in this particular; and no wonder, because

Secondly, The Text (m) in the use of the word יִקְּדָשׁ in its common, and ordinary sense imports not years, as Mr. Dean would have it, but days. And so our Translators have rendred it, with the greatest reason, as Nebemiah himself hath before us'd the very same original

---

(e) Neh. xiii. 6. (f) Or in the year before, A. D. 433. (g) Con. Hist. p. 397. (b) Or in the year before, A. D. 428. (i) Or in the year before, A. D. 409. (k) For then according to Dr. Pride. [p. 410. l. ii.] The Restoration of the Church and State of the Jews in Jerusalem, and Judaea was wholly finished in that last act of Reformation, which is recorded in the thirteenth Chapter of Nebemiah from the twenty third verse to the end of that Chapter. (l) Con. Hist. p. 397. (m) Neh. xiii. 6. יִקְּדָשׁ לָךְ at the end of days. But that is no other than as in our Translation, After certain days: And so the Syrius Version hath it, viz. פֵיָּד dies aliquot excolites.
original word in this sense (n): as is plainly evident from the Context. And tho' the Hebrew word may in Scripture also signify years, as Mr. Dean hath here pleaded, which is readily granted, yet as in Nehemiah's use of it in the place just now mention'd, it certainly signifies days, so for that very reason it ought to be presum'd to signify days also, and not years in this other place of Nehemiah now before us. Nor

Thirdly, can we conclude otherwise for any thing there is in that which Mr. Dean hath here farther (o) told us, viz. That Nehemiah had been twelve years reforming that people, and Ezra also thirteen years before him, whereby they had brought their reformation to such a state, and stability, that a little time could not have been sufficient in such a manner again to have uncleas'd it: for there is a twofold reason here to be assign'd, which makes it not only possible that the Jews might, but also more than probable that they did return to their former corruptions rather after certain days after Nehemiah's absence from them, than after certain years. One is the very great proneness of that people to backsliding (p). They had not been otherwise the seed of their forefathers. But were these a people more stable than had been their Ancestors?—They forgot their great Reformer Moses only upon his going a few days from them into the Mount (q). Nay within forty days they forgot God himself, even after his visible, and dreadful appearance to them (r). Why then might not a race of that people in Nehemiah's time also forget him after certain days upon his being gone to the Persian Court?—Especially considering another reason here to be assign'd for the probability of their so doing, as they were doubtless under the strongest Temptations upon Nehemiah's departure from those (s), who by strange marriages were allied to them, and who did all that they possibly could do by way of opposition to Nehemiah while he was at Jerusalem, and consequently after his departure, did not fail of their continued and redoubled Endeavours to undo in his absence, what they were not powerful enough to do during his stay, or residence there. So that these Temptations besetting a people in themselves prone to Evil, it becomes more than probable that the Corruptions which the Jews ran into, in the absence of Nehemiah must have fai'n out not a great while after his going back to the Persian Court, even after certain days much more likely than after certain years, or Mr. Dean's conjectur'd five years. Nor is it likely,

M

Fourthly,

(n) Neb. i. 4: We read of him, that he mourned certain days. He could not have mourned certain years, for it was in the twentieth of Artaxerxes in the month Chislev that the brother of Nehemiah, &c. came to him from Jerusalem [ch. i. 1.] And it was in the month Nisan of that year [ch. ii. 1.] that Nehemiah obtain'd leave of the King to go thither. So that the certain days of Nehemiah's mourning were after Chislev, and before Nisan of that year.

(o) Con. Hist. p. 397. (p) Of which manifold are the instances in holy writ.

(q) Exodus ch. xxxii. (r) ch. xix. 16, 17a. 18. (s) Of whom was Zibiah the Ammonite in particular, [Neb. xiii. 4, 7.]
Concerning the Ending of

Fourthly, that the pious and zealous Governor would allow himself so long an absence as is the term here supposed from the holy City, to attend upon his Office of Cup-bearer to the Persian King (t). His heart doubtless was still at Jerusalem: for God had made it his immediate care. And therefore doubtless he mov'd the King of Persia for a speedy return thither, not long after his coming back to Court. And we need not in the least to question the King's good-will to him in this respect of his royal favour; since the same good Providence which at the first inclined the heart of the King towards him was able now again to dispose him to a farther Dispensation with his absence from Court, and doubtless did dispose him accordingly.

But to have done with these five years, and to proceed

Secondly, to the remaining nineteen in this point of Mr. Dean's Hypothesis: as Nehemiah is by him supposed to have return'd to Jerusalem in the thirty seventh of Artaxerxes (u), and then immediately to have made the three several Reformations mention'd in the thirteenth Chapter of his book from the seventh verse to the twenty second verse inclusive, and not to have made the one other there remaining Reformation, (viz. in verse the twenty third, &c.) 'till the nineteenth year following (w); to the making such a wide gap, or distance of time as conseqently there is between Nehemiah's working the three first Reformations here, and the fourth or last of them. As touching which supposition,

First, There is no reasonable ground for it. For surely 'tis somewhat strange, and therefore not very probable that Nehemiah should reform only three of the four general Corruptions mention'd in one, and the same Chapter upon his return to Jerusalem, and have nothing else to do for nineteen years together than barely to reform one other also mention'd in the same Chapter, at the end of that period. ——Did not all these Violations of God's Laws happen equally in Nehemiah's absence? ——Why then should they not have all been equally reform'd by him at his return? Or what reason is there for to have imagin'd that upon his return he should have animadverted upon, and reformed the three first Abuses, and Corruptions only, and that the fourth should have escaped his censure, and reformation not only 'till nineteen, but exactly 'till nineteen years after? ——A figurative Ending was now wanting to these seven Weeks, or forty nine years, which had before a figurative Beginning assign'd to them, and therefore hither this last act of Reformation by Nehemiah was postpon'd, and reserv'd for it. But

Secondly, there is no ground for it in the Text: as will appear by considering the several Corruptions of the Jews, and Nehemiah's reformation of them as by him (x) recorded. They are these follow-

(t) As Dr. Prideaux hath imagin'd, Con. Hist. p. 397. (w) Or in the year before A.D. 428. (u) Viz. The fifteenth of Darics Notten, or the year before A.D. 409. (x) Viz. in ch. xiii.
the Seven Weeks of this Prophecy.

Lest the Prophanation of the Temple for the sake of Tobiah an Ammonite (y). A second was an abuse in Tythes to the neglect of a due carrying on the daily service of the House of God (z). A third was the Prophanation of the Sabbath [a]. The fourth was the removal of all unlawful Marriages from among the people: One of them in particular is now before us, being the more notorious, as it was in the Pontifical Houfe (b).

The Reformation of the three first of these Corruptions among the Jews are paced by Mr. Dean, as we have observ'd in the first year of his conceive'd return of Nehemiah to Jerusalem after his five years absence, viz. in the thirty seventh of Artaxerxes, or in the year before A. D. 428. The last is fixed at nineteen years distance, viz. to the fifteenth of Darius (Nothus) or the year before A. D. 409.

Now as to the time of the coming in of these Corruptions, we learn from the Text, as to the two former of them, that they certainly hapned during Nehemiah's Absence from Jerusalem: the first of them especially (c). The second also was doubtless in his absence (d). As to the third, that hapned after Nehemiah's return: but when, or how soon after, we are perfectly at a loss. For it is said (e) concerning it only in general, that In those days Nehemiah saw, &c. But, as before noted, in Mr. Dean's account this hapned in the first year of the nineteen now before us (f).

As to the fourth, that Corruption had doubtless sprung up in the absence of Nehemiah, for he speaks of the Act as in a time past (g). In those days also saw I Jews that HAD married wives, &c. And the Reformation of it was most likely at the same time with his reforming the third, and left mention'd corruption: for that also was in those days (b). And why might not THOSE DAYS in both (i) places have been much about one and the same time? For in the latter place (k) they are coupled with an ALSO very truly as in our Translation (l) the Original plainly importing the same. Since therefore Mr. Dean hath placed the third Reformation of Nehemiah in the first of the nineteen years now before us, which Reformation is in the Text said only to have been in those days, I conceive that he ought also there to have placed the fourth Reformation, which in the Text is expressly said to have been in those days also. The Text plainly justifies this: but what can justifie Mr. Dean's separation of the fourth from the third to a nineteen years suppos'd distance from it, in truth I see not: much less to
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(y) u. 14. (z) v. 10. (a) v. 15. (b) v. 23. (c) Neh. xiii. 6. (d) v. 10. As the same is there spoken of to have hapned in a time past; viz. I perceived that the Portions of the Levites had not been giv'n them. (r) v. 15. (f) vix. in the 37th of Artaxerxes [Dr. Prid. Con. Hist. p. 402.] or in the year of his suppose'd return of Nehemiah from the Persian Court. (g) Neh. xiii. 23. (h) v. 15. (i) vix. in v. 15. and v. 23. (k) vix. in v. 23. (l) Also in those days: Which is plainly a Copulative to those foregoing and last mention'd days in v. 15.
Concerning the Ending of

his placing it in the high Priesthood of Joiada, and in the fifth year of that high Priesthood (m). For upon enquiry it will appear that in Nehemiah’s (n) account the marriage, and reformation of one of the sons of Joiada was in the high priesthood not of the said Joiada, but of his father Eliafhib. For the word High-Priest in the Text (o) is to be appropriated not to Joiada, but to Eliafhib.

And therefore our Translators so truly understanding it read the words, one of the sons of Joiada, the son of Eliafhib the High-Priest; the Comma being placed here after Joiada, but none after Eliafhib, because they took him, and not Joiada to be the High-Priest here spoken of.

But contrariwise Mr. Dean hath appropriated the word High-Priest to Joiada: however telling us withal, being justly apprehensive of the Objection which here lies against him, and therefore guarding against it, in the following words (p), viz. If any one shall say that in the Text of Nehemiah [Ch. xiii. 28.] the word High-Priest is put in apposition with Eliafhib, and not with Joiada, and that therefore this last act of Nehemiah’s Reformation was in the High-Priesthood of Eliafhib, and not in that of Joiada his son, my answer to it is that the Hebrew Original cannot bear this interpretation. For it having been the usage of the Jews, as well as of all other nations of the East, for the better distinguishing of persons, to add the name of the father to that of the son, in the same manner as was lately practised by the Welsh; and still is among the Irish, these words in the Text, Joiada Ben Eliafhib, i.e. Joiada the son of Eliafhib, altogether make but one name of the same person, and therefore the word High-Priest, which followeth can be put in apposition with nothing but the whole of it.——

Now all this indeed is very plausible. But there is nothing here as there ought to be to the making the argument of any weight, viz. that Mr. Dean’s obliging usage of writing among the Easterns, &c. was certainly Nehemiah’s way of writing here. I deny not but such was the usual Eastern way of writing: but Mr. Dean will not say that they always wrote so, or that they never wrote otherwise.—Nor do I find as to Nehemiah, that this was his way of writing at all throughout his book, when he hath elsewhere spoken of Eliafhib the High-Priest. For had this been Nehemiah’s manner of expressing himself when writing of Eliafhib as High-Priest, he should have said Eliafhib ben Joiakim, i.e. Eliafhib the son of Joiakim the High-Priest. This would have put the matter out of dispute: and Mr. Dean’s Observation with respect to his son Joiada had then been just. But whereas Nehemiah hath not wrote thus so much as once of the father Eliafhib, tho’ he hath more than once, or twice (q) made mention of him in his book.

(m) Con: Hist. p. 411.
(n) Ch. xiii. 18.
(o) ib.
(q) Ch. iii. 1. Nehemiah calls him simply Eliafhib the High-Priest. So again, v. 20: And in v. 21. He is spoken of twice barely by the name of Eliafhib. In Ch. xiii. 4.
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Book, there then surely remains no reason for to suppose with Mr. Dean that he wrote thus of Joiada the Son in the Text before us (r).

I cannot, therefore, but conclude that the word High-Priest must remain in apposition with Eliafbib; the Hebrew Original in Nehemiah's way, or manner of writing evidently bearing, and indeed requiring this interpretation in direct conformity to his speaking of Eliafbib elsewhere as High-Priest, and so doubtless speaking of him here, by way of aggravation of the great crime now reform'd by him, as it was committed by a Grandson of him who was High-Priest, even by one of the sons of Joiada, the Son of Eliafbib the then High-Priest. For otherwise what need had Nebemiah of mentioning Eliafbib at all here? If Joiada had been then High-Priest, he need only to have said, one of the sons of Joiada the Priest, or Joiada the High-Priest. For this as I have evidently prov'd out of Nebemiah was his manner, or way of writing with respect to Eliafbib the father always; and therefore doubtless he would have written so likewise of the son in the Text disputed, had the son been then High-Priest. I see not therefore the least reason for the Supposition before us that he was.

But Mr. Dean's last Act of Reformation by Nebemiah which is his assign'd Ending of the seven Weeks of Daniel's Prophecy was in order thereunto necessarily to be fixed according to his series of High-Priests, in the High-Priesthood of Joiada. And therefore we are told (s) as much in the account which we have of this whole Proceeding, and the inducements determining Mr. Dean in it: and all is summed up in the REASONABLENESS of it (t).

As to which all I do reasonable of this part of Mr. Dean's Hypothesis, considering all that hath been already said by way of inquiry into the several particulars which have been before us) I need only to observe that that can never be reasonably inferred here which is in no wise warranted by the Text (w). That can not possibly be a reasonable Hypothesis wherein the holy Scriptures are immediately concern'd, which is not perfectly agreeing with them. But herein, as I have been now shewing, not they but Dr. Prideaux hath determined, and even determined that which they do not admit of.

He is call'd Eliafbib the Priest, and v. 7. only Eliafbib, and in v. 28: [the Text in dispute] Eliafbib the High-Priest. And these are all the places where he is mention'd by Nebemiah: forasmuch as according to Dr. Prideaux, [Com. Hist. p. 301. lin. 9.] All of the 13th Chapter from the first to the twenty sixth verse inclusive was never written by Nebemiah, but is an interpolation ther included long after his death by those who received this book into the Canon of Scripture. But there he is no otherwise spoken of than he is by Nebemiah. And that this was one and the same Eliafbib the High-Priest spoken of throughout, and not another Priest of that name, Dr. Prideaux hath told us so. [Com. Hist. p. 399.] (r) Ch. xiii. 28. (t) Com. Hist. p. 411. l. 28. (t) ib.

(a) Neh. xiii. 28.
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For not the Prophecy before us, but Mr. Dean hath fixed the beginning of the seven weeks to the seventh of Artaxerxes, whereby are cut off thirteen (w) years from his assign'd ending of them in the fifteenth of Darius Nothus. And Mr. Dean hath inform'd us of a five years absence from Jerusalem of Nebemiah after his return to the Persian Court in the two and thirtieth year of King Artaxerxes (x): not Nebemiah himself, in whose language (y) after certain days (or at the end of days) be obtained leave of the King to return to Jerusalem (z): And as to the remaining nineteen years following; at the end of which is arbitrarily fixed the last act of Nebemiah's Reformation, and therein the Ending of the seven Weeks, or forty nine years before us, this is entirely Mr. Dean's Chronology, not Nebemiah's. And these Years are no less in danger of being cut off also upon this most probable supposition that Nebemiah might work this fourth and last Reformation in one and the same year of his return, in which he wrought the three foregoing Acts mentioned in one and the same (a) Chapter of his book; at least, as I have above shewn, at the same time in which he wrought the third of them, nineteen years before: to the taking away consequently this most improbable Gap of Mr. Dean's now before us between the third and fourth acts of Nebemiah's Reformation made at Jerusalem.

But there is yet a certain reason whereby the last five years of this arbitrary period must necessarily be cut off, forasmuch as in Mr. Dean's own series of the Priesthood, the said five years belong to that of Joiada, as the fourth Act of Reformation by Nebemiah now before us in the nineteen years postponing thereof from the third is made coincident with the fifth year of that High-Priest. Whereas as I have shewn plainly from Nebemiah himself (b), Eliajsib, and not Joiada was High-Priest at the time when he wrought this Reformation.

And Finally, Whereas we are by Nebemiah confin'd to the High Priesthood of Eliajsib for his making this his last act of Reformation, the same for any thing that we know to the contrary might have been made by him nineteen years earlier, however certainly some years before the death of that High-Priest.

So far is Mr. Dean's figurative Hypothesis through this whole first period of this Prophecy, or of the first seven Weeks, or forty nine years of it, from being a true, or justifiable Hypothesis.——And so pass We

---Secondly---

(w) As the going forth of the Prophetick Commandment for the rebuilding the Wall, and Streets of Jerusalem was not in the seventh, but in the twentieth of Artaxerxes.
(x) Ch. xiii. 6. (y) As the word "VH" in Chapter xiii. 6. signifies Days: for so Nebemiah us'd the word before, viz. in Chapter i. 4. in a sense importing Days, and not years; as formerly noted.
(z) Neb. xiii. 6, 7. (a) viz. in Ch. xiii.
Secondly, To the late Bishop Lloyd's in this part of it, or in his assign'd Ending of the first seven Weeks of this Prophecy. And that is the sealing up of Vision, and Prophecy (c): which is one of the six general Events mention'd in verse the twenty fourth (d). For the Bishop expounding this predicted Event of God's shutting up, or putting an end to all Vision and Prophecy in the Jewish Church referred the same to the Prophet Malachi (God's last Prophet to the Jews) his writing his book of Prophecy to that people, (as the Bishop placed it) in the end of these seven Weeks, or at the distance of forty-nine years from their fire beginning in the twentieth of Artaxerxes, when went forth the Commandment to rebuild the City of Jerusalem, the Wall, and the Streets thereof. And for this that truly learned Bishop had doubtless very good reasons, beyond what I can here take upon me to assign.—However, He might be hereunto induced perhaps,

First, As the original words in the Prophecy taken in a large or unconfined sense (e) might admit of such completion; or accomplishment of them.

Secondly, As there is a Jewish Tradition of which the learned Dr. Prideaux hath also taken notice (f), actually referring to the Prophecy of Daniel, as the very completion of his sealing up of Vision, and Prophecy, the ceasing of the spirit thereof among them in God's last Prophet to them. And

Thirdly, As it is in no wise improbable but that Malachi might prophecy at such a distance of years as is that of forty-nine years (g) from the twentieth of Artaxerxes, so as in point of time the
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(c) See the Chronological Tables published in the year 1713: Table the third, in Column B, in the year before Christ 397. (d) Viz. Dan. ix. 24. (f) נָשָׁב רֹאשׁוֹ. Ad obligandum Visionem, & Propheta, i.e. Vida Prophetica, [Grot.] ut sit Henodiades—[מַשָּׁב] Ad obligandum, five ad periculandum, to bring to its design'd end and perfection. And so the learned Dr. Prideaux hath told us, [Con. Hist. p. 264.] the same word which in Hebrew signifies to seal up, is also used to Jewish, and complet. And thus Prophecy being now wholly finished in the Jewish Church, as God brought it to his design'd perfection of it in that age by his last Prophet Malachi, in whose solemn ending of his own, and therewith for a time all Prophecy in general, God did as it were also fit to his seal, [so closing up all Prediction in general, and of the Messias in particular, till the appointed time for its being open'd again at his coming in and by him,] these weeks might in this sense, and application of the Phrase be said to have their Ending; would the separating of this Event from the other five in verse twenty-four after all allow of it; tho' Events being doubtless applicable to the Messias, this also must necessarily remain with them applied to him. (f) In Con. Hist. p. 211. [from Abr. Zacc in Chuchanan, Dav. Ganz in Zemach Da- vid, Seder. Olam Zura, &c.] viz. that in the last year of Darius died the Prophets Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, and that thereon ceased the spirit of Prophecy from among the Children of Israel, and that this was the Obsevation, or sealing up of Vision and Prophecy spoken of by the Prophet Daniel, ch. ix. 24. (g) That Mal- achi was the last Prophet of God to the Jews under the Old Testament Dispensation, and that therefore he prophesied after Haggai, and Zechariah, it is beyond all dispute. And the learned Dr. Prideaux thinking it most likely that he write after Ezra's time [Con. Hist. p. 173.] hath placed the time of his prophesying under Nehemiah in the 17th year of his Administration at Jerusalem, [p. 397.] But it is perhaps more probable that this Prophet wrote later, even after, rather than under Nehemiah's Administration: Because
Concerning the Ending of

Bishop might well enough assign such accomplishment to this predicted Event.

But after all, whereas this is merely conjectural, and especially, whereas

First, this Event of sealing up of Vision, and Prophecy is spoken of in company with five other Events (b) all of them applicable to the Messiah, and fulfilled (i) in him, this also of course must remain to him, it being therefore both unnatural, and unwarrantable to separate it from the rest for an imaginary ending of these seven Weeks, or forty-nine years; and whereas

Secondly, there is no manner of mention made in verse the twenty-fifth, where we ought reasonably to look for it; and where it would surely have been affixed to this period there expressly mention’d, had it any reference thereunto: And whereas

Thirdly, another Event is unquestionable in the Text assignable to these seven Weeks, viz. the rebuilding the Walls, and Streets of Jerusalem, as the same must necessarily be appropriated to them, (as the learned Dr. Prideaux (k) hath truly here observ’d, tho’ he hath taken

Because, First, had this Prophet writ under it, we should probably have heard of him from Nehemiah in his book, as together with the Governor lending his hand to the redressing the prevailing Corruptions of those times. Secondly, had he not writ some time after Ezra’s prophesying of the Temple, [Neh. xiii. 4—9] and even after his High-Priesthood, it is most likely that his Reproofs of the Priest would not have been only in general, [as we find that they are ch. ii. 1.] but they would have been particular, and by name have been directed to that High-Priest: To the sparing him no less in his personal reproofs for profaning the Temple, than Haggai, God’s Prophet before him had spared [ch. i. 2.] even the Governor, and High-Priest of his time for their having neglected to rebuild it. Thirdly, tho’ Dr. Prideaux hath told us [Con. Hist. p. 397] that the greatest of the Corruptions, which this Prophet charged the Jews with, are the same with those which they had run into in the time of Nehemiah’s absence, yet there is no concluding from thence that in this time Malachi’s Prophecies were deliver’d, because the Jews might possibly fall again into those very Corruptions long after, and Confessively his Prophecies might have been deliver’d after. And indeed in Malachi’s time Corruption seems to have spread itself more universally, and to have got to a greater height both among Priests, and People: [the former especially, even the whole Priesthood, ch. i. 6. ii. 1. 8. 9.] than even before in the days of Nehemiah; and notwithstanding his labour’d Reformations among them. And Fourthly, it seems more likely than not, that Malachi should have prophesied at some distance of time after Nehemiah’s Administration rather than under it, as a Prophet from the Lord was wont among his people at that time, when they had him a wife, and faithful, and pious Governor providentially set over them: but when after that he was no longer with them, the Jews again fell away like their forefathers, they then greatly flocked in need of a Prophet to be once more sent unto them from God. And herein is God’s Goodness to his people yet magnified, that after his having graciously refused his people both in Church and State by their Governors Ezra, and Nehemiah, he should finally after their administration speak unto them thro’ an ungrateful and rebellious people by this his Prophet. And that God did so speak unto them, the additional solemn Prophecies of this Prophet in ch. iii. and iv. of the coming of the Messiah, and John the Baptist his forerunner in ch. iv. 5. 6 together with the solemn charge to the Jews till then to flock to the Old Testament Scriptures, [as in the verse preceding] do finally, make it more than probable that this Prophet might write much later than Nehemiah’s time, even so late as the eighth year of Artaxerxes Mnaemon, or in the year before A. D. 397, when the late Bishop Lloyd placed it, to his having therein his ending of the seven Weeks now before us, were there not other strong Reasons which will not at all admit of this Event, as the Ending of the seven Weeks.

(b) Dan. ix. 24.

(i) See our Exposition. p. 2

(k) Con. Hist. p. 290, Though in the end of the twenty-fifth verse both the two first periods of these Weeks, viz. that of seven Weeks, and that
the Seven Weeks of this Prophecy. 169

it in a figurative, we in the literal sense) I have for these reasons accordingly in the preceding (l) Exposition of this Prophecy remarked the said literal rebuilding as the immediate Event of this same period of Weeks (m): herein only begging leave to vary from that most learned, and judicious Prelate, whose Exposition is now before us.

And how this part of the Prophecy had its full accomplishment in Nebemiah's coming to Jerusalem in the twentieth year of the reign of Artaxerxes King of Persia, with an express Commission from that King to set up the Walls, and Gates, and to rebuild the Houses of that City, and how the Walls thereof were actually set up in that year, and also how the thorough repeopling, and rebuilding of it being by him most wisely, and effectually projected soon after, the void or waste places of that City as left in their ruins by the Babylonians began thence forward from time to time, to be again replenished with Houses, and Inhabitants, 'till at length in about half a Century, or in the here predicted period of seven Weeks, or forty-nine years, it might have been fully brought to a state of perfection, or recovery of its antient grandeur and lustre, and therein be truly, and properly denominated rebuilt. I have already occasionally shewn, and therefore I need not to repeat here.

I have also formerly (n) had occasion to shew that this great work of rebuilding the waste places of Jerusalem could not likely be accomplished in a less period of time than the prophetick period now before us.

I need therefore only Finally, to add as to the Jews having this full period of time (viz. of the here predicted seven Weeks, or forty-nine years) to themselves therein quietly, and undisturbedly to accomplish this work, should that be made a matter of doubt, or objection here, that there is no room at all that I know of, for it.

There cannot be any, during King Artaxerxes (Longimanus) his reign, for he gave the Jews their Grant to rebuild their City. And He reigned some twenty-one years from Nebemiah's being sent Governor by him (o), for that purpose.

And as to the next King of Persia, viz. Darius Nothus, we have Dr. Prideaux's authority (p) for Nebemiah's being still Governor at Jerusalem 'till the fifteenth year of the reign of that King. Consequently 'till this time all was well with the Jews. And in the year

that of threefem. and two Weeks being mention'd together, the Event of restoring and building [that is, of rebuilding] Jerusalem with its Street and Ditch [Wall] is subjoined to both of them without any distinct application to either, yet the words immediately following in the next verse appropriating the time of the Messiah to the period of sixtytwo Weeks, this necessarily leaves the other, that is the restoring and building [or rebuilding] of Jerusalem with its Streets or Ditch [Wall] to be appropriated to the period of seven Weeks.---

(l) Viz. in p. 3.
(m) And thus our learned Mr. Lydias explain'd this part of the Prophecy.
(n) See p. 142. 8cc.
(o) Nebemiah went with his Grant to Jerusalem in the twentieth of Artaxerxes, in the year before Christ 445. (p) See Con. Hist. p. 410 sub Anno anti. A. D. 409, in which year He makes Nebemiah to work his last act of Reformation.
Concerning the Ending of

following Mr. Dean (g) speaks of him also as still Governor there; telling us withal as a thing most likely that Nehemiah continued in his Government to the time of his death; but when that hapned it is no where said. But whenever that was, here were now some thirty-seven years past in Mr. Dean's account of Nebemiah's Life, and Government, as we are thus brought into the sixteenth year of the reign of Darius Notbus. And Nebemiah might possibly live longer, and govern at Jerusalem, as being now suppos'd (r) to be but seventy years old.

However, as for the remaining three years (s) of Darius's reign, even if it were suppos'd that he had an evil eye against the Jews, and there is nothing in History that I know of looking this way, yet if he had, his hands were then full with the Egyptians, and the Arabians, and the Medes, and also in Greece (t).

And as for Artaxerxes Mnemon, who was the next King of Persia, great were the perplexities of his reign for the first four years of it, occasion'd by the rebellion of his younger brother Cyrus. And He was no sooner cut off (w), but in the next year (w) there was work enough for him in Lesser Asia: which continued beyond the expiration of our prophetick period of seven Weeks, or forty nine years in the eighth year of his reign (x). And we are not any farther concern'd with his reign. But hitherto forasmuch as for any thing that we find, or have the least reason to suspect to the contrary, the Jews had long been, and now were, in a perfect state of Tranquility: and whether Nebemiah were living, or dead, they might be now as it were sui juris (y). However, they had doubtless full opportunity all this while of rebuilding their City, that is, of restoring it again to its ancient strength, structure, and grandeur: the great work this which either in their Walls, or in their Streets they had hitherto from time to time under their hands, even from Nebemiah's coming thither among them in the twentieth year of the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus King of Persia, with his royal Commission thereunto immediately authorizing God's people.

And

[Ant. xi. 5] tells us that he died loaded with years.  (s) For he reign'd 19 years.
(x) In the fifth of Artaxerxes the Lacedemonians join'd with the Athenians against the Persians.
(y) See Dr. Prid. Con. Hist. p. 439.  (x) Under the Government of the High-Priest; an Oath of Fidelity being however taken to the Persian King, and a tributary acknowledgment of his Sovereignty being made yearly by them; for this we find from Josephus [Ant. xi. 8] was the State of their Government when Alexander in the year before A. D. 332, came to them from the Siege of Tyre. He, it seems, had sent in that siege to Judas to furnish him with necessaries for his Army: who in anwser pleased his Oath to Darius. And in their favours asked of him, the Jews defir'd no more than his continuation of the privileges which they had before enjoyed under their great Government Nebemiah, and after his death doubtless, 'till Alexander's coming among them, viz: the free exercise of their Country Laws, and Religion, and an exemption from tribute every seventh year, because therein they did not sow: which he readily granted.  

----Dr. Prideaux [in Con. Hist. Vol. 1. p. 427] hath indeed imagin'd that after the death of Nebemiah, the Country of Judæa was thenceforth wholly subject to the Government of Sy-
And thus we have gone through this first period of Weeks; from its Beginning to its Ending, as respectively in the other Hypotheses which have been here under consideration, so also in the rise, continuation, and accomplishment of this the predicted Event thereof in the letter of this Prophecy. And having so done, we have also done with the first part of this Treatise.

... and that under him the High-Priest had the regulating all Affairs therein. But this is mere Conjecture, and what there is no ground for. And Dr Prideaux hath elsewhere told us the contrary [viz. in Vol. ii. p. 662] in the following words, The Tribe of Judah returning from their captivity into their own Land, had there their SCEPTRE and LAW-GIVER again restor'd to them. For being there imbodied again under the same Constitution of Government, they had again PRINCES of their own to be RULERS over them, and the Administration of Justice under them by their OWN LAWS in the same manner as before, and so they CONTINUED to have without INTERRUPTION, excepting only the three years and an half of Antiochus's persecution, &c. ... The Jews were therefore surely after Nehemiah's death sui juris: and not subject to the Governor of Syria, but merely under the Government of their High-Priest, they however making their acknowledgment to the Kings of Persia, as above.

PART.
PART the SECOND,

WHICH

Treateth of the Seven Weeks, and Sixty two Weeks: As the said two Numbers of Weeks together constitute the second Period of this Prophecy.


CHAP. I.

Concerning the Beginning of the Seven Weeks, and Sixty two Weeks.

E come now to consider the second Period of this Prophecy consisting of sixty nine weeks; viz. of three-score and two Weeks in reckoning grafted in upon the foregoing seven Weeks (a). And these according to our proposed method, We are to consider in the twofold respect, First of their Beginning, Secondly of their Ending.

And First, Of their Beginning.

And this from what hath been said of the beginning of the first seven Weeks is already evident: As the same Arguments which have

(a) As in Reckoning they necessarily must be, because it is expressly said in the Text, (Dan. ix. 25.) that from the going forth of the Commandment—shall be seven Weeks, and sixty two Weeks: that is, 7 Weeks for the Event there expressly specified of re-building Jerusalem: and 62 Weeks, [v. 26.] for the cutting off the Messiah at the end of them. But there is but One and the same Beginning here spoken of, from whence should be reckon'd the two respective Periods, which are here solemniz'd with these Events. Therefore the 62 Weeks are evidently to be reckon'd upon the foregoing 7 Weeks to the continuing a period of 69 Weeks; as Christ was no otherwise cut off after 62 Weeks from the going forth of the Prophetick Commandment than as those 62 Weeks are reckon'd upon the foregoing seven Weeks taking their beginning from the going forth of such Commandment.
have proved our beginning of the said seven Weeks do necessari-
ly prove the beginning of these sixty nine weeks also, as sixty two
weeks in reckoning immediately following upon those seven weeks
together make sixty nine Weeks.

But farther, in order to discover the true Beginning of these sixty
nine weeks, we may look to the sure Ending of them. And thence
by reckoning upwards so many weeks to the time of the going
forth of the here predicted Commandment, we shall not fail of
coming this way also to the knowledge of the true Beginning of
them.

Now the Scripture Ending of these sixty nine Weeks, and that
alone can be the true Ending of them, is certainly according to the
Prophecy, as we shall see anon (b), some time in that year
which immediately preceded the Passover in which the Messiah
was cut off, or Christ our Passover (c) was sacrificed for us. For ac-
ccording to this Prophecy Our Saviour Christ could not survive a
whole year after the expiration of these sixty nine Weeks, or four
hundred and eighty three Years: as it will be hereafter (d) shewn.
And he could not die but at Passover, as it will be also shewn (e).
And Finally, it will be shewn (f) that he died in the very Passo-
over after the expiration of these sixty nine Weeks in a reckoning
of time from the going forth of the Protetick Commandment to re-
build the Wall, and Streets of Jerusalem. And therefore from the
going forth of such Commandment, which as I have formerly
shewn was in the twentieth year of the reign of Artaxerxes Longi-
genus, King of Persia, did the late most learned Bishop Lloyd in
perfect agreement with the express letter of this Prophecy date his
Beginning of these Weeks.

And the Bishop had otherwise the greatest reason for so doing, as
no Reckoning whatsoever from the going forth of any of the other
three preceding Commandments whether by Solar, or Lunar Years (g),
can possibly throw out sixty nine Weeks of Years, or four hundred
and eighty three Years, as they ought to do to agree with the
Prophecy, between these two expres prophetick terms, to which
we are pinned down in the Text for the Beginning and Ending of
these Weeks. And Consequently None of those preceding Com-
mandments can with any agreeableness to the Prophecy give a be-
inning to these Weeks.

The learned Mr. Dean of Norwich as he hath begun these
Weeks from the seventh of Artaxerxes, hath herein endeavour'd
to help his Hypothesis by making the whole seventy Weeks of this
Prophecy to end in the death of Christ, and the sixty nine of them
to

(b) sic. in the following Chapter. (c) 1 Cor. v. 7. (d) sic. in the next Chapter.
(e) ib. (f) ib. (g) From the first of Cyrus to the cutting off of Christ are 568
Years; from the second of Darins to the said fad 552 Years; and from the seventh of
Artaxerxes to the same 490 Years. But the Prophetick Period now before us is but
483 Years. Thus all these Reckonings exceed by Solar Years, much more by Lunar
Years, when reckon'd from the going forth of any of these three Commandments in
favour of Jerusalem.
174 Of the Beginning of the 7 Weeks, and 62 Weeks, to have had their ending at his Coming seven years before, viz. in his coming to his Ministry. But these being in both these respects mistaken Endings of these Weeks, as we shall see hereafter (b), Mr. Dean's now mention'd beginning of these Weeks becomes necessarily also a mistaken Beginning.

Mr. L. also hath begun his five hundred years period (which he hath found in this Prophecy of the Seventy weeks) from the seventeenth of Artaxerxes (i). But his is such an arbitrary, and indeed unjustifiable seventeenth of that King's reign as the Learned can not admit of, because

First, it is absolutely inconsistent with Ptolemy's (k) seventeenth of that King's reign. And this puts Mr. L. quite beside the mark in his Exposition of these Weeks, were there no other Objection against his Beginning of them. For whereas the learned Dr. Prideaux hath also fixt his beginning of these Weeks in the 7th of Artaxerxes, yet he is entirely consistent with Ptolemy's year thereof: as the Year of the Julian Period, with which he hath made the said 7th of Artaxerxes coincident, is truly the Year 4236 (l). On the other hand Mr. L. hath stretched a point in Chronology here so far as to differ about some six years from Dr. Prideaux, as the Year of the J. P. 4250 (m) is Mr. L.'s Year thereof, with which he hath made coincident the 7th of Artaxerxes: And Consequently herein also is a like difference with Ptolemy's Canon. And

Secondly, tho' other Authorities are alledg'd by Mr. L. in justification of himself here, yet the whole centers in Ctesias: from whom Mr. L. hath assign'd but thirty one years to the reign of Darius Hyphasis, whereas Ptolemy hath giv'n him thirty six years, and so many Herodotus had also giv'n him long before. And the five years thus taken off from the reign of Darius Hyphasis Mr. L. hath thrown into the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus, to the encroaching the years of his reign, and therein to the anticipating, or making to come so much earlier the first year of the reign of King Artaxerxes, and consequently his seventeenth also for the sake of his Hypothesis: to which I shall speak more particularly present. But

First, as touching the contracted reign of Darius Hyphasis in the 5 years cut off from it upon the authority of Ctesias?—Alas what is his Authority here?—Mr. L. is not ignorant of the opinion of the Antients concerning him (n). Nor is he less slighted by the Moderns (o).

Mr:

or, as together they make 69 Weeks.

Mr. L. hath indeed call'd in question the credit of Herodotus (p): However the testimony of the latter is surely full as good as that of the former. It is put out of doubt that it is much more so, as in this particular the Generality of Writers have followed him (q), and not Ctesias: and especially as the great and immortal Ptolemy hath received his account, and not that of Ctesias here into his Canon.—But will Mr. L. say as much against Ptolemy, as he hath against Herodotus?——He will not (r).——Therefore the calling in question the authority of Herodotus here is groundless: for Ptolemy’s Authority confirms his. Had Ptolemy done as much for Ctesias, the Scales had then certainly turn'd here in his favour: but contrariwise We see the balance most powerfully turning not for him, but for Herodotus.

But Mr L. hath here (s) told us in favour of Ctesias that he was chief Physician to Artaxerxes Mnemon.—And I pray, what then?——Is his Authority a-whit the greater on that account?——If it be, why did not Mr. L. follow Ctesias also in the years of the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus, as well as he had before in the years of the reign of Darius Hyphasis?——Ctesias hath giv'n Artaxerxes Longimanus but forty two years. Mr. L. hath giv'n that King between forty five and forty six years. But if Ctesias’s Authority were ever the greater for the reason here alleged, viz. that He was Physician to Artaxerxes Mnemon, for the exact years of the reign of Darius Hyphasis, it is surely much more so as to the years of the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus, as that King’s reign was so much nearer to Ctesias’s own time. But Ctesias his Authority is not admitted by Mr. L. as to that King’s reign: therefore his testimony is equally to be rejected as to the years of Darius Hyphasis.

But we are yet told by Mr. L. (t) in favour of Ctesias, and in his own vindication in following him, that his Authority is support-ed by the Arundel Marble Chronicon, as therein the death of Darius Hyphasis is fixed to the year that Artidides was Archon at Athens; which according to Plutarch in his life of Artidides was in the year (u) following the defeat of the Persians at Marathon (w).

But of what service this testimony can be here, in truth I see not, however urged by Mr. L. upon the Authority also of that eminent Chronologer Mr. Lydiat (x). For

First,

Amis. lib. viii. c. 28. Plutarch in Artaxerxes:] they generally speaking of him as a FA-BULOUS Writer. ———He professing that all he wrote was taken out of the royal records of Persia, in which all Transactions according to the Law there ordained for this purpose faithfully registred, this ISPOSED on Many to give him more credit than he DESERV-ED. [ib.] (p) Chron. Eff. p. 78. (q) ‘Tis Mr. L’s own Acknowledgment, p. 78. ib. (r) For he justly reverenceth Ptolemy’s Canon; but only he would beg his pardon in departing from him in the particulars now before us: thinking that for the sake of his Hypothesis he might do so, without lessening the authority of this Canon in any other respect, or so much as losing one year, in all the Years it gives an account of: as are Mr. L’s words; Chron. Eff. p. 84. (i) p. 75, 78. (i) ib. (w) Or in the year before A. D. 490. (w) Chron. Eff. p. 75. (x) Can. Chron. p. 57. 73.
First, the Author of that Chronicon gives but twenty seven years to the reign of Darius Hystaphis: And herein he is agreeing neither with Herodotus, nor with Ctesias. And

Secondly, though the Author thereof might begin the reign of Darius Hystaphis, (as Mr. Lydias (y) the better to set off his opinion here hath supposed) from his taking of Babylon, after a twenty months siege thereof (z), which was five years from the death of the Magian (a), and so this Account of his twenty seven years reign will become reconcileable with Ctesias's thirty one years assign'd to this King, as they are reckon'd from the death of the Magian (b): And though according to Plutarch (c), Aristides, as it is here urged, was Archon at Athens in the year after the battle at Marathon, yet still this testimony of Plutarch proves nothing as to the death of Darius in that year. That proves nothing but the Archon of the Year after the battle at Marathon. And Aristides being then Archon, the Author of the Marble could not but of course place the death of Darius in that Archonship: even because his twenty seven Years reign of that King from Mr. Lydias's supposed beginning thereof necessarily end in that year.

Indeed according to Ctesias his thirty one years assign'd to Darius, he must also have died in this year.——But if the Author of the Marble Chronicon followed Ctesias, or some other who had follow'd him in the end of this King's reign, why had not he, or they also followed him in the beginning of his reign?——Or how came it to pass, that this Author gave Darius only a twenty seven years reign, whereas Ctesias hath giv'n him a reign of one and thirty years?——In short, We need no other answer than in the words of Mr. L. (d), as he hath told us, and therein indeed hath hit on the true reason here, viz. that this Author had no Account that he could depend on.——But if so:——if the Compiler of this Chronicon had no ground for what he hath deliver'd as touching this reign, as confessedly here he had not, I must then here beg leave to put the question, how Mr. L. or how We can, or indeed why we ought at all to depend upon his authority as to Darius his death after a twenty seven years reign?——If we depend upon it, we must confessedly depend upon uncertainty; and against the confessed (e) Generality of Writers also, and the true testimony of Ptolemy also, and more especially, as he hath declared for Herodotus's thirty six years of Darius, as before noted.

But after all, as to this taking off of these five years from the reign of Darius, it will not answer the end propos'd formerly by Mr. Lydias, and since by Mr. L. for the beginning of the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus so many years earlier, that the 7th of Artaxerxes;

(a) Smerdas, or the Artaxerxes mention'd in the fourth Chapter of Ezra. [See Prid. Con. Hist. p. 175.] (b) After a reign of 7 months from the death of Camæus.——Darius his first was in the Year before A. D. 521. He took Babylon in the year before A. D. 516. (c) In Aristides. (d) Chron. Epp. p. 76. lib. i. (e) ib. p. 78.
taxerxes, from whence Mr. L. begins these Weeks, and the twentieth thereof from whence Mr. Lydiat began them might also come so much the sooner, by the addition of them to the years of the reign of the said Artaxerxes; for the Testimonies alleged'd by way of Vindication here do in no wise bear them out in departing from Ptolemy's Canon also in this King's reign; as we shall see by briefly looking into thole Testimonies.

First, It is here alleged'd from Diodorus Siculus that the Flight of Themistocles was in the second year of the seventy seventh Olympiad (e); And

Secondly, From Cornelius Nepos, and Thucydides, and Charon of Lampfacsus, that the said Themistocles came into Persia to Artaxerxes then newly reignning after his father's death, and hence it is concluded that the Year of the flight of Themistocles, and the first year of the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus must be coincident, and consequently that the latter must be raised up so much higher. But against such Conclusion there lie the following Objections shewing the very great uncertainty, and indeed groundlees ness of it. viz.

First, though Thucydides and Charon of Lampfacsus have affirm'd as above, yet Others, and they the greatest Number according to Plutarch (f), have affirm'd otherwise; viz. that Themistocles came not to Artaxerxes, but to his father Xerxes. And Cornelius Nepos (g) also acknowledgeth the same, though he follow'd Thucydides: But Plutarch hath call'd in question (h) the Chronological Tables followed by Thucydides. And thus this becomes a more doubtful Point. Therefore there ought not to be any reasoning from hence to the Point in hand: for indisputably it cannot afford any sure foundation for the solution of any part of this solemn Prophecy now before us.—But

Secondly, Even allowing Thucydides, and Charon of Lampfacsus to have been certainly in the right as to Themistocles his coming to Artaxerxes, and not to Xerxes, yet there can be no sure conclusion hence to such raised first of Artaxerxes, as is now under consideration. Because,

First, Diodorus Siculus might be mistaken as to the Year of Themistocles his coming into Persia. For he is of no such uncontrollable Authority as Thucydides, and Charon of Lampfacsus: and however his Authority be often quoted by the greatest Chronologers, as Mr. L. (i) hath here giv'n us to understand, yet upon better authority he is also often laid aside (k). And the learned (l) Mr. Dodwell in this very particular hath therefore made no Scruple of laying him aside: having brought the flight of Themistocles six years lower (m)

---

(e) viz. in the Year before A. D. or the common Christian Era 471. (f) In Themistocles. (g) Alfo in Themistocles. (h) ib. (i) Chron. Effay, p. 78. (k) Sir F. Massham speaks of him as writing in some things Hyperbolically, [p. 75.] and falsely, [p. 476 and 485.] and that from Ctesias, [twice in the pages last quoted.] (l) Annal. Thucyd. p. 78. See the learned Dr. Prideaux also, 6th. Ed. p. 286. (m) viz. into the Year before A. D. 465; Olymp. 78. 40.
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In order to reconcile his testimony with Thucydides, and Charon of Lampsius, their testimony of Themistocles' coming to Artaxerxes, in the true first year of that King's reign. And yet

Secondly, There may possibly be another way of saving the credit of Diodorus Siculus here, and of making him consistent with Thucydides' account of Themistocles' coming to Artaxerxes, as Themistocles his flight into Asia might be in the year assigned by Diodorus Siculus, or in the fifteenth year of the reign of King Xerxes, and yet his arrival at the Persian Court might not be till presently after the death of Xerxes, and so in the first of Artaxerxes according to Thucydides. For it is more than probable that the several intervening passages of this History (n) of Themistocles might have been under transaction five or six years, or the whole interval between Diodorus Siculus' account of his flight, and Thucydides' account of his arrival at the court of Persia, rather than that they should all of them have happened in one, and the same year; or indeed before the death of Xerxes. And if so, then these testimonies are reconcilable; and the credit of Diod. Siculus as to Themistocles' his flight may also stand: viz. to Argos in the year by him assigned for it, but not into Persia in that Year.

But

(n) Themistocles being banished Athens went to Argos, and settled there. [Ib. habitation, cum cognitum, Corn. Nepos in Vit. Them.] How long his Settlement was there, whether for months, or Years, I do not find, but there he lived in great credit. [Ib. namum dignitatem, Corn. Nepos ib.] This drew on him the farther envy, and Prosecution also of the Lacedaemonians against him, who summoned him to Sparta before the general Council of all Greece met together. But he not obeying this Summons, and thinking himself no longer safe at Argos, he fled thence to Corcyra. Afterwards he went to Admetus King of the Molossians. There he doubtless laid a time, 'till the Athenians; and Lacedaemonians hearing where he was, sent formally to demand him, but in vain, Admetus concealing him. [Ib.] Afterwards by his affiance he was conveyed to the coasts of the Aegean Sea, and so taking Ship at Pydna in Macedonia, from thence he passed over to Gyrna a City of Eolia in the lesser Asia. Now Xerxes having put a price upon his head, many were in search after him: and therefore there he lay hid for some time, 'till at length by the affiance of his Host Nicerus, He was artfully conveyed safe to Syracuse, and so to the presence of the Persian King. See Dr. Pride's Con. Hist. p. 247, from Plutarch, whom he followed here, in making Themistocles come to Xerxes, and not to Artaxerxes according to Thucydides, whom he supposeth out in this particular, p. 249, and Diodorus Siculus not mistaken in it. But yet in page 286 he approves of Mr. Dowdell's laying aside the authority of Diod. Siculus, shewing that it is not in the least to be regarded in respect of any settlement that is to be made from thence of the true first Year of Artaxerxes Lampsius, by a few Years rife thereof up into the Year of Themistocles' his flight, as placed by Diodorus Siculus upon the testimony of Thucydides his making Themistocles' to come to that King then newly reigning. Either Thucydides, or Diodor. Siculus must have been mistaken in case that Themistocles' flight, and his arrival in Persia was in one, and the same Year. And in that case Diodorus Siculus must give place, as Mr. Dowdell makes him to do accordingly; or else the Authorities of Thucydides, and Corn. Nepos, and Charon of Lampsius must be here laid aside. But all their Authorities may stand, if otherwise as I have been here surmising, there might be about a six Years' Interval between Themistocles' his flight into Asia, and his coming to the Persian Court. But even thus the Authority of other Historians, of Plutarch in particular must be necessarily laid aside, as they have related Themistocles to have come not to Artaxerxes, but to his father Xerxes.——- The use to be made of all this is to shew how very dark and uncertain a point this is, and therefore how incapable it is of serving Mr. L. to the giving him any the least sure foundation for the setting his first of Artaxerxes in a six Years' difference from Plutarch's Canon, and all for the sake of fitting a Beginning to his new History of these Weeks.
But alas 'tis impossible for us to know of a certainty how these things were. The Ancients themselves, as we have seen, were not agreed in the exact time of them. Even in (a) Plutarch's time they were points disputed. 'Tis surely vain, and trifling therefore from such uncertain Characters of time to go about to settle the Chronological Points now before us; especially to think of establishing them from hence in opposition to Ptolemy's Canon, the SUREST GUIDE we have in Chronology (p): which therefore in the words of the learned Dr. Prideaux (q) is not for the authority of any other human writing whatsoever to be receded from.

And therefore the Learned have not allowed Petavius, nor Mr. Lydiat, nor Archbishop Usher their respective Liberties taken with this Canon in their departure from it for the sake of their respective Hypotheses of these Weeks now before us, to their anticipating the true twelfth of Artaxerxes, from whence they began these Weeks, tho' they All took different (r) methods for it. Nor must Mr. L. consequently expect a dispensation here for his having us'd the like liberty with this Canon to his anticipating Ptolemy's true seventh of Artaxerxes, which before him Mr. Lydiat took for his twentieth thereof, even after all would the Prophetick Text admit of the true seventh year of Artaxerxes for the beginning of these Weeks: whereas it will not, as I have above shewn. For Ptolemy must not be receded from, for the sake of an Hypothesis (s). He is in his Canon confessedly by Mr. L's (t) telling, right as to the number of years, from the first of Nabonassar, who is the first Emperor in it, even to the reign of Antoninus who is the last Emperor in it. And by Mr. L's (u) telling also, the Eclipse, on which the said Canon is founded, and which are given in the Almagest are sufficient to secure the exact number of years assigned in it.———They are so surely: And I will add also, they are sufficient to authorize his whole Canon. They prove indeed immediately, and directly only to those years of Kings reigns, in which they hapned: but our Astronomer's most exact and accurate Notation of them in those Years of his Canon makes the whole as it were sacred. His Canon being thus built upon Astronomical Observations, no year throughout the same can be broken in
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(a) Floruit sub Trajano, & Hadriano. (p) As Dr. Prideaux most justly calls it, Con. Hist. p. 286.——-Canon certissimus Astronomorum, it is call'd by the learned Mr. Dodwell, Annal. Thucyd. p. 80.—-The undoubted Measure of time among all the Astronomers both Jews and Gentiles, the late Bp. Lloyd call'd it.——-See the joy which Calvisius expressed [in the second Edition of his book] upon his having receiv'd a Copy of this Canon by the hands of Abraham Scultetus, who being here in England as Chaplain to Fred. El. of Palatine, afterward King of Bohemia, begg'd a Copy for him of Dr. Ouerall then Dean of St. Paul's, who had met with a MS thereof.——-Calvisius if he had liv'd, would have reduced all his Chronology to this Canon. (q) Con. Hist. p. 286. (r) How Mr. Lydiat formerly, and Mr. L. since, the latter for his 7th of Artaxerxes the former for his twentieth shortened the reign of Darium Hyphasis, and lengthened that of Artaxerxes, we have now seen. And how Petavius and Archibishop Usher shortened and lengthened, (as they had occasion for their respective Hypotheses) the years of Xerxes, and Artaxerxes, the Reader may see in Dr. Prideaux's Account, and refutation of their proceedings herein. [Con. Hist. p. 249, 284.] (s) By our second rule laid down by us in our Introduction [p. 14.] we ought to follow him ONL. and ALWAYS. (t) Chron. Eff. p. 74. (u) Chron. Eff. p. 83.
Of the Beginning of the 7 Weeks, and 62 Weeks
upon without Violation, and Presumption. For what tho' Darius Hyptapis his thirty six years reign cannot be proved directly from any Eclipse, Ptolemy knowing of none after the thirty first of that King's reign, And what tho' in the two following reigns of Xerxes, and Artaxerxes Longimanus he had no Eclipse from the Antients to guide him in, which particulars Mr. L. hath been careful to make us aware of (w), yet surer I am of the years of those reigns, as I find them in Ptolemy's Canon, upon the authority thereof as founded in general on Eclipses, than I can possibly be upon the authority either of a Writer ever accounted FABULOUS both by Ancients, and Moderns, as such is Ctesias, or of the other Authorities mutter'd up by Mr. L. on this occasion, and even of the Arundel Marble Chronicon, which tho' of the greatest Authority in Græcan Affairs, yet not so in the Persian; and confessedly (x) not so in the particulars which have been now under consideration, as the Compiler thereof knew not what account here to follow? — And therefore however Mr. L. hath told us that Ptolemy is PLAINLY mistaken in assigning thirty six years to Darius Hyptapis, and but forty one years to Artaxerxes Longimanus (y), yet with how little reason Mr. L. hath thus charged him, we have I think now sufficiently seen. The most uncertain Authorities by him produced to prove Ptolemy mistaken do much more plainly shew where the mistake must light, how plainly forever to Mr. L. for the sake of his Hypothesis he may have appear'd to be mistaken.

And so after this short digression occasion'd by Mr. L's great Liberty taken with this the Chronologer's uncontestable Authority, the golden Canon of Ptolemy, we may now return to what we were before shewing, viz. as to the Beginning of these Weeks, that they cannot possibly take it from any, left of all from Mr. L. his seventh of Artaxerxes.

And as it was before shewn, these Weeks not possibly taking their beginning from the two preceding Commandments which went forth in favour of the Jews from Cyrus, and from Darius, and as these two, and that in the seventh of Artaxerxes Longimanus were all the Commandments, or Decrees that went forth in the Jews favour, excepting only the last, which went forth in the twentieth of the said Artaxerxes, of course therefore the Beginning of them remains to the twentieth year of the said Artaxerxes, when went forth the Commandment to rebuild Jerusalem, &c. and where we have accordingly fixed the beginning of these sixty nine Weeks, or four hundred and eighty three years, as that number of Weeks, and years there are exactly between this Prophetick Beginning, and the Prophetick Ending of those Weeks in the death of Christ, as we shall see anon (yy).

In the mean time this being taken for granted, we may rest satisfied in the beginning of these Weeks; and so we may have done with them in this respect. Only

(w) Chron. Eff. p. 84. (x) Ib. p. 76 lb. fine. (y) Ib. p. 74-
(y) Viz. When we treat of Bishop Loyd's ending of these Weeks.
Or, as together they make 69 Weeks. 

Only it may be here farther observ'd by way of confirmation of such beginning, that from hence, even from the twentieth of Artaxerxes, as being the true Scripture Beginning of these Weeks did the (x) ancient learned Christians date their Computation of them. And after their example many of the (a) modern Expositors have done so likewise.

And as Scripture (b) was their Guide herein for such of these Weeks as are under present consideration, they were certainly in the right in such Beginning. But still these great men were out in their computation, tho' taken from such true Beginning, on some or other of these following accounts: viz.

First, as some (c) of them in their groundless interpretation of the word (d) נ dipped an abbreviation of the years here in their quality, or form, and therefore run them into Lunar years, which are abbreviated, or short years. Or

Secondly, as they reckon'd, some (c) of them the whole seventy Weeks, others (f) sixty-nine Weeks and a half, together in one continued Reckoning from one and the same Beginning: whereas neither the one Week (g) the seventieth, or last Week of this Prophecy, nor the former Half, nor any part thereof is to be reckon'd with the preceding sixty-nine Weeks, because it is a Week separate in reckoning from them, a Week by itself, and therefore not possibly having to do with their Beginning, or to be continued in reckoning with them, as it hath been formerly noted, and as it will be more fully shewn hereafter (b). And

Thirdly, as they were utterly ignorant of the true Prophetick year here made use of, viz. the ancient vulgar Eastern year of three hundred and sixty days. Which form of year in its proper place will be shewn to be the true year of Reckoning in this Prophecy, when after that we have consider'd the Ending of these sixty-nine Weeks, or four hundred and eighty three years, we shall then evidence the perfect agreement of such reckoning of the said number of Weeks, or Weeks of Years from the twentieth Year of King Artaxerxes, with the holy Scripture in the first place, and in the next with Prophesy's Canon. But we are now immediately to proceed according to our propos'd method to consider the respective Endings of these sixty-nine Weeks in the several Hypotheses now before us: and this will therefore be the subject of the following Chapter.

(x) Africanus who flourished in the beginning of the third Century: Euseb, Ston, Theod., (a) bed, Zonaras, Rupertus, Job, Temporarius, Corn, a Lapide, Job, Vossius, Petavius, Mr. Lydiat, Archbp. Usher, &c. (b) Dan. ix. 25. The Commandment there spoken of in the letter of the Prophecy suiting to no other than that which was granted to Nehemiah by King Artaxerxes in the 24th year of his reign. (c) Africanus, who is followed by Theod., Bede, Zonaras, Rupertus, and the generality of the Romish Doctors. [See Frid. Con. Hist. p. 280.] (d) V. L. Abbreviate sunt: In our Translation Are determined, are appointed of God for the great Events therein to fall out, according to their respective Predictions. (e) So particularly Dr. Prideaux. (f) So particularly Mr. Lancaster. (g) Dan. ix. 27. (b) When we come in order to treat of the said Week.
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Setting forth the Ending of the Sixty-nine Weeks; or four hundred and eighty three Years of this Prophecy, in the Reverend and Learned Dr. Prideaux's Hypothesis thereof.

The next thing which cometh under our consideration is the Ending of the seven Weeks, and threescore and two Weeks, or as in conjoined, or continued reckoning they make threescore and nine Weeks.

And herein I shall proceed in my former method to consider, First, Dr. Prideaux's Ending of these Weeks; secondly, the late Bishop Lloyd's Ending of them.

First, I beg leave to consider the Reverend, and learned Dr. Prideaux's Ending of these sixty-nine Weeks. And this is the (a) coming of the Messiah in the person of John the Baptist. For as Mr. Dean hath told us (b), From the first seven Weeks, or forty nine Years reckoning sixty two Weeks, or four hundred and thirty four Years more, this will lead us down to the Coming of Christ the Messiah, who is here in the Prophecy predicted to come at the end of the said threescore and two Weeks (c). For the words of the Prophecy are, From the going forth of the Commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince shall be seven Weeks, and threescore and two Weeks: that is, there shall be seven Weeks for the completing and finishing of the work, for which the Commandment, or Decree was granted; and from thence sixty two Weeks more to the Coming of Christ the Messiah here intended, that is, to the time of his first appearance on the Ministry of the Gospel. For his Coming here predicted MUST be interpreted either of his Coming at his birth, or of his coming on his Ministry. No one saith it of the former, neither will the term of Years predicted of it ever meet it there. And therefore it MUST be understood of the latter, that is, his coming, and first appearing in his Ministry, (viz. in the person of his forerunner John the Baptist;) And here the Years predicted in the Prophecy will EXACTLY find it.

Now

(a) Mr. L. makes our blest Saviour to come in his own person after 69 Weeks reckon'd from his eleventh of Ariaixesi,----But there is no such Coming at all here predicted, as I shall here shew against Dr. Prideaux his Hypothesis; after 69 Weeks,----But if the Coming of the Messiah were really predicted here in Mr. L's sense thereof, viz. in his own person on his Ministry, and would the prophetick Text allow of these Weeks their taking their beginning from the 7th of Ariaixesi, yet as I have shewn, they can never have it from his 7th of Ariaixesi, and therefore I take no further notice of Mr. L's ending those sixty-nine Weeks, (b) Con. Hist. p. 291 line 5, (c) Dan. ix. 25,
Now all this is indeed very promising. But upon enquiry these things will appear not so EXACTLY to answer, as 'tis here imagin'd, and indeed affirm'd that they do. For

First, those words in the Text (d) Unto Messiah the Prince have nothing either in themselves, or elsewhere in the least warranting such exposition, or reference of them to such Coming of the Messiah. They have nothing in themselves importing such his Coming. Here is not one word of it either expressly, or even implicitly.—And they have nothing elsewhere: for the Context speaks of no other Coming of the Messiah either in verse 25, or in the beginning of verse 26 than that, and that only of his Coming to be CUT OFF.

For the Angel having told Daniel only in general in verse the twenty fifth, that from the going forth of the Commandment, &c. unto Messiah the Prince there should be reckon'd two periods of Weeks, viz. seven Weeks, and threescore and two Weeks, therefore by way of explaining himself in the following verse he tells him that after those periods of Weeks (e) the Messiah should be cut off. Those periods of Weeks in verse the twenty fifth unto Messiah the Prince are the very same number of Weeks (f), after which he was to be CUT OFF, as in verse the twenty sixth. Therefore the reckoning the said number of Weeks unto Messiah the Prince must also terminate in the same sense: viz. that there should be so many Weeks unto Messiah the Prince his being cut off.

So that thus it is plain that there is no foundation at all for interpreting these words unto Messiah the Prince in any other sense of his Coming, than that of his Coming to the Cross, or to be CUT OFF: as verse the twenty sixth in this particular is no other than an explanation of verse the twenty fifth.

And therefore here is indeed no room for Mr. Dean's Dilemma now before us. There is not the least ground for interpreting these words unto Messiah the Prince (g) either of the Coming of Christ at his birth, or of his Coming on his Ministry. The former part hereof is indeed giv'n up by Mr. Dean: and as to the latter part, however it be affirm'd by him that the words must be understood of that, and that there the Years predicted in the Prophecy will exactly find

(d) Ib. (e) For tho' it be said in verse the twenty sixth that after threescore and two Weeks shall the Messiah be cut off, whereas it was said in verse the twenty fifth, Unto Messiah the Prince shall be seven Weeks, and threescore and two Weeks, which together make sixty-nine Weeks, yet in fact those threescore and two Weeks become also sixty-nine Weeks, as they are necessarily reckon'd upon the heels of the foregoing seven Weeks as having one and the same Beginning with them: As it hath been formerly shewn.

(f) As it is plain from the foregoing Note. (g) To what hath been said formerly in our exposition of these words UNTO MESSIAH THE PRINCE as having no other meaning in them as to our blest Saviour's Coming than that of his Coming to the Cross, or to be CUT OFF as in verse the twentieth, it may be here farther added in favour of such Exploitation, that his SUFFERINGS did eminently prove him the MESSIAH the Prince, as he is here called. For, by, or in those he immediately triumphed over all his Enemies, and was therein truly a triumphant Prince. So St. Paul expressly tells us [Col. ii. 15.]

Viz. that on the Cross He spoiled Principalities, and Powers, and made a show of them openly triumphing.
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find it, yet upon enquiry it will appear that these words cannot be so understood, forasmuch as

Secondly, the years predicted in the Prophecy in truth do not at all find such interpreted Coming of the Messiah: however Mr. Dean hath been pleased to tell us that they do, in the following words ( b ): viz. The 7th Year of Artaxerxes Longimanus from whence these Weeks do begin, being so incident with the Year of the Julian Period 4256 if we reckon from these thirty Weeks, and sixty two Weeks, i.e., sixty-nine Weeks, or 483 Years, this will lead us down to the Year of the Julian Period 4739, which was the very Year in which the Ministry of the Gospel first began. This Christ executed at first, and therein made his appearance as the Messiah by his fore-runner John the Baptist for the space of 3 Years, and a half, &c.

Now as to the Matter of fact here, viz. of Christ's seven years Ministry, and the former part thereof for three years and a half by John the Baptist, it will not be long e'er that it self be call'd in question. We are at present immediately concern'd with the beginning thereof, as the same is here the affliction's ending of the 69 Weeks, or 483 years, and as these predicted years, according to Mr. Dean's assertion hereof do exactly find such appearance of the Messiah in his Ministry in the person of John the Baptist.

Now if this be so, if there be really such Exactness and Agreement in reckoning here as Mr. Dean hath told us there is, it will surely hence follow (for it must in order to approve it self here) that the Year of the Julian Period in which John the Baptist came preaching is truly corresponding with the fifteenth year of the Roman Emperor Tiberius. For it is certain that in that Year ( i ) of Tiberius, John began his preaching.

Well,—But according to Mr. Dean (as above) John came preaching in the year of the Julian Period 4739. It will then here surely follow that this same year of the Julian Period answers to the fifteenth year of the said Emperor Tiberius. Otherwise this cannot be the truly affliction's year of the Julian Period when John came preaching. But in truth it doth not so answer. For not the Year 4739 but the year 4742 answers to the true fifteenth of Tiberius Caesar. For let any one look into Ptolemy's Canon, as Mr. Dean of Norwich himself hath adapted the years of the Julian Period ( k ) to that Canon, and he will find the year 4742 and not the year 4739 truly answering to the fifteenth of Tiberius according to Ptolemy. Here then

Triumphing over them in it,—His MINISTRY indeed fully proved him to be the CHRIST the SON OF GOD [John xx. 31.] But so also did his DEATH, or CUTTING OFF; as it appears particularly in the recorded testimony of the Centurion, Mat. xxvii. 54.—His MINISTRY proved him to be the ANOINTED, as He was the great Prophet that was to come into the world, [John vi. 14.] But no lesa did his Death also prove him so, as He was our ANOINTED HIGH PRIEST, our GREAT HIGH PRIEST as He is call'd [Heb. iv. 15.]—Finally our Saviour Christ did in his death, or in his being CUT OFF most eminently approve himself the great CAPTAIN of OUR SALVATION, or the MES- SIAH the FAINCE, as he was made perfec through Sufferings, [Heb. ii. 10.]

then is a difference of about some 3 years exceeding the predicted term of 483 years now before us (l).

Consequently our second particular is hereby prov'd: viz. that the Years predicted in the Prophecy do not exactly find the said Coming of the Messiah in the preaching of John the Baptist. These years are so far from exactly finding the true fifteenth of Tiberius according to Ptolemy, that they find only the twelfth of it. Therefore Mr. Dean's Hypothec is failing in this particular.

But here Mr. Dean will doubtless require us to look upwards in his Chronological Table in the same Column of Roman Emperours to another account of Tiberius his reign, and not that of Ptolemy. For Mr. Dean hath now for the sake of this part of his Hypothesis fled to another reckoning of the years of that Roman Emperour's reign, having forsoaken Ptolemy here because of no longer service to him; though he elsewhere (m) hath appealed immediately to him, by way of establishing his Hypothec in its claim'd agreement with his Canon. But the Reckoning now in credit with Mr. Dean is that of Velleius Paterculus, and Suetonius, who account the years of the reign of Tiberius not from the death of Augustus, but from the time of his being admitted into Copartnership with him in the Empire. This Reckoning as it happens to suit Mr. Dean's Hypothesis in this part of it is therefore declar'd for, as the true reckoning of the fifteenth of Tiberius in which John the Baptist came preaching. For so Mr. Dean hath told us (n) in the following words, viz. the 15th Year of the reign of Tiberius in which John the Baptist began to preach, MUST be reckon'd from the time, when he began to reign jointly with Augustus, and was according to Velleius Paterculus, and Suetonius admitted by him into Copartnership with him in the Empire, &c.

Thus Mr. Dean hath told us concerning this his reckoning of the said fifteenth of Tiberius, that this MUST be it. It must indeed be so to serve Mr. Dean's turn here. For as he had already actually fixed the end of the 70 Weeks, or 490 Years of this Prophecy in a current reckoning of the whole, in the death of Christ in the 19th of Tiberius even according to Ptolemy's account of the years of that Emperour's reign, it hence became necessary for Mr. Dean to end the 69 Weeks, or 483 Years at the distance of the remaining Weeks, or seven Years from the death of Christ in the said 19th of Tiberius. But reckoning upwards from the nineteenth of Tiberius seven years, the said reckoning will bring us up to the 12th

(1) Forasmuch as between the year of the Julian Period 4256, (with which is coincident the 7th of Attaxerez) and the year of the said Period 4742 there are 486, not 483 years only. (m) As in page 265, L 12. of Mr. Dean's book of Con. Hist. (n) 2 p. 232, l. 23. &c. And so again Vol. II. p. 665. L 7, &c. (sub Ann. Chrifi 12. Aug. 42. Tit. 1.) Tiberius was admitted into Copartnership of Command, and Sovereignty with Augustus in all the Provinces, and Armies of the Roman Empire. And a Decree passed both the Senate, and people of Rome to confirm him in it. And from hence the fifteenth year of Tiberius mention'd in the Gospel of St. Luke is to be reckon'd. Again p. 668. L 28 (sub anno Christ. 26. Tit. 15.) This year was the fifteenth year of Tiberius from the time that he was admitted to reign in Copartnership with Augustus. And this was that fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius mention'd by St. Luke [ch. iii. 1.]
12th of Tiberius according to Ptolemy. But this year of Tiberius would by no means serve Mr. Dean's turn in this part of his Hypo-
thesis; because according to St. Luke (c) John the Baptist came
preaching not in the 12th but in the 15th of Tiberius. And yet
Ptolemy's fifteenth of Tiberius would not serve Mr. Dean's turn here
neither; forasmuch as between the seventeenth of Artaxerxes Longima-
nus Mr. Dean's assign'd beginning of these Weeks, and Ptolemy's said
fifteenth of Tiberius there are so far from being exactly 483 Years,
that there are about some 486 Years. What had Mr. Dean now to
do then, but that which he hath accordingly done, viz. to forfake
Ptolemy here, and to fly to another reckoning which might help out
here, as it happens to do by its 7 years distance from the death of
Christ?——— And then as nothing more was wanting but an artificial
adapting of the conceived matter of it thereunto, Mr. Dean hath
accordingly so adapted it, viz. by assigning to John the Baptist for
his Ministry, and our Saviour's Coming, or first appearance therein in the
Person of John three Years, and a half of these 7 Years, and to our
Saviour Christ the remaining three Years, and a half. And so the
whole seven Years are accounted for. And now nothing was wanting
to complete all but to make St. Luke's fifteenth of Tiberius not
the fifteenth of Ptolemy, but the fifteenth of Velleius Paterculus,
and Suetonius: Which Mr. Dean hath accordingly done:

From all which particulars I beg leave therefore

First, To expostulate a little with Mr. Dean as to his leaving the
golden rule of time, Ptolemy's Canon.

For wherefore should we thus notoriously depart from that?———
Let us stick to Ptolemy's Canon. It is that surely which in adapting of Events to their respective periods in the Prophecy before us we ought to stand, or fall by, once and always (p). For it equally ought to be our guide, and we ought to stand the test thereof uni-
versally in all, and every part of it. For, as Mr. Dean of Norwich
hath most excellently told us (q) of this Canon of time, (and indeed he hath spoken nothing of it but what in the strictest justice ought to
be said of it), viz. that it is the surest guide which we have in Chrono-
logy, and it is also verified by its agreement EVERY WHERE
with the holy Scriptures: And that therefore it is not for the Au-
thority of any other HUMAN WRITING whatsoever to be re-
ceded from.

Here then, according to Mr. Dean, is our fixed Rule for us to go
by in our Exposition of this Prophecy. Wherefore then should Mr.
Dean have departed from it?——Wherefore should he have forfaken
his own acknowledg'd Rule of time, Ptolemy's Canon, the surest
guide in Chronology, that which (confessedly) every where agrees with
the holy Scriptures. There can be no doubt of this, for Mr. Dean
hath himself told us so here, that it is so agreeing. And if so, if

(c) Ch. iii. 1. 3.  (p) Otherwise a Rule is no Rule. "Tis here a Rule, but not
there. A Rule only ad libitum. A Rule when for, but not when against an Hypo-
thetis.  
this Rule be thus every where agreeing with the holy Scriptures. Consequently it is so agreeing here with the Scripture fifteenth of Tiberius. And Consequent also the fifteenth of Tiberius in Ptolemy's Canon is the fifteenth of Tiberius in St. Luke (a), or vice versa, the fifteenth of St. Luke is the fifteenth according to that Reckoning which Ptolemy followed after in his Canon:—But this notwithstanding, Mr. Dean hath forfaked Ptolemy here, and followed other HUMAN WRITINGS: Even those of Velleius Paterculus, and Suetonius. For the authority of these Writers, He hath receded from the surest guide we have in Chronology. Even in a Scripture point He hath receded from this golden guide, this surest guide, which ought therefore here especially to have been followed because in a Scripture point: and for this very reason of Mr. Dean, even because this guide is verified by its entire, or perfect agreement with Scripture. And therefore according to Mr. Dean himself it ought by no means (with all due submission be it spoken) to have been receded from, (though for the sake of an Hypothesis for the authority of Velleius Paterculus, and Suetonius, or indeed any other Human Writing whatsoever.

Indeed for another reason Mr. Dean should not have dealt thus by Ptolemy; Even because on this very account, and for a like transgression Mr. Dean had himself (b) animadverted upon Petavius, and Arch-Bishop Usher: viz. for their giving Artaxerxes Longimanus, upon the testimony of Thucydiides a beginning of nine years earlier to his reign, than that giv'n him by Ptolemy: That which looks bardest (faith (c) Mr. Dean among other particulars before him observ'd in this opinion is for the sake of any Historical Writer (even Thucydiides himself who is their Author here) to lay aside the authority of Ptolemy's Canon, which is built upon Astronomical Demonstrations.

But Petavius, and Arch-Bishop Usher did no more as to the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus, upon their interpreted testimony of Thucydiides (d) than Mr. Dean of Norwich hath done since, as to the reign of Tiberius, upon the Authority of Vell.Paterculus and Suetonius. He hath therefore split upon a like Rock, on which those great Men had split before him; and for which they have not escaped his censure. But they did it to serve a turn; And so did Mr. Dean likewise: even for the sake of his ending the two first periods of this Prophecy, or 483 years, at that distance from the 7th of Artaxerxes, and also of his thence (e) beginning the remaining week, or 7 years thereof, and his therefore aligning John the Baptist 3 years and a half to his Ministry, and our blessed Saviour also 3 years and

(a) Luke iii. 1.  (b) viz. in p. 283, 284, 285, 286. Cons. Hist.  (c) p. 286. l. 11.  (d) As to which testimony I have formerly spoken, when I took notice of Mr. Z's appealing thereunto in behalf of his arbitrary drift of Artaxerxes in a like departure from Ptolemy's Canon.  (e) For that which in Mr. Dean's Hypothesis is the align'd Ending of the 483 years of this Prophecy, is also the beginning of the remaining seven Years.
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and a half for his, the whole 7 years reckoned from Mr. Dean's fifteenth of Tiberius, viz. the fifteenth not according to Ptolemy's Canon, but according to Velleius Paterculus, and Suetonius. And this, as I beg leave to shew

Secondly, that as it is thus all arbitrary and groundless, so it is also even inconsistent with the holy Scripture's Account of these things.

For we do not any where find therein any thing favouring either a seven Years Ministry of John the Baptist, and our blessed Saviour, the Years of both their Ministries consider'd together, as making seven Years, or a separate Ministry of three Years and a half to John the Baptist, and three years and a half after that to our blessed Saviour. We no where find cause to imagin, as Mr. Dean here doth, that their Ministry should be altogether separate, or that John the Baptist should absolutely have finished his Ministry before our Saviour Christ began his.

That John the Baptist was to begin his Ministry before our blessed Saviour enter'd upon his, that is truly beyond all dispute. It was necessary for him as he was the predicted fore-runner of the Messiah to come before him: as accordingly he did in the 15th year of Tiberius Cæsar, even in Mr. Dean's rejected fifteenth of that Emperor's reign, as it will appear by and by: viz. not in Mr. Dean of Norwich's Year of the V. A. of Christ 26, but in the year of the V. A. of Christ 28. Then John the Baptist, as the fore-runner of the Messiah did doubtless come preaching and preparing the way before him. But surely Our blessed Saviour might come preaching after him in much less time, in a great deal much less time, than three years and a half. And without question so he did. For as his Ministry was (even in Mr. Dean's opinion of it) of three years and a half's Continuance, and as he died in the nineteenth of Tiberius, and that according to Ptolemy's Canon, even in Mr. Dean's opinion, and acknowledgment (f) also: And whereas John the Baptist came preaching certainly in Mr. Dean's rejected 15th of Tiberius, (as it will be fully prov'd before we have done with this matter) hence of course it follows that our blessed Saviour must necessarily have come upon his publick Ministry not long after John the Baptist's coming upon his. He came after him even in the very same year, the same fifteenth year of Tiberius, as learned Men have generally gather'd from the account giv'n us in the holy Gospels of this matter. And therefore our learned Arch-Bishop Usher in particular (to give no other instances here) hath placed John the Baptist's coming upon his Ministry, and our blessed Saviour's entering upon his in one, and the same year, according to his Account.

And

(f) For this is the main foundation of Mr. Dean's Hypothesis in beginning these Weeks from the seventh of Artaxerxes, as he makes the whole 70 Weeks, or 490 Years of this Prophecy to end in the death of Christ in the 19th of Tiberius according to Ptolemy's Canon. See p. 265. l. 1. (of Mr. Dean's book) &c.
And that John continued preaching and preparing the way of the Lord still as he went, (even after that Our Saviour was enter'd upon, and acting in his Ministry) 'till his being shut up in prison, is evident from the Gospel History thereof: however Mr Dean of Norwich for the sake of his Hypothesis hath separated their Ministry as above. I say the Scripture Account plainly lets aside Mr. Dean's separate account, as we shall soon find by looking into a few passages of it. For not to enter into a long dissertation here in order to shew this from the whole History, we need only to look to John iii. 22, 23, 24: And we shall find this fully evident from thence. For in verse the twenty second we read that after these things (the things there before mention'd) came Jesus and his Disciples into the land of Judea, and there he tarried with them, and baptized. — That John was now in his Ministry is evident from the foregoing History. That our Saviour was now enter'd upon, is evident from hence, even that he also had now his Disciples, and that he also now baptized, as well as did John. He had now actually some of John's Disciples with him, who had forsook their Master John, and followed Christ upon John's testimony of him. [John i. 35—37.] He had also with him those other Disciples therein after-mention'd, and others doubtless not mention'd. And even now while Christ was baptizing (g) in Judea (iii. 22.) It is certain [from verse 25] that John was at that time also baptizing in Enon near to Salem. And thus John acted in his Ministry after that our blessed Saviour was enter'd upon his: for as we learn [from verse 24.] John was not as yet cast into prison.

Now these Ministerial Acts of Christ were after his first Passover which was in the month of April in the year of the V. AE. (b) of Christ 29, and in the fifteenth of Tiberius. But Christ was enter'd into his Ministry some time, probably a few months before the said Passover: and John also a few months before him.

This first Passover of Christ, of which I am now speaking is that mention'd in John ii. 13. It was on April the 15th of this Year. And that this Year was the Year of the V. AE. of Christ 29, is evident from that discourse which the Jews had with our Lord a little before it at Jerusalem as touching the SIGN by them then requir'd of him upon his now acting in his ministerial office even at Jerusalem. For now towards the Passover Christ was come up to Jerusalem [John ii. 13.] There having now acted as a Prophet in whipping the buyers, and sellers out of the Temple [ver. 14—17.] the Jews said unto him, what sign showest thou unto us, seeing that thou dost these things? [ver. 18.] Our Saviour knowing them to be such

---

(g) Though Jesus himself baptized not, but his Disciples. John iv. 2. (b) By V. AE. we mean the Vulgar Era of Christ introduced into use by Dionysius Exiguus, in the 577th Year of that Era. [See Prideaux, Pref. to Con. Hist. Vol. 1. p. 2. and also Vol. 2. p. 337, and 678.] It differs 3 full years, and as much as from Decem. 29 of another from the true Year of Christ's birth: forasmuch as in the year 4 before A. D. or the V. AE. of Christ Our Saviour was born, and that on the 25th of December in the Church's Account.
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as would not be convinced by a Sign, gave them none; but refer'd them to that great Sign which he intended to give them by his Resurrection from the dead. He did it in these Words, [ver. 19.]

Destroy this Temple, and in three days I will raise it up again.
The Jews understanding Christ as if he had spoken of that august pile of their Temple which Herod had built, they said to him [ver. 20.]

This Temple hath been building now these 46 years, and wilt thou rear it up in three days?

Now hence it appears that this first Passover of Christ was in the 29th year of the V. Æ. of Christ, forasmuch as that about the Passover of this Year was the beginning of the 47th year from the spring time of the 18th year of reckoning before the Vulgar Æra of Christ, when Herod began his building of the 1st being the outer part of the Temple. (i)

That this Passover as it was thus in the twenty ninth year of the V. Æ. of Christ, so it was also in the fifteenth year of Tiberius (the year when John came also preaching) is evident, forasmuch as that the said fifteenth year of Tiberius began in August the nineteenth preceding the twenty fifth day of December when began the 29th year of the said V. Æ. of Christ. To this fifteenth of Tiberius from the 19th of August till December the twenty fifth corresponds the year of the V. Æ. of Christ 28: thenceforward 'till the nineteenth of August following the Year of the V. Æ. of Christ 29. But this Passover being in April was included as in the twenty ninth year of the V. Æ. of Christ, so also in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius, as being the very next April following in course after the said 19th of August.

But now as we have seen, Christ was plainly come upon his Ministry even at Jerusalem.

He had been also in a private Exercise of his Ministry for some little time before. For he came thither from Capernaum, where he had wrought Miracles, and thereby much displeas'd his Brethren at Nazareth [Luke iv. 23.]. And before that he had been in Galilee, where he was to begin his preaching [Isaiah ix. 1.]. There at Cana he began to work Miracles. [John ii. 11.]. And into Galilee he came presently after his leaving John the Baptist, when looking upon Jesus, he had giv'n that testimony concerning him, Behold the Lamb of God; [John i. 36.] even the next day after that, [v. 43.] taking John's Disciples with him [v. 37.], and now leaving John to his business, which was to prepare the people for Christ. [v. 31.]

And thus we have traced up Christ's Ministry, as he came thereunto, as it were upon the heels of John the Baptist.

So that the Exactness of this matter as near as can be guessed may stand thus: viz. that as Our Saviour Christ came upon his Ministry in the fifteenth year of the reign of the Roman Emperor Tiberius some time before the Passover of the year of the V. Æ. of Christ.

the sixty-nine Weeks of this Prophecy.

Christ 29, so John the Baptist came some time before him in the same fifteenth of Tiberius. Our blessed Saviour came consequently either not long after the year of the Vulgar Æra of Christ 29 was begun, or very little before the Year of the V. Æ. of Christ 28 was expir'd; but still in the fifteenth year of Tiberius: forasmuch as the Year of the V. Æ. of Christ 28 answers partly to the fifteenth year of Tiberius, viz. till December the twenty fifth of that year, and partly to the year of the V. Æ. of Christ 29, as the said fifteenth of Tiberius thenceforward runs in with the said 29th of Christ till the 19th of August following, when began the sixteenth of Tiberius: As we have before obser'v'd. John the Baptist as he came on his Ministry, as the fore-runner of the Messiah, and consequently before him, He came in the end of the V. Æ. of Christ twenty eight, and in the beginning of Tiberius his fifteenth, and consequently not 'till after the nineteenth of August (of the said twenty eighth year of Christ) as that began the said fifteenth of Tiberius, but still before the twenty fifth of December (following the said nineteenth of August) forasmuch as the said twenty fifth of December (k) began the Year of the V. Æ. of Christ twenty nine.

To return therefore to the point immediately in hand, So far is Mr. Dean's Hypothesis in this part of it, viz. of a separate Ministry of John the Baptist from that of our Saviour, and that of John's being three years and a half before our Saviour enter'd upon his of three years and a half more, so far I say is this 7 Years Hypothesis from being reconcilable with Scripture.

In vain therefore hath Mr. Dean argued on this occasion, as we find him here to have argued (I); viz. that if St. Luke's fifteenth of Tiberius were to be reckon'd the fifteenth from the death of Augustus his Predecessor, then it would follow, (First) that in this case (whereas Christ died in the 19th of the said reckoning) there would have been but 4 years for the Ministry of John the Baptist, and the personal Ministry of Jesus Christ put both together: And that therefore this time would have been too narrow a space for the actions which are recorded of them in the Gospels. And (2dly) because that in so short a time as must be allowed to the Ministry of John in this case, It is not likely that he could have acquired that great fame, as appears not only from Gospels, but also from the writings of Josephus the Historian, that he had obtain'd not only in Judæa, and Galilee, but also through all the circumjacent regions before his death.

But the former of these Reasons ceaseth of course, As it was just now shewn from Scripture, that both John the Baptist, and our blessed Saviour acted in their respective Ministries at one, and the same time, (so long I mean as that of John the Baptist lasted in his time.) Tho' John came first in the year of the V. Æ. of Christ twenty eight, and in the fifteenth of Tiberius, yet

(k) Forasmuch as the Church accounts that day the birth day of our Lord.

Fed Saviour was not long after; not many months after, (if not in the same twenty eighth year of the V. Aë. of Christ, as before noted, yet) in the same fifteenth of Tiberius, and early in the year of the V. Aë. of Christ twenty nine: forasmuch as the former part of the Year of the V. Aë. of Christ twenty nine answers to the latter part of the fifteenth of Tiberius, as it hath been here also noted. For as we have seen, Christ was doubting on his Ministry before the Passover of this Year. But as Christ came thus soon after John, here is room enough, with Mr. Dean's leave, for both their Ministries. I do not say for a separate Ministry of three years and a half for John, for that is groundless, and merely ex Hypothesi, but for both their Ministries, as we have now accounted for them; Even Mr. Dean's

2d reason urg'd in favour of his fifteenth of Tiberius, and against the rejected fifteenth notwithstanding: viz. that it so short a time as must be allowed to the Ministry of John in this case (viz. in case that he came in the fifteenth of Tiberius, in Mr. Dean's rejected account thereof, and our Saviour came preaching so soon after him in the end of the said fifteenth of Tiberius) that then it is not likely that he (John) could have acquired that great fame, as appears not only by Gospels, but also from the writings of Josephus the Historian that he had obtained, &c. as above.

For surely this is all nothing else but reasoning for an Hypothesi, even for such a one as is not consistent with Scripture, as it hath been now shewn. Such reasoning therefore is vain.

It is in itself also inconclusive of that, which it is brought to prove and establish. For as John the Baptist came preaching most likely, as it hath been shewn in the latter end of the year of the V. Aë. of Christ 28, and in the beginning of the fifteenth year of Tiberius, in Mr. Dean's rejected account thereof, so as John continued preaching 'till the time of Herod's shutting him up in prison, which we suppose was not 'till the Year of the V. Aë. of Christ 30, and the sixteenth year of the reign of Tiberius, (viz. not 'till after the twenty fifth of December of the said sixteenth of Tiberius, and consequently not 'till the Year of the V. Aë. of Christ 30) so here being thus about (m) eighteen months allowed for his whole Ministry, He might during this time very well have acquired that extraordinary fame which before his imprisonment he had most deservedly acquired not only in Judæa and Galilee, but also through all the circumjacent Regions.

It

(m) It was at the Passover time, or soon after, that Christ came to hear of this. [Wherefore, when Christ left Jerusalem (after the Passover there of this Year, John v. 1.) He went from thence into Galilee, Mat. iv. 12. and there first to his Brethren at Nazereth. Luke iv. 16.] Therefore allowing John 3 months of this year, as the Passover was in April, [and on the 7th day thereof this year] and the whole foregoing year, and 3 months only of the V. Aë. of Christ 28, viz. the last 3 months thereof (for in the August preceding began the 15th of Tiber) here are the 18 months by us allowed for John the Baptist's Ministry.
It is surely possible that so eminent a Preacher as was John the Baptist who came in the Spirit, and power of Elias (Luke i. 17.) might have acquire'd a great fame, and without all doubt he did upon his first appearance, in as many months preaching, as Mr. Dean hath assign'd him years, wherever he went in that time, even before Our Saviour's enquiring upon his Ministry. So great a Prophet as was John even upon one months preaching as he went up and down in a country, his Preaching would certainly make a great rumour in it, and raise a very high character, and esteem of his person in that Country. His fame would quickly reach remote and distant parts, and put all people presently upon the curiosity of hearing, at least upon making enquiry concerning him, and his Doctrine. And thus it was now with the Jews upon John the Baptist's coming, and preaching the baptism of Repentance for the remission of Sins, and that they should believe on him who was now to come after him, even the Messiah. They of Jerusalem no sooner heard thereof, but by what they heard they were presently convinced that he was an extraordinary person. And so was also the matter of his Preaching. For he proclaimed the Messiah whom they expected, as being just now upon his coming. Hence both the people, and even the Rulers also as they were exceedingly affected with this news; so no less with the Messengers of it. Therefore no sooner had John begun his preaching in the wilderness of Judaea (Luke iii. 1.) and the fame thereof reach'd Jerusalem, but as the people presently flockt thither to him, and were baptiz'd of him in Jordan confessing their sins (Matt. iii. 5, 6.) So the Priests and Levites also sent from Jerusalem to John to know of him who he was, and by what authority he acted in his Prophetical office. (John i. 19--25.)

Hence it is plain that John had now acquire'd a very great fame, and was held as a very wonderful person even by the Priests, and Levites, but especially by the people; for among them All men mused whether John himself were the Christ, or not. (Luke iii. 15.) This therefore put him upon declaring to them (v. 16.) and also upon returning a message to the Priests and Levites by the Pharisees whom they had sent unto him on that enquiry (John i. 19, 24.) that indeed He was not the Christ (v. 20.) but that he was sent before him as his immediate fore-runner. (v. 23, 27.)

The next day after that John had giv'n this answer to the Priests and Levites, Jesus then walking by him, John saw the holy-Ghost descending upon him. Thereupon John declar'd again that this was He, even that this was the son of God: and that he knew him by this sign, as he was told that he should, by him that sent him. (v. 29--34.)

Now can we imagin that these things were not tranacted presently after John's coming upon his Ministry?
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Is it not natural to believe, and most likely to be according to the very truth, that the rumour of so singular a person as was John the Baptist upon many accounts (as he is describ'd to be in the Gospels, as to his habit of dress, his austere way of life, especially his New Doctrine, Mat. iii. 1, 4. Mark ii. 1, 8.) no sooner reached Jerusalem, but that they should be all immediately set on fire with an eager desire of being fully satisfied both of the person, and his Doctrine? And that therefore the multitude should run away presently after him into the Wilderness, without any delay, after that this news had spread itself among them?—The populace are naturally affected with novelty: and upon such surprizing occasions they go without bidding, and without delay.

However, After all, Is it in the least likely that John the Baptist should be three years, and a half preaching, before he could acquire such a fame as was sufficient to create such resort to him? even before they of Jerusalem, the people went after him, and the Priests and Levites sent their message of enquiry to him?—Is it at all likely that they were at this time big with expectation of a Messiah, when now a person even in their opinion, and in His own great worth and excellencies so nearly resembling him, made his public appearance, coming to them as a Prophet sent from God, could be long at any eafe within themselves, till they had put the question to him, as did the people in their own persons, and as did the Priests and Levites by the Pharisees, whom they sent on that errand to know, if he were the Messiah, or not?—Surely they could not possibly have waited Mr. Dean of Norwich's assign'd term for John's getting fame, and credit enough among them for to have such enquiry made of him. They could never have stood thus long. As they were big, so as one may not improperly say here, they would have burst with expectation, e'er that time came about.—No.—'Tis surely beyond all reason to imagine any such thing.

Add to all this, that it is most unlikely that the Messiah himself should be so long in coming after his fore-runner, as is this Mr. Dean's assign'd term for John the Baptist's Ministry. John came as the immediate Herald of this great King, the King Messiah. But Herbals in this service give notice of the approaching appearance of their Sovereign. So did John the Baptist proclaim his great Master now at hand.

Farther, As John the Baptist was to prepare, or make ready the way before Christ, this evidently shews that the Messiah was now forthwith upon his coming. And

Finally, the very nature of such Preparation implies as much. The Jews were now to be prepar'd by John the Baptist for the coming of the Messiah. But if they were to have waited Mr. Dean's assign'd term of three years and a half for the Messiah's coming to his public Ministry, after that John had thus declar'd him upon his preaching in the wilderness, then probably at some distance of time, some of them where he had first preached, might have stood in need of
of another forerunner of the Messiah, another John the Baptist to
have prepared his way: especially considering the refractoriness, heed-
lessness, and inconstancy of that obdurate people.

So that if Reasoning only were to carry the point in hand, it seems
strongly to declare not for Mr. Dean's separate Ministry of three
years and a half by him assign'd to John the Baptist before our Sa-
vior's entering upon his Ministry, but contrariwise for our Lord's
coming quickly after that John the Baptist had enter'd upon his Mi-
nistry in the fifteenth of Tiberius, and in the Year of the V. A.E. of
Christ thereunto corresponding not the twenty sixth, but the twenty
eighth in the latter end of that year; or in other words, in the fif-
teenth of Tiberius, as reckon'd not from his being admitted into Co-part-
nership with Augustus, but from the death of the said Emperor:
in which latter way Ptolemy reckon'd according to his usual way of
Reckoning in his Canon.

And Conclusively (a) in Mr. Dean's own Hypothesis Ptolemy's nine-
teneth of Tiberius is the true Scripture nineteenth of the reign of that
Emperor; as our blessed Saviour was put to death in the nineteenth
of Tiberius, according to that Canon: therefore Ptolemy's fifteenth
of the reign of that Emperor is surely the Scripture fifteenth also of
the said Emperor. It is so even in Mr. Dean's own testimony as
he was constrain'd to return to Ptolemy's nineteenth of that Em-
peror's reign, however oblig'd to leave him a while as to his fif-
teneth.

Also such returning to Ptolemy in his nineteenth Year of Tiberius is
a tacit acknowledgment at least of St. Luke's fifteenth of Tiberius
being indeed the fifteenth not in the reckoning followed after by
Velleius Paterculus, and Suetonius, but of its being the fifteenth really
in that account which was afterward followed by Ptolemy in his
Canon. For Mr. Dean acknowledging Ptolemy's nineteenth of Ti-
berius to be the true nineteenth of Tiberius, and as such the true
Scripture year of Christ's death (b), by consequence must allow Pto-

\[O \text{ Dean's.}\]

(a) For Mr. Dean reckons the 490 years of this Prophecy from the year of the
1st Period 4276, as that year according to Ptolemy's Canon was the 7th year of Ar-
taxerxes Longimanus. [Con. Hist. p. 265.] And these years thence reckon'd end in the
nineteenth of Tiberius according to Ptolemy's Canon. But in the other reckoning fol-
low'd by Mr. Dean in his fifteenth of Tiberius, they do not end 'till the twenty second of
Tiberius. And therefore indeed had Mr. Dean been consistent with himself, and with
his reckoning of the fifteenth of Tiberius, he should have placed the death of Christ in
the twenty second of Tiberius by the fame Reckoning. But this year of Tiberi-
us would not serve Mr. Dean's turn here. And therefore he comes back again to
Ptolemy's Canon for his ending of the sixty-nine Weeks in his 1st thereof, here follow-
ing one Reckoning, and in the ending of his sixty-nine Weeks following another. For
which Liberty indeed not to be allowed in any Hypothesis of these Weeks there is not
the least Occasion after all: forasmuch as the predicted Events of its especially in this
grand Period of the sixty-nine Weeks now before us had their exact accomplishment.
In full agreement with Ptolemy's Canon, as we shall see particularly in the following Chapter.
(b) As it surely is according to the testimony of Ptolemy Trallianus, who hath remarked
at the last year of the two hundred and second Olympiad, as follows, There was this year the
greatest Eclipse of the Sun that ever was known, It was night at the first hour of the
day, so that the Stars of Heaven were seen, &c.---This could be no other than the mira-
gulosa.
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ley's fifteenth to be the true fifteenth, even St. Luke's fifteenth there-
of in that account which he followed, which could be therefore no o-
ther than the fifteenth year of Tiberius as reckon'd from the death of
his Predecessor Augustus: And that the holy Evangelist's fifteenth of
Tiberius is the fifteenth of that Emperour's reign in the said Ac-
count, viz. as the years thereof are reckon'd from the death of
Augustus, we are yet farther confirm'd from Josephus, and Eusebius
their reckoning of the years of the reign of the Emperour Tiberius,
not from the time of his Copartnership in the Government with
Augustus, but from the time of himself being Emperour.

For proof hereof, Let it be consider'd that the twelfth of Tibe-
rielus according to these Authors is evidently the twelfth from his be-
ing actually Emperour. For

First, As to Josephus (c), It is evident from him that Valerius Gra-
tus the Roman Governour of Judæa was recall'd from his said Go-
vernment in the twelfth year of the reign of Tiberius.---Now he had
been put in by Tiberius in the beginning of his reign, viz. (in Dr.
Prideaux's (d) own Calculation hereof,) in the beginning of the fif-
teenth year of the V. Æ. of Christ. And He was recall'd accord-
ging to the same account (e) in the twenty-sixth year of the V. Æ. of
Christ, viz. in the twelfth of Tiberius; after that he had now held
the Government eleven Years: In the end whereof according to
Josephus (f) he made Caiaphas High-Priest.---Thus much from Jose-
phus. Now

Secondly, As to Eusebius, we have his testimony that Pontius Pilate
was made Procurator of Judæa in the twelfth year of the reign of
Tiberius. He tells us so twice in his Ecclesiastical History (g).

Now to return to Josephus, as to Pilate's continuing in his Procu-
ratorship. It was for the space of ten years. He tells us (b) that
Pilate continued in the Government ten years, and was recalled in
the last year of Tiberius.

Hence it is evident, that as by the testimony of these Authors
both Caiaphas, and Pontius Pilate came into their respective Offices
in the twelfth of Tiberius, so the said Authors reckon'd their first
Year of Tiberius his reign, not as doth Mr. Dean of Norwich in this
part of his Hypothesis from the time of his admission into a Coper-
ratorship in the Government with Augustus, but from the time of his
being himself Emperour upon the death of Augustus. For their
twelfth of Tiberius can be only the twelfth year of his reign from the
latter reckoning. Also

culous Darkness, which was over all the Land, i. e. not only over all Judæa, but over all
the Roman Empire, or at least all the Eastern part of it, during our blessed Saviour's Cruc-
ifixion in the nineteenth of Tiberius, as the year of the above-named Olympiad ended
in the said nineteenth [not in the twentysecond] of that Emperour: as Philoponus de Creat.
ii. 21. hath shown: and some months after April 3. of A. D. 33. (e) Lib.
Ant. xviii. c. 3. (d) Con. Hist. Vol. II. Chron. Table: as the years after
Christ in the second Column truly answer to the right hand figures in the Column of
Roman Emperours of Tiberius alone, which Josephus followed, and not the left hand ac-
count in the said Column of the years of Tiberius his reigning with Augustus, which
Josephus medleyc not with. (f) In loc. jam cia.
(c) 1. 9. (k) Lib. Antiq. xviii. 5. ending.
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Also Tiberius his recalling Pontius Pilate according to Josephus (i) after that he had held the Government ten years, as the said recalling was in the last year of that Emperor, which was his twenty third plainly proves the same.

Therefore since Josephus reckon'd thus, and Eusebius reckon'd thus, is it not most likely, we leave it to the Reader if it be not almost next to a certainty that St. Luke had before them reckon'd thus also? Even that he reckon'd his fifteenth of Tiberius not as afterwards did Velleius Paterculus, and Suetonius from the time of that Emperor's being admitted into a Copartnership of Government with Augustus, but as did Josephus, and after him Eusebius from the time of that Emperor's himself commencing Emperor.

So that these, and the foregoing particulars being duly consider'd, we finally leave it to the judicious Reader if Dr. Prideaux's ending of the 69 Weeks, or 483 years of this Prophecy in the Coming of Christ in the person of John the Baptist in Mr. Dean's fifteenth of Tiberius according to the reckoning of Velleius Paterculus, and Suetonius, can possibly even in this view of such Ending be a truly assign'd Ending of the said 69 Weeks.

It hath been formerly shewn (k) that such Ending is in itself most unlikely to be the Ending intended in the Prophecy in the true sense and meaning of those words of it (l), unto Messiah the Prince. It is also inconsistent with the letter of Scripture, with the express character laid down in the Prophecy (m), viz. the cutting off the Messiah at the end of the 69 Weeks, or 483 Years; as this is the very remarkable ending of them as it is immediately assign'd in the Prophecy. And therefore by our second Rule laid down for us to go by in the exposition of this Prophecy, it is impossible that this Hypothesis should bear on that account.

It hath also been now shewn that it is impossible it should, by reason of it's utter repugnancy, and irreconcileableness with the unquestionable measure of time Ptolemy's Canon. Even supposing with Mr. Dean of Norwich that those Years were to take their beginning from the seventh of Artaxerxes Longimanus (which however cannot be suppos'd with any colour of truth, forasmuch as the Commandment mention'd in this Prophecy could not possibly be that which went forth in the seventh of Artaxerxes, as we have formerly shewn) yet even this suppos'd, even in this View of the said 69 Weeks, or 483 Years, they cannot have their Ending in Mr. Dean's fifteenth of Tiberius for the reasons now given. And therefore by our third Rule Mr. Dean's Hypothesis is incapable of standing its ground, as being in no wise according with, or approving it self as it ought to do in all its parts by Ptolemy's Canon (n).

And

(i) Ib.  (k) See above. (l) Dan. ix. 25. (m) Ver. 26. After three-score and two Weeks (i.e. after 69 Weeks) as these 62 running in upon the foregoing seven Weeks make together 69 shall Messiah be our off. (n) 'Tis doubtless with Dr. Prideaux one among other Objections which he may have against Mr. L's Hypothesis.
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And thus Dr. Prideaux's assign'd Ending of these sixty-nine Weeks appearing as groundless as is his beginning of them, neither the one nor the other being founded in Scripture, nor the whole sum of 483 years between the two terms approving it self by the Chronologer's sure and infallible guide Ptolemy's Canon, we may now proceed to shew on the other hand in favour of the late Bishop Lloyd's Hypothesis, in this part of it, viz. in his ending of the 69 Weeks, or 483 Years of this Prophecy that it hath both these sure qualifications recommending it, viz. It hath a perfect Harmony, or Agreement both with Scripture, and also with Ptolemy's Canon, as we shall fullly evidence in the following Chapter.

C H A P. III.

Giving an Account of the late Bishop Lloyd his Ending of the 7 Weeks, and 62 Weeks or 483 Years the second Period of this Prophecy of Daniel's LXX Weeks.

We are now come to consider the late learned Bishop Lloyd's Ending of these 69 Weeks, or 483 Years. And that is the death of the Messiah, or his being cut off after the expiration of the said predicted term, even at the very next Passover following upon the expiration of the sixty two Weeks (a) as being reckon'd in a current reckoning upon the foregoing seven (b), and making together 69 Weeks, or 483 Years.

And the perfect Agreement hereof we are to shew,

First, With the holy Scripture,

Secondly, With Ptolemy's Canon.

First, This is evident from Scripture. For it is the very express Character in the Prophecy of this the second period of these Weeks: namely, that after three score and two Weeks the Messiah should be cut off (c), viz. after 62 Weeks, as they were current in reckoning upon the foregoing seven Weeks (d): or in other words, after 7 Weeks and 62 Weeks, or 483 Years. For

That the 62 Weeks are to be reckon'd in a current or continued reckoning upon the foregoing 7 Weeks it hath been already shewn, Nor is this a disputed point. They have one and the same Beginning assign'd them in the Prophecy, viz. the going forth of the Commandment

*Note: The above text contains a reference to Ptolemy, the date 483 years, and the prophecy of Daniel. It also mentions the works of Dr. Prideaux and the Chronologer, who are noted for their contributions to the understanding of biblical chronology. The text further discusses the agreement of this ending with both Scripture and Ptolemy's Canon.*
mandment to rebuild Jerusalem; For herein is the Text express (Dan. ix. 25) that from thence, even from the going forth of the Commandment to rebuild Jerusalem, unto Messiah the Prince shall be seven Weeks and sixty two Weeks. And this Commandment, as it hath been formerly shewn, was that which went forth from Artaxerxes Longimarus King of Persia in the twentieth year of his reign. Therefore from the going forth of that Commandment UNTO MESSIAH the Prince there were by this Prophecy to be reckoned just so many Weeks of Years and no more, that is 483 Years, and not one other whole year farther. What?----Unto the birth of the Messiah?---No reckoning will ever find it there.---Or unto his Coming to his Ministry, either in his own person, or according to Mr. Dean of Norwich, in the person of John the Baptist?---Nor will any reckoning of the said term as we have seen, suit here in either of such the Coming of the Messiah. And no wonder that it doth not. As no such coming of the Messiah, as we have also seen, can be the true sense of these words unto Messiah the Prince any more than any reckoning in such sense of them can be a true Reckoning.

What other Coming of the Messiah is there then besides these which is most likely to be that intended in these words?---What but that which as I have also observed was truly, and properly his great and important Coming both to Jews and Gentiles his Coming to his SUFFERINGS?---The Prophecy it self, as we have formerly shewn, points out this very explanation of the words in the very next verse (f), in those words, After three-score and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off. Thus from the going forth of the Commandment, &c. unto Messiah the Prince his coming to the Cross, or his being CUT OFF there were to be seven weeks and three-score and two weeks. This is the very letter of the Prophecy which here expressly pinneth us down to the word AFTER, and therein doubtless to a time immediately, or very soon after following upon the expiration of these seven weeks, and three-score and two weeks, a time which should then certainly be come for the death of Christ, at least before another full year should come about after the expiration of the said sixty nine weeks, or four hundred and eighty three Years. Our Saviour therefore could not survive a whole Year after the said precisely here predicted term was run out. For otherwise he had not then been cut off according to this Prophecy after 483, but after 484 years. He had not been cut off after seven weeks, and three-score and two weeks, but after seven weeks, and three-score and two weeks, and one year also of another week: which had been inconsistent with, at least not precisely agreeing with the express Character of this part of the Prophecy now before us, viz. (g), that AFTER seven weeks and three-score and two weeks the Messiah should be CUT OFF.

---

(1) His Sufferings especially had been from time to time foreshewn both by Types and Prophecies. To these chiefly he was to come. By these he most eminently proved himself the Messiah, even by his Sufferings. See in the bottom of p. 183, Note (g).

(f) Dan. ix. 26. (g) 1h.
Of the late Bishop Lloyd's Ending of

We see then how in this Prophecy we are evidently pinned down to the death of Christ, as the express Character of this the second period of this Prophecy. This was the grand Event to be immediately accomplished when the fulness of time was come for the cutting off of the Messiah, as it was at the Passover which immediately followed upon the expiration of the here predicted sixty-nine weeks; such exact Accomplishment then abundantly verifying such precise prediction; as we shall fully make to appear anon.

But before we proceed to that, Mr. Dean of Norwich hath made it necessary for us to dwell a little upon this most solemn, and significant word here in the Prophecy the word AFTER. As he hath been pleas'd to give us a very singular exposition of it in favour of his Hypothesis: by telling us expressly, as he doth (b), that the word AFTER in this place cannot be understood to mean strictly the time immediately after, but in a large and indefinite sense to denote the WHOLE NEXT WEEK which after followed: viz. which followed upon the expiration of the seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks. And in this partial Exposition of the word AFTER in favour of his Hypothesis, Mr. Dean makes our Saviour to be CUT OFF not according to the express Letter of the Prophecy here after the said seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks, but after 70 weeks to the utter exclusion of the grand Event, or express Character of the 70th, or the single week from the said week, viz. the Destruction of Jerusalem, as if the same were not a part of the seventy weeks determined upon the holy City: Of which more hereafter, when we come to treat particularly of the said single week.

We are now immediately concerned with the seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks, and particularly with the most significant, and important word join'd with them in the Prophecy, the word AFTER; which word tho' in itself plainly, and expressly predicting the cutting off of the Messiah before another week, or so much as one other Year of another week could come about after that the said threescore and nine weeks were run out, yet Mr. Dean hath made of none effect by expounding it clear away from them; and running it into a large, and indefinite sense, as denoting no less than the WHOLE NEXT WEEK, or seven Years which remained after that the sixty-nine weeks, or four hundred, and eighty three years were expir'd.

Mr. Dean was himself sensible that an Objection lay against him for his making the death of Christ to fall out at the end of the 70 weeks; and therefore he was careful to ward against this Objection, by thus expounding away the plain and natural sense of the word AFTER.

But surely the Objection is in no wise taken off by such Mr. Dean's Exposition of the word. The Objection is most just, 'tis

---

grounded as we see upon the express words of the Prophecy: as the Messiah was to be cut off (ver. 26.) after three score and two Weeks (i). This is the letter of the Prophecy, and in the common sense of the word after he was cut off accordingly in the very next year after, even at the Passover following, as we shall see anon, after such three score, and two Weeks. Therefore Mr. Dean's exposition of the word after is by no means a just exposition of the said word. Indeed it is not so, on many accounts.

First, It is not so even in Mr. Dean's assign'd reasons for such wide exposition of it.

The main reason by Mr. Dean urg'd (k) in favour of such large and indefinite sense of the word after as denoting the whole next Week after, is that otherwise his (the Messiah's) Coming and his Cutting off must have happened at the same time both together, and no intermediate space would have been left for his Ministry. For in the verse preceding it is positively said, that from the going forth of the Commandment to restore, and build Jerusalem, Unto Messiah the Prince should be seven Weeks, and three score and two Weeks, and therefore if at the end of the same sixty-two weeks he should be cut off also, then his Coming, and his Cutting off must have happened both together at the same time, and the CONSEQUENCE which I have mention'd (faith Mr. Dean) must necessarily follow, i. e. that no intermediate space would have then been left for his Ministry, which cannot be said. The word AFTER must therefore mean the whole Week after, at the end of which Christ, the Messiah named in that Prophecy was cut off by his death on the Cross.

Now that this reason is inconclusive, and utterly incapable of proving any thing here as to the true literal meaning of the word now before us, the word After in this Prophecy, it is evident from hence, even because it is founded on a mistaken interpretation of those words of the Prophecy (in verse 25) Unto Messiah the Prince, there being as before shewn (l), no other prediction here, but that of Christ's coming to his sufferings, or to be cut off by his death on the cross after those three score, and two Weeks. And therefore here it is once an end of Mr. Dean's necessary consequence here. There is indeed no consequence at all. For tho' the Messiah was according to this Prophecy to be put to death after three score and two Weeks, as accordingly he was, yet it doth not therefore in the least follow that his Coming to his Ministry, and his Cutting off must have happened together, because as the matter of fact shew'd He came to the former some years (m) before he was brought to the latter: but however not so many Years, viz. seven Years, or whole week's Ministry as by Mr. Dean in this case is assign'd. And therefore doubtless the former could not be intended in this Prophecy. Besides, as we might note here by way of confirmation in the case before

(i) Viz. as reckon'd upon the foregoing 7 Weeks.  
(l) See p. 183.  
(m) See p. 188.
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before us, what we have formerly (o) shewn at large, Mr. Dean is
forced to make up this 7 Years Ministry assign'd to our Saviour by
the allotment of the former 3 Years and a half to his forerunner
John the Baptist, which is doubtless a very far-fetch'd Exposition in
it self (p), and which after all as I have shewn (q) will not bear,
forasmuch as it clashes in no less than a three Years difference with
Ptolemy's Canon. And even this were sufficient to overthrow Mr.
Dean's reasoning here. But.

Secondly, The plain and natural sense of the word After in the or-
dinary or common acceptation of it, doth in no wise admit of such
extended sense.—We read here in the Prophecy (ver. 26) that After
threescore, and two weeks (r) shall Messiah be cut off.—Would not
any impartial Reader from these words conclude that at the end of
the said weeks, or quickly after the expiration of them, at least be-
fore one other whole week, or so much as one whole year of another
week could come about, this grand Event should be accomplished?
Here he finds the death of Christ predicted as surely to fall out after
that such a sure time here set for it should be expired. Would he
not accordingly look for it soon after the running out of the said
predicted term?—He would surely in the plain, and natural sense of
the word After, and in our ordinary way of thus understanding one
another in the common usage of the word.

For should any one tell me that such a thing should come to pass
after a week, or seven days, should I not have reason when those
seven days were come to look for the accomplishment of that Event
in the eighth day following? But should that Event not fall out till
one whole week, or seven days after, even on the fourteenth day following,
this would surely be a postponing my expectation, and in that
case really rendering the word AFTER of little or no signification.
For the Event here falling out so many days after the set time for it,
and my expectation also for it, any farther day after the seventh, and
before the day of the Event might have been as well set for the ac-
complishment of it; nay in truth much better, because the Event
fell so much nearer.

But as we are here concern'd with a Scripture-expression, or a
Scripture immediate use of the word, Let us look into other pas-
fages of Scripture where we meet with the word AFTER, and by
the sense in which we find it in them, let us be guided in our un-
derstanding of it here.

Now not to trouble the Reader with too many instances of this
nature, it may suffice to mention these following, and to note their
respective meanings as we go along.

First, We read in the second book of Samuel in the 13th Chapter,
at the 23d verse, that AFTER two full years Abiram had sleep-
bearers,

(o) See p. 186.  (p) For what is there in this Prophecy that doth in the least
counterenance such Exposition of the word After?  (q) See p. 184, &c.
(r) vix.  As they are reckoned in one and the same current Reckoning upon the foregoing seven Weeks.
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We may on this occasion look to those words of our blessed Saviour which we read in St. Matthew's Gospel in the 26th Chapter at the 2d Verse, viz. AFTER two days is the feast of the Passover. — Now was not Passover-day the third day following? — Most undoubtedly it was.

Thirdly, Look we into that text of St. Paul in his Epistle to the Galatians in the 2d Chapter at the first verse, Fourteen years after I went up to Jerusalem. — Was it not in the end of the fourteenth year (from the Apostle's reckoning there in Ch. i. ver. 18.) or at least in the beginning of the fifteenth, wherein the Apostle took this journey? Beyond all dispute it was before the fifteenth could come about: For otherwise the Apostle had said not as he doth, fourteen years after, but he would surely have said, fifteen years after, &c.

Now if this be not the plain and natural sense of the word AFTER in the usage of it in the several foremention'd passages of Scripture, and consequently the true and genuine sense thereof, it is entirely submitted to the Reader. But if it be thus in them, it is an unquestionable proof that the like is the usage, the same is the sense of this one and the same word here in this passage of Scripture now before us. For why should it not be so equally here as there? It ought to be so doubtless without very particular Evidence to the contrary. For without such evidence All farther Extension of this or any other word in Scripture beyond the Letter of it, and the genuine and natural sense of it, especially the known usage and sense of it in other places of Scripture is certainly groundless, and unwarrantable. But such particular Evidence cannot possibly be brought here. For as yet none surely hath appeared. I may be bold to say none ever can be brought sufficient to justify such large and indefinite sense as is that of Mr. Dean of Norwich's sense of this word of the Prophecy now before us. For otherwise to what purpose is it that the Angel hath thus solemnly deliver'd this part of the Prophecy in such express terms, or fixed number as he hath here done? If the Messiah had not been to have been cut off after the three score and two weeks (s) as exactly determined for the same in this Prophecy (t) according to the very letter of it, and in the ordinary sense or acceptation of the word After, but was in Mr. Dean of Norwich's Hypothesis hereof to have been cut off After three score, and three weeks, we may surely with all the reason in the world on our side conclude that the Angel in his delivering this Prophecy to Daniel for his very information in this particular and most weighty concern of it, would without all dispute have so immediately express'd himself. But as he hath not, 'tis sufficiently evident that such strained and unnatural ex-

(s) As they follow in course of reckoning after the foregoing seven Weeks.
(t) v. 26.
extended sense was never here intended; and the rejected literal and
plain sense is moreover fully established. And therefore since we find
these words literally and expressly in the Prophecy \(\textit{viz. After}
\) threescore, and two weeks \(\textit{x} \) shall Messiah be cut off, we are neces-
sarily tied down to the cutting off of the Messiah, if not strictly and
immediately after the very Day of their Expiration, however so far
forth after, as that it was impossible for so much as one whole year
of another week to pass away without the accomplishment of this
grand Event of this predicted period. And the matter of fact in its
Accomplishment accordingly shewed that it did not, as we shall see
hereafter. And no wonder that such solemnly predicted, and such
momentous Event as is this of the Messiah's being cut off after three-
score and two Weeks, had its precise Accomplishment accordingly
after the expiration of them in the Passover immediately follow-
ning thereupon (as it will appear anon that it had) when it is con-
ider'd that it is the very letter of Scripture here that so it must
be \(\textit{After the threescore and two weeks} \) \(\textit{y}. \) For to use Mr. Dean of
Norwich's words here \(\textit{z} \), and we cannot any where more proper-
ly and with greater reason use them in any part of this solemn
Prophecy than in this now before us predicting this grand Event
of the Cutting off of the Messiah, and that in the precise time de-
termined for it, after threescore and two weeks, \textit{No word of God}
is given in vain, Every part of it hath its significancy, and Every
word of Prophecy therein contained must have its Compliment.

So in this word of God now before us, in this noble and fo-
lemn Scripture Prophecy of these weeks, \textit{Every part of it, Every
word of it, Consequently the word \(\textit{After} \) in this momentous part
of it setting forth the determined time for the cutting off of the Me-
siah hath its significancy, and it had its Compliment accordingly.

It could not indeed be other wise. For as the learned Mr. Dean
exceeding well and truly affirms in the words immediately follow-
ing \(\textit{a}, \) \textit{What Our Saviour faith of the Law is also true of thePro-
phets, And as not one jot or tittle of the former was to pass without
being fulfilled, so neither could any one jot, or tittle of the latter ever pass
away without being accomplished. Consequently not one jot or tittle,
much les could one word, So significant a word especially as the
word \(\textit{After} \) in this part of the Prophecy pass away, without its
actual Compliment, and full Accomplishment in the express letter
of it.

And yet after all that Mr. Dean hath thus truly observ'd and affirm'd
of the significancy and comple ment of every word of this Prophecy,
How inconfestent therewith is his Exposition of this word, this
principal word the word \(\textit{After} \) in this Prophecy?

Instead of giving it its just significancy, and comple ment as it had in
the death of Christ at the very next Passover after that the hese
predicted

\(\textit{a} \) lb. \(\textit{x} \) \textit{Vix. As reckon'd after the foregoing seven Weeks. (y) In verse
26, as they are reckon'd after the foregoing seven Weeks spoken of in verse 25.
(z) As we find them in page 287 l. 1, \textit{Of. Cont. Hist.} \(\textit{a} \) lb. lin. 3.
predicted term for it was expir'd (as we shall soon come to shew that it exactly had) all the significance and completion that Mr. Dean of Norwich hath giv'n to it is, that indeed Christ died some one whole week, or seven full years after that the very set time for it in the Prophecy was run out.—But alas what is this to the determined Period in the Prophecy for Christ's being cut off after three score and two weeks? Where is the significance and completion of the word After here, for Christ to be cut off a whole week after this very number of weeks here expressly determin'd for it (b)?

Had the Messiah been a whole week, or seven whole years in cutting off, then indeed there had been some ground for Mr. Dean's large and extended sense, and completion of this word After. Such extended Cutting off had then indeed justified such extended Exposition. But there was nothing like this in the matter of fact. Nor indeed hath Mr. Dean built at all upon it. The real foundation of such extended Exposition was that of suitting the word to Mr. Dean's Hypothesis, in the bringing it to such a sense as would admit of Christ's being cut off, as therein accordingly he is (not after three score, and two weeks, as in the express letter of the Prophecy (c) but) after three score, and two weeks, and one week; and as these are all in Mr. Dean's Hypothesis reckon'd upon the foregoing seven, they make together 70 weeks, the whole Number of the weeks of this Prophecy, after or at the end of all which according to Mr. Dean the Messiah was cut off. And therefore this is made an argument by Mr. Dean in favour of his extended Exposition of the word After. But how groundlessly 'tis so made, will yet appear by taking a distinct view of the Text, and shewing

Thirdly, How utterly incapable of such Exposition the word After is, consider'd as it stands here in the Prophecy.

We

(b) In this sense of the word After, In what time forever afterwards Christ's death had happened, yet still in a large, and indefinite sense, it had been all one. The Prophecy had been equally accomplished after a manner, such a one as it is: for Christ had still died after the Prophecy's three score, and two weeks. But then of what force had been the word After here?—Surely of none at all. Nor is it in truth of any more in Mr. Dean's limited sense to the meaning of the whole next week only after the three score, and two weeks. For as we must observe here though Mr. Dean will have the word After taken in a large, and indefinite sense, as it lies in apposition with the three score, and two weeks in verse 26, yet in order to take in the one week in verse 27 (which in no wise concerns the cutting off of the Messiah, as we shall fully shew hereafter, when we treat thereof) Mr. Dean will no longer after that allow this word to have a large, and indefinite sense. And so what upon the expiration of three score, and two weeks had a large and indefinite sense, had yet a strict and limited sense after seventy weeks. But still this is surely enlarging; and limiting at pleasure. And here is still a whole week or seven years postponing the death of Christ beyond the time in the express Letter of the Prophecy determined for it, in the plain and natural sense of the word After, which in the common acceptance of the word, as we have seen, denoteth strictly an Accomplishment of the predicted Events, after the very number of weeks precisely set for it, and when the said Accomplishment must necessarily have hap'n'd, as it truly did accordingly to this word After, having its full weight, and due significance here. But nothing like this accomplishment had the word in the extended sense now before us at the end of a whole week after the precise time for it appointed in the Prophecy. There is indeed nothing in the matter of facts, any more than in the ordinary sense of the word After in the least justifying such Extension. (c) Viz. In verse the twenty sixth.
Of the late Bishop Lloyd's Ending of

We have formerly observ'd that there are three several Periods in this Prophecy, the one of seven Weeks, (v. 25;) another of three score and two Weeks, (v. 26,) reckon'd upon the foregoing seven Weeks, (as both these periods have one and the same beginning from the going forth of the Commandment &c. as in v. 25.) And a third of one Week separately spoken of in verse 27. These Weeks are thus immediately divided by the Angel's distinct manner of delivering himself concerning them as in the express Letter of this Prophecy in the verses now quoted.

Now of these three Periods 'tis the second only that immediately belongs to the Messiah, as expressly setting forth the time determined for his cutting off. The first and the last, they immediately respect Jerusalem, that her full Restoration, this her final Destruction. The first Period was accordingly solemniz'd with the going forth of the predicted Commandment (in v. 25.) for the rebuilding of Jerusalem both the Wall and the Streets thereof, in the very beginning of the said Period, as the said Commandment did actually go forth from Artaxerses Longimanus King of Persia in the twentieth year of his reign. The last of the three periods, viz. the distinct and separate One Week thereof, as it respects Jerusalem in the final Destruction of it, in its EXPRESS CHARACTER in the very letter of the Text, (v. 27.) and in the there predicted Circumstances of it had its exact completion accordingly, as we shall have occasion (a) to shew more fully hereafter. It cannot therefore have any relation to the cutting off of the Messiah, but must necessarily be distinct from it. And therefore as it bears no relation to that grand Event, as being immediately concern'd with another of its own viz. the Destruction of Jerusalem, as we shall more fully shew anon, We see plainly in the Prophecy that that other Grand Event, viz. of the cutting off of the Messiah is not placed after the said One Week, but immediately after its own proper, and express period of the sixty two Weeks.

Consequently for Mr. Dean of Norwich to make Christ to be cut off, as he doth, after the said One Week, and in order to that to make the word after, (which is in immediate Apposition with the threescore and two Weeks, and not with the one week,) to signify the whole Week, as it is in truth against all reasonable sense of the word after in the genuine and natural sense of it, as before shewn, So it is notoriously against the express Letter of this Prophecy. Such extended and forced sense is utterly repugnant to, and inconsistent with it in this twofold respect, as it renders of none effect this immediate apposition of the word After to the threescore and two Weeks, and also as it robs the other One Week of its immediate express Character directly and distinctly applied to it in the Prophecy. And this is proof sufficient that such extended sense of the word After as denoting the whole next Week after the running out of

(a) Viz. When we come in order to treat of the said Week.
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the threescore and two Weeks cannot possibly be the true sense of the word After.

Nor will that help Mr. Dean of Norwich, which we are yet to consider; as being what he hath urg’d in the case before us (viz. as to the true and proper sense of the word After) as he hath been pleased to tell us (p. 294. l. 29.) in the following words, The Death of the Messiah is in the Prophecy exactly determined to that time (viz. to the end of the Seventy Weeks) by what was said before in the twenty-fourth verse. For according to that, It must be there placed, where it placeth the Events that were to be accomplished, and brought to pass by it. But the Events which were to be accomplished and brought to pass by the cutting off of the Messiah, are by that part of the said Prophecy (viz. v. 24.) placed at the end of the Seventy Weeks, and consequently at the end of the last of them, and therefore the cutting off of the Messiah must there be placed also.

To which the Reply is most easy, viz. that there can not possibly be any Conclusion from verse the twenty-fourth of this Prophecy to the determined time of the cutting off of the Messiah. Not

First, from the number of Weeks determined in the said twenty-fourth Verse, for they are in general determined as in the express Letter of the Prophecy, not upon the Messiah, but upon Jerusalem (b). Of which more in its proper place hereafter. Not

Secondly, from the predicted Events in verse the twenty-fourth, for as they were to be accomplished, and brought to pass by the cutting off of the Messiah, they were therefore to have their accomplishment where his cutting off is expressly and most precisely placed in verse the twenty-sixth. But that is there determined not after seventy weeks, but after [seven Weeks and] sixty-two Weeks. And therefore in vain hath Mr. Dean argued for the cutting off of the Messiah after seventy Weeks spoken of in verse the twenty-fourth, which are there in general determined (not upon the Messiah, but) upon Jerusalem.

And so we may have done with our vindication of the plain and natural, and as such truly the most significant, and most proper sense of the word After in this Prophecy, as it stands in immediate apposition with the threescore and two Weeks thereof, and in such apposition solemnly denoteth the precise time here determined for the cutting off of the Messiah after the running out of the said period of Weeks.———As the learned Dr. Prideaux had well-nigh expounded away the true significance, and great importance of this word thus

(b) For herein is the Text exprefts, Seventy Weeks are determined upon THY PEOPLE and upon THY HOLY CITY.———Therefore the judicious and learned Mr. Mede objected against Fuscinius’s Hypothesis of these weeks, as having this great and unavoidable Inconvenience among others, that as it begins the Seventy Weeks from the seventeenth of Artemæx, and ends them in the death of Christ (as the learned Dr. Prideaux hath also done) that therein it ends the said Seventy Weeks which by the Text were allotted for the HOLY CITY long before the times of the Holy City were fulfilled; as are Mr. Mede’s words in p. 710. of his book. But of this more in its proper place hereafter.
thus surely pointing out the time by God himself here appointed for the Messiah's sufferings, after these sixty-nine weeks, as soon as ever his HOUR was come after the expiration of them, it was therefore incumbent on us to dwell thus long in the vindicating and restoring the true sense thereof: left otherwise we might be depriv'd of this the main intent and purpose of this noble Prophecy in this most solemn, and weighty part thereof foreshewing and fixing at so great a distance of time, the death of our Great Redeemer, as in the fulness thereof He should come unto his Sufferings, as it is here most expressly foretold that he should.—For what more considerable Revelation, what of greater consequence for the conviction of the Jews, what more solemn confirmation of the Christian Faith than that such precise Time of the suffering Messiah so completely afterwards verified was thus predicted so many hundred years before in this Prophecy (c) that He the Messiah the son of God, and the Redeemer of mankind who according to this Prophecy was to come unto his sufferings, viz. to be cut off after (seven weeks and) three-score and two weeks, the time herein determined for that his cutting off, was in the fulness of time accordingly cut off, viz. at the Passover immediately following upon the expiration of the said determined weeks for it. The chief End both of our Saviour's birth, and also of his Coming was to DIE for our Salvation. Therefore the Prophecies of his Dying are of the weightiest concern to mankind above all other Prophecies of Scripture. It was the SALVATION by the SUFFERINGS of Christ which Moses, and all the Prophets had foretold (d): And yet they knew not when it would be. But for that they enquir'd and search'd diligently, as St. Peter tells us (e), desiring to know when, and what time, or what manner of time it should be that the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when he testified beforehand of the sufferings of Christ, and of the glory that should follow.

Nay not only Men, but even the Angels desir'd to look into these things, as St. Peter there (f) tells us. For even they were not in this secret, as St. Paul plainly shews (g) calling it the Mystery of our Redemption by the death of Christ, and telling us that from the beginning of the world it was hid in God, to the intent that unto the Principalities, and Powers in heavenly places, (that is, to the blessed Angels themselves) might be known by the Church the manifold wisdom of God. According to both these Apostles the DISCOVERY of the DETERMINED TIME of Christ's death, which God was pleased to send to his Prophet Daniel by the Angel Gabriel, was not more surprizing news to the Prophet, than it was to the Angel himself. But God was therefore pleased to make this Revelation to the

---

(c) The Prophecy of the LXX Weeks was revealed to Daniel in the year 538 before A. D. or the V. Ec. of Christ, Dan. ix. 1, 2.  
(e) 1 Pet. i. 10, 11, 12.  
(f) 1 Th. 23.  
(g) Eph. iii. 9, 10.
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the Prophet Daniel, because as the Angel's words (b) to him are, that he was a man greatly beloved: an expression this not used to any other of the Prophets, nor perhaps to any other person, but only to the blessed Virgin (Luke i. 28) for in the same words this might have been translated with that (i). And the Angel herein brought him this sure token of it in giving him the first Revelation of the PRECISE TIME of Christ's death. The Knowledge of which had been so earnestly desired, and sought after by Angels, as well as Men, but never could be attained by any of them.

And indeed for the PRECISE TIME of the Messiah's death there is no other Prediction of it, than that which we have in this Prophecy. And therefore the most learned Grotius (on Mat. xvi. 3) understands those words there of our blessed Saviour to the Pharisees, and Sadducees, as if he had said thus to them; If ye look'd into the Prophecies of Scripture with so much concern'dness as ye do into the face of Heaven, when ye are taking a journey, ye would see and acknowledge out of doubt that the end of Daniel's weeks is at hand.

It was after Passover of the A. V. Christ's 32 (John vi. 4) at which Christ was not, but still continued in Galilee, or thereabouts, and also after his Miracle of the Loaves, and a few little fishes near the sea of Galilee (Mat. xv. 29. Mark vii. 31) but not long after this, as appears by our Saviour's words to his Disciples, (Mat. xvi. 9, 10) that he had this Debate with the Pharisees, and Sadducees about the TIMES. They required of him a sign from Heaven to prove that he was the Messiah, which they resolved not to believe. He sign'd deeply in the Spirit (Mark viii. 12) and asked them, as they could discern the face of the Sky, if they could not also discern the signs of the Times, Mat. xvi 3. Upon which Grotius hath commented as above.

And it is hard to say what Times Christ should mean here but those two times that are mention'd in this Prophecy: namely, first the time of the Messiah's being cut off, which was to be After the 69 weeks; (Dan. ix. 25, 26) and secondly the time of the single week, (ver. 27) the week that was appointed of God for the destroying of the City, and Temple at Jerusalem, and the dissolving of the Jewish Church. But

That our Saviour intended the former of these, namely the time when the Messiah was to be cut off, it appears by considering at what time it was that he said this. It was now this very year, on the 11th day of May (k), or some little time later, that the sixty-nine weeks were expired.

Now

(b) Dan. ix. 23. (i) The Original words in Daniel are, Nam Deidera Tu es. pro Vir Deifieriorum, ut plene dicatur, ch. x. 11. i.e. Omnium deiderabilium virorum deideratifimus. Bux. in Voce. The original word in Luke i. 28 is, Thou art highly favoured of God. He was therefore greatly beloved, or thus highly favoured of God, as being of all others most deserving of such love, and favour of God, as was now shown him in this important Revelation of God made to him. (k) As we shall presently have occasion to shew more fully.
Of the late Bishop Lloyd's Ending of

Now our Saviour knew the time was come that St. Luke speaks of (ix. 51) the time when he should be taken up, that is, crucified (1). He knew it to be so near, that there was not now one DAY of another week left: he had not a year longer to live. But he also knew that his piece of a DAY should not be at an end 'till next Passover. He knew that that was his HOUR, (John xiii. 1.) He should be cut off then, and no sooner.

Therefore in the mean space Christ took particular care that this should be no surprize to his Disciples. And that it might not be so to them, He first broke it to them immediately after the reproof that he gave to the Pharisees. It was in his progress in the parts about Caesarea Philippi, that he BEGAN to shew his Disciples, that he must go up to Jerusalem, and there be rejected by the Sanhedrin, and be killed, and after three days must rise again, (Mat. xvi. 21. Mark viii. 31. Luke ix. 22.) Ἀνὴρ ὁ θεός ἐκεῖνος ἦ εἰσάγων, as St. Matthew's words are, From that time forth, as in our Translation most truly and properly: Christ having not before, as is evident from St. Peter's taking our Lord aside from the rest, and rebuking him for saying things so frightful to them (Mat. xvi. 22. Mark viii. 32) but now the sixty-nine weeks of Daniel, after which he was to be cut off, being expir'd, He thenceforward made them acquainted with it (m) that when this horrid Tragedy of his being cut off according to this Prophecy should happen, as it was now to be accomplished at the very next Passover, the said sixty-nine weeks being now run out, it might however be no more than what he had himself taught them to expect among other things concerning himself.

Thus our Lord's own Observation of the expiring of these Weeks, and his immediate information thereupon, then and not before, of his approaching death which he was necessarily (n) to undergo at Passover following, as he could not survive the next Passover now that these determined weeks for his cutting off were run out, is to us a most strengthening proof, and an additional Confirmation of what hath been above said as to the true, and genuine signification of the word After, in this Prophecy. And therefore as for the foregoing reasons, so for this also we cannot look upon it otherwise than a mangling or mutilating of this noble Prophecy in this solemn part of it, for to take the said word in Mr. Dean of Norway's, or in any other such like large and indefinite sense. Nor can we therefore also but conclude that such, and every other such (o) like extended sense there-

(1) So Dr. Hammond expounds it: Or rather, as Christ expounds it himself; for this was his manner of speaking; He said that the Son of Man should be lifted up, (John xii. 14.) He said the word lifted up, thereby signifying what death he should die (ch. xii. 22; 33.) And he was therefore delivered to Pilate to be crucified to the fulfilling of this saying (ch. xviii. 32.)

(m) So again ch. xvii. 22 and xx. 17—19. (n) As he could not die but at Passover, as will be presently shewn, but could not survive another, because the [7 weeks and] 62 weeks were now expired.

(o) Such also is Mr. Law-eller's extended sense of the word After to three years and a half run in upon the sixty-nine weeks in a current reckoning with them, as he makes Christ to be cut off in the middle of the seventeenth week.
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thereof, as it is inconsistent with the natural sense of it, in its common acceptation, and as it stands in the Text, and is consider'd with the Context, and is moreover in no wise agreeable to the matter of fact; so likewise that such extended sense run through the whole single week, as in Mr. Dean of Norwich's Hypothesis, or through the former half of it, as in Mr. Lancaster's, is in truth altogether arbitrary, and groundless, and therefore put upon the word merely for the sake of their respective Hypotheses, both founded in a mistaken current reckoning of more than sixty-nine weeks; whereas no more than these (p) are by the letter of this Prophecy to be so reckon'd, both computed from a mistaken beginning of these weeks (q), and consequently productive of as groundless an Ending, as that of the Messiah's being cut off either at the end, or else in the middle of the separate one week of this Prophecy.

But otherwise it is with the late Bishop Lloyd's Hypothesis in all these respects. He therein every where abiding by the express letter of the Prophecy, as he took his beginning of the seven weeks, and threefore and two weeks, (of them, and them only) from the express Character to which we are actually pinned down in the Prophecy for the same, viz. the going forth of the Commandment to rebuild Jerusalem in the literal sense of such Commandment, (which Commandment in such the true sense thereof, as we have shewn (r) went not forth 'till the twentieth of Artaxerxes Longimanus) so likewise, as it hath now appeared, He fixed his ending of the said seven weeks, and 62 weeks in the letter of the Prophecy, viz. in the express Character of the death of Christ expressly signified to us by the phrase of the cutting off the Messiah immediately, or so soon after the expiration of the said weeks as at the very next Passover following: which grand Event hapned accordingly after such expiration, as in exact accordance with the letter of this Prophecy, which was the first thing to be shewn by us in favour of the said Hypothesis, so also as it is to be shewn in the second place in point of time, in full and perfect Agreement with Ptolemy's Canon (s).

P 2

For

(p) Verle 25. (q) Viz. The 7th of Artaxerxes. (r) See above. (s) Mr. Dean of Norwich (p. 265 and elsewhere) and also Mr. Lancaster (p. 60) have both of them laid claim to such agreement also. The former especially, as he begins these weeks in Ptolemy's very leaventh of Artaxerxes, and ends them also in Ptolemy's 19th of Tiberius: the latter also so far forth as he claims an agreement (i.e.) with the number of years in Ptolemy's Canon. But at the same time both of them have been constrain'd for their respective Hypotheses to forfake Ptolemy tho' in different particulars. Mr. Lancaster hath widely left Ptolemy in his 7th of Artaxerxes making that year in his Hypothesis to be the 7th of that King's reign, which in Ptolemy's Canon is truly but the first thereof. And even the learned Mr. Dean of Norwich hath for the sake of one particular part of his Hypothesis been constrain'd to do something of the like nature. I mean as to the 19th of Tiberius, making that to be his 19th which in Ptolemy's Canon is truly but the 12th. As these things have been shewn at large above. So that in neither of these Hypotheses is there a true agreement with Ptolemy's Canon, for in the foregoing particulars there is an actual departure from him. And that of Mr. Lancaster's especially is notorious, and indeed not to be allowed, because not justifiable by
Of the late Bishop Lloyd's Ending of

For it is expressly predicted in this Prophecy (ver. 25.) that from the going forth of the Commandment to rebuild Jerusalem there should be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks, equal to 483 years, and that AFTER the Messiah should be cut off (ver. 26.)? And farther did this Commandment go forth in the twentieth year of the reign of King Artaxerxes Longimanus, as it hath been shewn at large that it did? —— Let the Reader be pleased to consult the Table in the End of this Chapter, wherein is computed this determined time by the Chronologers golden rule, Ptolemy's Canon, and he will accordingly find that Christ did not survive one full year after the expiration of it. As for instance, the year before the Vulgar Era of Christ which answers to the 20th of Artaxerxes Longimanus in that Canon is the year 445. If we reckon from the Jews Nisan of that year which answers to our April (1) 483 years, viz. Eastern (u) years, such as are the years of this Prophecy (w) each year containing 360 days to a year, the old Eastern year, or the Vulgar Year of the Jews, and of the Country where Daniel, and the Jews were now captive, when this Prophecy was giv'n, we shall find the said 483 years to end in the Jewish month Iyar in our May (x) of the year of the common Christian Era 32, in the 18th year of the Roman Emperor Tiberius. In the month of May then of the year of the V. Æ. of Christ 32, the 7 weeks, and 62 weeks of this Prophecy, or the 483 years thereof had their ending. And now not long After the Messiah was surely to be cut off according to this Prophecy. He could not live now one other whole day of another week, not the whole next year, to the surviving the May following of the year of the V. Æ. of Christ 33, or the 19th of Tiberius; for then he had not been the Authoritises by him urged in favour, and support of it. This Mr. Lancaster's great and unwarrantable freedom with Ptolemy in this particular, shocks his whole Hypothesis were there nothing else that did so. But the utter Inconsistency both of his beginning and ending of these weeks with the letter of the Prophecy directly overthrows it, as the same Objection lies against Mr. Lancaster's beginning of theses weeks, as hath been shewn to ly against Mr. Dean of Norwich's, and as both reckon by a current reckoning of more than thirty-nine weeks, as the former hath thrown in one half, and the latter the whole single week, making thus their respective Hypotheses to end in the death of Christ. And therefore all pretended Agreement with Ptolemy'sCanon in such cases is insignificant, unless withal such Chronological Agreement were the attendant of a strictly concurring Agreement also with the letter of the Prophecy in all particulars. But both these Hypotheses are absolutely void of such necessary qualification of procuring credit both as to the respective Beginnings and Endings of them: And therefore in such disagreement with the express letter of the Prophecy all Humane Testimony, even that of Ptolemy's Canon, is vain and insignificant. A perfect Harmony with Ptolemy's Canon doth uncontrovertibly confirm any Chronological System entirely founded on Scripture, and perfectly agreeing with the letter thereof: but in any Scripture matter it availleth nothing to the establishment thereof when adapted to a mistaken sense, and interpretation thereof: As is evidently the case here in both these Hypotheses. But not thus is it in the late Bishop Lloyd's Hypothesis. That as literally founded in Scripture both in its beginning, and ending, justly calls in the confirmation of Ptolemy's Canon, as it hath a perfect agreement there

(1) In the month Nisan the Decree, or Commandment for the Rebuilding Jerusalem went forth from Artaxerxes Longimanus, (Neh. ii. 1.) Therefore thence Daniel's 7 weeks, and 62 weeks began. (n) There will presently follow a distinct Chapter shewing that these years are the true years of this Prophecy. (w) Ib. (x) They end about May 11th from the day of beginning as above: But see the Table annex'd.
been cut off according to this Prophecy after 483, but after 484 years, not after 7 Weeks, and threescore and two weeks, but after 7 weeks, and 62 weeks, and also one Day, that is, one year of another Week, which we find not in this Prophecy. Therefore according to this Prophecy, as the Messiah could not, so he did not thus survive. He was cut off in the Jewish month Nisan our April of the 19th of Tiberius within this very Year which next followed upon the expiration of the seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks, or 483 Years of this Prophecy. He was cut off at the Passover of this very Year, which was the very next Passover after the expiration of the said Weeks.------

And wherein can there be a fuller and more exact Completion of this predicted matter of fact, this grand Event of the cutting off of the Messiah, than here is now before us (a)? The Messiah as by this Prophecy he was not to survive one other whole Year after the expiration of the 483 Years here determined for his cutting off, so in fact he did not. He was put to death as soon as possibly he could be cut off after the expiration of the said predicted term. For he could not possibly die any sooner in that Year for this most satisfactory reason; viz. because it was impossible for him to die, or in the Prophetick words to be cut off but at Passover. For as he could not die but at Jerusalem, (Luke xiii. 33.) So neither could he suffer death there, or be cut off but at Passover (b). Witness the following undeniable Proofs.

After that the nineteenth of Tiberius was begun (c) at Jerusalem, the Jews at the feast of Tabernacles (d) sought to take our Saviour, but (they could not, for) no man laid hands on him, because his HOUR was not yet come, (John vii. 30.) This was not because they knew not where to find him, for it is expressly said (ch. viii. 20.) that he taught in the Temple, and no man laid hands on him, for his HOUR was not yet come. Afterwards before the feast of the Passover the Apostle faith that Jesus knew that his HOUR was come (ch. xiii. 1.) Now then at Passover the Time was come for his being cut off. Now he was therefore to be cut off not only at Passover, but also on the very day of the Passover, the day when the Paschal Lamb was to be kill'd (e). For as the Paschal Lamb was the type of our blessed Saviour (f) so that (as it accordingly did) was to keep his Day for him 'till he came to take it unto himself; and to be thereon offer'd for our Sins as the Lamb without blemish, or spot (g). This

---

(a) Since Christ did suffer thus in that very Year in which it was foretold so many 100 years before (viz. 571 years before his being now cut off) how can the Jews stand out against such Evidence?--How can they remain unconvicted when thus it is plain that our Lord Jesus Christ is the very Messiah whose cutting off was so long before thus precisely foretold in this Prophecy?--Ought not Christ to have suffer'd these things? Luke xxiv. 26. Ought he not to be cut off, as he was in this the fulness of time determined for it.

(b) See the Chron. Tables published A. D. 1713. Table 4th Appendix, Col. 5. in fine.

(c) The 19th Year of his reign began on Aug. 19th E. V. Christi 32. (d) See the Chron. Tables just mention'd, Table the 3d Appendix Col. 4th sub medio. (e) Pass. on the 14th day of Nisan between the two Evenings. Exodus xii. 6. (f) As he was the true Paschal Lamb slain from the foundation of the World. Rev. xiii. 8. John i. 29. (g) As the Paschal Lamb was to be without blemish. Exod. xii. 5.

So was Christ as a Lamb without blemish, and without Spot. 1 Pet. i. 19.
Of the late Bishop Lloyd's Ending of

This time as it was now come after that these Prophetic Weeks were run out, so was it kept, and fulfilled most exactly in every respect. Our Lord was cut off in the very precise year, the same year that the Angel foretold in this Prophecy: And not only so, but he was cut off also in the very month, and on the very day of the month, and at the very hour of that day on which he was to suffer, and on which alone he could suffer from the Creation: even in the month, the day, and at the hour of the day when the Paschal Lamb was to be killed. And as thus all other Scripture Prophecies predicting our Saviour's Sufferings, so this especially predicting the precisely determined time for them was most exactly fulfilled: the said determined time for his cutting off falling out most truly as it hath been now shewn in full and perfect Agreement with Ptolemy's Canon, in the 19th year of the reign of Tiberius.

And no greater confirmation than this can possibly be given of the truth of any Hypothesis of these weeks. This of its entire harmony with Scripture, and with Ptolemy's Canon, with the letter of the former in point of exposition, and with the latter in point of time. Nor hath any other Hypothesis whatsoever yet extant such confirmation. 'Tis what is indeed peculiar to this Hypothesis of the late Bishop Lloyd. There is not any, I am bold to say it, that in all its parts in the several periods of this Prophecy, in the respective Beginnings and Endings of them as this is agreeing both with Scripture, and with Ptolemy's Canon. No other Beginning of the seven weeks and three-score, and two weeks can possibly be brought to agree with the letter of this Prophecy by any reckoning whatsoever than that from the going forth of the Commandment, &c. in the twentieth of Artaxerxes: As it hath been formerly shewn at large.

And it hath been now shewn as to the Ending of the said seven Weeks, and three-score and two Weeks that their Expiration in the 18th of Tiberius, and in the year of the common Christian Era 32 was strictly and precisely to be followed with the cutting off of the Messiah in the next year, which was the 19th of Tiberius, and the 33d Year of the common Christian Era, in the Passover of which Christ did suffer accordingly.

And no other Year of Reckoning whatsoever will thus throw out the determined seven Weeks, and three-score and two Weeks of this Prophecy for the cutting off of the Messiah to which the Prophecy expressly pins us down both in such beginning, and in such ending, but this alone. And by this in full accordance with Ptolemy's Canon the said number of Weeks is so exactly thrown out, as that Christ was cut off within the year following, even as soon as possibly he could be put to death after their expiration, viz. at Passover following, as it hath been here shewn.

And this is also a full, and convincing proof, and what in truth well nigh cometh up to a Demonstration that the ancient Eastern Year of
of 360 days to a Year is the very Year of Reckoning in this Prophecy: forasmuch as by it, and by it only is to be found the number giv’n in the Prophecy of 483 Years between the two terms of the beginning and ending of the 7 Weeks, and three score and two Weeks as therein expressly and precisely determined for this grand Event before us of the cutting off of the Messiah.

But for farther Satisfaction of the Reader in this important point I shall give it a particular consideration; wherein I shall endeavour to prove that the Computation of time in this Prophecy must necessarily be according to this form of Year. And this as it may deservedly be the subject of a distinct Chapter, I shall accordingly make it so in that which follows, after that I have now here in the first place in the End of this Chapter giv’n the Computation itself by the said Year adjusted with the Years, as well those of the Jul. Period, as those of King’s Reigns according to PTOLEMY’s Canon.
CHRONOLOGICAL TABLES
WHEREIN

Daniel's LXX Weeks, or 483 Years are adjusted with their concurrent Julian Years, and with the Years of Kings Reigns in Ptolemy's Canon: By which particular Calculation it is distinctly shewn how the Messiah was cut off, or Christ our Passover was sacrificed for us, at the Passover next immediately following after the Expiration of the 7 Weeks and sixty-two Weeks of this Prophecy: As the said Weeks are reckoned from the Going forth of the Commandment to rebuild Jerusalem in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes Longimanus King of Persia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DANIEL's Years of 360 Days</th>
<th>PTOLEMY's CANON The Years in it are of 365 Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>His 483 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. 445</td>
<td>1 : 109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>444</td>
<td>2 : 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>443</td>
<td>3 : 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 442</td>
<td>4 : 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441</td>
<td>5 : 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440</td>
<td>6 : 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>439</td>
<td>7 : 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>438</td>
<td>8 : 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 437</td>
<td>9 : 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>436</td>
<td>10 : 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>435</td>
<td>11 : 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>434</td>
<td>12 : 53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In the 20th year of K. Artaxerxes, Nehemiah came up to Jerusalem, Neh. ii. 1, 6.*
### Chronological Tables.

#### DANIEL's Years of 360 Days.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Julian Years before Christ</th>
<th>DB</th>
<th>DL</th>
<th>NL</th>
<th>DB</th>
<th>DL</th>
<th>NL</th>
<th>DB</th>
<th>DL</th>
<th>NL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. 433</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Feb 18</td>
<td>318</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 432</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Feb 12</td>
<td>323</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 431</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Feb 7</td>
<td>328</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 430</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Feb 2</td>
<td>333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 429</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Jan 28</td>
<td>339</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 428</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Jan 12</td>
<td>344</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 427</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Jan 17</td>
<td>349</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 426</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Jan 12</td>
<td>354</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 425</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Jan 7</td>
<td>360</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PTOLEMY'S CANON.

The years in it are of 365 Days.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Nabor</th>
<th>Year begins</th>
<th>Year of Nabor</th>
<th>Year begins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>Dec 9</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>Dec 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>Dec 9</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>Dec 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>Dec 8</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>Dec 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>Dec 8</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>Dec 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>Dec 7</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>Dec 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td>Dec 7</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>Dec 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>Dec 6</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>Dec 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329</td>
<td>Dec 6</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>Dec 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>Dec 5</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>Dec 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333</td>
<td>Dec 5</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>Dec 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>Dec 4</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>Dec 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337</td>
<td>Dec 4</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>Dec 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>339</td>
<td>Dec 3</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>Dec 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341</td>
<td>Dec 3</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>Dec 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343</td>
<td>Dec 3</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>Dec 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Year of Kings of ARTAXERXES I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Kings</th>
<th>Year of Kings</th>
<th>Year of Kings</th>
<th>Year of Kings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dec 7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dec 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dec 6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dec 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dec 5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dec 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dec 4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Dec 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Dec 3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dec 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Dec 2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Dec 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Oct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Aug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Jul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Jun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Apr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Feb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† In his 32d year he returned to the King. *Neh. xiii. 5.* And after that he came back to Jerusalem, and did those things which follow in his Book.

*NB. Whereas the Years of Daniel in this Column for the general part of them end on December the 31st, yet this doth not by reason that the first Day of January begins it: and consequently it borrowing no supernumerary days from the preceding Year, as that ended on December the 31st, thence it cometh to pass that the twenty second and twenty third of Daniel's 483 Years now before us do both of them run into the four hundred and twenty fourth Julian Year in Col. C. So again in the Year before Christ 316, and other Years also therefore noted in lesser figures.*
**Chronological Tables.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Julian Years before</th>
<th>Daniel's Years of 360 Days</th>
<th>Ptolemy's Canon The Years in it are of 365 Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>His 433 Years before</td>
<td>Number of Days</td>
<td>His 433 Years before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
<td>41 : 261</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>42 : 255</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>43 : 250</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>44 : 245</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>45 : 240</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>46 : 234</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>397</td>
<td>49 : 219</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>396</td>
<td>50 : 213</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td>51 : 208</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
<td>52 : 198</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393</td>
<td>53 : 192</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392</td>
<td>54 : 187</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391</td>
<td>55 : 182</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390</td>
<td>56 : 177</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>389</td>
<td>57 : 171</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388</td>
<td>58 : 160</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>387</td>
<td>59 : 156</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386</td>
<td>60 : 151</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385</td>
<td>61 : 146</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>384</td>
<td>62 : 132</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383</td>
<td>63 : 125</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382</td>
<td>64 : 116</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381</td>
<td>65 : 107</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380</td>
<td>66 : 102</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>379</td>
<td>67 : 114</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378</td>
<td>68 : 109</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>377</td>
<td>69 : 114</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376</td>
<td>70 : 108</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* VII Weeks after the 20th of Artaxerxes; wherein according to this Prophecy [Dan. ix. 25] as being the הָיָה יִשְׂרָאֵל [the letter of the two Periods of time mention'd in the said twenty fifth verse,] Jerusalem was to be rebuilt, and was accordingly; not only her סֶלֶם but her נֵבֶל also, being now completely finished. [See p. 144.]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Julian Years before Christ</th>
<th>Daniel's Years of 360 Days</th>
<th>Number of Days</th>
<th>Ptolemy's Canon</th>
<th>The years in it are of 365 Days</th>
<th>Number of Days</th>
<th>Years of Nabo reigns.</th>
<th>Years of Nabo reigns.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>375</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>72: Apr. 14: 262</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Nov. 25: 374</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>374</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>73: Apr. 9: 167</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Nov. 25: 375</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 373</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>74: Apr. 3: 273</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Nov. 24: 376</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>75: Mar. 29: 278</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Nov. 24: 377</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 371</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>76: Mar. 24: 283</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Nov. 24: 378</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>369</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77: Mar. 19: 288</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Nov. 23: 379</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 368</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>78: Mar. 13: 294</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Nov. 23: 380</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>367</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>79: Mar. 8: 299</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Nov. 23: 381</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 366</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>80: Mar. 3: 304</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Nov. 23: 382</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>81: Feb. 26: 309</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Nov. 23: 383</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>363</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>83: Feb. 15: 320</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Nov. 22: 385</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 362</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>84: Feb. 10: 325</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Nov. 22: 386</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>85: Feb. 5: 330</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Nov. 22: 387</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 360</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>86: Jan. 31: 336</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Nov. 21: 388</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>359</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>87: Jan. 25: 341</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Nov. 21: 389</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 358</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>88: Jan. 20: 346</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Nov. 21: 390</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>89: Jan. 15: 351</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Nov. 21: 391</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 356</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90: Jan. 10: 352</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Nov. 20: 392</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>91: Jan. 4: 2</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Nov. 20: 393</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 354</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>92: Dec. 30: 5</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Nov. 20: 394</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>94: Dec. 25: 7</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Nov. 20: 395</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 352</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>95: Dec. 20: 12</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Nov. 19: 396</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>96: Dec. 14: 18</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Nov. 19: 397</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 350</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>97: Dec. 9: 23</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Nov. 19: 398</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>98: Dec. 4: 28</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Nov. 19: 399</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 348</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>99: Nov. 29: 33</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Nov. 18: 400</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>100: Nov. 18: 44</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Nov. 18: 401</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 346</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>101: Nov. 13: 49</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Nov. 18: 402</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>102: Nov. 8: 54</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Nov. 18: 403</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 344</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>103: Nov. 2: 60</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Nov. 18: 404</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>104: Oct. 28: 65</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Nov. 17: 405</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>106: Oct. 18: 75</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Nov. 17: 407</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See note in p. 217.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Julian Year before the Vulgar Era of Christ</th>
<th>DANIEL'S Years of 360 Days</th>
<th>PTOLEMY'S CANON: The years in it are of 365 Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Days:</td>
<td>Number of Days:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>His 483 years:</td>
<td>Year which every</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>107: 279</td>
<td>Year begins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>108: 279</td>
<td>His 483 years:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>110: 279</td>
<td>108: Oct. 7: 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>109: 269</td>
<td>110: Sep. 27: 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>110: 264</td>
<td>111: Sep. 21: 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>111: 264</td>
<td>112: Sep. 16: 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>112: 253</td>
<td>113: Sep. 11: 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>113: 248</td>
<td>114: Sep. 6: 117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>114: 243</td>
<td>115: Aug. 31: 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>115: 237</td>
<td>116: Aug. 26: 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>117: 227</td>
<td>118: Aug. 16: 138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>118: 222</td>
<td>119: Aug. 10: 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>119: 216</td>
<td>120: Aug. 5: 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>120: 211</td>
<td>121: Jul. 31: 154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>121: 206</td>
<td>122: Jul. 26: 159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>122: 201</td>
<td>123: Jul. 20: 165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>123: 195</td>
<td>124: Jul. 15: 170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>124: 190</td>
<td>125: Jul. 10: 175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>125: 185</td>
<td>126: Jul. 5: 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>126: 180</td>
<td>127: Jun. 29: 185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>128: 169</td>
<td>129: Jun. 19: 196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>129: 164</td>
<td>130: Jun. 14: 201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>130: 159</td>
<td>131: Jun. 8: 207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>131: 153</td>
<td>132: Jun. 3: 212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>132: 148</td>
<td>133: May 29: 217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>133: 143</td>
<td>134: May 24: 222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>134: 138</td>
<td>135: May 18: 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>135: 133</td>
<td>136: May 13: 233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>136: 127</td>
<td>137: May 8: 233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>137: 122</td>
<td>138: May 3: 243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>138: 117</td>
<td>139: Apr. 27: 249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>139: 111</td>
<td>140: Apr. 22: 254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>140: 106</td>
<td>141: Apr. 17: 259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>141: 101</td>
<td>142: Apr. 12: 264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BC** **D** **D** **G** **F** **H** **K** **L** **H**

**Years of Kings** **OCTOG. D. II. ALEXANDER.**

**Years of NADE.**
## Chronological Tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JULIAN Years before the Vulgar Era of Christ</th>
<th>DANIEL'S Years of 360 Days</th>
<th>PTOLEMY'S CANON. The years in it are of 365 Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Days</td>
<td>Years of Nabor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>His 43 years</td>
<td>reigns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Days</td>
<td>Year begins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>His 483 years</td>
<td>Reigns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Days on which every year begins.</td>
<td>The Year begins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>142: 96</td>
<td>443: Nov. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>143: Apr. 6: 270</td>
<td>444: Nov. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>144: 90</td>
<td>445: Nov. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>145: 85</td>
<td>446: Nov. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>146: 80</td>
<td>447: Nov. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>147: 75</td>
<td>448: Nov. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>148: 69</td>
<td>449: Nov. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>149: 64</td>
<td>450: Nov. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>150: 59</td>
<td>451: Nov. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>151: 54</td>
<td>452: Nov. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>152: 48</td>
<td>453: Nov. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>153: 43</td>
<td>454: Nov. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>154: 38</td>
<td>455: Nov. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>155: 33</td>
<td>456: Nov. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>156: 27</td>
<td>457: Nov. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>157: 22</td>
<td>458: Nov. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>158: 17</td>
<td>459: Nov. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>159: 12</td>
<td>460: Nov. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>160: 6</td>
<td>461: Nov. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>161: 1</td>
<td>461: Nov. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>162: Dec. 28: 4</td>
<td>462: Nov. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>163: 356</td>
<td>463: Nov. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>164: Dec. 23: 9</td>
<td>463: Nov. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>167: Dec. 7: 25</td>
<td>466: Nov. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>168: Dec. 2: 30</td>
<td>467: Nov. 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See Note * in p. 217.
### Chronological Tables

#### Daniel's Years of 360 Days

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Julian Years before</th>
<th>His 483 years</th>
<th>Number of Days</th>
<th>His 483 years which begins</th>
<th>Number of Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>188: 205</td>
<td>188: 201</td>
<td>190: Aug 4: 151</td>
<td>190: 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 257 b. 256</td>
<td>189: 200</td>
<td>189: 198</td>
<td>191: Jul 29: 156</td>
<td>191: 194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>190: 194</td>
<td>190: 191</td>
<td>192: Jul 14: 162</td>
<td>192: 186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>197: 146</td>
<td>197: 143</td>
<td>199: Jun 8: 198</td>
<td>199: 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 245 b. 244</td>
<td>198: 141</td>
<td>198: 135</td>
<td>200: Jun 3: 204</td>
<td>200: 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 237 b. 236</td>
<td>204: 110</td>
<td>204: 99</td>
<td>206: Apr 30: 238</td>
<td>206: 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>206: 96</td>
<td>206: 89</td>
<td>208: Apr 20: 247</td>
<td>208: 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 232 b. 231</td>
<td>208: 83</td>
<td>208: 76</td>
<td>210: Apr 10: 257</td>
<td>210: 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>209: 77</td>
<td>209: 69</td>
<td>211: Apr 5: 262</td>
<td>211: 33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Ptolemy's Canon

The years in it are of 365 Days.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reigns major.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reigns major.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reigns major.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reigns major.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reigns major.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reigns major.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reigns major.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reigns major.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reigns major.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reigns major.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ptolemy Philadelphia**

**Ptolemy Euergetes**

**Ptolemy Euergetes**
### Chronological Tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Julian Years before</th>
<th>DANIEL's Years of 360 Days</th>
<th>PTOLEMY'S CANON. The Years in it are of 365 Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>His 483 Years...</td>
<td>Number of Days...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**See Note** in p. 217.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JULIAN YEARS before</th>
<th>DANIEL'S YEARS of 360 Days</th>
<th>PTOLEMY'S CANON of 365 Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>249: 264</td>
<td>548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>250: 279</td>
<td>549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>251: 254</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>252: 249</td>
<td>551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>253: 243</td>
<td>552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>254: 238</td>
<td>553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>255: 233</td>
<td>554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>256: 228</td>
<td>555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>257: 222</td>
<td>556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>258: 217</td>
<td>557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>259: 212</td>
<td>558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>260: 207</td>
<td>559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>261: 201</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>262: 196</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>263: 191</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>264: 186</td>
<td>563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>265: 180</td>
<td>564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>266: 175</td>
<td>565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>267: 170</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>268: 165</td>
<td>567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>269: 159</td>
<td>568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>270: 154</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>271: 149</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>272: 144</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>273: 138</td>
<td>572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>274: 133</td>
<td>573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>275: 128</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>276: 123</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>277: 117</td>
<td>576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>278: 112</td>
<td>577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>279: 107</td>
<td>578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>280: 102</td>
<td>579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>281: 96</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>282: 91</td>
<td>581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>283: 86</td>
<td>582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>284: Mar. 28: 279</td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B C D E F G H K L H
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Julian Years before</th>
<th>DANIEL'S Years of 360 Days</th>
<th>Number of Days</th>
<th>The Days on which every Year begins</th>
<th>Number of Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>His 483 Years</td>
<td>His 483 Years</td>
<td>Mar. 22</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>284</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>Mar. 22</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>285</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>Mar. 17</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>286</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>Mar. 22</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>287</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>Mar. 1</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>288</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>Jan. 1</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>289</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>Jan. 24</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>290</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>Jan. 19</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>291</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>Jan. 14</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>292</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>Jan. 9</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>293</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>Jan. 3</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>294</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>Jan. 9</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>295</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>Jan. 24</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>296</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>Jan. 19</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>297</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>Jan. 13</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>298</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>Jan. 8</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>299</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Dec. 21</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>300</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>Dec. 23</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>301</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>Dec. 18</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>302</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>Dec. 13</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>303</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>Dec. 8</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>304</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>Dec. 2</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>305</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>Nov. 27</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>306</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>Nov. 22</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>307</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>Nov. 17</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>308</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>Nov. 11</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>309</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>Nov. 6</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>310</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>Nov. 1</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>311</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>Oct. 27</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>312</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>Oct. 21</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>313</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>Oct. 16</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>314</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>Oct. 11</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>315</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>Oct. 6</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>316</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>Sept. 30</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>317</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>Sept. 25</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>318</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>Sept. 10</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Julian Years before</th>
<th>PTOLEMY'S CANON. The years in the are of 365 Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reigns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year begins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The 7th Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of Kings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year begins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7th Year major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PTOLEMY PHILOMETOR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years of Nabo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reigns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year begins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PTOLEMY E GRETII.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Of Kings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year begins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PTOLEMY PHILOMETOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years of Nabo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reigns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year begins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PTOLEMY E GRETII.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years of Kings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reigns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year begins.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See Note * in p. 217.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Julian Years before the Vulgar Era of Christ</th>
<th>DANIEL'S Years of 360 Days</th>
<th>PTOLEMY'S CANON The years in it are of 365 Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>His 483 Years</td>
<td>Number of Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Days on which every Year begins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>320: 257</td>
<td>321: Sept. 15: 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 129</td>
<td>321: 252</td>
<td>322: Sept. 9: 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>322: 246</td>
<td>323: Sept. 4: 119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>323: 241</td>
<td>324: Aug. 30: 124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>324: 236</td>
<td>325: Aug. 25: 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 125</td>
<td>325: 231</td>
<td>326: Aug. 19: 135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>326: 225</td>
<td>327: Aug. 14: 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>327: 220</td>
<td>328: Aug. 9: 145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>328: 215</td>
<td>329: Aug. 4: 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 121</td>
<td>329: 210</td>
<td>330: Jul. 29: 156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>330: 204</td>
<td>331: Jul. 24: 161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>331: 199</td>
<td>332: Jul. 19: 166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>332: 194</td>
<td>333: Jul. 14: 171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 117</td>
<td>333: 189</td>
<td>334: Jul. 8: 177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>334: 183</td>
<td>335: Jul. 3: 182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>335: 178</td>
<td>336: Jun. 28: 187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>336: 173</td>
<td>337: Jun. 23: 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>337: 168</td>
<td>338: Jun. 17: 198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>338: 162</td>
<td>339: Jun. 12: 203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>339: 157</td>
<td>340: Jun. 7: 208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>340: 152</td>
<td>341: Jun. 2: 213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 109</td>
<td>341: 147</td>
<td>342: May 27: 219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>342: 141</td>
<td>343: May 22: 224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>343: 136</td>
<td>344: May 17: 229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>344: 131</td>
<td>345: May 12: 234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 105</td>
<td>345: 126</td>
<td>346: May 6: 240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>346: 120</td>
<td>347: May 1: 245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>347: 115</td>
<td>348: Apr. 26: 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>348: 110</td>
<td>349: Apr. 21: 255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 101</td>
<td>349: 105</td>
<td>350: Apr. 15: 261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>350: 99</td>
<td>351: Apr. 10: 266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>351: 94</td>
<td>352: Apr. 5: 271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>352: 89</td>
<td>353: Mar. 31: 276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 97</td>
<td>353: 84</td>
<td>354: Mar. 26: 282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>354: 78</td>
<td>355: Mar. 20: 287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Chronological Tables

#### DANIEL'S YEARS of 360 Days

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JULIAN Years before</th>
<th>Number of Days</th>
<th>His 483 Years</th>
<th>Number of Days</th>
<th>His 483 years</th>
<th>The Days on which...</th>
<th>PTOLEMY'S CANON: The Years in it are of 365 Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>Mar. 15</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>Sept. 16: 654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>Mar. 10</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>Sept. 16: 655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>Feb. 27</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>Sept. 16: 656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>Feb. 22</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>Sept. 16: 657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Feb. 17</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>Sept. 17: 658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>Feb. 12</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>Sept. 17: 659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>Feb. 6</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>Sept. 17: 660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Jan. 27</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>Sept. 17: 661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>Jan. 22</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>Sept. 17: 662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>Jan. 16</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>Sept. 17: 663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>Jan. 11</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>Sept. 18: 664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>Jan. 6</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>Sept. 18: 665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>Jan. 1</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>Sept. 18: 666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>Dec. 26</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>Sept. 18: 667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>Dec. 21</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>Sept. 18: 668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>Dec. 16</td>
<td>373</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>Dec. 11</td>
<td>374</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>Dec. 6</td>
<td>375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>Nov. 30</td>
<td>376</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>Nov. 25</td>
<td>377</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>Nov. 20</td>
<td>378</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>Nov. 14</td>
<td>379</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>Nov. 9</td>
<td>380</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>Oct. 3</td>
<td>381</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>Oct. 29</td>
<td>382</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>Oct. 24</td>
<td>383</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>Oct. 19</td>
<td>384</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>Oct. 14</td>
<td>385</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>Oct. 9</td>
<td>386</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>Sep. 30</td>
<td>387</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>Sep. 25</td>
<td>388</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>Sep. 20</td>
<td>389</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>Sep. 15</td>
<td>390</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>Sep. 10</td>
<td>391</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>Sep. 5</td>
<td>392</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>Sep. 1</td>
<td>393</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>Aug. 28</td>
<td>394</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>Aug. 23</td>
<td>395</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PTOLEMY'S SOTER: YEARS OF KINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Kings</th>
<th>Reigns</th>
<th>Reigns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 12: 668</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 12: 669</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 12: 670</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 12: 671</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 12: 672</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 12: 673</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 12: 674</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 12: 675</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 12: 676</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 12: 677</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 12: 678</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 12: 679</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 12: 680</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 12: 681</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 12: 682</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 12: 683</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 8: 684</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 8: 685</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 8: 686</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 8: 687</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 7: 688</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julian Years before the Vulgar Era of Christ</td>
<td>DANIEL'S Years of 360 Days</td>
<td>PTOLEMY'S CANON: The years in ita are of 365 Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Years of Nabo: 68, 67, 66, 65, 64, 63, 62, 61, b. 60, 59, 58, b. 57, 56, 55, 54, b. 53, 52, 51, 50, b. 49, 48, 47, 46, b. 45, 44, 43, 42, b. 41, 40, 39, 38, b. 37, 36, 35, 34, b. 33, 32, 31, 30, b. 29, 28, 27, 26

Years of DIONYSIUS: 68, 67, 66, 65, 64, 63, 62, 61, b. 60, 59, 58, b. 57, 56, 55, 54, b. 53, 52, 51, 50, b. 49, 48, 47, 46, b. 45, 44, 43, 42, b. 41, 40, 39, 38, b. 37, 36, 35, 34, b. 33, 32, 31, 30, b. 29, 28, 27, 26

Years of CLEOPATRA AUGUSTUS: 68, 67, 66, 65, 64, 63, 62, 61, b. 60, 59, 58, b. 57, 56, 55, 54, b. 53, 52, 51, 50, b. 49, 48, 47, 46, b. 45, 44, 43, 42, b. 41, 40, 39, 38, b. 37, 36, 35, 34, b. 33, 32, 31, 30, b. 29, 28, 27, 26

Years of AUGUSTUS: 68, 67, 66, 65, 64, 63, 62, 61, b. 60, 59, 58, b. 57, 56, 55, 54, b. 53, 52, 51, 50, b. 49, 48, 47, 46, b. 45, 44, 43, 42, b. 41, 40, 39, 38, b. 37, 36, 35, 34, b. 33, 32, 31, 30, b. 29, 28, 27, 26

The truth at which every year begins.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>NUMBER OF DAYS</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>NUMBER OF DAYS</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sunday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Monday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Friday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There being a Decree of Augustus Caesar, that Register's should be made of the Names and Estates of all the Subjects of the Roman Empire: Lxx. II. 1, 2. In order to this Joseph with Mary his betrothed Wife came from their dwelling Place at Nazareth in Galilee, to Bethlehem in Judaea, where they were born; they being of the lineage of David, and that being the Seat of his Family. Lxx. II. 4. On this occasion it was that our Saviour was born there this Year: and that on Dec. 25., according to the Churches account. From hence we reckon the years of the true Age of Christ.

Before the Passover of this 3d year before the Vulgar Era, dyed Herod the great, having first daughter the Infant at Bethlehem, and then his own Son Antipater, whom he had designed for his Heir. He dyed in the utmost degree of torment and misery; leaving 3 Sons, between whom his Dominions were divided by Augustus and toward the middle of this Year. His Son Archelaus was made Tetrarch of Judaea and Samaria; Herod Antipas of Galilee and Perea; and Philip of Itrea, Trachonitis, and Lymania's Abilene. Josephus de Bello Judaico I. 21. & II. 1. Jos. Antiq. XVII. 10. & 13.
## Chronological Tables

### Daniel's Years of 360 Days

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Julian Years of the Vulgar Era of Christ</th>
<th>Number of Days</th>
<th>His 483 Years</th>
<th>The Days on which every year begins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>Oct. 22: 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>Oct. 17: 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>Oct. 12: 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>Oct. 6: 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>Sept. 1: 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>Sept. 26: 97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>Sept. 21: 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 8</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>Sept. 15: 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>Sept. 10: 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>Sept. 5: 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>Aug. 31: 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 12</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>Aug. 25: 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>Aug. 20: 134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>Aug. 15: 139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>Aug. 10: 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 16</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>Aug. 4: 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>Jul. 30: 155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>Jul. 25: 160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Jul. 20: 165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 20</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>Jul. 14: 171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>Jul. 9: 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>Jul. 4: 181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>Jun. 29: 186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>Jun. 23: 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>Jun. 18: 197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 26</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>Jun. 13: 202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Jun. 8: 207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 28</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>Jun. 2: 213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>May 28: 218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>May 23: 223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>May 18: 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 32</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>May 13: 233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ptolemy's Canon

| Years of Kings reigns | Years of Nabon. | Year begins | The Throth at | Years of Major | Years of Augustus | Years of Tiberius | Years of Major |
|-----------------------|-----------------|-------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------|---------------|
| 748                   | 748             | Aug. 23: 749 | 39             | 748           | 749               | 750               | 751           |
| 749                   | 749             | Aug. 23: 750 | 32             | 751           | 751               | 755               | 756           |
| 750                   | 750             | Aug. 23: 751 | 33             | 752           | 752               | 757               | 761           |
| 751                   | 751             | Aug. 23: 753 | 34             | 753           | 753               | 760               | 766           |
| 752                   | 752             | Aug. 23: 755 | 35             | 753           | 754               | 760               | 758           |
| 753                   | 753             | Aug. 23: 756 | 36             | 754           | 755               | 760               | 760           |
| 754                   | 754             | Aug. 23: 757 | 37             | 755           | 756               | 760               | 759           |
| 755                   | 755             | Aug. 23: 758 | 38             | 756           | 757               | 761               | 758           |
| 756                   | 756             | Aug. 23: 760 | 39             | 759           | 759               | 761               | 757           |
| 757                   | 757             | Aug. 23: 759 | 40             | 760           | 760               | 762               | 756           |
| 758                   | 758             | Aug. 23: 760 | 41             | 760           | 761               | 762               | 761           |
| 759                   | 759             | Aug. 23: 760 | 42             | 761           | 762               | 762               | 762           |
| 760                   | 760             | Aug. 23: 760 | 43             | 761           | 763               | 762               | 763           |
| 761                   | 761             | Aug. 23: 760 | 44             | 762           | 764               | 763               | 764           |
| 762                   | 762             | Aug. 23: 760 | 45             | 763           | 764               | 763               | 765           |
| 763                   | 763             | Aug. 23: 760 | 46             | 764           | 765               | 764               | 766           |
| 764                   | 764             | Aug. 23: 760 | 47             | 765           | 766               | 765               | 767           |
| 765                   | 765             | Aug. 23: 760 | 48             | 766           | 767               | 766               | 768           |
| 766                   | 766             | Aug. 23: 760 | 49             | 767           | 768               | 767               | 769           |
| 767                   | 767             | Aug. 23: 760 | 50             | 768           | 769               | 768               | 768           |
| 768                   | 768             | Aug. 23: 760 | 51             | 769           | 770               | 769               | 770           |
| 769                   | 769             | Aug. 23: 760 | 52             | 770           | 771               | 770               | 770           |
| 770                   | 770             | Aug. 23: 760 | 53             | 771           | 772               | 771               | 772           |
| 771                   | 771             | Aug. 23: 760 | 54             | 772           | 773               | 772               | 772           |
| 772                   | 772             | Aug. 23: 760 | 55             | 773           | 773               | 772               | 773           |
| 773                   | 773             | Aug. 23: 760 | 56             | 774           | 774               | 773               | 774           |
| 774                   | 774             | Aug. 23: 760 | 57             | 775           | 775               | 774               | 775           |
| 775                   | 775             | Aug. 23: 760 | 58             | 776           | 776               | 775               | 776           |
| 776                   | 776             | Aug. 23: 760 | 59             | 777           | 777               | 776               | 777           |
| 777                   | 777             | Aug. 23: 760 | 60             | 778           | 778               | 777               | 778           |
| 778                   | 778             | Aug. 23: 760 | 61             | 779           | 779               | 778               | 779           |
| 779                   | 779             | Aug. 23: 760 | 62             | 780           | 780               | 779               | 780           |

B C D F D G F H K L H K
EXPLANATIONS of the foregoing TABLES.

In the first Column every JULIAN year therein contained, has a Line belonging to it that runs through all the Columns in that page: in which line it is adjusted with two other sorts of years that are concurrent with it; namely, first with DANIEL's years, and secondly with the years in PTOLEMY's Canon.

The Column marked with B under it, shews what JULIAN years are Bissextile, or leap-years: which, in every 20 years before CHRIST, are the 17, 13, 9, 5, and 1st, in the years after CHRIST, the 4, 8, 12, 16, and 20th. These are carefully to be observed in Computation; because, whereas every common year has 365 days, every leap-year has 366, one day being added after the 24th day of February, which makes that month to be of 29 days, which has but 28 in common years.

Column C is of the JULIAN years before CHRIST from the year 445 downward till the Vulgar Æra begins, and then afterward this Column will be of the years of our Lord according to the Vulgar Æra. Every one of these JULIAN years, beginning on the first of January, and ending December 31, is divided into two Numbers of Days in the Columns of DANIEL's years. Those of the first number always begin on the first day of January, and those of the second end on the last of December: except only those in the lesser figures, whereof more will be said in its proper place.

The two Columns marked D, D are for the years of DANIEL's weeks; whereof the first VII weeks containing 49 years, the LXII following weeks containing 434 years, they make in all 483 years; every one of these years containing 360 days, as hath been already asserted, and as it will be particularly shewn in the following Chapter.

The first of these 483 years begins at the Nisan of the 20th year of ARTAXERXES. Now the first day of Nisan falling generally on the 21st day of April, according to the most learned Primacie Uber's Account, and the 21st of April in the 20th of ARTAXERXES falling into the JULIAN year 445; therefore DANIEL's first year, beginning on the 21st of April, is placed in the line of that year 445 before CHRIST. And whereas after the 20th of April there are 255 days to the end of a JULIAN year, this Number 255 is set down in that line, as being all that part of the 445th JULIAN which concurs with the first year of the 483 before mentioned.

But this Number of 255 days wanting 109 of the 360 that are in every such form of year; therefore that first year of the 483 is placed a second time in the 1st Column D in the second line; and there it is made whole, by allotting to it the first 105 days of the JULIAN year 444; namely, from January 1. till April 15. of that year; and
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whereas, besides these 105 days, there remain 260 from April 16th to the end of that Julian year, these go into the second year of the 483; and the Number two is therefore placed before the 260 in the second line of that Table.

The two Columns marked F, F, contain in every line the two Numbers of days which divide the 365 days of the Julian year in the beginning of that line, between those two of Daniel's 483 years which are in the very same line in the Columns D, D, above mentioned. Of these two Numbers of days in every line it is to be always remembered, that the first Number begins on the first day of January, and the second ends with the last of December; except before excepted: But besides,

Whereas in the Column over the letter G there is set down the month and day on which every one of Daniel's years begins, it is to be understood that the next foregoing year ends on the month and day next before it. As for example; The first Daniel's year beginning on April 21 in the Julian year 445, it has with that and the last of December 255 days out of that Julian year; and this first Daniel's year wanting yet 105 days of its 360, it has these out of the Julian year 444 before Christ, beginning at January 1, and ending April 15th. This appears in the Column over G: for there on April 16 begins the second Daniel's year. This second year has from April 16 to the last of December inclusively, the Number therein noted, of 260 days out of that Julian year, and these are made up 360 by adding 100 out of the Julian year 443; in which year they begin at January 1, and end at April 10th in that year. Then on April 11 begins the 3d year, and taking in that day with all that follow to the end of December, it has 265 days out of that Julian year 443: which Number being to be made up 360, therefore that third year has other 95 days out of the Julian year 442, beginning January 1, and ending on the 5th day of April which appears by the next day, viz. April 6th beginning the 4th of the 483 years. And that 4th year goes on, and so do all that follow, in like manner with those above mentioned.

NB. In every line the two Numbers of Days in the Columns F, F, being added together make up the Number 365 in a common Julian year, and 366 in a Biftextile: But as to the 360 days of any of Daniel's years, they are made up of the Number of days in the 2d Column F in the same line, adding thereunto the Number of days in the 1st Column F, in the line next below it.

In every line of the 2d set of Tables, the two Numbers of days in the Columns F, F, being added together make up the Number of 360 days for the Daniel's year in the beginning of the line: But as to the 365 days of a common Julian year, or the 366 of a Biftextile, they are made up of the Number of days in the 2d Column F, where
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F, where that Julian begins, adding therunto the Number of Days in the 1st Column F, in the line next below it.

Of the years in Ptolemy's Canon more needs not be said, than that every one of those years that are mentioned in the two first Columns over the first H and K must be account to begin with the 1st of January in that Julian year that stands in the beginning of the line, and so to be concurrent with the same Julian year until the next Tosth; that is, till that Month and day which in the same line is placed in the Column over L. And that same month and day begins those two following years in the two Columns over the 2d H and K: which last two years run on to the end of the Julian in that line; and after that they are continued with the next Julian year in the following line, from its 1st of January till the next Tosth, as is above mentioned.

C H A P. IV.

Concerning the Form of Year, by which the Years of this Prophecy are to be reckon'd.

Having in the former Chapter assigned the Year of the Prophecy now before us to be a year of three hundred and sixty days, and having also thereby framed our Calculation of the seven weeks and sixty two weeks, after which the Messiah was to be cut off; it remains that we now justify such Calculation, by shewing that this must necessarily have been the form of year by which we are to reckon in this Prophecy.

And in general it appears most likely to have been so, as this was the common Form of year us'd in that age, and in the Country where Daniel liv'd when this Prophecy was giv'n.

But at that time it is certain that the Eastern Nations had a Reckoning of known, and common use among them of just thirty days to a month; and of twelve such equal months compos'd their year: which was therefore of just three hundred and sixty days. It doth not appear that in Daniel's time there was any other sort of year in Common (a) Use, (or in use among the people) in any part of the World. And perhaps this was the only kind of year that had then been any where in common use since the Creation.---To shew this more particularly,

First,

(a) The Reader may be pleas'd to note what I now say, as I speak here of a year in Common Use.---I deny not but that at the time when the Prophecy was giv'n to Daniel, there had been introduced also an Artificial year, or a year of an intercalary sort, which however was known only among the Learned: of which more hereafter.
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First, In Noah's time; A Month was then just thirty days. It appears in the history of the Deluge, where (a) first it is said that the waters prevailed on the earth one hundred and fifty days: and again (c), after the end of the hundred and fifty days the waters were abated.—Now, According to our Reckoning these one hundred and fifty days should be five equal months of thirty days to the month: And so they were; as it appears by the History. For we are told of the Flood (d), that it began in the second month, the seventeenth day of the month, and of the Ark (e), that it rested on the fourteenth month, the seventeenth day of the month.——Now from the seventeenth day of the second month to the seventeenth day of the fourth month, there were just five months. And for each of these months there being accounted thirty days to each month, they make up the hundred and fifty days, in which the Text saith the waters prevailed on the earth.

We have no other certain Account of the antient way of reckoning their Time among the Jewes. Nothing is plainer than this: viz. If an hundred and fifty days be five months, then one month must be thirty days. And twelve such months in this the Scripture Account thereof thus constituting a year (f) the antient Jewish year could be no other than this of three hundred and sixty days. Thus it was originally among God's people the Jew.

Secondly, Thus also it was originally among the Egyptians. For so we are told from Manetho (g) the antientest that we know of their Historians.

(a) Gen. vii. 24. (c) Ch. viii. 3. (d) Ch. vii. 11. (e) Ch. viii. 4. (f) They have been indeed [Scaliger, and others, see Strachey, Chron. p. 175 Ed. 3.] who have pleaded for the solar Year at the time of the Deluges, each month like those of the Egyptians, consisting of thirty days, with an addition of five days: but purely without any ground from hence. For, First, All that is certain from Moses's numbers in the Account of the flood, (and that is evidently so,) is that these Scripture months could not be Lunar months [i.e. purely, or strictly so, as consisting only of 29 d. 12 h. 44 m. 3 scc.] for they will not make up the number of an hundred and fifty days, (or five months) in which according to the Text, the waters prevailed. And, Secondly, As to their making it a year like unto the Egyptians, they go altogether upon uncertainty, and improbability also. For who can certainly tell us how early the intercalation of five days was introduced among the Egyptians?——By the antientest Account thereof, as it is giv'n in the next Section, it was introduced by one King of Ethiopia, whose [as Sahhatis notes in Ep. 78.] Africamus [apud Enos, ex Maneth.] placed the fourth in order from that Pharaoh under whom Joseph came into Egypt.——Now, even were this the truth here, the Egyptian year must have been a year consisting only of three hundred and sixty days long after the Flood.——And how came it to be so among the Egyptians? But lastly, Noah reckoned by this year, and the families of the sons of Noah after their generations in their Nations, as they were dispersed after the flood, [Gen. x. 3.] did so likewise?——Thus all Nations must have reckoned from the beginning: Confessually the Egyptians also. And even by the now cited testimony, confedently they must have so reckoned long after Joseph's time.——And by Sir F. Marsham's telling, the Egyptians knew no other year than this at the Children of Israel's going out of Egypt. For commenstating upon whole words of Josephus (Art. lib. i. c. 4.) concerning the Jewish year, that however the month Nisan was thereupon made the first month thereof in matters Ecclesiastical, yet Allalong quo ad terram, puniam mundanationes, anique alios civiles sincererum, pratis, principios decorum servarum, non prostratias dignatus, apud o. o. G. [Sahhatis.] Skin Sir. F. Marsham [p. 253 fo. Edit.] est Equatissimus Anni Egypti, qui xii habebat etaeque (Art. lib. i. c. 4.) concerning the Judaean year, that however the month Nisan was thereupon made the first month thereof in matters Ecclesiastical, yet Allalong quo ad terram, puniam mundanationes, anique alios civiles sincererum, pratis, principios decorum servarum, non prostratias dignatus, apud o. o. G. [Sahhatis.] Skin Sir. F. Marsham [p. 253 fo. Edit.] est Equatissimus Anni Egypti, qui xii habebat etaeque}
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Historians. He faith their year was antiquely (b) of three hundred and sixty days: and that for it continued till the time of Asetb their thirty second King. This Asetb, as Sir J. Marsham conceives by the advice of Hermes, added five days at the end of the year, which were therefore called ADDITIONAL Days (i): And then their year was of three hundred and sixty-five Days. Upon this they had a Fable (k), that when Rhea was great with child, there was a Curse laid upon her, that she should not be delivered on any day throughout the (then) WHOLE Year. But Hermes playing at dice with the Moon, won from her a seventy second (l) part of every day of the three hundred and sixty days. These parts being put together make up five whole days, which he added to the end of the year. And those days, it seems, were at Rhea’s service. For on them the Egyptians used to keep the birth-days of their Gods (m).

Thirdly, As to the Greeks, It matters not whether they had their year by Tradition from the first Founders of their Nation, or whether from the Egyptian Colonies that were planted among them. For either way, (as it appears from what hath been said) their year would come to the same number of three hundred and sixty days. So we find the year was in the time of Cleobulus Lindius (n), one of the seven Wise Men of Greece, (who were all of them Daniel’s Contemporaries; for) he shewed how they reckoned their time in his riddle, in words to this purpose. There is one Father that hath twelve Children, and each of them hath thirty Daughters, which are all per- balt, part white, and part black: and they all die, and yet are immortal.—It is plain enough that these thirty Daughters were the days of the month, each day consisting of twenty-four hours, part light, and part darkness; and that the months were the twelve Children in this Fable, and that their Father was the year consisting of three hundred, and sixty days (o).

(b) Antiquissima, & simplicissima Anni Forma, ac popularibus temporibus accommodatis, eff ea, qua in trienicios numeros tribuitur. Nam fane anuquitos, praefertim apud Egytios Annuis confititab diebus tantum 360. [Iof. Scal. Eemend. Temp. lib. iii. p. 194.]—Hac Forma Anni venerabilis fuit cum apud Egytios, tum apud Graecos. [Salamis in Ep. 76. & 78. ] (i) Which they called Nestor. For it seems the Hierophants when they came afterwards to the knowledge of a perfect year, they painted in their Hieroglyphick Monuments a Serpent lying from a Sun with his tail in his mouth. And so they call’d this Serpent. [Iof. Scal. Em. Temp. lib. iii. p. 194.]—Vox Nestor est sena uispura ab Egytis, quo Graeci Gorgykerupa. [Salamis Ep. 76.]

(k) Plato, in libro de Iste, & Ofiside, p. 35. (l) As Sir J. Marsham [p. 237 Fol. Edit.] truly corrects it from a 70th part; for five days are not the 70th, but the 73rd part of the old year of 360 days. [So also Bp. Stillingfleet Crig. Sac. lib. i. c viii.] (m) Thence the names of the several Epagomenai were taken from the Gods. The first was call’d Ofis, it being celebrated in honour of him; the second Apsis, by which Staliger understands Anthis, but Vossius [de Idol. lib. i. c. xxviii.] more probably the second of Oras; the third to the; the fourth to Ufe; the fifth to Nephis the wife of Ufe, and sister to Is. [Bp. Stillingfleet Orig. Sac. lib. i. c. vii.]

(n) See Rhoman, Epis. 197:

cirius in Vic. (o) To the Inians already given in the point before us, they added that which we meet with in Suidas in Voece Kuviai, as he affords out of Rhubehus, that at Athens they had four Dolemi imitating the four feasts of the year; but they had
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It cannot be denied that they of Greece found even then in Daniel’s time how ill this way of reckoning their time would agree with the revolutions of the Sun and Moon. It will appear anon what a forsy shift they then made, by intercalating a month of thirty days every other year, in order to bring them to some kind of Agreement. Their learned Men (p) found out better ways afterwards. But for all that, not only in Daniel’s time, but for some hundred of years after, the people still kept up their old way of Reckoning three hundred and sixty days to the year: as we shall have occasion to shew hereafter.

Fourthly, For the Romans in Romulus his Age (q), how they used to reckon their time was a Question some ages after, among their own ancientest Writers. And tho’ divers learned Men since have taken a great deal of pains to find out the way of it, yet they are not come so far towards any certainty as to be able to say whether they had twelve months, or only ten months in the year. But considering that they were a mixt people, chiefly of Alba out of Asia, and of Sabins who were a Greek Colony, their Extraction both ways makes it seem very probable that their year was of three hundred and sixty days, being the same with that which was used by their mother Nations. And so much in effect Plutarch (r) hath told us, viz. that in Romulus his time they used their months disorderly and irrationally—observing only one thing that their Year must be of three hundred and sixty days. But,

Fifthly, As touching the Ordinary Chaldean year, or the year in Vulgar use among the people, to whom the Jews were now in vassallage, and among them also Daniel, to whom was revealed the Prophecy before us.

We are told from Abydenus (s) of three certain measures of time, which are so extravagant, if really denoting years, as there set down, as make it hard to think for what use they should serve in that sense, the shortest of the three being near the age of man, and the longest exceeding not only all Historical, but even Fabulous time. These Measures of time are, First, their Sarus containing according to that Author three thousand six hundred years; Secondly, their Nirus containing six hundred years; Thirdly, their Sothus containing threescore years.

But if instead of Years, we understand Days, as a learned Man (t) hath most probably guessed that that Author mistook Years for Days, which he might very well do, as the same Chaldee word [ד’] as well as the same Hebrew word is us’d sometimes for one, and

---

and sometimes for 'tother, in this sense it is easy to judge what that Author might mean. For so their Sofus was threescore days, 
_i.e._ the sixth part of a year, their Nirus was six hundred days, 
that is the sixth part of ten years, and their Sarus was three thou-
sand six hundred days, that is, just ten years.

Otherwisse, as our most learned Bishop Pearson (u) hath told us, 
the Sarus according to the Chaldee Account comprehends two hun-
dred and twenty and two mon.hs, which (faith he) come to eighteen 
years, and six months: and therefore (as he also faith) one hundred 
and twenty Sari make two thousand two hundred, and twenty Years. 
But none of these Computations taken one way, or 'tother are thus 
conformable, otherwisse than as thirty days (w) among the Chaldaeans 
made a month, and twelve such months made a year.

And so it was in the time of Semiramis, if that were true which 
we are told from Ctesias (x), that she built the wall of Babylon three 
hundred and sixty (y) furlongs in compass, because (faith he) she de-
sign'd to have the number of furlongs equal to the number of days in 
the year.

It may seem that Cyrus (z) had the like fancy in his head, when 
in revenge against the river Gyndes for drowning one of his holy 
horsetes, which were dedicated to the Sun, he cut the river into to 
many Canales, one hundred and eighty on each side (a), that is, in 
all three hundred and sixty (b). And 

Sixthly, Thus also it was among the Persians even after Cyrus 
his taking of Babylon. For in the words of the learned Dr. Pri-
deaux (c). After that Darius (Hyrtaspis) had brought all India under 
him (a), and made it the twentieth province of his Empire, from 
there he ANNUALLY received a tribute of THREE HUN-
DRED and SIXTY Talents of Gold, according to the NUMBER 
of the DAYS of the THEN Persian Year, appointing a Talent to be 
paid him for EVERY Day in it (c).

And

(u) On the Creed p. 59, 4th Edit.  
(w) And so they did in King Nebuchad-
nezzer's time.-- For wherefor were just thirty days set, wherein no one was to ask a 
petition of any gods, or men, save of King Nebuchadnezzar? Dan. vi. 7.----Wherefore, 
but as in common Account among the Chaldaeans so many days did then make a Month? 
(x) Apud Dion. Sic. II. 4. from Ctesias.  
(y) Tzetzes [Chil. ix. v. 568] faith, 
All the Canals of Babylon was 360 furlongs according to Ctesias. But according to 
Citharidus, and theo with Alexander, and according to Dio. Sic. himelii 365 furlongs. 

[NB. Vox superflua est. ait Cælius, quem vide hic plane explicantem, perturbate, 
us us, a Diocrates tradita. GALE in Herodot. p. 678.] Other Authors have variously 
enlarged the number of furlongs, [v. Bochart, Geogr. Sac.] but Tzetzes gives it in favour of 
Ctesias here, and says that others enlarged it more, and more. [v. GALE in loc. cit.] 
(z) And this was evidently in Daniel's time.  
(c) Herod. I. 189. p. 78 Edin. 

(b) ib. 1. 190, 202, and v. 52.  
(c) Con. Hist. p. 197.  
(d) In 
the year before A. D. 509, and in the 13th year of his reign. 
(e) In allusion also to the number of Days in their Year the Persian Kings, Artaaxèxes Mæorum, [US. i. 
29.; and Darius Codomannus [Curtius i. iii. c. 3.] had 360 Concubines. But the 
latter was so late as in Alexander's time. And he also aped Darius in this piece of 
s folly and wickednes, in his having also afterward just so many as Darius had. [Curtius 
I. vi. c. 6.]—And therefore what the Dr. Prideaux [Con Hist. p. 383] hath told us 
from
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And as thus of a certainty this kind of Year, was the Year in vulgar account among the nations of the East which have been here mention'd, so as I shall only add.

Severally, The same obtained likewise among other Asian nations, and particularly among the Lydians, who were the Allies of the Chaldeans in that war which they made against Cyrus in Daniel's time, and which ended in Cyrus his conquest of both these nations.

Of the Asian Month, and Year that was used in that age, we have a good account from him, whom Cicerō calleth the father of history. Herodotus (f) sheweth what kind of MONTH they commonly used in explaining the words of Aristagoras of Miletus, when he told Clement, that it was three months journey from Sardes to Susa. The distance, faith he, between these two cities is thirteen thousand five hundred furlongs, which at an hundred and fifty furlongs each day, makes a journey of just NINETY days. Thus a three months Journey at that time was a ninety days journey. Hence it is plain that their Months were equal, namely of thirty days in a month.

What their Year was in vulgar account, we learn from that Discourse (g) of Sólon to Croesus concerning the uncertainty of the happiness of man's life, which is so much the more observable to our purpose, as it hapned within some two and twenty Years of the time of Revelation of this Prophecy (b).

That Discourse was as it here follows, viz. In a long lifetime one may see many things, which be would not: and many things he must suffer. For suppose the measure, or term of man's life to be three-score, and ten years. These years amount to twenty-five thousand two hundred Days; without (reckoning) any leap months. But if one will make every other Year of the seventy a month longer, to make the feasts (i) of the Year happen right, then there are thirty-five Leap Months besides the seventy years: And in those thirty five months there are one thousand and fifty Days.—— Now of all the Days in seventy Years, which

from Curtius also [Lib. iii. c. 3.] that the Persian year was a year of three hundred and fifty-five Days; as in Darius Codomannes his army so many young men attended upon so many Magi, &c ?— We deny not but the year was then so accounted among the Magi, but we affirm that all the year in vulgar account was of 360 Days. Curtius's words here imply as much. [Quippe Perse quoque in totidem (360) dies descripits eft Annus.] The word QUOQUE here can refer no otherwise to the Persians, having a form of Year among them of 360 Days, than as they had had before another of 360, and as the Learned among the other Eastern nations, so now A 180 the Magi among the Persians as introduced that of 360 Days.—— But after all this testimony is so late as in Darium Codomannis's time, well nigh two hundred Years after Daniel's time, and about 176 Years after Darius Hyphasis his conquering India [for the battle at Issus between Alex. M., and Darius Cad. in whose Army 565 young men attended upon 365 Magi as above, were fought in the Year before, A. D. 333. and Darius Hyphasis his Conquest of India was in the Year before, A. D. 509] when confessedly in Dr. Prideaux's own testimony as above the Number of Days of the THEN Persian Year was that of three hundred and sixty. And this was about nine and twenty Years after that Daniel had this Prophecy revealed to him. (f) Lib. vii. lib. lii. p. 508 Ed. Gale. (g) Lib. i. xxxii. p. 13. Ed. Gale. (h) For the Prophecy was revealed in the Years before A. D. 538. And this Discourse of Sólon to Croesus must have hapned about the Year before, A. D. 560; as Sólon died in the year before. A. D. 559, and Croesus began his reign according to Dr. Prideaux in the Year before, A. D. 562. (i) "in et dias omnes non magispalet " is to be seen. [Herod. i. 1. xxii p. 13. Edit. Gale.]
Of Year of Reckoning in this Prophecy.

which [according to the last reckoning, taking in the days of the Leap-months] are twenty six thousand two hundred and fifty days; there is not one of all these Days so exactly like another, but they differ in something or other that happens, &c.

Now setting aside the Philosophy of this Discourse, and considering only the Chronology of it, we cannot but see that Solon makes, as David also did, the term of man's life to be seventy Years. And to turn these Years into Days he useth two ways of Reckoning.

In the first he reckons just three hundred and sixty Days in a Year, without any Leap-months; for seventy times three hundred and sixty, are just twenty-five thousand two hundred Days; which was his first number.

In the second way he reckons in thirty-five Leap-months, that is, one thousand and fifty days more to his seventy years. So that his first Year being a Year of three hundred and sixty Days, his second must have been a Year of three hundred and ninety Days, his third of three hundred and fifty Days, his fourth of three hundred and ninety Days, and so on: adding a month of thirty Days to every other year, and so making the whole seventy Years to be twenty-five thousand two hundred Days, and one thousand and fifty Days more, that is, in all twenty-five thousand two hundred and fifty Days.

This second way of Reckoning which addeth a Leap-month to every other Year, is plainly artificial. It was introduced merely for the regulation of the feasts of the Year (c). But it was far from answering this end; and therefore no wonder that it did not obtain (d).

The Learned among the Chaldeans, and the Persians, and among the Egyptians also had a much better way here (m) as they added...
added five Days to the three hundred and sixty Days, of which their Year vulgarly confounded.

But even here is so far a Proof of their antient, and ordinary number of Days in the Year, as these five Days (a) were thus plainly fu-

every Year, this brings the Months so quick again, that we who are ur'd to quite another way of Reckoning, know not where to find them without some Consideration. E. g. In a Year of 360 Days, if the first Day of the first Month were now our first Day of January, it would fall seven Years hence on the last Day of November; seventeen, or eighteen years hence, it would be at Michaelmas; within thirty five Years it would be at Midsummer.——— In few words, it goeth round the twelve Months, and returns to its former place in sixty nine Julian Years. For 69 times 365 Days, and 6 Hours is 25202 Days, and a Quarter, that is, it is two days and a quarter more than feventy Years of 360 Days to the Year; as the Reader may see by comparing this great number with that in Solon's discourse above mention'd.—-But however strange this may look to us that are used to no other than the Julian Year, to observe their Months by this their antient Form of Year thus to run through all the Seasons of it, yet doublets was it no strange thing to the common people of those Eastern Nations. It was surely no more strange to them, than it is now to the Turks, and other Mahometan Nations, that use the Lunar Year of 374 Days to see their Ramadan, and their two Bairams to run round the Year, and to fall sometimes in the Winter, and sometimes in the Summer, as they do within a few Years in common observation. [See Rycaut of the Ottom. Emp. p. 160, 161, 162.] Even within three and thirty Years. [Frid. Con. Hist. Vol. I. p. 393.]—-And this will become less strange to us, if yet it be consider'd how hard, and even impossible it is to make any Year of common Use to hold pace with the natural Year; as it may be seen by our Julian Year, which was made for that purpose by advice of the most Learned Men in the world. And yet this will not do exactly: tho' it comes as near as is possible. For our Julian Year of 365 Days 6 Hours exceeds the natural Year by something more than 10 Minutes. And this Excess in the space of about 330 Years makes a Day's difference between Ours, and the Solar Tropical Year: Which in the space of some thousands of Years will bring the first of January to Midsummer, and in so many thousand Years more will bring it round to Midwinter again. But in one or two thousand Years the Difference is not to great on this Account, but that January is now a Winter's Month, as it was in the time of Augustus: And so April is a Spring Month, and July a Summer Month, and October is the fall of the Leaf, as well now, as it was at Christ's Incarnation. So that the' here be a yearly Variation, yet it is so insensible, that the common People take no notice of it; at least in those Countries which have not received the Gregorian Calendar.——— These things being consider'd, altho' in the Year antiently in ordinary Use among those Eastern, and Greeks, the Variation with respect to the Seasons of the Year be very great, and sensibly, and which their Learned consequentely could not but take notice of, and did; yet as Antiquity, and Custom had inured the use of it to the common People, and as withall they found it a Year, as Scaliger call'd it [v. Supra p. 241.] A Year that for its equaliby of Division was most convenient for their Use: It is therefore no Wonder, that they kept up the use of the idle Year among them, even long after that their Learned in their several Countries had brought In their respective Incorrections for the Seasons of the Year: Which Seasons the common People needed no farther than as Nature direct'd them for the Supports, and Conveniences of Life, and which they knew well enough by the ordinary Course of Nature for these Ends; doublets as well as do the Turks, and other Mahometan Nations at this time, as in their present ordinary Year, the variation as to the Seasons of it is immensely greater. (n) Yog, Stat. [Em. Temp. p. 195.]

(a) The very word Neteri among the Egyptians, and θεότητα among the Greeks being used made sheweth that their antient Year was simply of 360 Days. And however Petavius [1. 252] hath reproached him for its, yet as learned as he [Bp Stillingfleet Orig. fac. c. VI. p. 56] hath concluded as Scaliger did before him in this very matter in the following words, This ADDING of five Days to the end of the Year, which Days were thene called θεοτητα IMPLIES that they were not antiently in use amon them, &c. [V. vore ib.]——— He goes on to shew that in process of time, the Egyptians came to understand the necessity likewise for the sake of the redundant Quadrant in each Year above 365 Days, of adding a Day every fourth Year.——— But as he sheweth [from Conflorus De Die Nat. c. 18] this Incorrection did not obtain in their Civil Years,——— because as the reason is well assign'd by Geminus [de Sphera c. VI.] The Egyptians according to a superfluxion Observation which they had, would needs have their
or Year of Reckoning in this Prophecy

supernumerary Days, and Days added to their Year, which in vulgar Account thereof consisted only of three hundred and sixty Days.

And that this latter still obtain’d among the several Nations above-mention’d, as being their Year in vulgar Account, and ordinary Use, long after that the other had been found out, and even after Daniel’s time, I have above shewn.

And therefore tho’ the learned Dr Prideaux (o) hath told us, that when Daniel had this Prophecy revealed unto him by the Angel Gabriel, the Chaldaean Year was most certainly the Nabonassarian Year, consisting of three hundred and sixty-five Days, and the Egyptian Year was the same, and so also was the Persian: All which is allowed to have been true so far, as that the Learned in those respective Countries might have now arriv’d at the Knowledge of such a Year, and made use of it in their Observations (the Chaldaean especially,) Yet this makes not against the form of Year of three hundred and sixty Days, being the Year of Reckoning in this Prophecy, because this, and not the other, was still the Year commonly known, and used among the People of those respective Countries, and consequently among the People of God also, who had been now well nigh seventy (p) such Years in Captivity in one of those Countries, even in that of the King of Babylon, at the time when this Prophecy was given.

And what is more natural than for to suppose that in the said Prophecy such a Year of Reckoning should have been intended in it, as was commonly known, and used in that age, and in that Country, where Daniel and the Jews were at the Revelation of it?—Especially considering that as I have formerly shewn, no other Form of Year whatsoever will possibly suit with the Prophecy in the express Letter of it.

These considerations therefore do surely render it more than probable that this was it. But there are others behind, whereby, as I am not without hopes, we may bring this matter well nigh to a certainty of its being so. As

First, Supposing with the learned Dr. Prideaux (q) that this prophecy concerning principally the Jews, and being written in them (for it is in the Hebrew which was the Jews Language, and not in the Chaldee, as some other parts of Daniel are) it is most likely that the Computation of the time mention’d therein should be according to the Jewish Form, and none other; yet this allowed, it makes not against this Form of Year being the measure of the Years of this Prophecy, because the same was certainly a Jewish Form of Year, for ’tis evidently their
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their Festivals to run through every Day in the Year. ——— [See Masbarn, also Sec, X. p. 236 fo. Edit.] ——— Epistil Alexandrini quarto quoq; Anno annum Diem intercalabant. Epistii Naturales Intercalectionem illum numquam admiferunt. [Salmas. Ep. 76, and 78.]

(o) Con. Hist. p. 281. (p) as it will be shewn anon.

(g) Con. Hist. p. 283 in fine.
Scripture (r) Year, and as such it is a Year that could not but be of known, and common Use among that People: Whereas that kind of Jewish Year, which is said to have been introduced by the Sanhedrin for the regulation of the Jewish Festivals is on many accounts most unlikely to have been the Year of Reckoning intended in this Prophecy: as I shall shew presently.

But as here confessedly the Years of this Prophecy are Jewish Years, I know not of any other form of Jewish Year strictly, and properly so, whereby they can be reckoned, but one, or other of these Jewish Forms of Year now mention'd.

For however Dr. Prideaux (s) hath spoken of the solar (t) Year as a Jewish form of Year, and as such hath made it the Year of Reckoning in this Prophecy, having first concluded those weeks of Years to be PLAINLY, and MANIFESTLY the same with those sabbaths of Years mention'd in Levit. xxv. 8, and then concluding of a certainty that those sabbaths of Years were reckoned by solar Years, yet truly I see not any ground for either of these Conclusions, but manifest reasons against both of them. For

First, As to those Sabbaths of Years in Levit. xxv. 8, being therefore said to be Solar Years, because they began from the first of Tisri, which was pinned down by the Feast of Tabernacles (which was always celebrated in the middle of that month) to a certain season of the Year, and therefore from that season in one Year to the same season in another, can only be measured by the course of the sun, tho' this observation may be true in real time, yet this proves not to the purpose here, unless it prov'd withal that the Jews measur'd their Years in this, and in other things pertaining to the Law, by a solar Year. For it is the Jewish measure of time, or Computation that we are here immediately concern'd with. But we have not any the least footsteps that I know of (u), of any such Jewish form of Year or Computation of Years: but we have direct proof of the contrary as in the practice of the Sanhedrin in their continual regulation antiently of the Jewish Year, of which more anon, so also in the direct testimony of Maimonides here, upon the authority of both the Talmuds, that in All things pertaining to the LAW, (consequentially also in the Jewish sabbaths of Years) their Years were neither SOLAR nor LUNAR, but such as arose out of the Order of Intercalation, whether they were Years Common, or Intercalary, according to the Determination of the Sanhedrin (w).

Secondly, I see not how Dr. Prideaux can argue from those Sabbaths of Years in Levit. xxv. 8, to the Weeks of Years in this Prophecy, as having any relation to them either in form of Year, or indeed in any point whatsoever. For

(1) As it hath been above noted, and as it will appear farther hereafter. (r) Con. Milt. p. 239. (t) Of 365 d. 6 h. (s) Tis said indeed of the Jewish Astronomers that they had a Solar Year of 365 d. 6 h. but however 'tis said also that this was used only in the Schools. (w) Selden, de An. civ. vet. Ind. p. 1, 2.] (u) Ib. c. XVII. p. 73, 74.
Or Year of Reckoning in this Prophecy.

First, The original word in Leviticus [ib.] is not [Weeks] as in the Prophecy (x) before us, but [Sabbaths of Tears].—However, if it be pleaded here that the sense is far the same, as a Sabbath of Years is evidently seven Years, and seventy Sabbaths of years, as well as seventy Weeks of Years, equally, make four hundred and ninety Years, I add

Secondly, That in the nature of one, and the other there is no manner of ground for relation. For what have any of the several EVENTS of these Weeks of Years to do with Sabbaths of years?

— I add

Thirdly, The sabbatical years of the Jews being in Dr. Prideaux's (y) own Account confessedly UNCERTAIN, because [as he truly says] it doth not appear WHEN, or HOW, they were observed, therefore there is surely no manner of room for thus arguing from those Sabbaths of years, to the Weeks of Years of this Prophecy. Because this is confessedly to argue from UNCERTAINTIES.

And

Fourthly, Even Dr. Prideaux hath himself elsewhere concluded no Relation here, as he hath expressly told us (z), that this Prophecy means no more than by the seventy weeks to express seventy times seven years, that is four hundred, and ninety years in the whole, without ANY RELATION had either to Shemittahs, or SABBATICAL years.

I conclude therefore, as to the weeks of years by which the time of this Prophecy is computed, that they are far from being Plainly and Manifestly the same with those Sabbaths of Years mention'd in Leviticus (a), [as are Dr. Prideaux's words in p. 283 of his book] that [as in Dr. Prideaux's words also in his preface] they are without Any Relation, i.e. in other words, they have no manner of Relation. And what is without any relation, or hath no manner of Relation, is without any relation, or hath no relation in any thing: consequently not in the form of year. Which solar Form of Year was after all not a Jewish Form of Year, as evidently upon the forecited testimonies it had not, nor could it have to do with Jewish Sabbaths of years. For their form of Year is certainly upon those testimonies the Year ordained by the Jewish Sanhedrin in the regulation of their Festivals.

This is undeniably a Jewish Form of Year. And yet as this, as I may now proceed to shew, could not possibly be the Year of Reckoning by the Angel intended in this Prophecy, it will of course remain to the other Scripture Jewish Form of Year of three hundred, and sixty Days; as we shall see anon.

That the Form of Year made use of by the Jewish Sanhedrin for the regulating of their Festivals should have been the Year of Reckoning

(a) Ch. xxv, 8.
Reckoning intended in this Prophecy, it is in no wise likely for the following Reasons;

First, It is no Scripture Year. For it consisted variously (b) sometimes of 12 months, sometimes of 13 months by the intercalation of the Jewish Veadar, or second Adar. But of this Veadar, or second Adar in the Jewish Year we have not throughout the Scriptures so much as one single mention of it, either by name, or as a thirteenth month. Whereas we have twelve months by name, and twelve months also in order of number, as the first, and second, and third, and so on to the twelfth, but never beyond that to the bringing in of a thirteenth, any where in the Scriptures.

Secondly, It was ever of most Uncertain Account, as being merely Artificial, and Arbitrary, as it depended purely upon the Determination of the Sanhedrin. The People knew nothing at all about the Year current, whether it would be a Year consisting only of twelve Months, or otherwise of thirteen Months, 'till they of the Sanhedrin had made public declamation of it. And this we are told (c) was not usually till towards the end of the Year. It was

Thirdly, A Year this very Uncertain also as to its Origin, or Rife. For who can tell how, or when it was first invented (d)? Nor is it Isee Uncertain.

Fourthly, As to its Continuation. For who can tell us of a Certainty how long it was in use (e) among the Jews?

Fifthly, 'Tis so as in it self (f), so also as to any real use that it could be of to the People, however we are told by the learned Mr. Selden

---

(b) Annua Civilia (for to Mr. Selden calls it) juxta Talmudicos seu Amtas Communias seu intercalarii. Commonem implebant Mesues duodecim, qui aut cavi fuerat, aut pleni, five intercalares, i. e. aut dieum 29, aut 30. In Intercaliari Anno Mesues tredecim. [Selden de Anno Ciev. vet. Jud. c. iii.] (c) Anne labentes, & plerunque sub finem ejus, Mos erat Synedri magni Collegis Decreto publico Intercalationem, ut O P U S erat, futurum statueret. [Selden de Anno Ciev. vet. Jud. c. 9.] (d) Libi nonnulla est compertum Sibi fuerit Intercalationis secundum Adar Amplior, quam subserit tempore.——— Ludumi operem Chronologi qui Veterum Hebraeorum temporar ad rationes Cynchridi redactum. Veteres non ex Scriptura, non ex compate, sed ex observatione numerorum suas notabant. Tempora quae exstitera, ex inventoria. Nulam exist. in S. Litteris Intercalationis vestigium; nes; consilus Chronologiae technicam auctae primo Templo Judaeis fuisse cognovit. [Marsham p. 184, for Ed.] ——— But here Sir John Marsham bards surely carried the matter too far. For otherwise how did the Jews regulate their Festivals under the first Temple? ——The Resum of intercalating among the Jews was simply the same under the first, as under the second Temple; but that as Mr. Selden hath told us, was purely upon account of their Festivals, and especially of the Passover, on which all the rest depended, left that and they should otherwise happen variously sometimes in the Summer, and sometimes in the Winter. For as we read his words [c. v. p. 20, 21.] Tempus festinum Paschatis non incipit annus ex receptissima Majoribus Traditione, nisi plana consistat Aequinodiium Vernum, &c. And yet in the following Chapter Mr. Selden gives the great uncertainty of Jewish Calculation, and declares in these words, Quoniam temporis momenta, ante die inventorum, atque in se aequilibrant occurrence Annum, velati Egyptiorum, ante Judaeorum chronologiae Aequinodiium Vernum, seu Temporum Niam culcarenti Mathematici Vent. Jud. i Mihi SATIS non est COMPERTUM. [p. 24.] (e) Alii finem suam Chronologiae ante Captivitatem, aliis post Redemum; aliis denique post institutum ab Hilla tem. Cyclosum decennvalem Anno Christi 358. [Marsham p. 184. folio Edit.] (f) As it is plain from the foregoing notes.
Selden (g), that it was the Year in Civil Use among the Jews. He hath told us this indeed upon the testimony of both the Talmuds (b) and upon the testimony also of Maimonides (i) from them. And yet he himself hath made this most improbable, by his own most just observation of the manifest difficulties, and uncertainty necessarily arising from accounting by such a Form of Year: as he hath rightly concluded, that in this case, No one could be sure of the future term of his own, or another's legitimate Age; before the quality of the last preceding year was determined by the Sanhedrin: i.e., 'till they had determined whether the Veadar should be added, or not (k). The like difficulty, and uncertainty, (as that learned man hath also observed) attended such supplication in all other civil Matters, wherein regard was necessarily to be had to years, particularly with respect to yearly wages of hired servants, and soldiers: and divers other such like Contracts either annual, or of longer duration.

But however, setting aside the great difficulties, and uncertainties of reckoning by such a form of Year, methinks had it been a year commonly known, and in ordinary use among the Jews, it should have been so in scripture times; if not in all, at least in some, or other of them. And then consequent in an intercalary year we should have there read of an additional month known by the name either of the month Veadar, or the second Adar, or otherwise by a numeral denomination of a thirteenth month.

For it is much that whereas, as I before observed, in the holy scriptures we have mention made ever and anon of twelve months by their respective names, or in numeral order so many months spoken of, with their Historical Events for which they are remarked, that however nothing at all should have hap'ned through the whole course of sacred History to the making famous also a month Veadar, or a thirteenth month, as well as those other twelve, of which there is mention made under a twofold Denomination, as above, had there been any regard commonly had to, or ordinary Use been made of, or indeed any other Use made of such artificial, and uncertain calculation, or Form of Year, than that for which we are told (l) it was ordained, even for the regulating of the Jewish Festivals.

And so far as Scripture is our Light here, not this but the antient Jewish Year, or the scripture Year of three hundred and sixty Days must have been the civil Year, or the Year in ordinary Use among God's people.

For, it is in no wise probable that in the regulating of King Solomon's Officers [1 Kings iv. 7.] who made provision for the King's Household, each man his month in the Year, or of those twelve captains
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[1 Chron.

(b) De Anno Civ. Vet. Jud. c. xvi. In Rebus CIVILIBUS decernendis idem genus et alius, neque Lunaris Ratio, neque solari habeatur Anni, sed solmundo CERTISSIMI ilius, et menses eius non mensis mensibus confabatur; theorum communis, fere Intercalari. (b) Selden in loc. cit. (i) In the following words, Anni omnino fave de prole altissimis sensus, fave de Rom. quasque solutos ostendit. Alius, aliique memortis non solares sunt nec Lunares; sed Anni quales ex ordine intercalarii nasccuntur, fave Communes, fave Intercalares juxta quondam synedrion eum proficiscutur. (ib.) (b) ib. (l) Selden, c. v.
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Of the Form of Year,

1 Chron. xxvii. 1.] which went in, and out before the King month by month throughout ALL the months in the year, any regard should have been had to that irregular Form of Jewish Year, as it differently consisted now of twelve, now of thirteen months. Indeed it was impossible that there should. For had a Yadav been here to be provided for, as in an intercalary Year it must have been, then in the Caesars before us TWELVE officers of the household, and TWELVE captains, EACH Man his MONTH had not been sufficient for the number of months in such intercalary Year.

Tis indeed absurd to suppose any regard had to such uncertain Form of Year. The certain Regulations of the King’s Household and Guards now before us were not capable of being adjusted by it. But upon the foundation of scripture months of thirty (m) Days to a month, and of twelve such months constituting the Jewish ordinary, or common Year, the Regulation was most readily adjusted; the monthly succession of Officers went on smoothly without interruption; and the King’s Majesty was duly attended without waiting the uncertain determination of the number of the months in the Year from the Sanhedrin, whose sole Province it was (n); and who, as we are told (o), did not admit of the King’s having any thing to do in the regulation of the Year, unless he were the head, or at least a member of their College. Nor needed (p) he, as I am now shewing, to concern himself with such regulation for any civil use of such form of Year, as his officers, and soldiers, and other Attendants on the Court, whether military or civil, as evidently from the now cited scripture passages, they knew their attendance, so they doubtless had their respective Salaries by the same known, and ordinary scripture year consisting now in King Solomon’s time, as antiently and from the beginning among God’s People of 12 equal Months of 20 Days, and of 12 times 30, or 360 Days.

And

(m) As in the instance formerly giv’n in Noah’s time: and as we may add here those in Numbers [xx. 29.] and in Deuteronomy [xxiv. 8.] of Israel’s mourning first for Aaron, afterward for Moses after their deaths THIRTY Days, i.e. doubless a MONTH in both those places. — For wherefore was this set number of Days for mourning, but as thirty Days was ordinarily the Number of Days in a Month, even after the Children of Israel’s coming out of Egypt?

(n) In *Phaisibus decernendis, amnique intercalandis praetere Princesse, ut Synedri, seu College Synedri, seu consiliori Hierofynimici illius celebrerunt ΝΗΝΝΗ ΗΗΗΗΗΗ, dict., i.e. Synedrii, seu Sanhedrin Magni Dr. [Stedem de An. civ. vet. ʒn. c. xi. p. 54. 55 from Jewish testimony there mention’d.]

(o) *NB. Phaisus Lutetius est cum Luna a raduis solaribus emersa conspicereur. [v. Stedem c. iii. p. 12. &c.] — It was the first Appearance of the new Moon after the Cootus. This was the second Day after its Cootus.

(p) V. Stedem c. XI. p. 55.

(q) And therefore there is no ground for that Jewish preeminence mention’d by Mr Stedem. [de An. Civ. c. xi. p. 55. from Gemar. &c.] viz. prospera foedibus, quin matrimonium certam annuum pereat, unde praefumebat in propriis et privatis, ut Anni SINGULI fuerint intercalares. —— Quod enim in annorum simplicissima praefumebat, id ita praefumdata erat, ut quosdam Intercalari situr annuus, quodcumque quodammodo nisi Intercalatio nulla, modo semper Manes Annum cognovisse. ——

But, ‘tis with much more reason to be premum’d, that neither the King, nor his Officers were either pleas’d, or displeas’d about the Intercalation of the Sanhedrin, as to its affecting them; because, as I am now shewing, the Royal Attendance, and consequently the military payment was not regulated by it,
And as such it did therefore continue in vulgar Account among them from time to time afterward. And we hear of it accordingly even after the Captivity: as thus it was in King Abasuerus his time. For, as we are told [Eber I. 4.] He had a Feast for all his Princes, and Servants, even an hundred and fourscore Days. Wherefore just so many Days, but as this number of Days was at that time also ordinarily accounted half a Year? We have Jews that and other testimony here: and that with very good Reason, as at that time expressly he the First Month was the Month Nisan, and the Last Month still was the Month Adar, or the twelfth Month. Since therefore an hundred and fourscore Days in King Abasuerus his time made six Months, or half a Year, consequent three hundred and sixty Days made twelve Months, or a whole Year in such known, and ordinary use of it among God's People.

Upon the whole then, As thus before, and after the Captivity, we have evident Footsteps of a Year of three hundred and sixty Days as a known, and common form of Year among the Jews; What hinderers in the Prophecy before us giv'n to that People, that the Year of Reckoning intended in it should not have been this very Jews or Year, even as a Jewish Form of Year; as the same was, as I have shewn, undoubtly their antient Scripture-Year, and as such their known, and ordinarily accounted Year in these Scripture times afterward?

However, if All that hath been now said be not sufficient to yield full satisfaction in this matter, as it amounts to the proving the ordinary use of this Jews, or Scripture Form of Year only in the SINGULAR form thereof: And whereas therefore that which Dr Prideaux hath observ'd with respect to Years strictly (u) Lunar may also by way of Objection be applied here, viz. that All among the Antients that had Lunar Years [or that otherwise had a Year of twelve Months of thirty Days in a Month (w), making in the whole a Year of three hundred and sixty Days,] had also intercalated Years to make amends for their Defects; and therefore whatsoever any of their Years might be in their SINGULAR numbers, they were always Solar in their COLLECTIVE Forms: And whereas therefore the Question is put by Dr. Prideaux in what follows, viz. And who can think then that in the collective Sum of seventy Weeks, or the four hundred and ninety Years of them the Angel should intend a Computation which was then no where in practice the whole World over, my Answer is, that there must have been such a Form of Year in practice in the World, even in the Collective Sum both before, and after the giving of this Prophecy, (however...
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\(g\) Pirke Ewser c. 49. from R. Abraham. 
\(r\) Durat ex membris. [Mem- 
\(n\) nobius] ------ Dionysius Siculus 1608 50 Dies ebrietatis vacavit. [Scribas.] ------ Pele's 
Syn. in. 1. 
\(e\) Ether III. 7. 
\(t\) Con. Hift. p. 282. 
\(w\) As above shewn of the Epsiar 
Nations, and of the Greeks.
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Dr. Prideaux hath asserted the contrary,) as it will, I think sufficiently appear from the following Instances.

First, it must have been fo in the Asiatick Year before-mention'd. For otherwise how could Solomon have asserted that there were 25200 Days in SEVENTY Years?——This was no otherwise than as so many Days made so many Years of three hundred and sixty Days in the Year in the COLLECTIVE Sum of such a form of Year.

If it be said that there was now however an Intercalary Year also among the Greeks, 'tis what I have above granted. But here it must be likewise granted on the other hand, that there was a known Computation also by this other form of Year in the collective Sum thereof both among the Greeks, and Lydians, as the Parties concerned in the Discourse refer'd to, were of those Countries.

For otherwise how could Ceres have understood Solomon in this way of Discourse to him, had not this Collective Computation of seventy Years by a Year of three hundred and sixty Days been equally known, or in practice both in Lydia and in Greece (x)?

'Twere indeed absurd to suppose that the wife, and grave Solomon, would have troubled Ceres with such a Computation of Seventy Years, had it not been then in known practice even in the Collective Form thereof. I see not what could otherwise have justified Solomon's making mention thereof in his Philosophical Discourse with the Lydian King.———But

Secondly, and more especially, we have, I think, a clear proof hereof among God's People under their Babylonish Captivity: As that could have been a Seventy Years Captivity by no other than this kind of Year in the Collective Form thereof. For that Captivity, as it may be seen above (y), commenced from the taking of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar the Son in the fourth Year of Jehoiakim in the year before A.D. 606, in the beginning of November of it (z). And it ended in the first Year of Cyrus, after the Death of Darius, who died at Babylon in the Year before A.D. 537, when Cyrus succeeded in the whole Empire (a). And to the learned Dr. Prideaux hath himself told us under this Year (b), viz. that the seventy

(x) Solomon is said to have been the first Inventor of the Intercalary Year among the Greeks. [See Jaf. Stal. Ep. Temp. p. 23, 24. and Ricciusius p. 24. from Proclus lib. 1. in Tim. Plat.] But that is said to have been soon dropped. [v. supra.] However it would not pass with the People. They still kept up their ancient year of 360 Days.———Even Aristotle accounted by it as the Year in ordinary Account in his time. [Hist. Anim. VI. 20.] Quaest. Anns. canibus quinque Anni parturium, nimium diebus 72: Laconica uterum genit febrae parte Anni, h. s. diebus 60.———And among the Athenians after Aristotle's death, [for he died in the year before A.D. 322.] the year in vulgar Account was still the same: for they erected for him 360 Statues at Athens as many as there were Days in the year. [Dig. Labinius in Vit. Dem. & Plin. L. 34. c. 6.] 600 and 600.———See Pliny's Words.]. See Pris. Con. Hist. p. 572.———See Lang. de an. Christ. p. 158. See also Ricciusius; and also Leo Alatini de mens. temp. c. 10. where there are many more Instances of this nature than I am here willing to trouble the Reader with.

(y) V. the first fet of Chron. Tables.


(a) lb. p. 129, 130.

(b) lb. So also in our first fet of Tables.
or Year of Reckoning in this Prophecy.

WENTYEars which Jeremiah had prophesiéd, should be the continuance of the Captivity, were now just expir'd, viz. in the Year before A. D. 537, in the November of it (c). Wherefore as Dr Pridexaux hath thus rightly concluded the Years of the Jewish Captivity at Babylon in the beginning and ending of them, the same could not possibly have been of seventy Years continuance by a solar form of Year, (for from the Month of November of the Year before A. D. 606 to the same Month in the Year before A. D. 537, there are unde­niably only 69 Solar, or Julian Years) but it was of so long continuance, certainly in the collective Sum of the Jewish Form of Year now before us, as seventy such Years are found (d) in so many Julian Years.

Thus it must necessarily have been, if Dr. Prideaux's own Calculation be just here; as undoubtedly it is: As Babylon was taken by Cyrus in the 17th Year of Belbanzar toward the end of the Year before A. D. 539; And as Darius's two Years Reign expir'd, consequently in the Year before A. D. 537 to the giving some part of the end of that (e) Year to Cyrus, as his reign must truly have begun then immediately upon the death of Darius.

And so allowing with Dr. Prideaux (f) Cyrus his Decree to have gone forth presently after the death of Darius, and as Dr. Prideaux hath put it, in the middle of November also, and then with him allowing, after the going forth of the said Decree a Month's time for the Jews preparing for their Journey, and also four Months for their march from Babylon, (which was the time (g) in which Ezra performed the like march,) the beginning of the said March must thus have fall'n out about the middle of the December of the said Year 537 before A. D. where Dr. Prideaux hath placed it accordingly. And so of course the coming of the Jews into their own Land was in the April following, viz. of the Year before A. D. 536; and of the Scripture first Year of the Reign of King Cyrus.

But thus there could not now possibly have elapsed seventy Julian Years, as it was just now observ'd. We may add here, seventy such Years from such professed beginning, as above, could not possibly have been expir'd till the November of the Year before A. D. 536. But the returning Jews are here supposed, and indeed in the truth hereof, to have been released from their Captivity twelve Months before, and to have been upon their March eleven Months before, and actually to have been in their own Country seven Months before the said November, or the November of the Year

(c) Tb. & Prid. p. 130.  (d) The Difference is only 2 d. 6 h. as in 69 Juli­an Years there are 27202 Days 6 hours, in 70 Years, of the other kind of Year there are only 27200 Days.

(e) Truly so in Dr. Prideaux's own Tables at the end of Vol. 1. Con. Hist. Truly so upon the authority of the Phoenician Annals, as the fourteenth Year of the Reign of King Hiram, in which according to them Cyrus was made Emperor at Persia, is corresponding with the said Year; As it may be seen in our first set of Tables.

(f) Con. Hist. p. 129. 130.  (g) As Dr. Prid. hath observ'd from Ezra VII. 9.
Of the Form of Year,

Year before A. D. 536. Therefore 'tis beyond all contradiction that the sev'nty Years Captivity of the Jews was expir'd as above; to the giving us thus confessedly no more than sixty nine (b) Julian Years between such professed beginning, and such professed ending of this Captivity as above; and to the evidently furnishing us therein with this most remarkable Instance of the form of Year of 360 Days, used in this collective Sum of seventy Years, in God's own determined (i) duration of his People's Vassallage to the King of Babylon. But

Thirdly, We have yet a proof behind, which to us Christians (k) is as great as can be given in this matter, to the confirming this form of Year to be the sure Year of reckoning in the collective Sum of seventy Weeks, or the four hundred and ninety Years of this Prophecy.—— It is this: Namely, that whereas the Angel who deliver'd this Prophecy to Daniel, speaks elsewhere to him of a number of Years in his prophetical way, that number of Years is resumed, and explained in the Revelations of St. John, by being turned into so many times three hundred and sixty Days.

The Angel Gabriel who deliver'd this Prophecy of the Weeks to Daniel was the same whom he had seen in the Vision at the beginning (l), i.e. whom he had seen in his first Vision (m), and who then gave him a Prophecy of a time, and times, and half a time (n). A TIME in Daniel's Sense is a Year. So the seven times (o) that passed over Nebuchadnezzar in his beastial State are by Josephus (p) called seven YEARS (q).

But that there might be no room for doubt here, Daniel thus explains himself elsewhere, viz. in Ch. XI. v. 13, where it is said in our Translation, that the King of the North shall come after certain Years. There it is in the Original, he shall come at the end of times (r), even of Years.

And thus we are to understand those words of the Angel, where in the first Vision he saith (s) of the fourth Beast, He shall wear out the Saints of the most High—— and they shall be given into his hand, until a time, and times, and the dividing of a time. This Chaldee Phrase, the dividing of a time is rendered in Hebrew, Half a time (t).

And so the words are resumed in the Book of Revelations (u), A time, and times, and half a time. This is plainly Daniel's Language: and according to the Exposition now giv'n, it signifies in common Speech nothing else but a Year, and Years, and Half a Year.

How

---

(2) Indeed 2 d. and 6 h. short of so many Julian years. See last Note. d.
(i) By his Prophet Jeremiah xxv. 11, 12. xxix. 10. (k) It must be so especially to Dr. Prideaux, as it will appear hereafter.
(m) Ch. vii. 16. (n) V. 25. (l) Dan. ix. 21.
(p) Ant. x. ii. bis. (q) So Bellarmine [de Rom. Pont. iii. 8.] faith, All Men, understand it.
(r) The Word דְּשָׁא here is not placed in regimine, but in apposition.
(s) Ch. vii. 25. (t) Ch. xii. 7. (a) Ch.
Or Year of Reckoning in this Prophecy.

How many Years are meant by the word times in Daniel's Prophecy, we had not certainly known, if it had not been for that place in the Revelations (w) last mention'd. There (x) it is first laid prophetically of the Woman persecuted by the Dragon, that after her Child-birth, she fled into the Wilderness, where she hath a place prepared of God, that they should feed her there 1260 Days,—Again this is laid in its proper place (v. 14.) that to the Woman there was given the Wings of a great Eagle, that she might flee into the Wilderness, where she is nourished for a time, and times, and half a time from the face of the Serpent.

In both these Texts the Person that is spoken of being the same Person, and the thing that is said of her being the same thing, the time of its continuance also must be the same time also in both these Verses. And therefore 1260 Days in verse the sixth must be the same with a time, times, and half a time in verse the fourteenth. This being clear, there is no difficulty in finding out the Form, or Measure of these Times, or Years. For the number of Days 1260 being to be reduced into a year, years, and half a year, that is, into three years and a half, it cannot be reduced into Years of any other form than that now before us of three hundred and sixty Days. This number 360 is found in the collective Sum of 1260 Days, one time, and two times, and half a time. And so that number of Days is also divided into one year, and two years, and half a year. But so many Days making so many Years, and one half of a Year in, or by such form of Year, it doth so no otherwise than as being here evidently used in the collective Form thereof.—I need only to add

Finally, that All this is Confessedly so in the learned Dr. Prideaux's own account hereof, as he hath told us (y), that Daniel's time, and times, and half a time [ch. xii. 7.] are THREE YEARS AND A HALF, a time in that place signifying one Year, and times two Years, and an half of a time an half Year, as ALL AGREE.—And again (z), THREE YEARS AND AN HALF, reckoning them by MONTHS of THIRTY Days length make JUST 1260 DAYS. These Days therefore literally understood make the three years, and an half, during which the Propagation, and Persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes remained in the Church of the Jews, &c.

But how after all could this be, otherwise than, as I have been here shewing, as a Form of Year of three hundred and sixty Days was ordinarily known among the Jews, and used in the Collective Form thereof, and as it appears in this remarkable instance of it, evidently and confessedly so late as in the Days of Antiochus Epiphanes (a) in the accomplishment of the Prophecies of Daniel relating to him?—Wherefore then should not the same Form of Year have

(w) Ch. xii. 14.
(x) V. 6.
(z) p. 209.
(a) His Propagation of the Temple, and Persecution by Apoc.

Begun in 168 before A. D. He died in the year before A. D. 164.
have been intended in the Prophecy of the seventy Weeks giv'n by the Angel to the same Prophet Daniel? What is confessedly the Form of Year in the Collective Form thereof in a Prophecy of three Years and a half, why not equally so in a Prophecy of the same Prophet of four hundred and ninety Years?

And so leaving this, and the foregoing Proofs with the Reader, I may now put an end to this Chapter, and therewith to the second Part of this Treatise; as I have now done with the seven Weeks, and sixty two Weeks of this Prophecy. There remain yet to be spoken to, the One Week, and the more distinguished One Half thereof: and they will make up the third Part, in that which is now to follow concerning them.
PART the THIRD.

CHAP. I.

Of the third Period of Weeks, or the separate One Week, or Single Week of the Seventy Weeks of this Prophecy.

We are come now to consider the remaining Week to be spoken to in the Prophecy before us, and the more distinguished Half Part thereof. And these having one and the same Ending, as that which in the prophetick Characters is the ending of the latter (a) Half part of this Week, is so consequently of the whole of it;

And as their respective Beginnings are discoverable by the accomplishment of the EXPRESS CHARACTERS of the Half Week ending with the grand Event, or purpose of this one week, and its more distinguished Half part, which is the destruction of Jerusalem, as it will manifestly appear anon, and especially as the Arguments which I shall here occasionally make use of, will have equal regard to the Half Part of this one week, as to the whole of it, for these reasons I shall not trouble the Reader with a separate discourse of the one week, and another of the Half part thereof, in their respective Beginnings, and mutual ending, but here a little leaving my former method, I shall treat of both of them together, as their Express Characters lead me to make joint mention of them.

And in so doing, I shall first give their EXPRESS CHARACTERS as they lie in the text, in the accomplishment of which this one week was surely to be known, and also the distinguished Half part thereof. I shall then set down their respective Beginnings, and their mutual Ending, as we find them in the several Hypotheses now before us: And afterward I shall produce the several

(a) As the accomplishment of its predicted Events plainly shew that it was, and as we shall see anon.
arguments which I shall make use of, either for, or against them, as they shall appear to approve, or not to approve themselves by the real sense, and accomplishment of the EXPRESS CHARACTERS of this part of the Prophecy.

I am first to give the said EXPRESS CHARACTERS. And they, as we find them in the prophetick Text are these following, v. 27. He shall make a (b) firm Covenant with many (c) in ONE Week; and in the (d) HALF part thereof he shall cause the Sacrifice, and oblation to cease; and upon the (e) battlements of the Temple shall be the (f) Idol of the defolator (g) &c.

These are the several Express Characters of this part of the Prophecy, one whereof we see is immediately appropriated to the one Week, the other two to the distinguished Half part of it.

Secondly, As to the several Hypotheses now before us in their respective Beginnings of this one week, and Half part thereof, and their Ending of both, they are thus.

First, In the late Bishop Lloyd's Hypothesis (b), the several Express Characters here being all of them, as we shall see anon, literally fulfilled, the first of the three in the beginning, the two other in the last of the seven Years next preceding, and ending with the destruction of Jerusalem in the year of the V. AE. of Christ 70 by the Romans (i), the Messiah's future people, the here predicted Destroyers of the City, and Sanctuary (k), the Bishop accordingly referred the accomplishment of all the said Characters to them as being particular, or circumstantial Events here solemnly predicted to attend the grand Event, or Purpose of this one week, the Destruction of Jerusalem.

Thus the late learned Bishop understood this part of the Prophecy to the giving us the full and real accomplishment of the Express Characters of it in the letter of them.

But otherwise Dr. Prideaux, and Mr. Lancaster also taking the two former of these express Characters in a figurative sense have referred the accomplishment of them to the Messiah, tho' after a different manner, and in different parts of the said Week, as it is evident from their respective Hypotheses, as they here follow in this part of them.

The one week, and the Half Part thereof, stand thus in Dr. Prideaux his Hypothesis (l).

From the Coming of our Saviour (viz. in the fifteenth (m) year of the reign of Tiberius) began the third period of these seventy weeks, that

(b) In our Translation it is, He shall confirm the Covenant; but as I shall have occasion to shew anon, He shall make a firm Covenant, cometh much nearer to the Text.

(c) In one Week: In our Translation, for one Week. But the former is justified by the Context, as it follows that in (not for) Half of that Week, &c. As therefore here in, so also there. And so the Vul. Lat. render it, Hildomada man. (d) Not in the middle, as in our Translation, but in the HALF part thereof, as Dr. Prideaux (Con. Hist. p. 207) hath most justly observed here. [See our Expofi. in p. 6. in Not.] — And so it is in the LXX. So also in the Vul. Lat. and in the Syriac, and Arabic Versions.

(e) See our Expofition p. 6. in Not. c.

(f) The Idolatrous Ensigne, seeib. Not. d.

(g) The Romains. See p. 57. Not. c.

(h) As in the Chron. Tab. printed at Oxford.

(i) See p. 57. Not. c.

(k) Ver. 26, 27.

(m) As in p. 292, ib.
that is, the ONE WEEK, which is spoken of in the twenty seventh verse, the EVENTS whereof as there predicted are that for that week the Messiah should confirm the covenant with many, and in the HALF part thereof (for thus it ought to be rendered [they are Dr. Prideaux's words, and the observation is most true here] where, in our English Translation we read the MIDST) should cause the sacrifice, and oblation to cease. And so accordingly (continues Dr. Prideaux) it came to pass. For during the seven years of his evangelical Ministry, he did first by his fore-runner the Messenger, whom he had sent before him, and then by himself in his personal Ministry confirm the COVENANT of the GOSPEL with many of the Jews, who were converted, and admitted thereto; And then in the HALF part of the said week, that is, in the Last Half part thereof, when he appeared in his own person in the same Ministry, on which John was sent before him, He caused the SACRIFICES and the OBLATIONS of the Temple to cease, that is, first by his PREACHING of the GOSPEL which was to supersede them, and then, Lastly by that GREAT SACRIFICE of Himself, which was once offer’d for all, in his death upon the Cross at the END of THIS (n) WEEK, whereby they were all absolutely, and finally extinguished for ever.

Thus hath Dr. Prideaux refer’d this ONE WEEK, and the accomplishment of these two Express Characters of it, as here mention’d by him to the Messiah. But as to the last of the three Express Characters of this week, or the latter of the two Characters of the Half part of it, that he hath wholly dropped in his Exposition of this one week; of which more anon.

Mr. Lancaster’s Hypothesis in this part of it is as follows (o). He (viz. the MESSIAH) shall make a Firm Covenant with many (viz. the Jews, and with them only, or chiefly) in one Week, viz. the seventieth. And in the MIDDLE (p) of the [sæd] Week he shall cause the sacrifice, and oblation to cease, and bring over a Wing of Abominations; [i.e. ruling, presiding over, or influencing an army of idolaters, viz. the Romans bearing in their Ensigns the Images of their Gods, &c.]

Thus Mr. L. hath refer’d also to the Messiah the accomplishment of these Express Characters; but differing from Dr. Prideaux as to the accomplishment of the first of these Characters, as he makes it to have been accomplished by the Messiah himself in the beginning.

(n) As Dr. Prideaux makes our Lord to be cut off AFTER the whole 70 Weeks, or after VII Weeks, and LXII Weeks, and One Week: whereas, as I have formerly shown, this is directly contrary to the EXPRESS LETTER of this Prophecy, (ver. 25, 26) as the Messiah was to be cut off after [VII Weeks, and] LXII Weeks; And, as I shall here make it to appear, he could have nothing to do in THIS Week, as the Grand Purpose of it related not to him in their accomplishment, but to his FUTURE PEOPLE.


(p) Mr. L. hath given us some Scripture Inferences, where the original word [ἐστὶ] may signify the middle of a thing; But the LXX and Vul. Lat, and other Versions [See the preceding Not. a] are all against him here, as they render it, as in our Translation the HALF.——Besides there was no completion of the Express Characters in Mr. Lancaster’s sense of them, nor in the Middle of the Week as it will hereafter appear.
Of the One Week, and Half Part thereof,
ning of this Week, and for the first Half of it 'till his cutting off in the middle of it, and after that by his Apostles in the latter half of it immediately following our Lord's Passion; whereas Dr. Prideaux, as we have seen, assigns the accomplishment of it to the Messiah in the person of John the Baptist in the former Half, and to the Messiah in his own person in the latter Half: And however both of them have referred the accomplishment of the next Character, viz. of causing sacrifice and oblation to cease, to the Messiah in his being cut off, yet they differ as to the time of his being cut off. Mr. L. bringing him to the Cross in the middle of the seventieth Week, Dr. Prideaux in the end of it.

But that they are both equally mistaken in all these their references, and assign'd accomplishments, and absolutely wide of the immediate Event, or purpose of this one Week, and also that the said week, and Half part thereof had their true and real accomplishment in all their fore-mention'd predicted Espress Characters only in the above given Exposition of the late learned Bishop, it will fully appear from a particular consideration of each of the said Characters.

First, As to the Party predicted to accomplish them.

Secondly, As to the feme in which they were to be accomplished:

And

Thirdly, The time predicted for their Accomplishment.

First, The prophetick Characters of the One week, and Half part thereof consider'd as to the Party accomplishing had not their predicted accomplishment either in Dr. Prideaux's, or Mr. Lancaster's Exposition of this part of the Prophecy.

For not the Messiah first in the person of his fore-runner John the Baptist, nor in his own person after, as in Dr. Prideaux's Hypothesis, nor the Messiah by himself first, and his Apostles after, as in Mr. Lancaster's, are any of them the Party here predicted to accomplish.

As for John the Baptist, and the Apostles, they are no otherwise supposed to have been concern'd here, than as the Messiah himself is supposed to have been concern'd. But if he were not, neither could they. It will appear also anon that they could not be concern'd.---Nor are they any where mention'd in the Text, or Context, tho' the Messiah be. But that he is not the Party here predicted to accomplish either by himself or others, it is evident from the Text, as therein not the Messiah, but his future people are manifestly the Party accomplishing.

For not He, but they are certainly the next preceding Relative here. For when the Angel had told us, as he doth [ver. 26.] After threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, 'tis plain that he had now done with him. He had now deliver'd the GRAND PURPOSES or EVENTS of two of the prophetick Periods, viz. first of the seven weeks, and then of the threescore and two weeks, which were to be soon followed by the Messiah's being cut off (a). He

(a) And the matter of Fact accomplished in full correspondence with the time here predicted for its accomplishment, I hope that it hath been above shewn almost to a Demonstration.
He had yet a remaining Week to account for, having as above accounted only for sixty-nine Weeks of the Seventy determined upon Daniel's People, and holy City, [ver. 24.] that is, the Jews. This Week therefore evidently remained determined upon Jerusalem. And accordingly the Angel immediately takes up his Prophecy concerning them, by declaring presently upon the here predicted Cutting off of the Messiah by them, that they were now no longer his People (r). And therefore they are plainly in all that follows, to the end of this Prophecy, a People given up to Destruction in the sure Event of this One week determined for it by the Romans, who are the here predicted future People (s) of the Messiah, in the words immediately following those of the rejecting of the Jews, viz. And the People of the Prince that shall come, (as in our Translation) i.e. the People of the Messiah, or the Messiah's future People, shall destroy the City, and Sanctuary, and the End thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the war Defolations are determined (t).

So much in general predicting the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans.—Then (u) it presently follows to the indicating, or giving the sure Signs, or Tokens of the One week and Half Part thereof here certainly predicted as to the Event, or determined Destruction, tho' otherwise as to time left at large, that however the said One week, and Half part thereof, should infallibly be known by the following Characters evidently, and remarkably distinguishing it, viz. that in order to the effecting of this determined destruction, the Party here concern'd to accomplish it should make a firm Covenant, [ver. 27] HE shall make a firm Covenant with many.—Who should do this?—Who, but the next preceding Relative?—But that is plainly the Messiah's future People (w). Consequentially not the Messiah: who, tho' spoken of before, yet as I have been here shewing from the Text, the Angel had now done with him, having by solemn prediction brought him to his Cross. And therefore it is most unreasonable, as being against all natural construction of the words, as well as the plain sense of the Context, to suppose that the Angel should come back again to him, without any new mention of him, to the giving him a part in the accomplishment of the Characters of this One week, and Half part thereof: All which Characters lie in the midst of the here literally predicted destruction of the Jewish Church, and Politie, and in their accomplishment were therefore doubtless to make a great part in it.

I will not say but in the Jewish manner of writing sometimes such reference to an antecedent Relative may possibly be justified. But I am bold to say it, that nothing can justify such irregular reference here. There is no manner of room for it, as the Prophecy admits

(r) See our Exposition, p. 5. Notes c and h. (s) And who are therefore called as the Christian Faith was after the Jews refusal of the Gospel to be preached throughout the Roman Empire, which is called the "Omnipow'r/, Matt. xxiv. 14. Luke ii. 1. And the Church to be formed out of some Believers. (t) Ver. 26. (u) Ver. 27. (w) For they are plainly the Party last spoken of, in ver. 26.
admits not of it, either in the sense of the Express Characters before us, or in their time of accomplishment, as we shall soon see, any more than it doth in the plain, and natural construction of the words. For as I observe,

Secondly, These Express Characters in their plain sense in the Prophecy had not, for that they could not have their accomplishment in the persons of the Messiah, or John the Baptist, or the Apostles.

For the sense in which the Character of the One week, and the former Character of the Half part thereof are supposed to have been fulfilled by those Parties, is both by Dr. Prideaux, and Mr. L. taken in a figurative sense: Whereas the sense of the Prophecy here is plainly not figurative, but literal. But

First, I urge against the figurative acceptance of these express Characters, their Inaccomplishment therein by the Parties supposed to have accomplished them.

First, As to the Character of the One week, viz. the making a firm Covenant with many, as the said Covenant is supposed both by Dr. Prideaux, and Mr. L. to have been the Covenant of the Gospel confirmed with many of the Jews by John the Baptist first, and after by the Messiah himself, as in Dr. Prideaux's Hypothesis, or by the Messiah and his Apostles, as in Mr. Lancaster's.

For even allowing that the word Covenant here were the Gospel-Covenant (tho' as it will evidently appear anon the predicted Covenant could not be such Covenant) yet, as to Dr. Prideaux's Hypothesis, how he could suppose the accomplishment of this Express Character even in this sense thereof in the person of John the Baptist, in truth I see not. For if I apprehend his meaning here, he should have understood that by receiving the Baptism of John, one undertook the conditions of, and was entitled to the benefits of the Christian Covenant. This, or some such like meaning there must be in John's confirming the Covenant of the Gospel to the giving us any colour of Accomplishment of this Express Character of the One week in this sense of it. But if this be the meaning here, the contrary appears as by St. Paul's practice at Ephesus, [Acts xix.] where those who had been baptiz'd unto John's baptism, [ver. 3.] were after baptiz'd in the name of the Lord Jesus [ver. 5.] So also by Aquila, and Priscilla their treating with Apollos, who needed to have expounded unto him the way of God, (or the Christian Faith) more perfectly, because he had hitherto known only the baptism of John. [Acts xviii. 25, 26.]—I add, that John himself was so far from confirming the Christian Covenant, that he was declar'd by our blessed Saviour to be not one of the Gospel State, or Kingdom of Heaven, as it is said in Matt. xi. 11. He that is least in the Kingdom of Heaven is greater than He.

Besides, As I have formerly shewn (x), such imagind Accomplishment of this Express Character in this figurative sense thereof comes

(x) Vide p. 184.
comes short of it, as the true fifteenth Year of the reign of Tiberius in which John came preaching, doth not really correspond with the first year of the single week, or seventieth Week of this Prophecy, even in Dr. Prideaux's (y) own Hypothesis thereof.

But wherefore after all, should the prophetick Covenant be interpreted the Covenant of the Gospel, as it is in both the Hypotheses now immediately before us?—The Original word (x) is of general signification, and denoteth only at large a Covenant. And what immediate Covenant is here meant, as to that we cannot otherwise be surely guided than by the Context. But the great Purpose thereof being as we have already observ'd, and as we shall see more fully anon, all of it giv'n in a literal sense setting forth the final Destruction of Jerusalem, therefore the Covenant here predicted to be confirm'd, must necessarily be suppos'd as giv'n also in a sense relating to the said grand Purpose of this One week, and the more distinguished Half part thereof. Consequently the Covenant to be confirm'd in this Week could not possibly be the Gospel Covenant.

And therefore Mr. L. hath as ineffectually refer'd the accomplishment of this Express Character to the Messiah, and his Apostles, as Dr. Prideaux to the Messiah in the person of John the Baptist first, and after that in his own person. Even because it appears that the Covenant here predicted to be confirm'd could be no more the Gospel Covenant, than as it before appear'd, their Parties accomplishing were, or could be any of them the Parties here predicted to accomplish.

Nor, Secondly, Had the next prophetick Character in this Week, or the former of the two Characters of the Half part thereof, viz. the Causing Sacrifice, and Oblation to cease, its accomplishment in the death of the Messiah.

For the Sacrifice and Oblation of the Temple at Jerusalem can be said to have ceased there only VIRTUALLY; and to ALL EFFICACY at the death of Christ, as Dr. Prideaux (a) and Mr. L. (b) have both of them told us that they did. And Dr. Prideaux (c) hath also told us very truly that the Virtue, and Propitiation of this One Sacrifice hath sufficed for all ever since. We must readily allow it. We allow also in his words (d), that in the death of Christ the Sacrifices of the Temple were all absolutely, and finally extinguished for ever, so far forth I mean (e) as to any obligation upon Believers, and after his Resurrection his (f) Commission gave rise to the Christian Church. But, as we shall be presently convinced, 'tis not the sufficiency of Christ's meritorious Sacrifice of himself that...
himself on the Cross that we are here concern'd with; nor with the 
sealing of the Jewish Sacrifices, as to Virtue and Efficacy, and Obligation,
but with a literal sealing of the Sacrifices of the Temple. The Practice 
is one thing, the Obligation is another. But the Prophecy plainly 
refers us to the practice of Offering, because it being restrained to 
the Temple, it must also be restrained to the continuance of the 
Temple. And it appears (g) that for some Years after the death 
of Christ the Jews continued as a People and Nation in their City,
offering Sacrifices in the Temple, even 'till an end was put to all Sa-
crifice, and Oblation at Jerusalem, with the Destruction of the City,
and Temple. As to the 

Third Character of this One Week, or the latter of the two Cha-
racters of the Half Part thereof, I am prevented from saying any 
thing as to the Inaccomplishment of that in a figurative Sense: for 
'tis not supposed to have been accomplished otherwise than in the 
Letter of it both by Dr. Prideaux, and Mr. L. also. I may there-
fore proceed to shew, 

Secondly, Against the figurative Sense, and supposed accomplishment therein of the two preceding Characters, viz. that of the Begin-
ning of the One Week, and the former of the two Characters of the latter half Part thereof, that the Sense of the Prophecy in all of 
them is plainly not figurative, but literal. For 

First, The Sense of the express Character of the first seven Weeks 
of this Prophecy, viz. of rebuilding the Wall, and Streets of Jeru-
salem being literal, as I have formerly shewn, so also must be ne-
cessarily the Sense of these Characters of the Seventieth, or Last Week 
equally determined upon Jerusalem. For in all reason the Prophe-
cy ought to be received in the Letter of it alike in both Periods. 
As therefore the determined Restoration of Jerusalem in the begin-
ning of these Weeks was literally predicted, and fulfilled in the first 
Period of them, so no less her final Destruction in the end of them, 
in the accomplishment of the express Characters of the last Period of 
them, or the One Week, and more distinguished HALF PART 
of it. But 

Secondly, We have, I think, an undeniable Proof here of the lit-
teral Sense of all the express Characters now before us in the con-
fessed (b) literal Sense and Accomplishment of the last of them. 
This surely puts it out of Dispute, that the preceding Characters 
which stand along with it in One and the same Week, and especi-
ally the Character of ceasing Sacrifice and Oblation to cease, which 
stands with it immediately as a joint Character of the Half part 
of this Week, should also be meant in the same literal Sense. 
This necessarily determines a literal Sense equally to all of them. 

The

(g) From Josephus, who hath told us very particularly when the Daily Sacrifice of the 
Temple ceased to be offered. [See Christi 76 in the Table annex'd.] 

(b) Both 
by Dr. Pride, and Mr. L. as we shall see presently.
The learned Dr. Prideaux well knew (i) that this express Character was certainly meant in a literal Sense. And therefore he knew not how possibly to bring this, as before he had brought the preceding Characters in their imagin'd figurative Sense, to have their assign'd accomplishment in the Messiah. He was therefore constrain'd to give it its literal accomplishment by the Messiah's future People the Romans (k) long after. And this necessarily occasion'd his silently passing over this SOLEMN (l) Character in his Exposition of this Week, and the two preceding Characters in it, without any the least notice of this: As if it were not at all concern'd with the predicted Half Part of this One Week. But is not here one great Objection against Dr. Prideaux's Hypothesis in this part of it, viz. that it drops this latter Character of the distinguished Half Part of the Seventieth Week of this Prophecy? And is not such DROPPING of the said express Character a tacit Acknowledgment, as I just now observ'd, First, That as this Character is to be understood in a literal Sense, for it had confess'dly no other than a literal Accomplishment, so must the two preceding Characters be understood likewise? And, Secondly, That as this Character was also confess'dly fulfilled by the Romans, (the Messiah's future People) the next preceding Relative, so likewise those other two preceding Characters should equally refer to the said Party, and were accordingly to have their accomplishment by them? 

And these particulars equally concern Mr. L. as Dr. Prideaux. For in his Hypothesis (m), though this express Character be refer'd to the Messiah, yet the immediate Accomplishment of it is not assign'd to him: for Mr. L. makes the Messiah to fulfill this, not as in the two preceding Characters, in a figurative, but in a literal Sense; not personably, but by his future People the Romans: the Messiah ruling, presiding over, or influencing an Army of Idolaters, viz. the Romans bearing in their Ensigns the Images of their Gods: as are Mr. Lancaster's Words there (n).

But as this Matter of Fact was confess'dly in the Destruction of Jerusalem by the Roman Army in both these Hypotheses, it was also confess'dly in the Year of the V. AE. of Christ 70. But in both also the two preceding Characters are suppos'd to have been accomplish'd a great many Years before (o). Therefore as I am to shew

Thirdly, The several express Characters of this One Week had not in either of these Hypotheses their real accomplishment in point of the here predicted time for their respective accomplishment.

(i) From our Lord's referring [Mat. xxiv. 15. Mark xiii. 14.] his Disciples to the accomplishment of this express Character in the final Destruction of Jerusalem; as Dr. Frid. himselfe understand it. [Con. Hist. p. 295 in fine.] (k) Viz. in Christ 70, under Titus beginning Jerusalem with their Ensigns, the ABOMINATION of DESTRUCTION, etc. [ib.] (l) For so our blest Lord's immediate Notice of it most surely made it. [See Gratios in Mat. xxiv. 15.] (m) P. 6. (n) P. 7. (o) Viz. either in Christ 33, as in Dr. Prideaux's Hypothesis, or in Christ 36, as in Mr. Lancaster's: As we shall see more particularly presently.
Of the One Week, and Half Part thereof,

To state the matter clearly in these Hypotheses in point of time, the Accomplishment of the several express Characters of the One Week, and latter Half Part thereof will stand

In Dr. Prideaux's thus,

1. The Messiah by John the Baptist began (p) to confirm the Covenant of the Gospel, (the express Character of the Beginning of the One Week) with many of the Jews, in

2. The Messiah began to cause Sacrifice and Oblation to cease, (the former of the two express Characters of the latter Half Part of this Week) by his appearing (q) personally in the Ministry of the Gospel, in

3. The Roman Armies caused the Abomination of Desolation (the latter of the two express Characters of the latter Half Part of this Week) to stand in the Holy Place (s) in the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, in

The Accomplishment of the said express Characters in our present View will

In Mr. Lancaster's Hypothesis stand thus.

1. The Seventieth Week began (r) in

The Messiah in the beginning thereof entering on his Ministry, made a firm Covenant by himself for three Years and a Half, with many of the Jews (r).

2. In the middle of it by an Act peculiar to himself, viz. by his death on the Cross, He caused Sacrifice and Oblation to cease (w).

3. The Seventieth Week ended, the Messiah having from the time of his death confirm'd the Covenant with many of the Jews, and with them only by his Apo.

Noles for three Years and a Half, (w) in

3. The Messiah brought over a Wing of Abominations, i.e. the Roman Armies bearing in their Ensigns the Images of their Gods, (x) in

Now

(q) Ib. P. 295, 296.
(i) Ib. P. 295, 296.
(w) Ib.
(x) P. 7.
Now in both these Hypotheses there is evidently a Separation of Accomplishment of these express Characters in point of their predicted Time. Such as is most directly contrary to the Prophetick appropriation of them in this respect: As in the Text they are all of them manifestly appropriated to ONE, and the SAME WEEK, or Compass of SEVEN YEARS in this Prophecy.

The Text is express here as to such appropriation.

V. 27, He shall make a firm Covenant with Many in (y) ONE Week, and in the HALF (z) Part of that Week He shall cause the Sacrifice and oblation to cease, and also (a) the ABOMINATION of DESOLATION to stand in the Holy Place. These two Characters of the Half Part of this Week being evidently coupled (b) together, therefore they must necessarily have had their joint accomplishment in it. And ONE Week, or SEVEN Years, as we just now noted, are expressly the Time in the Prophecy determined for the accomplishment of all, or every one of the threefold remarkable Characters of it.—— But is it thus in their respective accomplishments in either of the two Hypotheses now before us?—— Evidently it is not.—— The only one of the three express Characters, viz. the last of them, is in the true literal Sense, and accomplishment thereof placed in Christi 70: in the final subversion of Jerusalem.—Therefore in point of time, either then, or within seven Years from thence, the two preceding Characters in agreement with the Prophecy ought to have had their accomplishment also: even as being express Characters of one, and the same Week determined upon Daniel’s People, and Holy City. But to give those preceding Characters their accomplishment to the times of the Messiah, as in both these Hypotheses above set down, is surely to anticipate them, or to give them their accomplishment in times to which they do not belong: nor possibly can they, because they are times so long before the Time of the Seventieth Week, or the Time of the Holy City, to which they all equally belong, was come for their accomplishment.
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(y) So V. L. and Syr. Version. So Manurf and Pagnin. Indeed to Dr. Prideaux and Mr. Lancaster.

(z) The full accomplishment of the two express Characters of the Half Week in the end of the One Week demonstrates that it was the latter Half of it. But the said two Characters are therefore immediately appropriated to the said Half Part, or three Years and half before their actual Accomplishments, as the Cause finally accomplishing (v.c. the Romans) then immediately began to operate, and incessantly was to continue more or less operating during the said predicted term, till it ended with the actual accomplishment of the said express Characters: As the Movers of Fact shew that it did In Christi 70. The Particulars appear in the Table annex’d, viz. in Christi 67, and 70: the beginning and ending of the HALF Week, and therein the ending of the whole.

(a) To give it here in our blessed Savio’s Words, in his immediate Interpretation of this Prophetick Character, by Name referring to the Prophet Daniel, Mat. xxiv. 17. Mark xiii. 14.

(b) So the Greek Version is το τοιούτων τος ἢδορμοντες ὁμο

ηθέλεται παίνειν καὶ σταίροντες ἐκατ' ἐπανάλημμα λήγειν ἔρημον:—— So the V. L. in dimidio Hedonamdis desicet Hœma, & Sacrificium, & Eurit in Temple Abominatio Desolationum.—— So also the Arabick Version, In dimidio Hedonamdis annetor Sacrificium esse, εἰς θάμνον μελέμ; ET 侄ες γε Θαμαντονιον Desolationis.
It is in truth no other than to exclude this Seventieth Week from being one of the Seventy Weeks in this Prophecy (c) determined upon Jerusalem: the time whereof could not possibly be come before, or could not possibly have been expired but in, or with the full accomplishment of all these express Characters in the One Week, or seven Years immediately preceding, and ending in her final Destruction. For Seventy Weeks being determined upon her, that is, as we have shewn Seven Weeks, for her thorough restoration, and rebuilding after her Destruction by the Babylonians; and therefore and two Weeks following for her cutting off the Messiah, after the expiration of them; and consequently One Week more, or a SINGLE (d) Week remaining for her utter Ruin, and Destruction; therefore the said One Week, though a Week separate, or in reckoning discontinued from the rest, as ending in Christ's 70, and therefore beginning in Christ's 63 (dd) could however be no other than One of the seventy Weeks determined upon Jerusalem: even because otherwise seventy Weeks which were determined upon her, had not been also accomplished upon her. But that determined upon her in the said single Week, and Seventieth Week of this Prophecy evidently displayed it itself in an exact accomplishment of its predicted Events, as they were all accomplished in the beginning, proceeds, and conclusion of it. And Events, as Dr Prideaux (e) hath well observ'd, are sure Comments upon the Text: their Completion fully verifying their Prediction.

Hence is plainly discoverable the palpable Error of all current, or continued Reckonings of the seventy Weeks of this Prophecy. Hence is equally demonstrable the absolute Necessity of a discontinued Reckoning of this last Week of it. Which Week, as it was a detach'd Week, it was sufficient that it should be known by its Characters: and by them it is so remarkably distinguished, as that it could not but be known, and discern'd in their seal of accomplishment (f).

Indeed had there not been such actual Events, all and every of them in fact either preceding, or ending in the Destruction of Jerusalem in this One Week, and the more distinguished HALF PART thereof, such Events I mean, as in their own Nature are immediately corresponding with the Prophetick Events, in the very Letter of them, and in their respective accomplishments exactly agreeing with these Prophetick Times determined for their accomplishment, there

(c) v. 24. (d) For so the Hebrew Word מָה may be most properly translated here, and so it truly importeth in the following places of Scripture, vix. Zech. xxvi. 20. 2 Sam. vii. 25. 2 Chron. xviii. 7. (dd) As it may be seen in the Table annexed. (e) Con. Hist. p. 306. (f) Our blest Saviour had not otherwise refer'd his Disciples to the Prophet Daniel for a SIGN, whereby they should know of a certainty when the END of the Jewish Church and State was certainly come. He refer'd them particularly to the last of the three Characters, as it was the very last determined to be fulfilled in the last of Daniel's seventy Weeks. And it was surely not in vain that when our Saviour quoted the Prophet, He added, He that readeth, Let him understand.
of this Prophecy.

there had not then been such evident Proof, as there is in favour of the late Bishop's Hypothesis in this part of it. But whereas in the said Destruction of Jerusalem there were in fact such particular Events directly answering to the several express Characters of the Text, and whereas the same were exactly accomplished in entire Correspondence to the precise Time of seven Years (in some or other part thereof) predicted in the Prophecy for their accomplishment; then 'tis plain, that such evident Proof there is of what we here urge it in favour of. And no small stress surely ought to be laid upon such exactness of Completion, as it unanswerably proves the accomplishment of the express Characters of this One, or Single Week, and Half Part thereof as predicted in the Prophecy to be referable in respect of Sense, not to a figurative, but a literal Sense; in respect of Party, not to the Messiah, but to his People; in point of Time, not to any Times preceding the final destruction of Jerusalem, but to the immediate Time thereof.

Therefore in few words, and to sum up the whole, do we read in general in this Prophecy (v. 26.) that the Messiah's future People the Romans were to be the immediate Instruments of God's Vengeance upon Jerusalem, when the Day, or Season of her Visitation was come for it, even the time therein determined for the Destroying of the City, and Sanctuary?—The matter of fact in full accomplishment evidently proves that they were accordingly the effectual Executioners of the divine displeasure against that People, and Nation. (g)

Do we read more particularly in what follows in this Prophecy, that they were to make a firm Covenant with many People in this One Week?—The Event shews that it was in the Beginning of it, when the Romans did actually make such a Covenant with many of their Neighbouring Nations (b). And a firm (i) Covenant it was, as by the Prophecy it was to be (k); and that as near as it can be guessed, made also much about the distance of one of these Prophetick Weeks, reckoning back from the final destruction of Jerusalem up to it; to the demonstrating the sure beginning of this Week in Chrifhi 63. But for particulars, I beg leave to refer the Reader to the Table annexed.

Moreover is the latter (l) Half Part of this Week more remarkably distinguished with the predicted accomplishment of two express Characters (m) or noted Events thereof conjoined with the utter, and final Destruction of the Jewish Oeconomy, as predicted in this Prophecy?—The Matters of fact in evident accomplishment of both such express Characters of it, shew plainly that

(g) See the Table annex'd. ———— The Jews themselves conceived this of the Romans; John xi. 48. If we let him [our Saviour Christ] thus alone, all Men will believe on him; and the Romans shall come, and take away our Place, and Nation.
(b) See the Table annexed in Chrifhi 63. (i) See ib. in Chrifhi 64.
(l) v. 27. (l) For to the accomplishment of its express Characters proves it to have been. (m) As before-mention'd.
no part of this solemn Prophecy is giv'n in vain; but as every part
of it hath its significance, so every part of it had also its exact Com-
pletion.

For is it here predicated that the Romans in this distinguished Half
part of this Week should cause the daily Sacrifice, and Oblations to
cease in the Temple; and moreover, that they should set up upon it
the Standards of their Legions, those idolatrous Images under which they
marched, and as such were an Abomination to the Jews, and by rea-
sion of the great and heavy Defolations now wrought under them,
were truly the Abominations of Defolation here spoken of?—These
things hapned accordingly in the time here immediately predicted
for their accomplishment: the final Caufe of them more immediately
beginning to actuate in the beginning of the latter Half (n)
Part of this Week, and thenceforward incessantly actuating, (and
therefore no wonder that in the Prophecy it is more eminently dis-
tinguised,) till the full completion in, and with it of its pre-
dicted Events (o); even 'till the Abomination of Defolation spoken of
by Daniel the Prophet flood in the Holy Place (p). All which par-
culars may be seen distinctly in the Table.

And as therein was accomplished the sure Sign giv'n by our Lord
to his Disciples (q), whereby they should infallibly know when the
time was finally, and irreversibly come that now Jerusalem should
be no more, so this Sign immediately accomplished on the Temple
was accordingly followed soon after with the taking of the
lower, then of the upper City (r): and with a most full and
exact completion of our Lord's express Prophecies both of City,
and Temple. For did our Lord expressly declare concerning the
Temple (s) that there should not be left in it ONE STONE upon
ANOTHER that should not be THROWN down?—-This
was now literally, and most exactly fulfilled; Turnus Rufus
with a plough Share tearing up the Foundation of the Temple, and
leaving no part of it, not so much as under Ground undiscovered (t).

And did our Lord also prophetically declare (u) concerning the
City, that it should be laid even with the Ground,—-and that
her Enemies should not leave in her ONE STONE upon ANO-
THER?——- even thus it was with Jerusalem in this the Day
of her final Visitation (w): the Romans drawing the Plough over
the Ground on which both the City, and the Temple had stood;
hereby

(n) When Josephus enter'd into the Jewish War. See the Table annexed in Chrifti
67.
(o) See ib. in Chrifti 70.
(p) Mat. xxiv. 15. Mark xiii. 14.
(q) Ib.
(r) See the Table.
(s) Mat. xxiv. 2. Mark xiii. 2.
(u) V. Grot. and Ham. in Mat. xxiv. 2.
(v) Luke xix. 44.
(w) Erat id quidem verum & de urbe, quae & ipsa, ut Josephus lo-
quusus, praebet in ibidem a mpsu et ab ipso fundamentis erat eft, pau-
cius terribus exceptis in monumentum victoriam, & Muri parte, quae Valler vice etfet Roma-
se militi. [Vide Jos. delib. Jud. viii. 18, & Theod. Hist. iii. 20.] Sed propri de
Templi qvit Chrifti, quondam dirum eft, nulla ejus parte servata. [Grot. in Mat.
xxiv. 2,]——- Thus Maimonides, Tan.ii. c.5; Turnus Rufus impius aratro Tem-
plum fodit, & circumiacentia, ut illud adimpleirentur, Sion ut Ager arabiur; Ablab iii. 14.
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hereby shewing that they meant this to be a FINAL Destruction, such as had been here predicted by our Lord, and had been before in this Prophecy of Daniel (x).

Thus ALL THESE THINGS were fulfilled (y). And Heaven and Earth might sooner have passed away, than the Words of the Son of God concerning Jerusalem (z) : Or than that determined upon Her in this Prophecy of the Seventy Weeks deliver'd by the Angel of God to his Servant the Prophet Daniel.

Every the most minute Circumstance determined upon her was, as we have seen, exactly accomplished to the making her an utter Desolation : in her being thus trodden down, and possessed by the Gentiles (a).

And so the once Holy City, Strangers became Lords of it; and Strangers still are, and will continue to be so, till such time, as is fully completed that which follows in this Prophecy, in the end of the twenty seventh Verse. For not only unto the end of the War, Desolations were determined (b), as we read in the end of the twenty sixth Verse; but also as in the last Words of this Prophecy, even until the Consummation (c), and that determined should be poured out (as in our Translation) upon the Desolate, viz. upon the Jews; or, (as the original Word may also be translated,) upon the Desolator ; that is, the Gentile People of the Roman Empire, by whom Jerusalem was destroyed. For according to our blessed Saviour's prophetick Declaration, [Luke xxi. 24.] The Jews were (not only) to fall by the edge of the [Roman] Sword (d), but also to be led away captive (e) into all Nations; [so much concerns the DESOLATE] until the times (f) of the Gentiles be fulfilled; (and this respects the DESOLATOR:) even the times in which God will permit the Gentiles to possess the Jesus Land, and until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in : as are St Paul's Words, Rom-

(x) And therefore God now putting an end to this Dispensation, no wonder that the Jews could never rebuild their Temple, though as Ammiannus Marcellinus a heathen Historian tells us it was attempted by the Jews several times ; but whenever they went about to lay the Foundation, Fire broke out of the Foundation and consumed the Workmen.

(y) Mat. xxiv. 34. Mark xiii. 30. (z) Mat. xxiv.

35. Mark xiii. 31. (a) Luke xxi. 24. 24. (b) And how great, and terrible they were, Jophenus hath informed us in the 7th Book of his Jewish Wars.

(c) Or the time appointed. [Dan. xi. 36.] (d) And how remarkably they did so before, and in, after the Siege and taking of Jerusalem; witness Jophenus in his prodigious Account of the Slaughter of the Jews from time to time by the Roman Army, or by their own Tumults and Seditions. Such vast numbers of them were destroyed, and many of them in so dreadful a manner, as made it visible that there was Wrath upon this People.-----Titis iepi [apud Philostratum in Vita Apollinis] siebat post victori-

am m6a words, &c.---- Non fumum hoc opusuisse, fed IRATT DBI. [Grot. in Mat. 24. 16.] I cannot on this occasion, but refer the Reader as to Jophenus himself in the first place, so in the next to Arch-Bishop Thilstone's fifth, and sixth excellent Sermons on 2 Cor. iv. 3. 4. wherein he particularly considetrs, and shews the accomplishmment of our Saviour's general Prediction of the Siege, and total Destruction of Jerusalem, and the Temple.

(e) And the accomplishment hereof needeth not to be proved : We see the Effect of it to this Day: As the Jews still remain as scatters'd Monuments of the Destruction of Jerusalem, and the fierce Wrath which God executed upon them for the crucifying of Christ.

(f) See Daniel vii. 25. xii. 7. Rev. xii. 14.
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xi. 25. And when this fulness of the Gentiles is come in, then as the Apostle tells us, v. 26. The Redeemer shall come out of Sion, and All Israel shall be saved.

This fulness of the Gentiles, in the words of our learned Mr Mede (g), whatsoever the Apostle here meaneth by it, is yet to come. Indeed the whole which there follows in this judicious Author's Observation on this Phrase of the Apostle is most worthy of the Readers Remark: and therefore I cannot do better than to transcribe it; and also to end this Treatise with it.

Some, (in faith he) think that St Paul in this place, (viz. of Rom. xi. 15.) hath reference to that Speech of Christ, Luke xxi. 24. where he foretells, that the Jews should fall by the edge of the Sword, and be led Captive into all Nations, and Jerusalem should be trodden down of the Gentiles, untill the times of the Gentiles should be fulfilled, or accomplished. But it seems to me that the fulness of the Gentiles, and the fulfilling, or accomplishing of their Times should not be the same, however they may be coincident. It should rather seem that our Saviour hath reference as to a thing known, unto the Prophecy of Daniel, where the Times of the Gentiles, or the Times where- in the Gentiles should have Dominion, with the Misery and Subjection of the Jewish Nation are set forth in the Vision of a forefold Image, and four Beasts, which are the FOUR MONARCHIES: the Babylonian, Persian, Greek, and Roman. The first began with the first Captivity of the Jewish Nation, and through the times of all the rest they should be in Subjection, or in a worser Estate under them. But when their Times should be accomplished; then, faith Daniel, [ch. vii, 18.] The Saints of the most high God shall take the Kingdom, and possess the Kingdom for ever and ever: that is, there shall be no more Kingdoms after it, but it shall continue as long as the World shall endure. Three of these Monarchies were past when our Saviour spake; and the fourth was well enter'd. If then by Saints there are meant the Jews; which we know are called The Holy People, in that Sense their Country is still called The Holy Land, and their City in the Scripture The Holy City, viz. relatively; then it is plain enough what Daniel's; and our Saviour's words import, namely, a glorious Re-vocation, and Kingdom of the Jews, when the time of the fourth Monarchy which then remained, should be expir'd, and accomplish-

But if here by the Saints of the most High are in general meant the Church, yet by coincidence of time the same will fall out on the Jews behalf; because St Paul faith that at the time when the fulness of the Gentiles shall come in, the Jews shall be again restored. [Rom. xi. 25.]

By

(g) In the end of his 36th Discourse [viz. upon Jerem. x. xi.] p. 147. Sube-

Ed. 3.
By way of Conclusion, adds this great Man, *The last Limb of the fourth Monarchy is in Daniel*, [ch. vii. 8, 25.] the Horn with Eyes, which spake proud things against the most High, which should continue a Time, Times, and Half a Time, *that is, a Year, Years, and half a Year.* In the Revelation [ch. xiii. 1, 5.] It is the Beast with so many Heads and Horns, full of Names of Blasphemy, *which was to continue forty two Months; the same Period* with the former, *which was expressed by Times, or Years; and the same time with a thousand two hundred, and sixty Days of the Church remaining in the Wilderness.* [Rev. xii. 6.]

When these Times, *(WHATSOEVER THEY BE, faith Mr Mede)* shall be ended, *then is also ended* the Period of the TIMES of the GENTILES, *and of the JEWS Misery, whereunto our Saviour seems to refer in the Gospel.* Then, *by St Paul, shall the FULNESS of the GENTILES enter in:* Then, *faith Daniel, [as in the former place, v. 18. of the seventh Chapter, so also in verse the twenty seventh] shall the Kingdom, and Dominion, and the Greatness of the Kingdom under the whole Heaven be giv’n to the People of the SAINTS of the most High; whose Kingdom is an EVERLASTING KINGDOM,* and All Dominions shall SERVE and OBEY Him.

In an assured hope, and comfortable expectation of which blessed enlargement of Christ’s KINGDOM, and CHURCH by the coming in of the fulness of the GENTILES, and by the Conversion of the JEWS, as by these, and divers other holy Scriptures we are taught to possess our Souls, so more particularly, and immediately are we taught to pray for it in that most excellent Collect of our Church for Good-Friday: With which I desire therefore to shut up this Treatise, nothing doubting of every pious Reader’s concurring in such ever seasonable, and charitable Petition unto thee,

O merciful God, who hast made all Men, and hatest nothing that thou hast made, nor wouldst the death of a Sinner, but rather that he should be converted, and live; that in thy good appointed time thou wouldst be pleas’d to have Mercy upon all Jews, Turks, Infidels, and Hereticks; and take from them all Ignorance, hardness of Heart, and contempt of thy Word; And so fetch them Home, blessed Lord, to thy Flock, that they may be saved among the Remnant of the true Israelites, and be made one Flock under one Shepherd, Jesus Christ our Lord, who liveth and reigneth with thee, and the Holy Spirit, One God, world without end. Amen.
A Chronological TABLE, SHE W I N G

The particular Matters of Fact, or Accomplishment of the Express Characters, of the Seven Years of the Single Week, (v. 27.) that is the Last of the Seventy Weeks (v. 24.) of this Prophecy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roman Emperors and Consuls</th>
<th>Years of the Single Week</th>
<th>Years of the V. E. of Christ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here it is to be shewed from what Year, Month, and Day we are to date the beginning of this ONE or SINGLE Prophetick Week.

The precise Ending of it in the accomplishment of the latter of the two Characters of the latter HALF Part of it is known to have been at the setting up of the Abomination of Desolation, viz, the Roman Idolatrous Standards (a) on the Temple, on the 18th Day of August (b) in the Year of the V. E. of Christ 70.

From thence it is not hard to climb up to the beginning of that Year, as by reckoning upward 360 Days, we shall be brought to August the sixteenth of the year 69, for the beginning of the last year of this Week. Thence if we go up 360 days yearly for six years higher, and allow for the Leap Days within the Period; or which of the two is the easier way, if we throw out five Days in every ordinary year, and six Days in every Bissextile, or Leap year, as it will appear here below; by these Steps we shall come up at length to the seventeenth Day of September, in the Julian year of the V. E. of Christ 63.

Therefore that Day is here set down in this Table for the time of the beginning of Daniel's SINGLE WEEK; or the ONE remaining Week of this Prophecy. Within the compass of which Week all those things happened relating to the City, and Sanctuary, that are recorded in the two last Verses of it.

September 17th, began the Single Week appointed of God for the destruction of the Holy City, and therein for the dissolving of the Jewish Church. [Dan. ix. 26, 27.]

In this Week the Romans, the People (c) here pre-

(a) As the Words have been above explain'd.
(b) As we shall see anon from Josephus.
(c) As above shewn.
To the last Week of this Prophecy.

predicted to destroy the City and Sanctuary were to make a FIRM COVENANT with Many. [Dan. ix. 27.]

Accordingly they did so in this very year; and also as near as it can be judged, at this very time of the year: their General Corbulon now making PEACE with the Kings of the Parthians, Medes, and Armenians. (d)

September 10. Ended this Prophetick Year.

Sept. 11. Began the Second Year of this Week.

Of this Year Tacitus faith (e), that there never was so FIRM a PEACE as now. His Words are HAUD ALIAS TAM IMMOTA PAX. Which Words of the Historian do most fully explain those of the Prophet, concerning the Messiah's People, he shall make a FIRM COVENANT (f).

And Tacitus had great reason to say this. For tho' this Peace was made when he was very young, yet when he writ this, which was about 40 Years after, he saw that in all that time the Romans had never open War with any of those Kings, or their Successors.

Sept. 5. Ended this Prophetick Year.

Sept. 6. Began the Third Year of this Week.

In this Year, according to the Conditions of that PEACE which had been made as above in the Year 63, Teridates, King of Armenia, and his Queen took a nine Months Journey to Rome, in order to lay down his Crown at Nero's Feet. (g)

All the other Kings sent their Sons Hostages to Rome, with him (b).

Aug. 31. Ended this Prophetick Year.

(d) Tacitus Annal. xvi. 28. -- 31. -- Who will gainsay it, that the Almighty Providence of the great Disposer of Kingdoms, and Nations did not this ordain, that the Romans might have their hands freer for the executing the great work upon the Jews, she now had for them to do upon that People in the latter Part of this Week? (e) Annal. xv. 46. (f) As the Words have been above explain'd. (g) Tacitus Annal. xvi. 23.

(b) Dion Lib. livii.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of the</th>
<th>66</th>
<th>Sept. 1. Began the Fourth Year of this Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roman Emperors</td>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>In this Year Tertullus lay'd down his Crown at Nero's Feet, and receiv'd it again at his Hands (I).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07. 13. Began his 15th Annum.</td>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Also JANUS his Temple was shut in Token of GENERAL PEACE (k).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Sept. 1. Began the Fourth Year of this Week</td>
<td>67. Feb. 28. Began the HALF Part of this Week to which are immediately appropriated the two Prophetick EXPRESS CHARACTERS of causing SACRIFICE and OBLATION to CEASE; and the ROMAN IDOLATROUS (and therefore by the Jews ABOMINATED) Standards to be set up on the TEMPLE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.</td>
<td>Pontius Pilatus</td>
<td>And therefore the said Express Characters are thereunto especially appropriated, as the final Cause of their Accomplishment began more immediately to operate now in the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(I) Tacitus Annal. xvi. 24. Dion lxii.

(k) As it appears from some Coins of his struck on this occasion. But this Peace was no other than what had been actually concluded before, viz. in the year 63. And the immediate Solemnity of the shutting of JANUS his Temple, Nero might purportly have deferred 'till the coming of Tertullus to Rome, as above.
God had indeed permitted the Roman Army under Cæcilius to attack Jerusalem in the year before, viz. in Chrifi 66; when that General entered the lower City with his Forces, and then advanced to the higher City, and lay down before the Palace. At which time according to Josephus [Bel. Jud. ii. 20.] if he had but made an assault, he might have speedily carried the Place, and so put an END to the War. But instead of doing so, he desisted from any farther enterprise at that time,—And yet about six Days after, he made an assault upon the Temple, and that successively, as that he was going to set fire to the Gates: but after all, instead of proceeding to do so, he gave over his enterprise all on the sudden, without any apparent Reason.—— *Josephus* partly accounts for it from the interest of the General, and the Bribery, and Corruption of the Officers for the protracting of the War. But however these might Influence, as second Causes, yet doublets that Historian hath assign'd the much more certain cause here: as he hath also told us, that *God being angry with the Jews, would not permit it, but refer'd them for a greater, and sadder Destruction.* And well might Josephus reflect thus, First, because had Jerusalem now so easily fall'n into the hands of the Romans in the compass only of a few Days (for it was upon the fourth day after Cæcilius his appearing before Jerusalem, that he made the first attempt, and about five days after the second) the Jews had not in that cause futter'd those direful Calamities which our Lord had predicted concerning Jerusalem in the Day of her Visitation, as recorded by the several Evangelists, and which had been also foretold, so long since as even by Moses, Deut. xxviii.

49——57.

The Jews themselves have acknowledg'd that the fulfilling of this Prophecy was to be at the destruction of their City by Titus. [See Maimon ben Israel, de term. Vit. iii. 3.] And on this Prophecy our blessed Saviour doublets reflect'd, as when we read [Luke xxiii. 28.] He said to the Children of Jerusalem, Weep not for me, but weep for your selves, and for your Children: for behold the Days are coming in which they shall say, Blessed are the Barren and the Wombs that never bare, and the Paps that never gave Milk. These Words are no other than the foremention'd Verse of that Prophecy of Moses, which speaks of the tender, and delicate Woman's eating her own young Child for hunger secretly in the Siege. Which Fact *Josephus* tells us was most remarkably fulfilled in that Siege in which he was present. [Bel. Jud. vii. 8.] And there also [ch. 17.] he tell us of above 2000 Men, among whom, were two of the most bloody Zealots of all the Jewish Nation, that had hid themselves in the bottom of several Jakes to escape the hands of the Romans. These, no doubt, were intended in those Words of our Saviour [Luke xxiii. 30.] foretelling of those who should cry to the Mountains, and to the Hills to fall on them, and cover them from the dreadful Judgment of God. And

Secondly, Another Cause assignable here, viz. why God would not permit the City and Temple to be taken by the Romans at that time; is this, viz. Because though Cæcilius his Attempts upon Jerusalem were now indeed within the ONE WEEK determined upon Her, yet they were in a time preceding, and therefore exclusive of the distinguisht latter HALF Part of the Week, more immediately in the Prophecy before us set apart for her utter Destruction: As Cæcilius's Expedition and Assault hapned in the Year 66, and some Months before the February in which the HALF Part of this Week began.

That Jerusalem could not be destroyed before the S I N G L E, or seventieth Week of this Prophecy was come, it is certain, because there was first necessarily to precede an Universal Publication of the GOSPEL. Mat. xxiv. 14. This Gospel of the Kingdom shall be preached in all the World. But this was not accomplished till the Year 62, the Year preceding that in which began the last Week of this Prophecy. Then the Gospel was published all over the Roman Empire: and this is what is meant by the WORLD in the same Sense that Apocryphus is said by St. Luke to have taxed all the World. It is the Thrae which the Romans constantly used, calling the Roman Empire, Imperium Orbis Terrarum. And that the Gospel was by this time thus published, we have the Testimony of St. Paul, Col. i. 23.] when he writ that Epistle, viz. in Chrifi 62. [Porson On. p. 100.] It was by this time preached, for a Witness unto All Nations, of the unanswerable Obininary of the Jews: and then, and therefore not before, should the END come, viz. the ONE WEEK spoken of by Daniel the Prophet for the Destruction of Jerusalem, and the Jewish Commonwealth. But till the Immediate Accomplishment hereof could not be put in, and with the Latter HALF Part of this Week, because the particular Events, or EXPRESS CHARACTERS thereof concomitant of, or conjoined with that Destruction, are immediately in the Prophecy appropriated to the HALF Part of that Week.—— No wonder therefore that Cæcilius did no more than as we have seen.
...as yet the Day was not come upon her, when according to our Saviour's Prophecy [Luke xix. 43.] Her Enemies should cast a Trench about her, and compass her round, and keep her in on every side. Therefore we find nothing more than an advancement of the Roman Army under Caesar before Jerusalem, and a sudden Assault, or two, as above; but under Titus in Christi 70 there was a formal, and indeed a surprizingly quick Opening of the Trenches, [See Jef. bel. Jud. 1. c. 12, and their on Mat. xxiv. 17] even in the space of three Days: and then was most truly, and properly fulfilled that of our Lord, as recorded by St. Luke, [xxvi. 20.] viz. Jerusalem its being Compassed with Armies. So that it seems as if the eiscopal Providence of God permitted the coming of Caesar before Jerusalem merely by way of Anticipation, as all the Christians then at Jerusalem, even to a Man, are said to have been gone away before Titus's coming, and sitting down before the City. [See Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib.iii. c. 5, and Epiph. de Pond. & Men. c. 15, and Dr. Hammond, Annot. p. 123.] They might now think of what our Lord had discoursed with them concerning the Destitution of Jerusalem, and conclude that the time was then come for it, applying the accomplishment of our Lord's Sign [Luke xxii. 20.] to the appearing of that Army, and conforming our Lord's Warning for Flight to themselves only at Jerusalem. But this Flight of theirs could be only by Anticipation of our Lord's Sign, unless it could be certainly made out, that the Sign mention'd by St. Luke did refer to the sitting down of Caesar before Jerusalem. But that the learned Gracious [in loc. Sup. cit.] hath most properly refer'd to Titus, as having its full accomplishment ONLY by him. However evidently the Coming of Caesar could not be the Interpretation, nor the Accomplishment of the Sign which Christ quotes from Daniel the Prophet, as recorded by St. Matthew, and St. Mark: of which I shall have occasion to speak more anon. [Viz. in the next Note b] And there is One thing more which seems plainly to determine here, viz. the Extenton of our Lord's Warning to flee upon the accomplishment of the Sign given in all the forecited Evangelists, the same is not particular, or confin'd to Jerusalem, as we shall see also anon [Viz. ch. 18.] but in general, and relating to all the Christians throughout Judea, and yet remaining in it; as doubtfull there were numbers of them at the time of the taking, and burning of the Temple by the Romans: for whole GENERAL Preservation our Lord was concern'd, [even as being his ELECT, Mat. xxiv. 22.] by giving them Warning forthwith to quit that whole Country, which was then surely giv'n up to the Roman Fire and Sword, as they might then of a certainty know and understand that it was to giv'n up, when they saw THAT actually fulfilled in the FINAL Destitution of the Temple, which he had quoted to them from the Prophet Daniel.
this time Vespasian enter'd into War with the Jews, being sent by Nero for that purpose.

It was between Winter and Spring, according to Josephus. (m)

And this War, as it was of three years, and a half continuance, it did therein sufficiently distinguish the HALF Part of this Week, as being what was therein incessantly more, or less causing from the beginning of it, and in the end thereof actually did cause those two remarkable EXPRESS CHARACTERS of it to be accomplished together with the final destruction of the Temple, and City of Jerusalem.

Aug. 26. Ended this Prophetick Year.

Aug. 27. Began the fifth year of this Week.

In this year Vespasian went on with the War, and subdued all Galilee. (n)

Aug. 20. Ended this Prophetick Year.

(n) Bel. Jude iii. 4. or in Edit. Huds. p. 1168.

(m) IV. 4. or in Edit. Huds. p. 1168.
Aug. 21 Began the Sixth Year of this Week.
In this Year the Change in the Empire [See the outer Column] caus'd a slackning of the War with the Jews (o).
And yet in this Year, Vespasian reduced all the rest of Palestine, except Jerusalem, and three or four strong Holds in Perea (p).

Aug. 15 Ended this Prophetick Year.

Aug. 16 Began the Seventh and Last Year of Daniel's Single Week.
In this Year, Vespasian pursuing the hopes of the Empire, left the War in Palestine to his Son Titus, who prosecuted it vigorously. (q)

A little before the Passover, which this Year was on April 13, Titus began the Siege of Jerusalem: according to Josephus, (r) who was present at it, He therein shut up an innumerable Company of People that were come thither to the Feast. There were reckoned 1100000 of them to have died in the

---

(r) VI. 2. Or in Ed. Huds. p. 1215.
the Siege, and in the taking of the Temple, and of the City; and 97000 taken Captive (i).

July 17th (t) The DAILY SACRIFICE and OBLATION ceased: wherein was accomplished the former of the two Express Characters of the distinguished HALF Part of this Week: And thereby an End was put to the Worship of God in his Temple.

Aug. 10th, The Temple was set on fire (u).

And then at the very juncture of its Desolation, even while it was in Flames, the Roman Soldiers (w) set up on the Battlements of the outer Wall thereof, the ABOMINATION of DESOLATION spoken of by Daniel the Prophet (x), viz. the Standards of their Legions under which they now made Desolation, and therefore said to be the Abomination of Desolation, as every Standard had painted on it the IMAGE of the Tutelar God of that Legion (y): to which the Romans sacrificed (z) after their idolatrous manner, as they stood erected upon the HOLY PLACE (a). Wherein was

(i) See bel. Ind. vii. 17, or in Edit. Huds. p. 1291.
(ii) vii. 4, or in Edit. Huds. p. 1266. και τον δεπακινακα των ἐνδεξαθήσεων καὶ ὕμνον καταβαινών τῆς σταυροῦ τῆς ἡμέρας εἰς τὸν τότε προερήτητον. The Divisions and Diffractions of the Jews were now so great: and such their imminent danger from the Romans, as would not give them liberty to attend to their accustomed Sacrifices. And probably they might be also frightened for want of Victims.

(a) vii. 13. Or in Edit. Huds. p. 1283. It was set on fire by a Private Soldier, contrary to the inclination and command of Titus, who used great endeavours to have saved it, hazing his own Perdon to have quenched the Flames; but all in vain; and no wonder, as a greater than Titus had now irreversibly done; it to Athens. It is Josephus his Observation that the Soldiers set it on fire, divino quodam modo impetu.

(v) καταρρίφας τῇ ἐς τὸν ναὸν καὶ τῶν περί τέως ἀπόστατος, καταρρίφας τῇ ἐς τὸ κτίσμα Σύμμαχου τῆς ἔντολης τῆς ἠρματάς εἰς τὸν τότε τότε προερήτητον. Σάν τις ἀντίς ἄντις, [Bel. Ind. vii. 13, or in Edit. Huds. p. 1283.] (x) As our Lord's Words are, Mat. xxiv. 15. (y) Josephus [Antiq. xvii. 7.] tells us that when Vitellius Governor of Syria, was going to pass through Judaea with a Roman Army against the Arabians, some of the principal Jews met him, and begged him earnestly to lead his Army another way, because they could not bear the Sight of those Images, which the Romans had painted on their ENSIGNS.

Note w.
was most fully accomplished (b) the latter solemn Express Chari-

Even in this immediate Matter of Fact, as now our blessed Saviour's predicted Con-
sequence in the accomplishment of this SIGN giv'n to his Disciples, as the immedi-
ate fore-runner, and sure sign concomitant of the final Destruction of the Jewish Church
and Common-Wealth fell out accordingly, — Tell us when shall these things be ? was
the Question put to our Lord by his Disciples, Mat. xxiv. 5. — What things? — the
Destruction of the Temple, and the END of the World, —— [v. 3, 2, 3.] that is, the
end of the Jewish Dispensation. —— [v. 14.] that those things should not be till the Gospel was first preached to All the World. [See the last Note.] —— But if they would be more particular, our Lord bid them to think of
what Daniel the Prophet faith, viz. that the ABOMINATION of DESOLATION
should stand in the HOLY PLACE, (v. 15.) —— Whenever they should see that come
to pass; they were of a certainty to conclude that then Conclusio nemus ortus de Urbe, & Re-
publica Judæarum, —— The Matter of Fact fell out accordingly, and shows us evident-
ly, that this is the interpretation, and accomplishment of what Christ here quoted from
the Prophet Daniel. —— Therefore not fo.

First, Pilate's Attempt to set up the image of Tiberius in the Temple, as some have ima-
gined; nor Secondly, That of Caius to set up his own there, as others, particularly Mr.
Lydius, Can. Chron. p. 105; Nor Thirdly, the Prophanation of the Temple by the Zealots
in the bloodshed, and slaughter occasioned by that Passions which had seizes upon the Tem-
ple, as Capellus; Nor Fourthly, the coming of Cæsarius with the Roman Army before Jé-
rusalem in Chrifi 66; [See the last Note.] for the HOLY CITY still remained for some
years after all these imagined Accomplishments of this Sign, and the TEMPLE yet standing
in which the SIGN was to be accomplished; Nor Fifthly, Titus commanding his
image to be set up in the defiled Temple; Much less the placing of the Statue of Har-
drian on Horseback in the ruins of the Temple long after, even because the Accomplish-
ment of the Sign, is evidently conjoined with the desolation of the Temple; Nor
Sixthly, as Dr Prideaux, and Mr Langford, even Titus his Army standing in the
HOLY LAND, and attacking, and taking all the HOLY CITY, because Cæsarius had
in some measure done so before; and yet the Temple, and City remained; and however
they were finally destroyed by Titus, and this was the immediate Consequence of the
Roman Army their standing in the Holy Land, and even in the Holy City; yet such general
Exposition comes not up to the true, and proper interpretations and accomplishment of
what Christ quotes from Daniel; forasmuch as the word SIGN in the Prophecy, and
the HOLY PLACE spoken of by our Lord, [Mat. xxiv. 15.] do certainly import some
mysterious God-Fear, and peculiar place than barely the Holy Land, but even the Holy City.
They double import the TEMPLE, as therein immediately with the dissolution there-
of this Express Character was to have its accomplishment, and had it accordingly. And
therein the the following Reasons may fully confirm us.

First, The Interpreters of this Express Character in the large sense thereof as above
giv'n, in order to give it its accomplishment therein are forced to render the Prophectic
Word Canaph by the Latin ALAB, and thereby they understand an ARMY, whereas
there is no manner of ground for it here. For though the Latin ALAB be put for EX-
ERCTUS, and ALEAB, faithiam, pro COPIS metaphorics, as Isaiah viii. 8, yet to
this it is replied by One here [Graevi. Vide Pole Synop. in Dan. p. 153.] AL-
LAB Latiniui cui sumi concedis, Canaph Hebræis per meo. Diffar est Locus, Isaiah
viii. 8. In eum (they are the words of Graevi) Vox est INDIQ in plurali, vel duxici,
Signa de Excursibus Imperatorum circumstans, vides, & eleganter dicunt. Non item
Singulare, Deinde ibi additur vox INDIQ, quae maximum metaphoram partim
fascinet. EXPANSIONES, inquit, ALABUM ejus replebant. —— I add,
Secondly, by way of confirming this Assertion, and in favour of the Prophectic word
SIGN in its signifying the Temple, and the restriction of the accomplishment of this Sign
to the TEMPLE, that We have the authority of the following Verifications for it, viz. that
of the 1xx, as we read εἰς τὸ ἹΕΡΟΝ ἔπρεπε Ἑβραῖοι, [Ex.  ν] & ἐποίησαν [Al. M. S.]
that so however they understood those words of Isaiah above quoted as truly denoting the ARMY there meant; and accordingly rendered those words by εἰς τὸ ἹΕΡΟΝ ἐπρο-
σλος, yet here they understand the word SIGN quite otherwise, evidently understanding it of the Temple, and so limiting the accomplishment of the EXPRESS CHA-
RACTER to the Temple. —— And so also the V. L. expressly, Εἰρήν in TEMPLO
Abom. Defol. —— And so likewise the Arabic Version, Super SANCTUARIUM,
Sec., —— I add

Third
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Thirdly, The Occasion, and Situation of our Lord when he refer'd his Disciples to the accomplishment of this Sign, limits it plainly to the Temple. — The occasion, as the Temple was then the immediate Subject of their Discourse. [Matt. xxiv., 12. Mark xiii., 12.] —— The Situation, as our Lord was then together with his Disciples in the Mount of Olives, in the fairest view of the Temple. [Grot. on Matt. xxiv. 1, and also Ludov. de Dies on Mark xiii. 3.] —— And as the Roman ENSIGNS, by reason of the IMAGES of their GODS, pointed out them were an ABOMINATION to the Jews, 'tis out of doubt that they could be never more so, than now when they were triumphantly set up, on the Temple. As the Jews could not bear the Sight of those IMAGES, only as passing through their Land. [See the last Note.] much less could they bear the sight of them, when they now saw those BELLORUM DEI, [as Tertul. ca is them.] those GODS of WAR standing on the Temple of the GOD of ISRAEL: Especially as they now saw them SACRIFICING to them there as they flood on the HOLLOW PLACE, [Matt. xxiv. 37.] and therefore the PLACE wherein all others those IDOLS ought not to have flood. [Mark xiii. 14.]

And now the SURE SIGN of the downfall, or utter ruin of the Jewish Oeconomy being thus accomplished in, and with the Destruction of the TEMPLE, our Lord's Disciples who were doubting many of them yet in Judea, were without delay to take warning, and be gone away, as fast as they could out of that Country: as the Roman Fire and Sword was not to stop at Jerusalem, but to ravage throughout that WHOLE COUNTRY, either to the murdering, or capriciating, even to the making a FULL END of that Nation. For the SIGN given being accomplished, the Sentence was irreversible. —— [Signum Hoc & proprium erat rei Signatae; & CERTITUDINEM habebat non ex naturali consequentia, sed ex divino Decreto.] Grot. in Matt. xxiv. 15. —— Therefore did our Lord say to his Disciples, [Matt. xxiv. 16. Mark xiii. 14.] THEN, [viz. when they should see this SIGN accomplished, Then.] Let them which are in Judea flee unto the mountains. St. Luke adds [ch. xxiii. 31.] And let them which are in the midst of it depart hence; [viz. They that were any where in that Country, not in the midst of Jerusalem, for it was now impossible for them to get out, and our Lord's Disciples had been all providentially gone out before. [See the last Note.] —— And finally our Lord's WAREING to flee in all these Places, is by no means limitable to Jerusalem, but is given at large, and plainly intimates that no One that would now be safe, should abide anywhere in Judea. All that follows thereunto relating are no other than proverbial Speeches applicable to Cases of great Defolation, and signify as much as this, vix. Let every One at what time in Judea fleeth for himself for a place of relief; and make the securest retreat that he can. —— Fugiant ad MONTES — non ad Montes Judeae qui a Romanis quoque expugnati sunt, tette Josepho [bel. Jud. 1. 32.] & iv. 2.] Sed (loquitur Chriftus) ex vulgari more fugientium ad Montes, tanquam LOCA TUTA. [Lucis Brugensis apud Pals in Synopli. in Matt. xxiv. 16, p. 578.]
rather of the HALF Part of this SingleWeek, as it was the SIGN immediately fore-running, and accompanying the utter disfollution of the Jewish Church, and State: even as now the END (c) of them was certainly come in the Destruction of the TEMPLE.

Accordingly soon after the lower City was burnt (d).

Sept. 8. following the upper City was taken (e).

Then All was thrown down to the Ground, excepting only a part of the western Wall, and two or three Towers refer'd as Monuments of Victory (f). And the Plough was drawn over the Ground (g) on which the City, and Temple had stood, to shew that the Romans meant this to be a FINAL DESTRUCTION, such as was foretold in this Prophecy (b): and to shew also, and more particularly that there was not now ONE STONE left upon another, according to our blessed Saviour's Prophecies of the City (i), and of the Temple (k) as before noted.

---

(c) Mat. xxiv. 3, 14. Mark xiii. 7.
(f) As above observ'd from Grotius.
(g) As it was above noted.
(h) Dan. ix. 26, 27.
(i) Luke xix. 44.
INDEX.

A. Bydemus, His ancient Measure of Time, p. 236. Explained by Langius, ib. in not.---
---By Bishop Pearson. 237
Æra Christiana, when, and by whom introduced 189 in not.
Africanus when he flourished 180 in not.
Alexander M. His Favour to the Jews 170, in not.
Apries, (King of Egypt) the Pharaoh-Hophra of the Scriptures.
Aristagoras of Miletus quoted, 238
Artaxerxes (Longimanus)—King of Persia;—His Commandment to Ezra, in favour of the Jews 120.—Not the Commandment refer’d to by Daniel, in his Prophecy of the Weeks 121.—His Commandment, or Grant to Nebuemiab in the 20th Year of his Reign prov’d to be it, 124, 180.—The Years of his Reign consider’d, 175—
---Aseth, An Egyptian King, said to have added five Days to the old year 235

B. Bel, His Temple deck’d with the Spoils of War, taken by Nebuchadnezzar in his Syrian Expedition, 56

C. Cadytis, a City in Syria, taken by Ph. Necho, 145—this City, not the City Jerusalem, 146: but the Carcbemisb of the Scriptures, 147, &c. situate near the Euphrates ib.---
Probably the Hierapolis of Syria 150 in not.---Another City of that Name, 149; but this also not Jerusalem, 150
Cajaphas, when made High-Priest, 196
Calippus, his Cycle when publish’d, 236 in not.
Captivey, See Jeconiah,——and Judaism.
Carcbemisb, See Cadytis.
Cestius, His raising the Siege of Jerusalem accounted for 273.
Characters Express’d in the Text to be clolely adher’d to, in the Explanation of this Prophecy, 274
Charon of Lampacrus,——His Testimony as to the Flight of Themistocles, consider’d.
Christ, Wherein especially the Messiah the Prince, 183, in not. 184, ib. 199, ib.
---His First Passover, 189
---His Ministry consider’d 188, &c.
---His, and John the Baptist's
INDEX.

for the proof of his Mission, 190. — His Disciples thenceforward prepar’d by him for his approaching Sufferings, ib. — Prophecy of his Death of the greatest Importance. 208. — The Time when he should be taken up [crucified] 210.

He could not be put to Death but at Jerusalem, 213. Nor there but at PASSOVER, ib. — even when his HOUR was come ib. — He was cut off of a certainty in the 19th Year of TIBERIUS, 195, and in note b. — after the expiration of Daniel’s 7 Weeks, and 62 Weeks, 208, 213, viz. in the PASSOVER next following, &c. 214.

— His PROPHECIES concerning Jerusalem most truly, and exactly fulfilled, 266 &c.

— His WARNING to his Disciples to flee upon the Destruction of Jerusalem, how to be understood. 279.

2 Chronicles xxxvi. 20, 21. explained, 25 &c.

Cleobulus Lindius, his Riddle of the Months, and Days in the Year. 235.

Cornelius Nepos, his Testimony as touching the flight of Themistocles considered. 177.

Cretius, the Opinion of the Antients and Moderns concerning him. 174.

Curtius, his Testimony as to the Years of Jubilee among the Jews 75 in not.

Cyprus, — He had not the Sovereignty while Darius liv’d. 39.

— His Decree for the release of the Jews went not forth till after Darius’s Death, 43. It regarded only the Building of the Temple, ib. And therefore could not be the Commandment refer’d to in the Prophecy of the Weeks 117, 135.

152. — the first Year of his reign the same both in Ezra, and in Xenophon, 44. — His Seven Years reign according to them, and 9 Years reign according to Ptolemy, reconciled, ib. — the first Year of his Reign according to Josephus, and the Phoenician Annals, 62, 63.

A Computation of his Thirty Years Reign giv’n him by some Historians accounted for, ib. — His cutting the River Gyndes into 360 Canales accounted for, 237.

D.

Daniel i. 1. and Jer. xxv. 1. considered, and reconciled, 46.

— At Babylon had the Prophecy of the Weeks revealed to him, 43. When captive to Babylon, 47. Why not consulted by Nebuchadnezzar, as to his Dream, before the Magicians, 48. His Austerity of Life, and Devotion, 50. Probably about sixteen Years of Age when made a Captive, 52. Highly favour’d of God, 209 not.

— His Prophecy of the Weeks explained, 1 &c. and elsewhere, viz. 102, 183 &c. 199, 208, 258, 278.

Darius, (the Mede) made King over the Chaldeans, 40. — reigned 2 Years. 39 &c.

Hystaspis, His Decree in favour of the Jews considered, 118.

It related only to the Temple, ib. and therefore could not be the Commandment refer’d to in the Prophecy of the Weeks 119. — The Years of his Reign considered, 174, 176, 180.

DAYS
Index

DAYS, Epagomenai when first introduced 234 in not. & 235. The Abomination of DESOLATION spoken of by Daniel the Prophet, wherein fulfilled, 277

Diodorus Siculus, his Testimony as touching the flight of The mistoioes consider'd, 177 &c. laid aside by Mr Dodwell in that Particular, ib.

Dionysius Exiguus, when he introduced the Christian Era, 189 in not.

E

Egypt, the forty years Desolations of it, [Ezekiel xix. 1.] whence to be dated, 33.

Egyptians, their Festival Days in a certain space of time run through every day in the Year, 239, and 241 in not.

Elias in the then High-Priest, and not Josua in that Text. Neh. xiii. 28. Evil Merodach releaseth Jeconiah out of Prison, 37, 66. The Tradition of his reigning twice consider'd, 67

Ezekiel, ch. iv. 4, 5, 6. consider'd, 82. His Æra of Reckoning in his Prophecies 31. when he had the Prophecy in ch. xxix. 12. against Pharaoh Hophra. 32

Ezra, his first of Cyrus, 43. vindicated as to his giving us a full Copy of Cyrus his Decree, 137. Chapter iv. 12 consider'd, 153

G

Galilee, there Christ began his Preaching. 190

Gedaliah made Governor over the Cities of Judah, after the Destruction of the City, and Temple by Neb. 19. treacherously kill'd. ib.

Gospel, when published

Throughout the Roman World, 273

Gratus, the Roman Governour of Judea, when put in and when recall'd from his Government, 196

H

Haggai I. 4. consider'd, 153

Herod shuts up John in Prison, 192

Herodotus most probably, not at Jerusalem in his Travels, 146

Hiron King of [new] Tyre, in his 14th Cyrus was made Emperor of Persia, 62

I

Janus his Temple shut in token of GENERAL PEACE.

Jeconiah, the true Year of his Captivity, 28 &c. true Year of his Release out of Prison according to the Scriptures, 37. according to Josephus the fame, 66 &c. viz. not till after the Death of Nebuchadnezzar, 68

Jebus, the 4th of his Reign coincident with the first of Nebuchadnezzar [the Son.] Jer. xxv. 1. p. 46. and so according to Berossus, 56, and Josephus, 66, 70.

Jeremiah, ch. xxv. 11. explained, p. 22. His Letter to the Captives at Babylon, 29. Chapter xxxvii. 7. fulfilled, 32. His 23d of Nebuchadnezzar in ch. lii. 30. not possibily of the Father but of the Son, 70, &c.

Jerusalem, Seventy Years to be accomplished in her Desolations, 22. Four royal Persian Grants, and no more we read of in Scripture to have gone forth in her favour, 101, 116, 118, 120, 125. Not rebuilt by virtue of Cyrus his Decree, 136. remained unbuilt long after that other Cities of Judah had
INDEX.

had been rebuilt 140.—However rebuilt within the first PROPHETICK Period (Dan. ix. 25.) of vii Weeks, or forty nine Years, 142, 144.—Therefore not possibly rebuilt in the 21st of Artax. Longimanus, ib. and p. 143 in not.—Most probably not seen by Herodotus in his Travels, 146.—why called the HOLY CITY, 152.—Her REPROACH mention'd in Dan. ix. 16. taken away by Nehemiah's rebuilding of the WALL, 155.—In her final Destruction by Titus was accomplished Deut. xxviii. 49—57.—Her END when it was come, 273.—The lower City when burnt, 280.—Upper City when taken, ib.—Christ's Warning to his Disciples to flee upon the Destruction of Jerus. how to be understood, 279.

Jews left by Neb. under Gedaliah, their own fault that they staid not still in the Land, 19.—Their Destruction after in Egyp, ib.—The general Character of such as return'd after the Captivity, 138.—Their Proneness to backsliding, 161.—The sever Corruptions they run into in the absence of Nehemiah, 163 &c. —They were, as it were, SUI JURIS, from Nehemiah's coming among them, and also after his Death, 170, 171.

JOHN the Baptist, the Year of his Preaching, 185, 188.—His and our blessed Saviour's MINISTRY consider'd, ib. &c.—The Continuance of John's Ministry, 192.—His Testimony of Christ, 193.

Josiah, not he, but his Father Eliahih the High-Priest, when happened the strange Marriage, 164.

Josephus, reconcile'd with Scripture, as to his beginning, and ending of the Bab. Captivity, 55 &c.—Set right from Berossus, 56, 58—vindicated as to his first of Cyrus, 62 &c. Particularly in p. 65.—Also vindicated as to his Character of time of the Siege of Tyre, 64.—His Agreement with the Scriptures in the Kings of Judah, 69, 70.

Josiah, (King) His Death, 148.

Isaiah, ch. xlv. 28, and xlv. 13: consider'd, 151 &c.

Ithn, the Battle there when fought between Ail. M. and Dar. Condom, 278 in not.

Ithobal, King of [Old] Tyre, to his 7th Tyre was besieged by King Nebuchadnezzer, 64.—He reigned 19 Years, ib.

Jubilee, whether the 49th or the 50th Year was it, is a Point disputed, 75.—Reckoning by Years of it most uncertain, and therefore most useless, 74, 75 in not.—No Jubilee under the Second Temple, 77.

Judah when the Whole Land became a Desolation, 27 in not.—When her Desolation at an end, 24, 25, 74, 76.

Judah, Captivity of, 28, 45.—of 70 Years determined continuance, 29, 30.—Ending of it, ib. and p. 45.—God's Forbearance with that House, 82 in not.

L.

Mr. Lancaster's 570 Years period said to be equal to the Seventy Weeks of Daniel, considered, 17 and 75 &c.—Also his 500 Years Period consider'd, 77 &c.—His Seventh of Artaxerxes how differing from Ptolemy's Canon, 179; and therefore by no means to be allowed, 179, 180.

Langus, See Abydus.

Lloyd.
INDEX

Lloyd, late Bishop of Worcester, the peculiar Harmony of his Hypothesis of Christ's being CUT OFF after the predicted Period for it, [Dan. ix. 25,] both with Scripture, and with Ptolemy's Canon, 211—214.

Mr. Lydias confused as to his twentieth year of the Reign of Aratx. Longimanus, 179

M

Magdolum of Herodotus the Megiddo of the Scriptures, 145

Mahometan Nations, the Year in use among them, 240 in not.

Maimonides's Testimony as to the Year of Jubilees among the Jews, 75

Malachy God's last Prophet to the Jews.—The Jewish Tradition referring to him the completion of Daniel's Sealing up of Vision and Prophecy, 167 in not.—Conjecture as to the very time of his Prophecy, ib. in not.

Marmora Arundelian is, the of the greatest Authority in Graecian Affairs, yet not so in the Persian, 180

Sir J. Marsham quoted, and refuted, 9 in not. and 68.

Meton the Athenian Astronomer when he flourished, 236 in not.

Ministry when Christ came upon his, 190

Months antiently consisting each of 30 Days, 234 &c.—Jewish only twelve in Scripture, 244—245. So in Noah's time, 246 in not.—So in Moses, and Aaron's time, ib.—So in K. Solomon's time, 346.—So in K. Nebuchadnezzar's time, 237.—So in K. Absaferus his time, 247.

—Asian Months from Herodotus, 238.—So upon the Testimony of Aristagoras of Mileten, 238

Nabopolassar the Father of Nebu-
INDEX

additional Days added to their old Year of 360 Days only, 240 in not.
Noms, an ancient Measure of time explain'd, 237

P
Paschal Lamb a type of our Saviour's Sufferings, 213
Passover, Christ's first, 189—The Year of it, 190
Pearson (Bp.) See Abydennus.
Pharaoh Necho, contemporary with Kings Josiah, and Jehoiakim, 31.—The Pharaoh in Ezekiel xxix. 2, &c. not Pharaoh Necho, but Pharaoh Hophra, 31
Philemon, his Testimony as to the praeternatural Darkness, which happened at the Time of our Saviours Crucifixion, 195 in not.
P. Pilate, when made Procurator of Judaea, 196,—when recalled, ib.
Plutarch, when he flourished, 179—His Testimony as to the flight of Themistocles consider'd, 177, &c.
Prophecy, See Vision.
Providence of God towards the Christians at Jerusalem before her Destruction by Titus, 274
Ptolemy's Canon, the Chronologer's Guide, 14. 186.—His Agreement everywhere with the Scriptures, ib.—Mr. Lancaster's great Liberty taken with it, 175 in not.—The great Credit of it, 179.—When and how brought to light, ib. in not.—Calvisius's Joy upon receiving it, ib.—Dr. Prideaux's Liberty with it, 185, &c.—the Petavius, and ABp. Usher are animadverted upon by him for a like Liberty taken by them, 187.

R
Resurrection of Christ, the Jews referr'd to it by him, as the great Proof of his Authority, and Mission, 190
Rhea, a Fable concerning her, 235
Riblah, [2 Kings xxiii. 33] the Antioch of Syria, 148
Romans Ancient, their Extraction, 236.—The Messiah's future People predicted in the Prophecy of the Weeks, 5, 257 in not. 265 in not.—Their General Corbulo his making Peace with the Kings of the Parthians, &c. 271

S
Sabbatical Years,—the Land's keeping Sabbath in them was its resting from tillage, 18.—Mr. Lancaster's suppos'd neglect of Seventy of them among the Jews before the Captivity in no wise probable, 18.—Such suppos'd Neglect not the whole, and sole Occasion of the 70 Years Captivity, 19, 21.—Reckoning by Sab. Years most uncertain, 243
Salmasius quoted 235 in not.
Sardes, when taken by Cyrus, 33
Sarus, an ancient measure of Time explain'd, 237
Scaliger (Jof.) quoted, 235 in not.
Sealing up of Vision and Prophecy in Dan ix. 24. the Words consider'd, 167
Semiramis, her Building the Wall of Babylon 360 Furlongs, &c. 237
Solon, His Discourse with Cresus, 238.—When it happened, ib. in not.—Solons Death, ib.—His Year for the regulation of the Seafons, 239.—It soon fell, ib. in not.
Sofus, an ancient measure of Time explain'd, 237
Suidas quoted as to the word Funeral 235 in not.

T
Teridates, King of Armenia, His Journey to Rome, &c. 273
Themistocles, the Time of his Flight consider'd, 177
Thoth Egyptian explained, 239 in not.
Thucydides, His Testimony as to the flight of Themistocles consider'd, 177 &c.
Tiberius Caesar, the two-fold Way of reckoning the Years of his Reign, 185.—the FIFTEENTH Year of his Reign in St. Luke’s Reckoning, 187, 195.—The NINETEENTH Year of his Reign, the Year CERTAIN in which Christ Suffer’d, 195
A Time, what in Daniel’s senecis, 250 TIMES, to the SIGNS of them the Phar. and Sadd. are refer’d by Christ, 209
Turks, The year in use among them, 240 in not.
Tyre [old] besieged by Nebuchadnezzar in the 7th of the Tyrian King Isbobar, 64.—Taken after a 13 Years Siege in the end of the 26th Year of Jecominab’s Captivity, 36.—Kings of [new] Tyre according to the Phoenician Annals, ib.

V
Veada, an intercalary Month among the Jews, no mention of it any where in Scripture, 244
Vestafian (Divus) when he enter’d into the Jewish War, 275.—Titus when he laid close Siege to Jerusalem, 276.—His ascribing the taking and Destruction of it immediately to God, 267 in not.
Vision and Prophecy, the Sealing it up in the Jewish Church. 167

W
Weeks LXX of Daniel.—Nature of them, 8, 78, 81, 187.—Division 10, 81.—Plainly FOUNDEN in their several EVENTS, 83.—not possibly equal to 500 Years in respect of Jubilees, 77, &c. much less to 570 Years in respect of Sabbathial Years 80—but necessarily equal to 490 Years, ib.—void of all relation either to Years of Jubilee, or Sabbathial Years, ib. and 81 and 243.—The Prophecy of them of the greatest importance, 103.—the BEGINNING of the SEVEN Weeks, 125, 134.—Their ENDING, 159, &c.—The BEGINNING of the SIXTY NINE Weeks, 173 &c. 180.—Their ENDING 182 &c.—In Dr. Prideaux’s Hypothesis, ib.—In Mr. Lancaster’s, ib. in not.
—In Bp. Lloyd’s, 198 &c.—The Expiration of them signified by our blessed Saviour, 209, 210.—The FORM of Year by which we are to reckon in this Prophecy, see Year.—Of the Separate ONE Week, or the Last Week of the Seventy, and the HALF Part thereof, 253 &c.—Of the EXPRESS CHARACTERS thereof in Bp. Lloyd’s Hyp. 254.—In Dr. Prideaux’s, ib.—In Mr. Lancaster’s, ib.—The Same necessarily to be taken in a literal Sense, 260.—The BEGINNING of the ONE Week, 270.—Of the more distinguished HALF Part thereof, 272.—The ENDING of both, 280.

YEAR of Reckoning in Daniel’s Weeks, 233—viz. that which antiently consisted of 12 Months of 30 Days to a Month, ib.—So from the Creation, ib.—So among the Jews, 234.—The Jewish Year particularly consider’d, 242 &c.—Year of the Sanbedrin, 244.—this not the Civil Year among the Jews, ib.—It was ordained merely for
INDEX.

the regulation of the Festivals, ib. in not.—The Fourth Year in Vulgar Account in K. Solomon’s Time, 246.—viz. that of 360 Days both before, and after the Captivity, ib.—So in K. Abraham’s his Time, 247.—It was the ancient Year among the Egyptians, 234.—and all Nations ab origine, ib. in not.—So also among the Greeks 235.—Still kept up in divers Countries in Daniel’s time, as the Year in Vulgar Account, 236,—and long after, even in Darius Codomanus his time, 237 in not.—It was the Year among the Chaldeans, ib.—So among the Persians after Cyrus, and Consequently after Daniel’s time, ib.—even in Darius Hystaspius his Time, by Dr. Prideaux’s own Testimony, ib.—So among other Asian Nations, the Lydians in Particular, 238.—Prov’d from Solomon’s Discourse with Cyrus, ib.—As in the Singular, so also in the Col.

alian Form, 248.—First, in the Asiatic, ib.—Also in the Account of Aristotle, and of the Athenians after his Death, ib.—Especially in the Account thereof among the People of God in the Babylonish Captivity, 249.—So also in the Days of Ant. Epiphanius; 250.—The seeming Strangeness to us of reckoning by such a Form of Year remov’d, 239 in not.—from the consideration of the Year in use among the Turks, &c. 240 in not.—Julian, what Form of Year comes nearest to it for exactness, 239 in not.—The failure of it, as to the holding Pace with the Natural Year, 242 in not.—Sabbatical Years, Reckoning by them most uncertain. 243

Zedekiah, the true 11th Year of his Reign. 27.—The mistaken Year thereof, ib. 28.—inconsistent with Scripture, ib. &c. and with Josephus, 69.—72.

FINIS.

ADVERTISEMENT.

Whereas the Author of this Treatise did formerly Print at his own immediate Expence, at Oxford, on 8 Sheets of Super-royal Paper, as 2. 12d. a Ream, 5000 Sets of Chronological Tables, comprehending a Synchronism of Times Sacred and Profane, from the Creation of the World, to the Destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans in the Year of Christ 70. And Whereas 1500 Sets were printed in Latin, for exportation into foreign Countries, but for want of Correspondence abroad, and the Charge of Exportation not answerning, a 1000 Sets still remaining on the Author’s hands, These are therefore to request the Encouragers of Learning to be helpful in getting off the said Tables at home. And to that end they are desired to take notice that the said Tables are now to be had at J. Knapton’s at the Crown in St. Paul’s Church-Yard, London; and also at the Printing-House in Oxford at the Original Subscription rate of five Shillings a Set; And to such as will take six Sets, a Seventh shall be allowed gratis.