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A

LETTER

To the Reverend

Mr. LANCASTER.

Reverend SIR,

Naunton, Gloucestershire,
March 25, (4) 1727.

In the middle of December last came to my Hands your printed Letter immediately inscribed to me, containing your Remarks on the late Bishop Lloyd's Hypothesis of Daniel's Seventy Weeks, as by me formerly publish'd.

If thole Remarks came immediately by your Order, in good Manners to you, I ought to consider.

* This Letter was then sent up to London for the Press: but the Printing thereof was however deferred, in Expectation of your promised Defence of Your Essay on the Weeks. But that not yet appearing, at least as I have heard nothing of it, it is thought expedient that this, and the two following Letters, should now come forth together.

A 2 them,
A LETTER to the

them, as being doubtles sent to me for that End. If otherwise, (for I know not by whose Order they were sent,) as they are of a publick Nature, they call upon me for a farther Vindication of the Bishop's Hypothesis. And therefore I shall here consider, and reply to your several Remarks in the Order you have given them.

Your FIRST REMARK is, —

That by the Bishop's Hypothesis there is no Reason assigned either why in the Prophecy Weeks are mentioned rather than Years; or since Weeks are mentioned rather than Years, why Seventy was to be the Number of the Weeks determined rather than any other Number. —

Therefore you conclude,

That no Exposition of the Weeks as yet given, nor any to be hereafter advanced, will ever give Satisfaction, if it doth not rationally account for these two Particulars. —

Now as touching this Remark, and your Conclusion from it,

My Reply is,

That in Truth I know of but one Way of rationally accounting for these Particulars. I know of but one only good, and sufficient Reason assignable in answer to your two-fold Demands here, why the Prophecy before us is a Prophecy of Weeks, RATHER than Years, and why a Prophecy of SEVENTY Weeks, RATHER than any other Number of Weeks. —

And that is, that it was the mere, or absolute Pleasure of the allwise Predator to have it thus immediately in both: Even to have the Prophecy given with this Reckoning in it RATHER than any other Reckoning, and by this Number of Reckoning in it RATHER than any other Number.

Known unto God, and to him only, are all his Purposes from the Beginning of the World. He alone can foretel Things to come, and fix the Time certain
tain for their Accomplishment. Therefore he alone hath it in his uncontrollable Power, and unsearchable Pleasure to assign the immediate Reckoning, and the immediate Number of that Reckoning in this, or in any other Prophecy that he vouchsafes to give for the Manifestation of his Omniscience, which is one great End of Prophecy.

—And what better, or farther Reason would you have for these Particulars? — This, I say, is the only certain Way of accounting for the Particulars here insinuated on. —— You will not gainsay it. ——

But this general Way of accounting for them being always suppos’d, or taken for granted, as well by the Expounder, as by every one that is willing to receive an Exposition of this Prophecy, Any particular, or immediate Notice of it is render’d needless. And therefore any Neglect of noting this in the Bishop’s, or in any preceding Hypotheses of the Weeks, I cannot suppose to be the immediate Matter of your Charge here against them.

I must therefore look out for some other Meaning in your Charge; which, if I can learn it from your Remark, I take to be this, viz.

That you lay it down as a Rule here, that we must necessarily look out for some other Reason exclusive of this general one, now given in answer to your particular Demands, as above, if we would be able to evidence the Completion of this Prophecy of the Weeks.

This you object is not done in the Bishop’s Hypothesis, nor in other preceding Hypotheses.

I reply in few Words, Nor is there any manner of need that it should be done. —— Your Charge is without Foundation, as it is built upon a mistaken Supposition of the Essentaility of your Rule towards the expounding, that is, towards the shewing the Completion of this Prophecy, or the manifesting of the Accomplishment of the several predicted Events of
of it in Conformity with their predicted Time;—— for this I take to be the Meaning of your Word Expounding here.

Now that your Rule, as thus gather'd from your Remark, is by no means essential to the Purposes you make it, I prove,

First, Because the two-fold Demands which constitute the said Rule, are entirely exclusive of the Particulars of Enquiry immediately directed to, in and throughout the Prophecy.

Secondly, Your Rule, however full of Importance and Satisfaction it be in your Account, yet it is in it self uncapable of giving certain Satisfaction; because it is necessarily conjectural, and consequently ever uncertain. And,

Thirdly, When we have no manner of Light to guide us in such Enquiry in the Prophecy it self immediately, nor in any other Part of Scripture; nor, as I have observ'd, any thing in the Prophecy directing to such Enquiry, as in that before us evidently there is not, in such Cases REGARD had to such imposed Rule, serveth many times to perplex, and obscure, not to elucidate this, or any other Prophecy in the intended Exposition of it.

Pardon me, Sir, as here it cannot but occur to my Thoughts, so I call it also to your Remembrance, that your own Hypothesis of the Weeks, begun from the First of Cyrus, and squared immediately by this Rule, and thereby becoming an Hypothesis of 571 Years; and yet, as you assert, remaining still an Hypothesis of 70 Weeks of Years, (which I cannot believe, unless I deny my Sense, as 70 Weeks of Years, or 7 times 70 Years, make only 490 Years, even in the Acknowledgment of learned Jews here,) doth, as I have largely shewn, fully verify the fatal Error, as in this Objection.—— Give me Leave to add yet one other.

Fourthly,
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Fouribly, That your Rule is here a Rule needless and superfluous. The Prophecy may possibly be clear'd in the several Particulars of Accomplishment, exclusive of the Demands in your Rule. For,

1st, If it were not, it had been then given in vain. But the Angel, tho' he be silent, wholly silent as to your Particulars of Enquiry, yet he calls upon the Prophet to know and understand; even to know and understand the Prophecy in the several given Contents of it. He bids him to know and understand those Things which are in the Prophecy, not those Things which are out of it, as are the two-fold Demands which constitute your Rule. But,

2dly, The Prophecy in the nature of it should be also capable of being unfolded, as it naturally leads us in its particular Contents into all Demands necessary towards the evidencing the Accomplishment of the several predicted Events of it, in Correspondence with their severally predicted Periods, tho' it no where answers, or so much as regards the Demands of your Rule.

To this end it directs our immediate Enquiry into the Nature of Reckoning given in it, as it is a Prophecy given in a Reckoning by Weeks, not as you demand WHY, but only what kind of Weeks, even whether Weeks of Days, or Weeks of Years are here intended.

It likewise directs our Regard to the determinate Number of Weeks in it, namely in the GENERAL Number of them, that of SEVENTY: — not to enquire, as you insist, why this RATHER than any other Number; but only to note this express Number of Weeks in general, the Number Seventy; and after that, in a subsequent express Division of the general Number into lesser, to note also those particular Numbers of SEVEN Weeks, and SIXTY TWO Weeks, and ONE Week: Which lesser Numbers
Numbers put together, make the GENERAL Number of the SEVENTY Weeks of this Prophecy.

It farther refers us more particularly to certain Notes of Time, immediately pinning us down to a Terminus a quo, and a Terminus ad quem, in some of the predicted Periods of it: And in them, and others likewise, to express Characters immediately distinguishing their respective Periods, or causing them fully to be discerned by their falling out in their respective appointed Fulness of Time for their actual Accomplishment.

Now these being the several Matters of Enquiry, to which the several given Contents of the Prophecy do direct, and these Enquiries, I think, including the whole Contents of it, these, and these only therefore become essential Parts of our Enquiry, in order to our understanding of it. And therefore, I presume, our Rule here may be as follows, viz.

First, That we should inform our selves, as above, in the Nature of these Weeks: Secondly, That we should have especial Regard to the express Numbers of the Prophecy, both the general, and the particular Numbers: And also, Thirdly, to the given Notes of Time immediately pinning us down in the Beginning, or Ending of such of them, in which such Notes of Time are expressely given: And Lastly, to the several predicted Events, or express Characters, in order to the squaring them, or to the shewing their actual Completion, in Conformity with their respective Periods, to which they are appropriated in the Prophecy.

And if this may be allow’d to be a good and sufficient Rule in the Cafe before us, I hope I have not been wanting to it, in the several Particulars of it, in my Treatise upon the Weeks. As in the Introduction there, I have particularly spoken to the Nature, the Division, the Order, or Course of Reckoning in these Weeks: And also, as I have shewn, in the Process
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Proces of the said Treatise, the Completion of the several predicted Events of them, in their several Parts or Periods as distinguish'd in the Prophecy.

And these Particulars being accounted for, and being all, I take it, that the Prophecy in the several Contents of it requireth to be accounted for, in the unfolding of it, I am not without Hopes that the late Bishop's Hypothesis of these Weeks may yet find a favourable Reception; though, as you object, it hath not indeed any otherwise than as above, accounted for the particular Demands in your Rule: Which Demands as they are in themselves foreign, so in fact in your own Hypothesis of the Weeks, they have appeared useless to the expounding of this Prophecy. And therefore you are not to wonder that the Bishop, and other preceding Expositors of the Weeks, against whom you equally object here, have not had the least Regard to them in their respective Hypotheses. — But I crave your Patience, while I yet prove against your conceived Rule, or the Essentiality of it in order towards the manifesting the Accomplishment of the several predicted Events of this Prophecy, as the Prophecy is capable of being thus expounded.

Lastly, For the following Reason also, even because another Prophecy of the same Prophet, and of a like nature with this, is so capable, therefore why not this also?

As for instance, take we the Prophecy of the Times. It is a Prophecy of the same Prophet. And I call it a Prophecy of the like nature with this, as a Reckoning by TIMES is used in it, and not expressly by Years; and as here a Reckoning by Weeks is used, and not expressly by Years. But in the Prophecy of the Times, the Word Times do certainly denote Years. — You will allow it me. —— And in the Prophecy of the Weeks, confessedly the Word Weeks denote Weeks of Years also. ——

B
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Now will you say, that the Prophecy of the Times is not capable of being expounded without immediate Regard had to your Rule, or to your two-fold Demands which constitute it, viz. Why TIMES are used in it RATHER than Years; or since Times are used in it, why Time, Times, and Half a Time, is the given NUMBER of Times RATHER than any other NUMBER? 

I may here conclude for you that you will not. And therefore I conclude the same against you in this Prophecy of the Weeks. For if so in the Prophecy of the Times, why not so also in the Prophecy of the Weeks; without perplexing our selves with your superfluous Enquiries, why in the Prophecy WEEKS are used in it RATHER than Years, or since Weeks are used in it, why SEVENTY is the NUMBER of Weeks RATHER than any other Number?

Upon the whole therefore your Rule neither answering the Purposes to which you intended it, nor appearing necessary to such Purposes, which is what you aim at in this Remark, I conclude you have not your End in it. The said Remark makes nothing at all against the Bishop's, nor other preceding Hypotheses. — And so I proceed to your SECOND REMARK.

This you introduce, by informing us, that by the late Bishop's Hypotheses, the Beginning of the SEVENTY Weeks is placed in the 20th Year of Artaxerxes Longimanus. 

That I reply is a Mistake of yours.

The Beginning of the 7 Weeks, and 62 Weeks of the Prophecy, if you will, is so placed. And Such placing the Beginning of the said 69 Weeks, is founded upon the two Suppositions, which you add, as following, viz.

First, That before Nehemiah's Arrival at Jerusalem in the said Year, the Wall and Gates of Jerusalem had not been rebuilt since the Time of their having been
been broken down, and burnt by Nebuchadnezzar King of Babylon. And,

Secondly, That the Decree mention’d in the Prophecy for the rebuilding of Jerusalem was issued out by Artaxerxes in the said 20th Year of his Reign.

Against the former of these two Suppositions you object, and indeed well you might, were that true, which you have here most peremptorily affirmed, viz. as you say of it,

That it is DIRECTLY CONTRARY to what Nehemiah himself hath written on this Affair, as in one Place, and MANIFESTLY FALSE, as being directly contrary to Scripture; as in another. —— And as to

The latter of these two Suppositions, you say that whoever will read Nehemiah, or Josepbus, will find it to be without any manner of Support. ——

Heavy Charges these indeed against the learned, and pious Bishop! —— That these Suppositions, on which is founded his Beginning of the Sixty nine Weeks of this Prophecy in the Twentieth Year of Artaxerxes Longimanus, should be not only void of all Support, but as you have particularly urged against the former, that it should be MANIFESTLY FALSE, as being DIRECTLY CONTRARY to what Nehemiah himself hath written on this Affair. ——

—- But why, Sir, is the Bishop’s Hypothesis thus chargeable alone in this Remark, and not as in your former Remark, in Company with other preceding Hypotheses of learned Men, both antient and modern, even of our own eminent Countrymen among the latter, viz. the Primate Upher, and Mr. Lydias, who have also begun the Weeks from the Twentieth Year of the Reign of King Artaxerxes Longimanus, as well as the late Bishop Lloyd?

Do you think that the pious and learned Primate in particular, I may say Mr. Lydias also, would have been of that Number, or even the equally pious,
and learned Bishop Lloyd (without Offence be the Comparison) would, or could have been guilty of these MANIFEST Blunders, these ANTISCRIP-
TURAL Suppositions, as you make them to be?—
— But how, I pray, have you made good the glaring Accusation, as it here stands against Bishop Lloyd in particular, by way of Objection to his
First Supposition, as already noted?
— You have, it seems, attempted it thus;
The Reason why Nehemiah was moved to desire Leave of Artaxerxes Longimanus in the Twentieth Year of his Reign to go to Jerusalem, was upon the account of the News which he had received from thence, viz.
That the Remnant that were left of the Captivity in Judæa, were in great Affliction and Reproach: the Wall also of Jerusalem was broken down, and the Gates thereof were burnt with Fire.
— And what I pray of all this?
— Why, say you with the greatest Assurance this
Account EVIDENTLY relates to such a Destruction of Jerusalem, as had LATELY happened; even, as you affirm also under this Remark, in the Page following, in the 20th of Artaxerxes Longimanus. And there you add also with like Assurance concerning this Account, that it PLAINLY shews that in the said Year the third Wall and Gates of Jerusalem had been but very lately demolish'd. — And then you conclude, Consequentially that the said Wall had been built, and the said Gates had been set up since the Return of the Captivity in the Reign of Cyrus. — These being plain, and evident Truths with you, forthwith you run away with them as such. And so you become full of your Consequences and Conclusions: As in one Place you tell us of the foregoing Account, that consequently It can have no Relation to the Destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar: Forasmuch, as between the Time of Nebuchadnezzar's destroying Jeru-

Al
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there were (you tell me) according to my own Chronology, no less than 143 Years. And in the next Page, you are careful to give us such another Consequence, viz. That Nehemiah consequently was not the first who rebuilt the Wall, and set up the Gates of Jerusalem since the Time of Jerusalem's Destruction by Nebuchadnezzar King of Babylon.

And thus you think, as in a CLEAR Case, you have made good your heavy Charge against the late Bishop in his assign'd Beginning of the 69 Weeks of this Prophecy in the 20th Year of Artaxerxes Longimanus.

WHEREAS you have not given us so much as one Proof here out of the Account refer'd to, for all that according to you, is so manifest, so evident, so plain in it. Nor is it capable of yielding any. Forasmuch, as after all, the said Account doth not EVIDENTLY relate, as you say it doth, to such a Destruction of the Wall and Gates of Jerusalem which had lately hapned. Nor indeed can it have any such Relation.

First, I say it hath not evidently such Relation. Because

1st. No such late Matters of Fact, as you tell us of, are there Expressly spoken of as such. — You will not contend for it that they are. — You are therefore without this kind of Proof from the said Account. Nor have you any,

2dly, In the necessary Import, or necessarily implied Sense of the said Account. Because, were there any thing in it necessarily implying such Sense in which you take this Account, as the Sense certain in your Favour, the said Account in that Case must necessarily imply your Sense of it, and your Sense of it only. And the Contents of it consequently have no other Relation, nor be capable of having any other Relation than that, to which you immediately appropriate it.

Whereas
Whereas it is not so in the said Account. The Particulars of it are evidently capable of another Sense, and that the most natural Sense, and of having another Relation, and that the most natural Relation absolutely foreign from that in which you would have the said Account only to be understood:

— Even to have Relation not to such Destruction of the Wall and Gates of Jerusalem, which according to your Account, bad LATELY hapned in the 20th of Artaxerxes, but to that fatal Destruction of Jerusalem which was by Nebuchadnezzar indeed 143 Years before. In which Relation, the said Account implies no more than this, viz. that the Wall, and Gates of Jerusalem which had been destroyed, and left in their Ruins by the Chaldaans, STILL so remained in the 20th of Artaxerxes.

And, as it will appear anon, in this Relation, and in this only the said Account can be rationally understood.

It is sufficient to my present Purpose to have noted it only here. Forasmuch as what may plainly have another Sense, and another Relation than what you immediately give it, cannot possibly carry in it the Nature of a Proof certain for your Sense and Relation of it, as is the very Case of Nehemiah’s Account now immediately before us.

The said Account therefore having nothing of Certainty in it in your Favour, indeed that is not a little strange that you have told us of it, that it EVIDENTLY relates to such Destruction of Jerusalem which (by your affording also) had LATELY hapned. — And that is yet more strange, that you should take upon you to pronounce the late Bishop’s Supposition now before us MANIFESTLY False, as being DIRECTLY contrary to the said Account. —

And yet after all, the said Supposition appears to be in nothing contrary to the said Account: Much less is it directly contrary to it; and so far from being manifestly
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manifestly false, that the said Account we see proves nothing at all against it, and is at least equally capable (to go no farther at present) of his interpreted Relation of it, as well as yours. ——

Indeed you have taken a great deal of Liberty in determining here, and without any manner of Grounds: As it will appear also, and more especially by considering,

Secondly, That the Account before us cannot rationally be understood in your acertain'd Sense, and Relation of it. It cannot upon rational Grounds be referred to such imagined LATE Destruction of Jerusalem, as is that of yours in the 20th of Artaxerxes: because it is not so much as probable that there were, or could be, as yet any Wall or Gates to be destroy'd.

The Jews had not been impower'd to rebuild the Wall, and set up the Gates of their dismantled Metropolis, till after Nebemiah had received the News from thence in the Account referr'd to.

I had occasion to shew this at large in my Treatise on the Weeks, as all preceding Decrees of the Kings of Persia in favour of the Jews before that granted to Nebemiah by Artaxerxes Longimanus in the 20th Year of his Reign, had immediate respect either to their Return, and their rebuilding the Temple, as that of Cyrus; or to the finishing of the Temple, as that of Darius Hyfaspis; or to the Endowment of the Temple, as that of the said Artaxerxes, in a former Part of his Reign. But that latter Decree of his, which Nebemiah obtain'd of the King immediately upon his having received the ill News from Jerusalem, as above, that Decree, and that alone, respected the rebuilding the Wall and Gates thereof, in express Terms for it. These Things therefore I need not to repeat here.

The Use that I now make of the Observation is, that any Attempt therefore of the Jews to have

rebuilt
rebuilt their Wall, and set up their Gates before such Royal Authority actually obtained from the Kings of Persia, to whom they were immediately subject from their Return is most improbable: — much more so is your imagined actual Fortification of Jerusalem before the 20th of Artaxerxes.

The very Attempt of such a Work without EXPRESS LEAVE for it, had involv'd the Jews in a Crime bordering upon Rebellion. And think you that their good Neighbours would have sat still at the Undertaking, when they knew that as yet there was no Royal Authority or Permission for it? — You may be assured they would not have failed to have laid hold of such fair Opportunity from thence of just Accusation of the Jews before the King of Persia.

They made it a Pretence we see, even when they caused a Stop to be put to the building of the Temple under the Magian: They did it with an additional Charge of this very nature, as it is expressly recorded by Ezra. [iv. 12.] Which Accusation if it had been truly grounded to the proving that the Jews had really made an Attempt to have set up the Wall, and Gates of their City, yet the Sequel of the History expressly proves against any your imagined Accomplishment of the same at this time: because a Stop was immediately put to the Jews building under the Magian.

But the Accusation it seems was not truly grounded; as it appears from the Execution of the King's Answer to the Complaint made against them: which was to cause the Jews to cease building by Force and Power. [v. 23.] — Building what? — Nothing after all but the House of God: As it appears from v. 24, viz. Then ceased the Work of the House of God — unto the second Year of the Reign of Darius King of Persia.

Thus
Thus set against the Jews were their Enemies of those Times, that they should not build the REBELIOUS and the BAD City, as they expressly noted it to be, nor set up the WALL, nor join the Foundations of it.

Nor doubtles was their Envy and their Hatred against the poor Jews ever after lessen’d to their having any the least Good-will towards them; most unquestionably therefore not to their suffering them to have thus provided for their Security, in case that they had ever attempted it before the coming of Nebemiah among them.

Even after the coming of the Tirshathab to Jerusalem with the King’s immediate Authority for this great Work of rebuilding the Walls and Gates thereof, and after that he had made considerable Progress in it; yet, as we learn from his History of those Times, the many and inveterate Enemies of the Jews, their neighbouring Nations, stank not however to hinder him all they could from proceeding in it, and bringing it to Perfection. They were very wroth, as the Text says, at the News of the Wall it’s being now in building, and the Breaches thereof being now stopping; and thus exceedingly enraged they conspir’d all of them together to come and to fight against Jerusalem, and to hinder it, [Neh. iv. 7, 8.]

And no wonder at it, if we consider them prompt­ed thereunto, as by their inherent Hatred and En­mity, especially of the Samaritans, to the People of the Jews, so likewise by their Interest. Because, as the learned Dr. Prideaux well observeth from Josephus, During the Time that the Jews were in Captivity, their neighbouring Nations having seized their Lands, were forced to restore them on their Return. For which Reason, they did all they could to oppose their Resettle­ment; hoping that, if they could be kept low, they might find an Opportunity some time or other of resuming again the Prey they had lost.

C Now,
Now one of the surest Ways the Jews Enemies could possibly take in this respect of keeping the Jews low, was, I believe you will allow it me, to do what in them lay, to keep Jerusalem their chief City still a City NAKED and DEFENCELESS, because thereby more exposed to their Incursions.

What therefore more immediately in point of Interest put the Jews Enemies upon Opposition, at least the Thoughts of it, now upon Nebemiaab's immediately acting for her Security, and Defence, had been doubtless ever, and equally a Motive of stirring them up against the Jews, even from their very Return in the Reign of Cyrus quite down to the Year, with which we are immediately concerned, viz. the 20th of Artaxerxes.

And therefore it is no wonder that by Nebemiaab's News from Jerusalem in that Year, we hear of their great Affliction, and Reproach; as they were at that time, as they had been all along since their Return, still liable to the continued Inlicts, and Injuries of their oppressive Neighbours: Even as having been, and still being really in want of that Security, and Defence, which as yet they had only by your Imagination: nor could they possibly have had it otherwise for the Reasons now given.

That doth therefore on all Accounts become most improbable which you have here affirmed of the Jews their having set up the Wall and Gates of Jerusalem since their Return in the Reign of Cyrus, before the said 20th of Artaxerxes. And

Consequently Nebemiaab's Account now before us upon the most rational Grounds —— remains, as in the Bishop's Hypothesis, in immediate Relation to that Destruction of the Wall and Gates of Jerusalem which was by Nebuchadnezzar, and to that only.—

I add

Thirdly, In favour of such immediate Relation, and against your's, that had the Wall and Gates of Jerusalem
Jerusalem been set up, and again demolished in a Destruction of Jerusalem in the 20th of Artaxerxes, it is next to an Impossibility that History could have been silent of such remarkable Instances, or Occurrences of it. Surely Ezra, or Nebemiab, or Josephus would have told us something expressly of such LATE Destruction of Jerusalem since the Return of the Jews; especially as it was so late as, by your ascertaining, in the 20th of Artaxerxes: Had there really been any such NEW Destruction of it; or were it otherwise than in your Imagination. For indeed it doth not appear to have any other Foundation.———

And therefore upon the whole I conclude there was no other. And consequently Nebemiab's Account remains only to that which had been by Nebuchadnezzar. And consequently also the said Wall had not been built, and the said Gates had not been set up since the Return of the Captivity in the Reign of Cyrus; And consequently Jerusalem had remained without her Wall and Gates from the Time of her Destruction by Nebuchadnezzar to the 20th of Artaxerxes now truly 143 Years; And Consequently, Nebemiab was the first who rebuilt the Wall, and set up the Gates of Jerusalem since the Time of her Destruction by Nebuchadnezzar King of Babylon.

But these are the Particulars which make up the Bishop's First Supposition, on which is founded his Beginning of the 69 Weeks of the Prophecy before us. And these Particulars being maintained, the said Supposition is also maintained, in full and perfect Agreement with the Account of Nebemiab referred to. And therefore your Charge against it of its MANIFEST FALSITY, and DIRECT CONTRARIETY to the said Account becometh the more groundless; and consequently the more unreasonable in itself, and the more uneconomic also in the Reflection upon the late learned Bishop.
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But to go on, as it seems you object also against the Bishop's
Second Supposition, on which is founded his Beginning of the said Number of Weeks.

The said Supposition is, that the DECREE mentioned in the Prophecy for the rebuilding of Jerusalem was issued out by Artaxerxes Longimanus, in the 20th Year of his Reign.

Your Objection to it is, that whoever will read Nehemiah, or Josephus, will find it to be without any manner of Support.

And why so? — Even because, as is the main of your Objection here, Nehemiah and Josephus have not dignified, or distinguished the Licence granted to Nehemiah by King Artaxerxes, for the rebuilding the Wall, and Gates of Jerusalem with the Name of a DECREE: nor have they given us a Copy of that Decree.

And what after all tho' they have not? — Nehemiah it seems was not altogether that accurate Historian, as you here expect him to have been: therefore neither Josephus also who writ after him.

But will it therefore follow that this Supposition is, as you tell us of it, without any manner of Support, tho' it hath not this immediately from them in the Name, and Copy of the Decree? — Still this Objection hinders not but a Decree might now have been issued forth.

The King's Commission was now undeniably given to Nehemiah, and the royal Authority was confidently obtained, and expressly given for the rebuilding of Jerusalem. Therefore, what I pray, was that Authority, or what could it be in the Nature, Intents, or Purpoese of it but a DECREE ROYAL?

You indeed would here persuade us, that Nehemiah had only a VERBAL LEAVE, or LICENCE from the King.

— But have either Nehemiah, or Josephus thus said of it, even that the royal Authority now given
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Was only VERBAL? — Or are you, or can you be really so persuaded, tho' you have thus affirm'd?

— However, even a VERBAL LICENCE was now confessedly gone forth from the King in favour of the Jews for their now fortifying their naked, and dismantled Metropolis. —

And why should it not have been forthwith put in Writing, immediately expressive of the King of Persia's Royal Favour now granted to that People, and have been accordingly registred among the publick Records of the Kingdom, as other Decrees in favour of the Jews had been? — Nothing less than the Royal Authority made known, and consequently made publick to that End, could have restrained the Jews Enemies from actual Opposition, to the making them to fit still, even when they were exceedingly enraged at the Undertaking, as already observed. —

The Royal Authority therefore for the rebuilding of Jerusalem now given to Nebemiah, could not be, as you say only VERBAL, but it must necessarily have been EXPRESS by Writing.

Nor is it usual for Kings to send their Lieutenants abroad by verbal Commandments only, but by formal Commissions immediately expressive of their deputed Authority, and royal Pleasure; in Matters of greater Importance more especially, and immediately with LETTERS PATENTS most expressly licensing and protecting them in their fulfilling the Royal Purposes. — Which consequently could not but be the very Case in Nebemiah's now going to Jerusalem, to fulfill the King of Persia's immediate Pleasure by him of rebuilding the WALL, and setting up the GATES thereof.

And accordingly we find that Nebemiah had now the King's LETTERS. — The Text is express in it that he had them. Letters also had been before given by the King to Ezra, upon his going to Jerusalem.
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salem upon a Commission to him immediately delegated by the King. And Nebemiah had them now upon his going thither.

— But say you here, Nebemiah's Letters were only of a private Nature.

— Alas! How was it possible for you to say so of the King's Letters in a publick Affair?

Surely neither were the Ends, or Purposes for which those Letters were given to Nebemiah of a private Nature; nor were the Persons to whom those Letters were sent private Persons.

Not the Persons; for they were Persons not in private Capacities: very far from it. Nor do Kings usually write to such Persons. They were Persons of the highest Authority, and in the most publick Potts. And those Persons also were many of them, even the King's Governours on this side the River Eufrates. Persons these immediately invested with the highest Authority from the King of Persia.

Not the Ends and Purposes of those Letters immediately expressive of the royal Will, and Pleasure to those Persons. To the Governours to conduct Nebemiah in Safety to Jerusalem, not surely as a private Person, or even now as the King of Persia's Cupbearer; but Nebemiah the Tirshathah, or the King's appointed Governour of Judah, and Jerusalem. To the Keeper of his Forests in those Parts, as by express Command in those Letters to further him upon his Arrival at Jerusalem, in the great Work of rebuilding the Wall thereof, on which he was now sent by the King, by the furnishing him with as much Timber out of them, as should be needed for the finishing of it.--

— And yet by your Account these Letters were of a private Nature.

— They were, it appears, no less than the King's Letters Pateuts fully licenfing, authorizing, empowring Nebemiah, as above: Either to their contain-
containing a DECREE royal in form, as did before those Letters which the King gave unto Ezra, or otherwise to their having the full Force thereof by an expres Clause therein inserted, immediately expresive of the King's royal Pleasure, and Command for Nebemiab's fortifying the Metropolis of his now appointed Government.

And even in this latter View of Nebemiab's Commission, the late Dr. Prideaux hath expressly told us, that now in the 20th of Artaxerxes the ROYAL DECREE was issued out for the rebuilding the Wall, and Gates of Jerusalem; and Nehemiah was sent therewith it as Governor of the Province of Judæa to put it in Execution.

The said learned Author tho' he discarded this Decree from being the Prophetical Decree, from which the 69 Weeks of the Prophecy are expressly to take their Beginning, because it would by no means suit with his figurative Hypothesis of the Weeks, yet he hath not so much as cavilled at the Decree itself, but hath expressly acknowledg'd it, as above, in this View of it.

But take we it either way, it could not be otherwise for the Reasons above given, but that the King of Persia's Decree was now gone forth for the rebuilding of Jerusalem.

In Confirmation whereof, since you have raised so many Questions in the Negative, tho' putting of Questions proves not against the Decree, I now pray your Leave to put one Question to you also for the Affirmative, and mark you the Conclusion.

Give me Leave to put the Question,

Was Nebemiab now made Governor of Jerusalem?—

I think not to answer for you, that out of doubt he was? ———

Here I must therefore put another also,

How doth this appear? ———
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It doth not by any thing that Nebemiah, or Josephus have given us from the King's Letters. For there is not one Word in them about it. ———

I go on in your Way, ———

But yet will you say that Nebemiah had not now the King's Commission appointing him the Tirshatbab?

—— By the Rule you go by, in arguing against the Decree, you should. ——— Because neither Nebemiah, nor Josephus have called the King's Power now delegated to Nebemiah by the Name of a Commission, nor have they given us that Commission in Form. ———

Now should I upon all this go about to conclude by the Commission, as you have by the Decree, that Nebemiah had not the King's Commission, or that the royal Power which the King now gave him in appointing him Governor to the Jews, was not a royal Commission, what would you think of me? ———

Would you not here presently reply to me, that it could not possibly be, but that Nebemiah must now have had either the King's Commission to him in Form, exclusive of the Letters given him by the King, or otherwise certainly the Royal Commission must have been included in those Letters?

Thus it must have been necessarily one way, or other in Nebemiah's Commission: because otherwise he had no Authority to shew for his being the King's Lieutenant, or the now appointed Governor of Judah, and Jerusalem.

Nebemiah therefore now had the King's written Commission constituting him Governor, tho' neither Nebemiah, nor Josephus have stiled it a Commission, or given us that Commission in Form.

Go we now therefore from the Commission to the Decree.

Apply the whole of the former to the latter, and you will find the like necessary Conclusion in this also.
As in the end you must conclude by the Decree now before us, as I have here concluded by the Commission, that as in this, so in that also Nehemiah could not but have had the King’s Decree either in Form exclusive of the King’s Letters, or otherwise in Form included in those Letters, or by express Clause inferred, and immediately declarative of such determined, or decreed royal Pleasure in favour of the Jews. ———

Which royal Favour therefore necessarily remains a Decree, even altho’, as you have here thought fit to object, neither Nehemiah, nor Josephus, have filed it a Decree, or given us the Copy of it. ——— I add

Consequently, that it remains also the Prophetic Decree, as immediately by virtue thereof the Jews had now full Power to rebuild the Wall, and set up the Gates, and fill up the void, and waste Spaces, or Places of their yet naked, and dismanned Metropolis: And it is Certain, that they now executed it. ——— And now the Holy City was no longer a Reproach. ———

And if in this respect I have esteem’d this Decree not inferior to former Decrees granted in favour of the Jews by the Kings of Persia, as it seems you have thought it worth your while to note here that I have cally’d it the greatest of the Four, yet as in this respect I have thus spoken, I have not said it altogether, I hope, without Reason: Forasmuch, as in the immediate Nature, and Advantage of this Decree, or in the immediate Effects, and Consequences of it, the Security and Welfare of the People of God both in Church and State was more amply provided for, than by any of the former.

The City being now fortify’d, the Temple as I may say, was now at rest, as in Times of Prosperity was the Ark of God, of old.
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The People of God were now no longer exposed to the Incursions of Enemies, and Plunderers.

Every Man's private Affairs were now consequently attended with a much surer Prospect of desired Success.

And in few Words, the whole Jewish Polity was now restored: and Jerusalem once more brought into a promising Probability of advancing it self yet again, at least to some Degree of its pristin State of Power, and Grandeur.

And now I have gone through this second Part also of your Remark immediately before us, and therein of the whole of it.

And upon the whole it appearing, that not as you say, A verbal Leave only was given to Nembiahab, but the royal Decree express for the rebuilding the Wall and Gates of Jerusalem, and it having but now appeared also that the said Wall, and Gates to be built by virtue of that Decree had not, as you have told us, been but a little before demolished, but that they had remained in their Ruins, as left by the Chaldaans till the coming of Nembiahab to Jerusalem in the 20th of Artaxerxes; and consequentlly that Nembiahab was the first who rebuilt the Wall, and set up the Gates of Jerusalem, after the Jews Return in the Reign of Cyrus, however you have asserted the contrary to these Particulars; Which are the several Suppositions, on which is founded the late Bishop's Beginning of the 69 Weeks of this Prophecy in the 20th Year of Artaxerxes Longimanus; the said Suppositions being maintained, I conclude that the said Beginning of the said Weeks, as in the Bishop's Hypothetis, doth thus remain unshaken to the said 20th of Artaxerxes.

And
And so I go on to

Your THIRD REMARK, which respects the late Bishop's Ending of the 69 Weeks, and contains an Objection against the said Ending, immediately founded upon the former Objection against their Beginning.

But their assign'd Beginning being now maintained, this Objection against their Ending ceaseth of course.

I need therefore here only to return this Remark in this Part of it in the Reverse, or by giving that in the Affirmative, which you have in the Negative; viz. That *since the 69 Weeks did begin in the 20th Year of Artaxerxes Longimanus, it plainly follows, that the Ending of the 69 Weeks is, as well as the Beginning well, and truly fixed in the Bishop's Hypothesis.*

And therefore however you have concluded from your foregoing Objections to the Bishop's Beginning and Ending of these Weeks, that what I have amassed together in relation to the Eastern Year is of no use as to the Explication of this Prophecy, I on the other hand from their maintained Beginning, and Ending do insist that what I have advanced on that Occasion still remains to have its principal Use, and even its necessary Use for the particular Reasons given in my Treatise concerning the said Form of Year, to which you have not thought fit in any Particular here to object.

But, it seems in what follows, under this Remark, you have somewhat more to say against the Bishop's placing the Ending of the 69th Week so near, as within a Year of our Saviour's Death.

For Whereas, the Prophecy declaring that there should be Unto Messiah the Prince 7 Weeks, and 62 Weeks, and that after the 62 Weeks the Messiah should be cut off, —— You observe that I have
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from thence argued, that our Saviour could not survive a whole Year after the Expiration of the 69th Week, —— Because, as I have insisted, if he had, he would not then have been cut off after seven Weeks, and sixty, and two Weeks, (*) but after seven Weeks, and sixty and two Weeks (**) and one Year also of another Week; —— And that this, as I have observed, had been inconsistent with, at least not precisely agreeing with the express Character, that after 7 Weeks, and 63 Weeks the Messiah should be cut off; i. e. as he is here predicted to be cut off precisely after 483 Years, or in the very next Year after the Completion of the 69th Week of Years, as it is expressly noted in my Treatise, and in the very Beginning of this Argument, and therefore you should not have omitted a Recital of those Words here also:

— But however that be,

You have here objected,

Ist, That when the Time of an Event predicted is, as in this Case given, the Event must necessarily be understood to have its Accomplishment in some Part of such a Portion of Time, as is of the same Denomination with the Time given in the Prediction.

Here you apply a twofold Instance,

One in Days, as you tell us very truly, That if an Event be foretold to happen after 69 Days, the Accomplishment may be reasonably expected in some part or other of the 70th Day.

Another in Years, As when a Thing is foretold to happen after 69 Years, the Prediction is sufficiently verified, if what was foretold be accomplished in any part of the Year following.

(*) ....... (**) I note here after this manner, because you have done me a manifest Piece of Injustice, by taking away the very Force of the Argument here, and indeed by making it unintelligible in yours, or your Printer's Omision of those nine Words between the two Afterisks.
All which is very true.
I readily grant you both the Proposition, and
the Instances.
And whereas You go on to add,
The same is the Case in relation to the Word After
in the Prophecy, there being in it but one Denomina-
tion of Time, that of Weeks given, so I say like-
wise.
But to come to the Difference between us here,
You say it in one Denomination of Time, I in an-
other. You say it in a Denomination of Time by
Weeks, simply as Weeks; I say it in a Denomina-
tion of Time by Weeks resolvable into Years: and
that because
First, Tho' the Word Weeks be the Denoma-
tination of Time mentioned in the Prophecy, yet
Weeks are confessedly Weeks of Years; and conse-
quently resolvable into Years. For what are Weeks
of Years, but so many times 7 Years? — And
Secondly, A Year questionless, and not a Week
of Years is the here given Portion of Time for
the predicted going forth of the Commandment to re-
build Jerusalem; Which is the expressly assigned
Beginning of the first 69 Weeks of Years in the
Prophecy. And
Thirdly, In fact it is so in every Hypothesis of
the Weeks: As Regard is had in them, in your
own also, not to a Week of Years, i. e. not to any
part of 7 Years, or any Year of 7 Years within
which the predicted Commandment went forth, but
even to the very Year, and to that Year only of its
actually going forth.
A Year therefore thus being the Prophetick
Denomination of Time in the Beginning of the
given Period for the cutting off of the Messiah after
69 Weeks of Years, A Year also necessarily re-
mains the Denomination of Time in the Ending of
them.

And
And Consequently, As this predicted Event was thus to fall out after 483 Years, It was for the Reasons now given, and by your own Instances also necessarily to be expected, and accordingly accomplished within the Year following, or in the 484th Year: —— it being thus in this greater Instance of 7 times 69 Years, as in your lesser Instance only of 69 Years. —— And

Therefore that is without Ground, which by way of Objection to the Bishop's Explanation of the Word After, you have here said of it, that it is extremely fallacious.

You have indeed said it upon your having asserted immediately before in the following Words, viz. —— That this part of the Prediction —— that after 7 Weeks, and 62 Weeks the Messiah should be cut off —— had been fully verified, if our Saviour had been cut off in any part of a Week of Years immediately following the Expiration of the 69th Week.

But this Assertion hath no other Foundation than as it is built upon your conceived Denomination of Time in the Prophecy by Weeks, simply as Weeks.

Therefore for the Reasons above given it gives you no room for the objected Fallacy: Even because as it hath been now shewn, Not a Week of Years, or any part of a Week of Years, or 7 Years within which went forth the predicted Commandment, but the very Year of its going forth is the real Denomination of Time Beginning of these Weeks, and Consequently so remains in the Ending of them.

Nor should that have been remarked by you, as a Fallacy, which justifieth it self both by the Prophecy, and by your own Instances; As it verifieth the Prediction in the actual Completion of its immediate
mediate Event in the very first Year after the Expiration of its given Time of Completion; and Consequently, in less than a 7th Part of your allowed Latitude here of a Week of Years, or seven Years after. —

— Indeed the farther off the Accomplishment had been, the greater room had there been for the objected Fallacy. But where it now stands, for the Reasons above given there is none at all. —

You yet go on to object against the Bishop's Ending the 69th Week, as you have here noted.

2dly, That between the Ending of the 69th Week, and the Excision of the Messiah, there was a much longer Time than (you say) I am willing to allow. —

— How I pray is that? —

— Truly no otherwise than as you have argued, and concluded here merely ex Hypothesi in all that followeth under this Remark, as you have interpreted those Words of the Prophecy, — Unto Messiah the Prince, — as containing a Prediction of our Lord's Coming to be anointed by the Holy-Ghost, in that immediate Descent of it upon him at his Baptism.

And from those other Words of it, —— viz. Sixty nine Weeks from the predicted going forth of the Commandment to rebuild Jerusalem —— You have placed in the said Anointing in the very next Year after the Completion of the 69th Week.

Whereas, the late Bishop Lloyd saw no such Coming of the Messiah predicted in these Words, but took them only as implying that Coming of the Messiah which after follows in the Words immediately expressive of his Cutting off; As if the former Words were only an Inlet to the latter, and the latter Consequently immediately expletive of the former.

From
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From both the former, and the latter the Bishop placed the Death of Christ in the Year immediately following after 69 Weeks of Years. And for the Reasons above given he could place it nowhere but in that very Year.

And for the Reason now given he took no notice in his Hypothesis of the Event which you see in the former Words. —— But even were that Event really intended in the Prophecy, it makes not against the Bishop's placing the end of the 69th Week so near as within a Year of our Saviour's Death; Because that Event of course stands so many Years higher within the 69th Week: Which the Prophecy well admits of as I shall shew anon.

But, whereas You have understood, the Intent certain of the Prophecy in those Words of it, as above, and therefore to the said interpreted Intent You have referred the Gospel History of the Descent of the Holy-Ghost upon our Saviour at his Baptism, and withal have placed that Event in the Year, wherein the Bishop hath placed his Death, You have therefore concluded in one Part of your Remark here, as already noted, and again in the very last Words of it, You have not stuck to pass a most harsh, tho' indeed a very groundless Sentence against the Bishop, by telling us, that such his placing our Lord's Death is directly contrary both to the Intent of the Prophecy, and the History of the Gospel.

Indeed, You should have said of it only that it is contrary to your interpreted Intent of the Prophecy, and to your applied Reference of Gospel History, as is the most after all that this Objection comes to.

For in these immediate Words of the Prophecy You have nothing in your Favour any more than what the late Bishop hath also, viz. bare Probability
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bility for his, as well as your interpreted Intent of them.

But it doth not appear from those Words to be the Intent certain of the Prophecy, as you have here insifted, either

1st. That the Messiah is here predicted to come immediately to such Anointing, Nor

2dly, That he was to receive such Anointing in your ascertained year for it, or in the year after the completion of the 69th Week.

Not the Former,

Because the Words insifted on, viz. Unto Messiah the Prince----do not point out any particular Coming of the Messiah, and Consequently not your's in particular, and therefore not your's for certain.

Not the Latter,

For, However You have expressly told us of those Words that they do plainly direct us to the very Moment of Time, in which the Prince whose Coming is foretold, should be anointed, Yet they fall short of what you thus declare concerning them. Forasmuch as, not to take any Notice of your Moment here, they do not so much as direct us to the very year for which you here contend, or the year after the completion of the 69th Week for such Anointing.

Even because they equally leave us to the 69th Week it self; and Consequently to so many years within that Week, as the Year immediate of the Event preceded the Death of the Messiah in the next year after the said 69th Week.

For it is certain from the Scripture promiscuous use of the Hebrew Adverb here, which we not improperly render Unto, that the Words along with it, which you so much insist on, may as well denote
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denote a Time inclusive of the 69th Week, as your Time which is exclusive of it.
And therefore, However plainly you may have seen the latter here, yet the learned Grotius as plainly saw the former. For so he hath expressly told us in the following Words —— ἔν ἑκ καὶ alibi non ultimum terminum significat, sed aliquid intra terminos contentum —— &c.
Consequently a Term is here predicted, not as by your telling, necessarily beyond the 69th Week, but otherwise, according to Grotius, a Time within the very 69th Week. For such Scripture use of the Word he here refers in general. However in particular you may see such immediate use of the Word in Jonah iv. 2. and Job i. 18. undeniably.
Therefore the Hebrew Adverb, on which all is here depending, being thus of various use, and even in the Scripture usage of it, admitting of a Time inclusive, as well as exclusive of the 69th Week, which latter Sense is your Sense certain of the Word; but such Sense thereof being not the Sense here absolutely certain of it, it follows that your Time built upon such suppos'dly certain Sense of the Word is not the Time certain of the Prophecy here. Consequently the Prophecy hath not plainly directed us to your Time.
And so upon the whole, both your interpreted Coming of the Messiah, and your ascertained Time also for such Coming remaining uncertain, It appears that your objected Contrariety of the Bishop's Hypothesis in this part of it, to the Intent of the Prophecy, is without Foundation. And Consequently so likewise is
Secondly, Your objected Contrariety here also to the History of the Gospel. Because
Because plainly the only Foundation of such objected Contrariety to the Gospel is your interpreted Intent of the Prophecy. But your interpreted Intent thereof not appearing to be the Intent certain of it, your referred, or applied History of the Gospel in the Descent of the Holy-Ghost upon our Saviour at the Baptism of John, as the actual completion of such your interpreted Intent of the Prophecy is necessarily uncertain also. For what doth not appear certain in the Prophecy, cannot possibly give Foundation sure for Reference thereunto from the Gospel.

Nor are your Gospel References in themselves conclusive to the maintaining your Charge here against the Bishop, as applied by you both to your suppos'dly predicted Anointing of the Messiah, and to your appropriated Time for such Anointing. For

First, To take your Gospel-History here in the former View,

What though you have told us from the Gospel, that Our Saviour in the Descent of the Holy-Ghost upon him at his Baptism, did in an eminent manner become the Anointed One, and had the Name given him in a most exalted Sense?

Was He not likewise demonstrated to be the Anointed One at other times, and in other Descents of the Holy Spirit upon him; particularly at his miraculous Conception, As he was full of the Holy-Ghost even from his Mother's Womb; and also at his Birth, as HE was now born who was CHRIST the Lord, or the ANOINTED Lord?

And before our Lord's Baptism by John, which was expressly not till after all others had been baptiz'd, the Holy-Ghost a considerable time before, even upon the first Coming of the Baptist, had
had actually descended, and remained upon Christ by John's own immediate Testimony; to the fulfilling the Token which had been given John, whereby he should know him to be the Messiah: For he knew him not before, as John is therein express.

And our Lord was now accordingly acknowledged by John, and by some of John's Disciples also to be the Messiah expressly by name, even thus before his Baptism by John, and Consequent-ly before that other Decent of the Holy-Ghost upon him at that Time.

And though it be very true that you have here observed, viz. That God the Father now bore Testi-mony to his Son at the Solemnity of this Decent at his Baptism by a Voice immediately from Heaven, Yet so did God no less bear Testimony to him at the Solemnity of his Transfiguration also, and again in his immediate glorifying him a little before his Death.

And at his Resurrection surely in the most eminence manner he became, and in the most exalted Sense he was declared to be the Son of God with Power, even in his Resurrection from the dead.

In such Variety of Gospel Instances therefore all equally referable to your interpreted Intent of the Prophecy, or your supposedly predicted Anointing of the Messiah, How is it possible to assure with certainty, if any one of them more than another, or which of them more than all the rest, your's in particular is more immediately to be appropriated thereunto?

Your Gospel Reference at the best remains an uncertain Reference of Gospel-History to an Intent uncertain of the Prophecy in this former View of it, or of its supposed Relation to your supposedly predicted Anointing of the Messiah in the
the Words before us. Much more uncertain and inconclusive Consequently, must be your Gospel Reference.

Secondly, In the latter view of it, or of your applied Relation of it to your immediately appropriated Time for such interpreted Anointing, as you have from the Gospel also argued to the Year after the completion of the 69th Week, your Year certain for such ascertained Anointing.

You have here given us a twofold Gospel Reference. I shall take, and consider them apart.

One is, that our Lord having entered upon his publrick Ministry did expressly declare — That the Spirit of the Lord was upon him, and that by him he had been anointed to preach the Gospel unto the Poor, &c.

—— 'Tis true. —— Our Lord now upon his Ministry did thus declare. But this Declaration makes not to your purpose in any respect, unless it appeared that our Lord spake the Words with immediate Reference to your interpreted Anointing, and even to your appropriated Time for such Anointing. But it doth not so much as appear that our Lord spake the Words with any Reference at all to the Prophet Daniel. ——— Our Lord's Reference was of a certainty to the Prophet Ifaiab. He read the Words now in the Synagogue at Nazareth on the Sabbath Day, as there was delivered unto him the Book (or the Roll) of the Prophet Ifaiab: And when he had opened the Book, (or unfolded the Rolls) he found the Place, where it was written, as above. And thereupon he declared the accomplishment of such Scripture now in himself thus preaching, after that he had read those Words either from the Prophet, not of Daniel, but expressly of the Prophet Ifaiab, or from some Targum of that Prophet. —— Consequently
quenty there is nothing here proving the certain accomplishment of such Prophetick Purpose, or Time, as is this your referred Accomplishment of Gospel-History to your interpreted Anointing of the Messiah in the very Year after the completion of the 69th Week.

Your other Reference of Gospel-History here is, that immediately upon the Baptist's Imprisonment, we find our Saviour openly declaring that the TIME was FULFILLED. —— You add, that in such Declaration be evidently referred to a Time, which had been predetermined, and foretold. ——

Now I do allow it that our Lord might, and probably he did so refer. I make no Question that our Lord here referred to the Prophet Daniel also, in the Kingdom of the Messiah prophesied of, by that Prophet: As that Kingdom was now setting up by our Lord. And it should seem certain that he did so refer in the Words expressly following in the Gospel. —— The Kingdom of Heaven is at hand.

But were that also certain which you have here taken for granted to be so, Even that our Lord in the Words now before us from the Gospel did refer to the 69 Weeks of this Prophecy, Yet your Consequences here will not follow that in such Reference he referred to your time ascertained from those 69 Weeks, or in your Words to the Year after the completion of the 69th Week.

Because Undoubtedly our Lord could no otherwise refer to the Prophecy in the Time therein intended, than that is of a certainty intended in it. But your interpreted Time thereof, as I have just now shewn, is not the Time certainly intended in the Prophecy: Forasmuch as the Words all along insisted on, do not necessarily imply
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imply your Time after the 69th Week, but do equally admit of a Time inclusive of the said 69th Week. And Consequently our Lord might refer to such inclusive Time thereof equally as to your Time exclusive of it. Even if he did here at all refer to the 69th Week of this Prophecy.

So that though it were certain that our Lord in his now urged Declaration, did refer to the 69 Weeks of this Prophecy; And though as you have here told me, by my own Chronology there were about three Years between the Time of our Saviour's said Declaration, and the Time of his Death,—Yet the Prophecy not necessarily pinning us down in this interpreted Coming of the Messiah to the year after the completion of the 69th Week, as you have here contended, but equally allowing of a Time included within the 69th Week for such Declaration; And Consequently of so many years within it as the said Declaration was made before the Death of Christ in the year after the 69th Week; thus upon the whole it appears that our Lord's Death may be, and Consequently is well, and truly placed in the Bishop's Hypothesis so near the expiration of the 69th Week.

It thus appears that it may be so without any manner of your objected Contrariety, or any the least Inconsistency, or Disagreement; I insist it is in full Agreement with the Intent of the Prophecy, and the History of the Gospel: — However you have been free here to determine against such placing the Death of Christ expressly, that it is manifestly apparent to be directly contrary to both.

The objected Contrariety you see is manifestly apparent from nothing but Uncertainties, or upon no other Grounds either from the Prophecy, or the Gospel, but your uncertainly interpreted In-
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tent of the former, and your uncertainly referred History of the latter.

And was it meet for you, do you think, upon such uncertain Grounds, only to have thus concluded against a late learned Father of the Church; One mighty in the Scriptures, as any of his time?

And yet this is now the second Antiscriptural Charge that you have made against the late Bishop.

I am truly concerned at this your Liberty: to speak of it in no worse Terms.

I am concerned for their fakes who are unhappily pleased with Charges of this Nature, whether they be true, or false; and catch at them with the greatest eagerness: but, Alas, the more is the pity, they are not careful to have them removed.

For your sake I am also concerned, that you should have thus determined without that kind of proof, which is ever to be expected in Charges of this Nature, and nothing less than which is sufficient to found them upon: I mean that of EVIDENT CERTAINTY in the Foundation of them.

Whereas, it hath now appeared that you have nothing like it in all that you have here urged both from the Prophecy, and from the Gospel: As above it appeared in the former Charge that you had it not from the History of Nebemiah.

I conclude therefore here also in favour of the late Bishop, that for any thing that hath appeared to the contrary under this Remark, the Death of Christ necessarily remains where it stands fixed in his Hypothesis to the year after the completion of the 69th Week.

And
And so I go on to
Your FOURTH, and Last Remark.
This you introduce by telling me, that
According to the Explanation of the Prophecy of
the seventy Weeks, there were between the Ending
of the 69th Week, and the Beginning of the 70th,
Thirty one Years, and four Months.

Be it so. And what then?

Why say you,
The Unreasonableness, not to say Absurdity, of
this way of Proceeding may be very easily demon-
strated.

You go about your Demonstration by telling
me as follows, viz.

Let it be supposed then, that I have rightly fixed
the End of the 69th Week a year before our Savi-
our's Death, yet from hence you argue,

First, That since seven years are (as you here
tell me, I myself contend for) a Week of Years, it
will follow that as soon as the 69th Week ended, an-
other seven Years, Or in other Words a Week of
Years would of Course begin, even as necessarily as
one Week of Days succeeds another Week of Days.

This Succession of Time You go on immedia-
tely to apply to the Bishop's Hypothesis, by
telling us,

That therefore, since according to Him, Our Sa-
vior dy'd in the year following the expiration of
the 69th Week, the death of our Saviour would ne-
cecessarily fall out in the beginning of those seven Years,
or that Week of Years, which immediately commenced
upon the Ending of the 69th Week. And so you
conclude that therefore Our Saviour was cut off in
a seventieth Week, and Consequently in the seventieth
Week of the Prophecy.

Thus indeed you have here argued, and
concluded; But your Consequences do not follow,
First, Because however you have urged that seven Years, do, as I my self contend, make a Week of Years, Yet, as you cannot be ignorant, I have no otherwise so contended, than as the word Weeks in the Prophecy doth denote certainly not Weeks of Days, but Weeks of Years.

But How I pray doth your urged Succession of Time by Weeks of Years collectively as Weeks follow from thence? 

It doth not surely. Because Weeks of Years considered in their abstracted nature only, as so many Septenaries of Years, or being only so many times seven years, and Consequently being no otherwise Weeks of Years than as Weeks resolvable into Years, and so centring in a Denomination of Times by Years, which therefore as formerly insinuted in my Treatise, and now again for the Reasons above given, becomes the Denomination of Time in this Prophecy, It follows that the Succession of Time therein remains a Succession of Time by Years also. For Undeniably, such as is the Denomination of Time in the Prophecy; such also must be the Succession of Time in it. And therefore your arguing here from a Succession of Weeks of Days, to a Succession of Weeks of Years, collectively as Weeks, is not conclusive. Because for the same Reasons that we should not have to do here with your Denomination of Time, neither have we to do with your Succession of Time.

To apply to the late Biphop's Hypothesis, our blessed Saviour's Excision is there placed in the very next Year after the expiration of the 69th Week, or Septenary of Years, or 483 Years from the given Year of their Beginning.

He was cut off therefore in the 484th year, from the very Year, (not the Week) of the going forth of the Commandment to rebuild Jerusalem.

But
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But for the Reasons already given, He was cut off in that Year, as the Year in immediate Succession upon the Ending of the given Period of Years for such Event; Consequently not, as you contend, as a Year beginning of another Week of Years, or seven Years; and Consequently also not in a 70th Week, and therefore not in the 70th Week of this Prophecy. Nor

Secondly, Doth the Prophecy admit of your Consequences in the Succession of Time, expressly given in it.----Because the prophetick Succession of Time from the Date given of Beginning, reaching thus no farther than to the very year of our Saviour's Exsion, Consequently, it admits not of your seven years Succession immediately beyond it, for which you here contend:----As I shall have occasion to shew forthwith, in immediate Reply to what you have next gone on to Remark here.

In your Second Note, wherein you groundlessly take an Advantage of the late Bishop from his discontinuance of Succession of Time, in his Hypothecis between his Ending of the 69th Week, and his Beginning of the 70th Week of this Prophecy; As there is, as you remark, between the said Terms thirty one Years, and four Months: Which otherwise being four Weeks, and three Years, and four Months, you take occasion to charge the Bishop's Hypothesis with an Absurdity of being an Hypothesi of seventy four Weeks and three Years, and four Months, determined upon Daniel's People, and City, instead of seventy Weeks according to the Prophecy.----

An Absurdity this indeed! You might well remark, and deem it so; I would freely allow you to call it Antiscripturism also, were there real ground for the Charge.

F 2 But
But such conceived and charged Increase of the number of Weeks of the Prophecy upon the Bishop's Hypothesis from the neglected Interval of Time, is merely your own groundless Improvement, otherwise void of all Foundation. Because such neglected Interval of Time is really not prophetic Time: And Consequently you have no ground from the Prophecy for this Objection. As it will appear that you have not by considering

First, That by the Prophecy itself we have not to do with immediate Succession of Septenaries of Years from the given Date of Beginning beyond the 69th Week of it. The Prophecy is express in it, that from the going forth of the Commandment to rebuild Jerusalem, there shall be seven Weeks, and threescore and two Weeks, in the whole sixty nine Weeks, or Septenaries of Years, or 483 Years. The Prophetic Succession of Time therefore necessarily remains to those sixty nine Weeks, or Septenaries; but not to another. Those sixty nine Septenaries of Years ended in the Year of the V. A.E. of Christ 32: for which I refer to my Treatise. Here then the given Period of prophetic Succession of Time by Septenaries of Years from the express Date of Beginning being actually at an end, It follows that therein of course the Prophetic Succession of time immediately by Septenaries of Years, from such Beginning is also at an end. But,

Secondly, The Prophecy being a Prophecy of seventy general Weeks, or Septenaries of Years, of so many expressly, and no more determined upon Daniel's People and City, Consequentially a Prophetic Week, or one other Septenary of Years is still remaining, and without any Succession of Time
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Time for it in the Prophecy. However this remaining One Week of the Seventy, come when it would, it can possibly make no more than seventy Weeks, or Septenaries of Years, or 490 Years. For 69 Weeks and 1 Week put together are but 70 Weeks: Also 483 Years and 7 Years are together but 490 Years all the World over.

Well then. — A Seventieth Week is yet to come. And we are without a Succession of Time 'tis plain, for a Seventieth Week. — Where shall we find it then? Or how shall this Week be known, when the Fulness of its Time should be come?

We are not at a loss for it. Look for it in the remaining Single Week of the Prophecy distinctly spoken of afterwards: Which most rationally, and I think unexceptionably approves it self the Seventieth Week thereof upon this twofold Account, viz.

First, Whereas the Angel had given the general Number of the Weeks of this Prophecy in the Introduction of it, as a Prophecy expressly of Seventy Weeks, he then presently after goes into the Particulars of the Septenaries of Years here predicted, as they consisted of several Parts, or Periods: And to this end he immediately calls upon the Prophet for his Attention.

Accordingly, He gives him the Particulars first of a Period of Seven Weeks, then of another Period of Sixty and two Weeks: Which distinctly mentioned Periods of Weeks are beyond all Denial Weeks particular of the Seventy general Weeks, as Particulars of an Universal.

When the Angel had done with those two Periods of this Prophecy, He afterwards tells the Prophet expressly of another of One Week only, distinguishing that more immediately in the Half Part thereof.

Now
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Now in a rational, and natural Construction of the Prophecy in the Periods thus expressly and particularly here given, What can this remaining Week be possibly other than the Seventieth Week of it?

For if the particulariz'd seven Weeks, and threescore and two Weeks be Weeks undeniably Parts of Seventy Weeks, Consequently, with all Reason the single Week remains equally a Part, undeniably also of Seventy Weeks.

Otherwise why should they be so, and not this? — For the same Reason that they are Parts of the Whole, so is this also.

Nor do they make up the whole without this also. But altogether, or seven Weeks and threescore and two Weeks, and one Week put together make up the whole Seventy Weeks of this Prophecy.

The Prophecy therefore both in the general Number express, and in the particular Numbers also express being a Prophecy only of Seventy Weeks, Consequently the said Single Week necessarily remains the Seventieth Week of it. — As it appears to be also

Secondly, in its express Characters separating it from any immediate Accomplishment by the Messiah, and evidently relating to the Destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans in their plain, and familiar Sense, and in the natural Construction of the Context directly pointing out them, as the Messiah's future People, the Party immediately appointed to accomplish the here predicted Destruction of Jerusalem, and therein also to accomplish the threefold predicted Events of this Single Week. And accordingly they did actually fulfill those several Events, as I have distinctly, and plainly shewn in my Treatise; to which I immediately
mediately refer for Particulars: to none of which you have thought fit to reply.

You have indeed put a few Questions in what follows under this Remark. But those I leave to their proper Places.

Therefore at present to go on here, the Single Week of this Prophecy thus evidently approving it self the Seventieth Week thereof, or the Last Week of the three Periods of Weeks in it, as being the very Week destructive of Jerusalem, Consequently the Ending of the said Week cannot be fought for anywhere but in the final, and actual Destruction of Jerusalem.

That we know was in the Year of the V. æ. of Christ 70. 'Tis easy to look upwards seven Years; and so we are brought into the Year of the V. æ. of Christ 63; when was the Cause initial of that Destruction: the Romans then making a Covenant, and even a firm Covenant, for so it was, with many of their Enemies in that Year, as it is particularly shewn in the Treatise referred to; whereby they became more at leisure to fulfill the Work of God, which he had now for them to do within this predicted Week, or Septenary of Years.

Thus therefore in the Year of the V. æ. of Christ 63, now and not possibly before we come into prophetick Time again.

We had before the prophetick Succession of 69 Weeks, or Septenaries of Years. We have now one other additional Week, or Septenary of Years, thus in the whole the expressly given Number of Seventy Weeks in this Prophecy.

Consequently Your remarked Interval between the Bishop’s Ending of the 69th Week, and his Beginning of the 70th hath nothing to do in this Prophecy. For the Reasons now given it is not Prophetick Time.

Your
Your Addition of Weeks therefore to the Bishop's Hypothesis from that Interval is without Foundation.

And so, Upon the whole the said Hypothesis being thus justified by the Prophecy it self, it is clear'd of your objected Unreasonableness, and Absurdity in this Part of it: And it still remains an Hypothesis of Seventy Weeks, and of no more possibly than Seventy Weeks, the very Number of Weeks expressly determined in this Prophecy both in the general, and particular Numbers of it, as above shewn.

— And having said thus much upon this Occasion, I have in some measure prevented those Questions which you have raised presently after, upon your having noted from my Treatise,

That whereas in Defence of this Discontinuance of Reckoning in the seventieth Week, I have called it variously, A single Week; An odd single Week; A Week separate from the rest; A Week in Reckoning discontinued from the rest; and once I think occasionally A Detach'd Week,

— You have thereupon put

One Question here, introducing it by way of pleasing Admiration — An odd Kind of Week this! — And then you interrogate with immediate respect to the word — detach'd — But, pray Sir, from whence was it detach'd, or by whom?

Alas, Sir, You might as well have ask'd me,— From whence was the Prophecy, and by whom?—

— But I answer, the Angel who by God's immediate Appointment gave the Prophecy of Seventy Weeks, he also detach'd this Week from the other sixty nine Weeks: Or, if you want the Word to be explained, he separated it from having any Succession of Time with them.

And however, in a kind of ludicrous Disposition You admire it — as an odd Kind of Week. —
by your own Addition of the Word Kind here, as you thus express your self, because I may, and I think not improperly have call'd it, as above, an odd single Week, Yet when you are seriously disposed, as indeed in Things sacred we should ever be, I pray you to consider that the Angel hath made it so in the Sense, in which it is so spoken of, for the plain Reasons but now given from the Prophecy it self. In which Sense therefore it so remains.

--- You go on so put

Another Question here, as you ask.

How can a Week, according to the late Bishop, commencing above four Weeks, and three Years after the Ending of the 69th Week, be the Seventieth Week of a Prophecy in which 70 Weeks only are determined, and together mentioned, as conjointly determined upon the Jews, and Jerusalem?

--- I answer, --- very easily, and very rationally.

Because, However seventy Weeks be together mentioned, and conjointly determined in the Introduction of the Prophecy, Yet they are there determined only at large: they are there conjointly spoken of only in general, both as to the Persons mentioned, and the Purposes also mentioned.

But it doth not therefore follow that because seventy Weeks are thus, or in this respect only conjointly spoken of, that therefore the Seventieth Week was to have conjoined Accomplishment with the 69 Weeks. For out of doubt, Seventy Weeks may very rationally be conceived as spoken of conjointly in the general Number, and yet possibly by particular, or distinct Periods they may be separated from each other. As is the very Case in this Prophecy, as it hath been distinctly shewn above.
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But, Whereas I have farther insifted in my Treatife, as I have, and do here also, in favour of such necessary Separation, or Distance of the seventeenth Week from the sixty ninth Week, that it is so separated by its EXPRESS CHARACTERS, because by those Characters it appears immediately determined upon Jerusalem for her Destruction,

You have here also objected, As, by your own Account it seems, You are to learn where those express Characters are to be found.

I reply with Concern, that this I cannot help.---However that surely is no Ground for Objection. You may learn those Characters, if you please, from the Prophecy. I have also fully, and distinctly noted them in my Treatise. But for your sake, I will briefly note again the following Particulars.

First, That there are three Express Characters of this Week, viz.

1st, The making a firm Covenant with many.

2dly, The ceasing of Sacrifice and Oblation to cease, and

3dly, The Abomination of Desolation to stand in the holy Place.

Secondly, That they are all to be taken in a literal Sense; And

Thirdly, That the Party predicted to accomplish these Events is plainly not the Messiah himself, but the Messiah's future People the Romans, and that

1st, Because not He, but they are the next preceding Relative here: and

2dly, He could not possibly fulfill them all.

For however in a figurative Sense appropriated to him, he might fulfill the two former, Yet he could not possibly fulfill the last of those Events, as that is in no sense applicable to him. But all of them are together predicted for Accomplishment in One, and
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and the same Week, or within one given Period of seven Years. And the two last of them are con-
jointly mentioned, or immediately spoken of to-
gether in the Text.

And so the Greek Version, and the Vulg. Lat.
and the Arabick Version plainly understood them.

And therefore that is to no manner of purpose,
as you have said soon after, that you could offer
some probable Arguments to confirm your figurative
Explanation in your Essay for the Words, —
He shall make a firm Covenant with many in One
Week, and in Half of that Week be shall cause sacri-
crifice, and Oration to cease — (which Words
you say, I so much insist on; and you rightly say so,
for I do so insist;) — but, as it so seems by your
own telling, You reserve those probable Arguments
for the Defence you intend to publish. — And
be it so. —

But give me Leave to tell you, that where-ever
you offer those probable Arguments, they can be of no
manner of Service to you, Unless you take the Pro-
phecy in these Particulars of it also, as elsewhere in
a literal sense; and withal, as I do farther insist that
together with those Words — of causing sacrifice,
and Oration to cease — You take along with
them those other Words immediately conjoined
with them, viz. — the Abomination of Deola-
tion to stand in the Holy-place: — to which
Words our Lord himself solemnly, and expressly
hath referred, as the Token certain of the inevita-
ble Destruction of the Jewish Oeconomy, when
that Event should be actually accomplished: which Words you have hitherto dropped in this
Part of your Hypothesis. — And as you have
thus neglected an essential Part of the Prophecy
in the seventieth Week of it, it is no wonder that
you
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you are at a loss to learn the express Characters of
the said seventieth Week.

Nor is that any Argument which you have imme-
diately given here, why you should not have yet
learned those express Characters, as you have laid
down the following Proposition in order to exclude
those Events from having Relation to the Seven-
tieth Week of this Prophecy, viz.

That the Prophecy is express that the 70 Weeks
were determined upon the Jews, and Jerusalem for
no other than the following Purposes; viz. to finish
Transgression, to make an end of Sin, and the rest
of them, as they are mentioned in the 24th Verse
of it:

For the Proposition is not true.

I deny, that 70 Weeks were determined upon
Jerusalem for no other than those Purposes.

Because, tho’ the Prophecy be express that
seventy Weeks were determined upon the Jews, and
Jerusalem, for those Purposes, yet that Number of
Weeks is not determined immediately for those
Purposes, nor for those Purposes only.

First, Not immediately for those Purposes.

For how are Seventy Weeks here determined? —
no otherwise than in the Introduction of the Pro-
phecy; no otherwise Consequently in that Num-
ber of them, than, as I have above noted, in
general Determination. Seventy Weeks were
therefore only generally determined for those
Purposes.

And confessedly those Purposes were accom-
plishesable by the Messiah. But, as it hath appear-
ed, only Sixty nine Weeks, or Septenaries of
Years were determined immediately upon him,
Consequently Sixty nine only of Seventy general
Weeks, and not the whole Seventy Weeks were
immediately determined for those Purposes.

Secondly,
Secondly, Were Seventy Weeks determined in this Prophecy for no other than those Purposes, Because

1st, The Prophecy is express that Seventy Weeks were determined upon the Jews and Jerusalem, as well as for those Purposes. But those Purposes in their Accomplishment centreing only in the Mefsiab, consequently Seventy Weeks were determined for other Purposes also immediately relating to the Jews, and Jerusalem. And

2dly, The Prophecy shews it in its Particulars, or in its express Distinction of Periods of Seven Weeks; and threescore and two Weeks; and one Week. For undoubtedly the Reason of dividing the general Number of Seventy Weeks into three distinct Periods of Weeks could be no other than that of their having particular Events, or Purposes relating immediately to them. Every Period was determined, or appointed by God upon the Parties, and for the Purposes concerned immediately with their respective Periods, as much as were seventy Weeks in general. And consequently every Period could not but have its particular, and immediate Purpose of, and for Accomplishment.

The middle Division is here immediately appropriated to the Time, and Purposes of the Mefsiab.

The first, and last of course remain to the Jews, and Jerusalem.

The former for her predicted Restoration in the Purposes of the rebuilding of the Wall and Streets of Jerusalem; and also of the going forth of a Commandment expressly for that Purpose.

The Latter, (as she should prove a City which would not see the Things belonging unto her Peace,) for her final Destruction; in the expressly predicted Purposes
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Purpose thereof, mediatly, or immediately executive of that Destruction, as above.

I see not therefore how you could exclude these from being Purposes of the Seventy Weeks; as it is plain you have in the Proposition before us.

But you might as well affirm that these distinctly mentioned Periods of Seven Weeks, and One Week were not Parts, or Weeks particular of Seventy general Weeks, as much as the Sixty two Weeks Prophecy are so.

You have indeed affirm’d it of the Latter, or the one Week, that it is not so.

But will you deny it also of the seven Weeks? Surely You will not.

I conclude therefore that if seven Weeks, and sixty two Weeks are so, consequently so is the One Week also.

But all have their respective Purposes, as above, which are other Purposes than those only included in your Proposition: Consequently the said Proposition is not true, that seventy Weeks were determined for no other Purposes.

There cannot therefore be any true Conclusion from it.

And therefore, However you have gone on to argue from those Events, or Purposes, that Even, by my own Paraphrase on them they received their Completion a considerable Time before my seventieth Week began.

Yet, that doth not follow, as you have here concluded, viz.

That the Destruction of Jerusalem was an Event, or Purpose, with which the seventieth Week in the Prophecy was no otherwise concerned, than as the Death of the Messiah in that Week was the Occasion of that Destruction;

Because,
Because,

Tho' those Events did receive their Completion in the Messiah, yet they received it not in the seventieth Week of the Prophecy, he having not to do with a seventieth Week, or Septenary of Years, as it hath appeared above.

And however the Death of the Messiah were the Occasion of the Destruction of Jerusalem, which I most readily grant you,

Yet the Death of the Messiah not being in any given septenary of Years, and therefore not in the seventieth Week,

Consequently, the Destruction of Jerusalem still remained an Event, or Purpose immediately to the Seventieth Week of it.

And therefore this Event being thus necessarily concern'd with that Week, it appears to be an Event, or Purpose, with which the seventieth Week in the Prophecy was otherwise concerned than you would have it to be: Even as the Destruction of Jerusalem, and not the Death of Christ was the Event immediately concern'd with it.

And therefore that also is without Ground, that you have told us afterwards of this Week of the Destruction of Jerusalem, viz. That it was a certain Week which was to commence several Years after the seventieth Week was expired.

Such Affertion hath no Foundation in the Prophecy; Forasmuch as both in the general, and also in the particular Numbers of it, as we have seen, it is a Prophecy expressly of seventy Weeks, and therefore a Prophecy only of seventy Weeks.

It hath doubtless none at all in the Reason you subjoin for it, viz.

That Computation of Time by Weeks of Years was the most noted among the Jews, and by them, and no other Nation used.

For
For, though the Jews did thus reckon, Yet that doth not appear to be truly grounded, which you have said here that they were the only People that did so reckon.

For if so,

How then cometh it to pass that Aristotle [in Polit. Lib. VI. in fine] hath told us of those, who antiently distinguisht their Ages by Septenaries, or Weeks of Years? — For which I may refer you also to Censorinus, in his Book De die natali. —

Or How came it to pass that Varro also according to Aulus Gellius [Lib. 3. c. 10.] at the time of his writing his Book inscrib'd Hebdomades, reckoned his Age after the like manner, as by his own Account he was then enter'd into his twelfth Septenary, or Week of Years? — i. e. He was then enter'd into his 78th Year. And to that Day, it seems, he had written seventy Septenaries, or Weeks of Books; i. e. 490 Books.

But, Even were the Observation true in the whole of it, what is it after all to your purpose here? —

It proves nothing one way, or t'other to the point in hand.

The Jews might be the only Nation in the World that reckoned thus, as you contend; and yet the Week of the Destruction of Jerusalem may still be the seventieth Week in the Prophecy, notwithstanding any thing that there is in this Observation to the contrary: —

In truth it is to no manner of Purpose.

Upon the whole therefore,

In the late Bishop's Hypothetical, the seventieth Week of the Prophecy being thus accounted for, in the Week destructive of Jerusalem by the Romans, and the other predicted Periods of seven Weeks, and
and of three score and two Weeks, being above accounted for, as having their Beginning certain in the 20th Year of the Reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus, and, in their conjoined Sum of sixty nine Weeks, their Ending in the Death of the Messiah in the very next Year after the completion of that the given number of Weeks of Years, or 483 Years for such immediate Event.

It follows, That thus by the said Hypothesis the Seventy Weeks of this Prophecy are particularly accounted for: and with your leave, they are so accounted for, I conceive, in a rational manner.

And therefore, If I have with Zeal endeavour'd to obtrude the said Hypothesis upon the World, as it seems, by your telling, I have, Yet I hope the World will be so candid as to pardon me that Zeal.

Even Because, as it hath now appeared again of the said Hypothesis, that However zealous you have been on the other hand to explode it in express Terms, both as irrational, and antiscr iptural, — Yet still it remains unshaken, as being built upon the Foundations both of Reason, and Scripture. —

— And therefore I said of it formerly, and therefore I do say of it still, that it is truly deserving that very great Character, as you are pleas'd to call it, which I have given of it in my Preface, viz. That it appears to be on all accounts infinitely better than any Hypothesis that ever was yet extant of the Seventy Weeks,

—— For so it truly is in the late Bishop's View of the Prophecy, as a Prophecy only of seventy Weeks,

—— I do yet add in favour of the Bishop's sure Beginning, and Ending of the sixty nine Weeks of
of the Prophecy, that However did we take it with you, as a Prophecy of seventy one Weeks in the whole of it, and also in Your Denomination, and Succession of Time by Weeks collectively as Weeks. Yet Even thus the Weeks will still date their Beginning, as in the Bishop’s Hypothesis, from the twentieth Year of Artaxerxes Longimatus: As in this View of the Prophecy, even as a Prophecy in the whole of seventy one Weeks, as you contend, Yet the sixty ninth Week being ended in the Bishop’s Hypothesis in the Year of the V. Æ. of Christ 32, (as it may be particularly seen in the Calculation in my Chronological Treatise) and withal the Messiah being cut off in the Pasover following of the next Year, or the Year of the V. Æ. of Christ 33, He will thus according to your self, be cut off in that Year, as the Year beginning of the Seventieth Week. And so Your additional Week will of course remain to the Destruction of Jerusalem in the said Hypothesis.

And thus I am come home with you to Your Conclusion: As by way thereof, You tell me that the truth of your Remarks, which you have now offered to my Consideration on the late Bishop Lloyd’s Hypothesis of the Seventy Weeks, entirely depends upon the truth of the following particulars.

1. That the number of Years, from the first of Cyrus to the Destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, is rightly assigned in Ptolomy’s Canon.
2. That our Saviour dy’d in that Year, which, according to the said Canon, was the nineteenth of Tiberius.
3. That the Word מִשְׂרָאֵל in the Prophecy is rightly translated — determined —— and not —— cut out.

These
These, as you add, are Positions with me of undoubted Verity.

Now,

As to the two former; I very readily acknowledge the late Bishop's Hypothesis built upon them, as such:

As to the Latter; Translate the original Word, either way, as you will. I see not how it affects the said Hypothesis.

--- But after all, However these Particulars be confessedly true, Yet it doth not follow that therefore Your Remarks are of undoubted Verity also.

How the truth of your Remarks is depending upon their truth, I see not, any farther than they are immediately concerned with those Truths. And so far, but no farther are those immediate Remarks justified by those Truths.

But Your Remarks may be either true, or false in other respects; tho' the truth of those Positions be still, and always is the same.

As to your Remarks,

I have now gone through every Line of them. As to the Truth of them, that I leave with your self, and the World.

And so I need not to add any thing farther at the present, than that I am, as far as you can desire me to be with regard to truth,

Sir,

Your very Humble Servant,

BENJ. MARSHALL.
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Mr. WHISTON.

SIR,

HEREAS some time since you gave the World an Hypothesis of Daniel's Weeks, with an alteration of their numbers from what they are in our common Masorete Copies, and by making the History of Ezra, and the former part of Nebemiab to belong not, as in those Copies to Artaxerxes (Longimanus) King of Persia, but to his Father Xerxes, in your therefore protracted 28 Years Reign of that King, upon the Authority of our present Josephus, and moreover, for the sake of those that might still prefer the common
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common Copies, You (a) did declare, that of all the Hypotheses of the Weeks You had hitherto seen, that of the late Bishop Lloyd, is, without controversy, the best;

Being now brought again, by Mr. Lancaster's printed Letter to me, to appear in farther Vindication of the said Hypothesis; I take this opportunity, as well in favour of that Hypothesis, in its immediate Beginning of the sixty nine Weeks of the Prophecy, in the twentieth Year of the Reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus; as also in favour of our present Copies of Ezra, and Nehe-miab, who are express in that King's Reign in those times with which they were immediately concerned, to give you the following Reasons, not to enter farther into particulars, why I cannot allow of your departing either from the said Hypothesis, or from the said Copies in that King's Reign, and in that year thereof, for the sake of your new Hypothesis of the Weeks begun from the twenty fifth of your supposed twenty eight Years Reign of Xerxes.

And they are

First, That not One of all your Testimonials produced on this occasion, yields you any proof of such protracted Reign of Xerxes, besides that of our present Josephus. And therefore,

Secondly, It is most unreasonable to set up his single Authority against our present Copies of Ezra, and Nehemiah, particularly in your beginning of the Weeks from a supposed twenty fifth Year of the Reign of that King. And

Thirdly, That however the Weeks are by you said to take their Beginning from such supposed twenty fifth Year of the Reign of Xerxes, Yet in

(a) Supplement to Dr. Accomp. p. 90.
fact they are not so begun. There is not possibly any twenty fifth of that King in the said Hypothesis.

To make good these particulars in their order;

First, Not One of all your numerous Testimonies gives you ground for such protracted Reign of Xerxes, as by Josephus, and your account from him is that of a twenty eight years Reign of that King, excepting only our present Copies of the said Josephus.

For to look a little into those Testimonies: Some of the Authors which you quote on this occasion either say not, How many Years Xerxes reigned; and therefore they are quoted to no manner of purpose; Or otherwise they say directly, that he reigned twenty one Years, as Ptolemy in his Canon; Or else they give us so to understand, as do Charon of Lampasacus, and Thucydides, and Cornelius Nepos who follows Thucydides, that the coming of Themistocles after his flight out of Greece was not to Xerxes, but to Artaxerxes; and that expressly according to Plutarch from Charon and Thucydides, after the Death of his Father Xerxes. Which is directly against you.

But, Even were all that true, which you would have us to believe in this matter, viz. (b) That Plutarch, and others misunderstood Charon, and Thucydides in this particular, and that Artaxerxes was newly made King Regent (c) in the twelfth year of the Reign of his Father Xerxes, and also that Xerxes was living, (d) when Themistocles came to the Persian Court,

Yet, even all this granted, the Testimonies of these Authors in your own understanding of, (b) p. 68. (c) p. 73. (d) p. 68.
them, yield you no manner of Proof, and are indeed quite foreign to your twenty eight Years Reign of Xerxes.

Because these thus interpreted Testimonies bring us no farther forwards on the Reign of Xerxes, than his thirteenth: In which (e) Year you place the arrival of Themistocles at the Persian Court.

Therefore all this is nothing at all to your protracted twenty eight Years Reign of Xerxes.

Indeed you have in effect argued here after this manner,

"Artaxerxes upon these Testimonies as now interpreted was made King Regent in the twelfth of his Father Xerxes; "Ergo, his Father Xerxes reigned sixteen years longer upon the Authority of these Testimonies.

Had you indeed been here pleading for a longer reckoning of the Reign of Artaxerxes than that which we have in the Astronomical Canon, you might in that Case have urged these your thus interpreted Testimonies with some Colour of Reason: but with respect to the Reign of Xerxes, to the proving from hence a twenty eight Years Reign of that King, they are urged without any.

'Tis so likewise in the Testimony of Diodorus Siculus, as in effect you have argued also from that Author after this manner,

"Diodorus Siculus informs us that Xerxes reigned somewhat above twenty Years, (f) "Ergo, He reigned twenty eight Years by the Testimony of that Author.

You have argued yet stronger here, as you have told (g) us in the following Words concerning that Author, that Xerxes reigned somewhat

\[(e)\text{ ibid.} \quad (f)\text{ p. 70,} \quad (g)\text{ ibid.}\]
above twenty Years, in Agreement with the Astronomical Canon.

But surely this Testimony cannot be urged with any manner of Reason in Agreement with the Canon, than as it agrees with a twenty one Years Reign of Xerxes; as he is said to have reigned so many Years in the Canon.

It is plain from the express Testimony of this Author, that his Agreement with the Canon in the Reign of Xerxes is not with Josephus, but with Ptolemy, as above.

You had given us but just before to as much purpose the Authority of Ctesias on this Occasion.

For, after that you had told us that Artapanus (or Artabanus) the chief Minister of Xerxes had contriv'd to murder him, — You have added in the following Words — that, as Ctesias thought, he did really murder him.

So that Ctesias, by your own Acknowledgment thought thus: [I add, so also agree Diodorus Siculus, and Justin — — ] But it seems you do not believe a Word of it. — To what purpose then is the Testimony of Ctesias here?

But, it seems you have insisted much upon certain Facts, and plain Indications, and evident Signs, as you call (b) them, out of Justin, for your protracted Reign of Xerxes: as if the Murder of Xerxes: or as you call it only the Attempt of it by Artabanus, and his Design upon Artaxerxes, which most probably were only some Months asunder, did appear from those Signs, and Indications to have been several Years asunder: as you would have them to have been for your purpose.

(b) p. 71.
Mr. WHISTON

But whereas Justin hath not given us any Dates of Time for those Facts, there is no concluding with any Certainty from them.

Nor can they possibly be of any manner of Service to you, place them where you will; Because by the sure Authority of the Astronomer's Canon, the Death of Xerxes cannot be placed later than that Year of Nabonassar in which it there stands. And for you to place it earlier makes so much the more against you. But as to any longer Reign of Xerxes than that in the Canon, your own Computation of the Years of the Reign of that King in your new Hypothesis of the Weeks admits not of it; but, as it will appear anon, is evidently against you in any longer than that of a one and twenty Years Reign: notwithstanding the Plainness, and Evidence of the Signs, and Indications here referred to.

There is yet a Testimony, that next to this from Justin, You have also built much upon: As you have (i) told us from Clemens Alexandrinus, that His Reckoning the Years of the Reign of Xerxes to be twenty six Years well agrees with Josephus.

But such good Agreement, 'tis plain, is no more than this, viz. That the Latter hath given Xerxes a Reign of twenty eight Years: the Former only of twenty six Years. Which is far in Strictness from a good Agreement. It is so far from it, that any farther than a twenty six Years Reign of Xerxes, it is plainly a Disagreement. Clemens is indeed against Josephus and you in a twenty eight Years Reign of that King.

And indeed the Numbers of Clemens, as well in the Reign of Xerxes, as in the preceding Reign of Darius Hyphasis, in a forty six Years Reign attributed to that King, and in his collective Number

(i) Page 72.
of the Years of the Persian Kings are so confused, and disagreeing, that in such an Uncertainty of Numbers there is in Truth no rational Foundation for arguing from his Authority to that of Josephus, even for a twenty six Years Reign of Xerxes. There is none at all for a twenty eight Years Reign of that King.

And thus upon the whole Josephus stands alone for such protracted Reign of Xerxes. But

Secondly, His single Authority is surely not sufficient for such extended Reign of that King. Much less is it for your altering our present Scripture Numbers of Daniel's Weeks, and our present both Numbers and Names in Ezra, and Nehemiah, in your referring that History with our present Josephus to Xerxes; which according to them expressly belongs to his Son Artaxerxes.

You indeed have pleaded (k) in favour of such Alteration that our present Majority Copies of the Scriptures have undergone a Change by the Jews in a concurrent Meeting of theirs at Tiberias in the Beginning of the second Century. But, not to enter into that Dispute, which is entirely needless here, it is surely full as likely for the Jews also to have corrupted Josephus voluntarily, and by a concurrent Meeting also, as for them so to have corrupted their Scriptures.

Where, or when Josephus hath been corrupted, I will not take upon me to say. But that in Fact he hath been miserably corrupted, there is nothing more plain. You your self have allowed (l) that the Jews have corrupted Josephus.

I see not therefore how you can urge his Testimony in any thing against our present Copies of

(k) Essay towards the restoring the true Text of the Old Test. Scriptures, p. 156, and 261. (l) p. 28 and 270.
the Scriptures, wherein, as he now stands, he varies from them.

Even because in those very Differences Josephus possibly, and not they may have been corrupted. And therefore indeed not they, but He must be given up: and that with the greatest Reason, particularly in the Times we are now immediately concern'd with.

And therefore the late learned Dr. Prideaux (m) hath well observ'd of his Writings, as we now have them, that they have in them many great, and manifest Mistakes; and no part of them more than the eleventh Book of his Antiquities: Wherein he says of him most truly according to our present Copies of them, that he varies from Scripture, History, and common Sense. And he there among other Instances to this Purpose gives this in particular of his confounding the History of the Artaxerxes of Ezra, and Nebemiah with his Father Xerxes: As upon the sure Authority of the Astronomical Canon, he says, that Xerxes could not have reigned beyond the twenty one Years given him in that Canon.

And that this is the very Truth of this Matter, it will appear undeniably, if from no other, however from your own undoubted Testimony, because though you have asserted from Josephus, that Xerxes reigned twenty eight Years, and however you have therefore set the twenty fift of his Reign, upon his Authority also, for the going forth of the Commandment to rebuild Jerusalem, your Year said to be the Beginning of your new Hypothesis of the Weeks, Yet

Thirdly, In Fact there is no such twenty fift of Xerxes, nor in Truth any more than a twenty

(m) Con. Hist. Vol. i. 8vo Edit. p. 302. See also p. 211.
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one Years Reign of that King in the said Hypo-
pothesis.

That this is the real Truth of the Matter, it
certainly appears from your own Words, as
touching your FIRST Year of the Reign of
Xerxes: As Ptolemy's, and Yours are confessedly
one, and the same First of that King's Reign.

For in one place of your Book (n) you tell us
very truly thus,

The great Standard of antient Chronology, which
we call the Astronomical Canon of Ptolemy, assures
us, that Xerxes's First Year corresponded to the Year
of Nabonassar's Æra 263; which began A. P. I.
4228 ante Ær. Christi 486. Dec. 23; and there-
fore corresponded in general to the next Year A. P. I.
4229, ante Ær. Christi 485.

In another (o) place you have told us likewise,
with this Addition, viz.

That the Decree of Xerxes for the rebuilding of
Jerusalem by Nehemiah going forth by our Copies
in the Month Nisan, and by Josephus, and the Au-
thor of Excerpt. Lat. Barbara, about nine Months
before the 9th Month Calleu, in the twenty fifth of
Xerxes is to be dated about March A. P. I. 4253 ;
ante Ær. Christ. 461; and can be dated at no other
Time whatsoever.

Now, Sir, from what you have said here with re-
spect to the FIRST Year of the Reign of Xerxes,
your late Hypothesis of the Weeks said to be dated
from the going forth of the Commandment to rebuild
Jerusalem in a twenty fifth of Xerxes is evidently
false. And however you have set such a Year as
the only Time of the going forth of such Com-
mandment, or Decree, Yet in fact there is no such

(n) Supplement to the lit. Accomplishment, &c. p. 67.
(o) Page 74.
twenty fifth of Xerxes in the said Hypothesis. Indeed there cannot be.

Because in both these Quotations from your self, the first Year of the Reign of Xerxes in your own adapted Years of the Julian Period, and before the Vulgar Æra of Christ, and also of Nabonassar's Æra is confessedly the first of Xerxes his one and twenty Years Reign in the Astronomical Canon. And Consequently your twenty first of that King is the same with the twenty first of his Reign in the said Canon. But this is impossible with respect to your twenty eight Years Reign of Xerxes; as Ptolemy's twenty first of that King was certainly the last Year of his Reign. Otherwise beyond all Dispute Xerxes if he had reigned longer would have had more Tboths of his Reign; and Consequently seven more Tboths thereof, if as by your Assertion he reigned seven Years longer. But by the sure Authority of the Canon, Xerxes was now dead after twenty one Tboths of his Reign; before another Tboth came about. And Consequently the last seven Years of your imaginary twenty eight Years Reign of that King necessarily run in upon the seven first Years of his Son Artaxerxes in the said Canon, after the Death of his Father Xerxes.

And therefore surely you were not aware of Consequences here.

Otherwise you should indeed have taken quite another Method in a twenty eight Years Reign of Xerxes; Even by anticipating, or beginning seven Years earlier than Ptolemy's first of Xerxes: that to his Last and your last of that King might have been one and the same Last thereof.

For this, as I need not to tell you, is, at least ought to be always the Case in Agreement with Truth,
Truth, in any Reign of a longer Computation than that which we have in his Canon.

Thus you know very well, that it is in the two-fold Computation (p) of the Reign of Nebuchadnezzar the Great, or the Son. Thus, as you have observ'd your self, it is in the three-fold Computation of the Reign of Cyrus. Thus it was also in the two-fold Computation of the Reign of Tiberius Caesar.

It might have been also thus in the twofold Computation of the Years of Artaxerxes Longimanus his Reign, if his Father Xerxes took him in Co-partner with him in the Government, in his 12th, as you contend.

But if this were so, 'tis nothing at all to your purpose in your protracted Reign of Xerxes. The Parallel that you talk of, (q) in such Cases is very far from being obvious in this. It is impossible, as I have shewn, that there should be any Parallel here: as Ptolemys, and your First of Xerxes are confessedly one, and the same First of that King.

And for the same Reason that Xerxes must have been dead after his one and twenty Years Reign in the Canon, before another Tobiah came about, it necessarily follows that he hath also in fact no more than the same twenty one Years Reign in your Hypothesis.

And therefore in truth you have only talk'd to your Reader of a Reign of Xerxes, and a twenty fifth Year of that King, for the going forth of the Commandment, or Decree to rebuild Jerusalem, the Year by you said to be the Year beginning of your new Hypothesis. But indeed it is only said so; as from what hath been already noted from

all your corresponding Numbers with the first, and the twenty first of Xerxes in the Canon, your talk'd of twenty fifth of Xerxes necessarily, and really is in your corresponding Numbers also the Fourth of Artaxerxes Longimanus, after his Father's Death. And so your Decree really went out thus not in the Reign of Xerxes, but of Artaxerxes: And so your Hypothesis also begins in fact not from a twenty fifth of Xerxes, but from the fourth of Artaxerxes. And Finally, your imaginary twenty eighth of Xerxes is in fact the seventh of Artaxerxes, as his Father had been now certainly dead going on seven Years.

And thus, Having given you my Reasons, as at first propos'd, by the present Opportunity, why I cannot possibly join with you, in departing from the late Bishop Lloyd's Hypothesis of the Weeks, (of which you have spoken so well, as above noted) for the sake of your new Hypothesis of them, nor in altering our present Masorete Copies of Ezra, and Nebemia in those places of them, with which we have been here immediately concern'd, upon the single Testimony of an Historian confessedly corrupted in many places of his Writings; and, as it hath appear'd, not at all to be credited in these Times; Even as you yourself have in fact not followed him: I think nothing more needeth to be added in a Cave so, very plain, as this is, but that I am,

Sir,

Your very humble Servant,

Benjamin Marshall.
A LETTER

TO THE

Author of the Scheme of Literal Prophecy considered.

SIR,

That which is the main Subject of the foregoing Letters having merited (as you have (a) told us, a very particular examination from you, (and very particular it is, as we shall see anon from your own Hypothesis of the Weeks) obtruded upon the World, with a Design to evade this Prophecy of Daniel so clearly and literally applicable as it is to the Christian's MESSIAS JESUS, even the Son of God, our ever blessed Lord,

(a) Scheme of Literal Prophecy considered, p. 173.
and Saviour,) I cannot but even for your sake, at least for your Reader's sake, endeavour to shew in the following Letter, how vainly you have talkt to him of confusing (b) a literal Prophecy from hence; and to how very little purpose you have been engag'd in the groundless and presumptuous Undertaking.

My Design therefore in this Letter is to shew you that your Hypothesis of the Weeks makes not at all against this Prophecy its having in its obvious, primary, and literal Sense an immediate relation to that, which in the late learned Bishop Lloyd's Hypothesis of the Weeks is the grand purpose of it, viz. the Death of the Messiah, our blessed Redeemer. Forasmuch as upon particular enquiry made into your Hypothesis, this Prophecy in the Messiah therein expressly predicted will be found to have no manner of relation to your several pretended Messiahs, nor to any interpreted Messiah under the Persian, or Græcan, or Syrian Kings, nor particularly in the times of Antiochus Epiphanes, to whose Person and Times you would fain accommodate this Prophecy, and shut it up with them. And Consequently the said Prophecy must, and will remain necessarily to the true Messiah only of the Christians, who was born King of the Jews in the Reign of the Roman Emperor Augustus, and was put to Death under that of Tiberius.

The Method that I here propose to observe is that of looking into your explication of the Prophecy, in every Verse thereof in their order, together with your Notes upon it, whereby you pretend to justify such Explication, and also your Chronology, or Application of time to it; and

(b) p. 174.

withal
A Letter to the Author of the Scheme

Withal of noting, and obviating as I go along, such Objections as you have occasionally made to the late Bishop Lloyd's Hypothesis of the Weeks.

To begin therefore in the Method propos'd,

The Prophecy opens it self in the ninth Chapter of Daniel at the twenty fourth Verse, as in our Translation thus,

Seventy Weeks are determined upon by People, &c.

Here you take upon you to correct our Translation, and you read, as follows,

"Seventy Weeks are shortened, or abr"viated with respect to by Peo-"ple, &c.

And Why so? —

You tell us in your Note here, "Because it is so render'd in the Greek, in the Vulgate, and in Tertullian.-----

----- But I pray, What tho' it be so render'd as in the Authorities cited? ----- Were we to look only upon Authorities, there are many more to be produced (c) here in favour of your Translation.

Hear in particular what our late learned Dr. Prideaux (d) hath most justly said as to the Sense of the original Word in Dispute, as it here follows; The true Meaning of the Word Nechtach is, as in our English Version decided, or determined; And in this Sense it is used in the Chaldee Para-phrase (e); and nowhere in any other. -----

And therefore Father Harduin the Jesuit should not have taught you to say, as in the bottom of

(c) Vide Pole Synops. in Dan. ix. 24. in Voca Nechtach; also Leigh's Critica Sacra; Kircher in Concord; and Buxtorph in Voca.
(d) Con. Hist. p. 28. 8vo. Edit.
(e) In Ethier iv. 5.

your
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your Note on this occasion, that the Original Word both in Hebrew and Chaldee signifies to abbreviate, or cut, and not to determine.

You might have learnt better from our judicious Mr. Mede also, who (f) hath told us that the Word here translated determined, or allotted, signifies properly to be cut, or cut out (g): Not cut short, as by Father Harduin’s, and your Sense put upon the Word here. ------

But to come home to the Point; after all, neither Father Harduin’s, nor your Hypothesis of the Weeks doth in Accomplishment approve your Sense of the Word: And Consequently your’s cannot be the true meaning of it.

You have indeed both of you taken upon you in your respective Hypothesis to shorten seventy Weeks of Years, or 490 Years to 434 Years; by beginning the said shortened Period from the going forth of the Word of the Lord to the Prophet Jeremiah in the fourth Year of the Reign of Jehoiakim, for the return of the Jews from Babylon after a seventy Years Captivity; and by ending the said shortened Period in the second Year of Judas Maccabæus.

But it is inconsistent not only with the Prophecy, but even with common Sense.

First, To make this Beginning, and this Ending of the Weeks, as it will particularly appear anon. As it is also

Secondly, To suppose that sixty two Weeks of Years, which is the Number of Weeks in your 434 Years should be equivalent to the given Number of seventy Weeks, which number of Weeks makes 490 Years.

(f) On Daniel’s Weeks.
(g) So Kircher, Buxtorph, Leigh’s Critica Sacra in Vace.
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It is as if you had said in plain Terms after this manner,

"Seventy Weeks of Years, or 490
Yeas are in Number here predicated
to be lengthened upon God's People,
and yet at the same time they
are in Accomplishment to be shortned
to 434 Years upon God's People."

Surely, a very rational way this of expounding by a manifest Contradiction a Prophecy given in express Terms, and with an express number to it. And

Thirdly, Whereas the number 434 is your greater number here, and whereas you have also a lesser number of 70 Years, as you reckon by such a Period from the fourth year of Jehoiakim to your accommodated first Year of Cyrus (b), viz. the year of his being made General of the Confederate Army of the Medes, and Persians under Cyaxares the Second, (i) King of Media, nothing can be more senseless,

First, Because We have not to do with any Period of Seventy Years, or ten Weeks of Years in this Prophecy: Nor

Secondly, With your accommodated first Year of Cyrus, as that was not the first of his Reign over the Persian Monarchy: For the year in which the Jews returned was such first (k) Year thereof,

Thirdly, In fact there was no Abbreviation of the seventy Years Captivity of the Jews. ———
But were your interpreted meaning of the Word here the true meaning of it, in that Case the

(b) In the Year before the V. AE of Christ 559.
(k) 2 Chron, xxxvi. 22. Exxah i. i.
Jews should have returned according to the first Period of Weeks, in this Prophecy immediately after 7 Weeks, or 49 Years: Whereas Confessedly they did not return till after 10 Weeks of Years, or 70 Years, the whole given number of Years of their Captivity from the fourth of Jehoiakim, even the full length of time by God himself appointed by his Prophet for it: A time this determined to the very first year of Cyrus after seventy Years, but not abbreviated to forty nine Years.

But these things will open gradually, as we go along, to their fully evidencing your groundless Explication of the Word before us.

Nor have you given us an explication less absurd, or more probable, or possible of being a true Explication of the several predicted Purposes of the Prophecy, which do next immediately follow in this Verse: As you have referred their accomplishment either to the times of the seventy Years Captivity, or otherwise to the times of Antiochus Epiphanes.

But that the said predicted Purposes could not possibly have their accomplishment in either of those times, it will appear by looking into them in their order, together with your Notes upon them.

As to the several Purposes here predicted, they are these following, as they stand in our Translation; viz. 1st, To finish Transgression; 2d. To make an end of Sins; 3d. To make reconciliation for Iniquity; 4th. To bring in everlasting Righteousness; 5th. To seal up Vision and Prophecy; and 6th. To anoint the most holy.

The two first of these you have reduced into one, under the following Explication, viz.

"To put an end to all Punishment for their (the Jews) Sins. —

Now
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Now to let your own Words pass here as applied by you only to the People of the Jews, yet after all, how is this Explication, and Application justified in the Note (†) to which we are here referred, as by your own proposed (m) Method they ought to be? — We are sent to Authors, it seems for your Justification, and also to Texts of Scripture.

But as to the latter, they are wholly foreign to your purpose, as cited by you with immediate relation to the ending of the seventy Years Captivity, with which we have not to do in this Prophecy.

And as to the former, I mean your Authors cited on this occasion, they have not justified themselves in that wherein you have followed them, without telling us Why, or Wherefore. —— Nor could you justify them herein, or questioned you would have attempted it. ———

But How, I pray, was an End put to ALL Punishment to that People for their Sins, who were so sorely punished, as they were in after times under the Yoke of the Syrian Kings, and Especially after by the Romans, when under Titus they underwent the greatest Punishment for their Sins, that they, or any Nation under Heaven ever did? —

Indeed You, and All with you who refer the accomplishment of the great and solemn Purposes of this Prophecy to any Event, or Time, or Person, but to Him, and his Times, who in the fullness of Time came into the World, as the promised Messiah the Son of God, in whom we believe, are necessarily gravelled in your forced, and mistaken Application of them.

(†) Note 189 of Scheme of Literal Prophecy considered. (m) P. 174. ib. in fine.
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It is very plain that you are so, by your flur- ring over the very next Purpose of the Prophecy, which we have in these Words, as in our Trans- lation, viz. To make Reconciliation for Iniquity; which Words are explained most remarkably by you thus, viz. "To make Atonement for their In-

quity."

Now to take you in your own Explication here also, I ask you seriously Wherein had this Pro- phetick Purpose thus explained by you its accom- plishment, or by whom in your Hypothesis?---- It doth not there appear to have had any. And if you have meant it to have had any, it must have been in the times to which you have referred the general accomplishment of this Prophecy, as above, viz. either of the Captivity, or of An- tiochus.

If you give it to the Seventy Years Captivity, my answer is

First, That the Jews cannot properly be said to have made an Atonement to God for their Sins, during that their just Punishment for them. And

Secondly, Even could this be rationally suppo- sed, yet it cannot have place here, as the Capti- vity being a Period of ten Weeks of Years, or se- venty Years, it is a Period of Time, with which we have not to do in this Prophecy.

But, If otherwize you refer this pre- dicted Purpose to the times of Antiochus, I see not how, or in whom you can give it any accomplish ment in those times, but in the Person of some of your Messiahses. Now, if so, Which I pray of all your pretended Messiahses, for it seems you have made three of them in this Prophecy, viz. Cyrus; Onias the High-Priest; and Judas Maccabeus; Which of All these wrought,
or accomplished this great, and monstrous Event?
—— In what Sense did they, or can they possibly be conceived to have done it?
—— Alas! Who was able to do this, even to make Reconciliation for Iniquity, as in our Translation, to make this Atonement, as in your Explication?
—— Who but the One, single Messiah here predicted, Who accordingly came into the World to save Sinners?
—— But Wherefore was it that you have not given us a Note here?
—— It is what you promised your Reader, even to (n) justify your Explication, as you go along, by Notes upon it?
—— Doth not this Omission here (doubtless wilful) prove what I just now said, viz. That you know not what to do with these predicted Purposes?
—— With this in particular, which you really knew not how to get over, and consequent-ly passed it over in silence without any Note upon it, thus leaving your Reader wholly in the dark about it, in hopes that it might so pass unobserved by him also: Whom after this, and such like artificial Methods you would uncharitably lead into your miserably perverted Sense of this Prophecy.

And the truth of this Observation is confirmed by your arbitrary, and groundless Sense, and accomplishment imposed upon the very next following Purpose of this Prophecy: though indeed you have here attempted to justify your Explication by a Note.

This predicted Purpose in our Translation is to bring in everlasting Righteousness: which as it doth, and can belong only to Jesus Christ our Messiah in his making the Last Revelation of the

(n) Scheme of Literal Prophecy, p. 174.

divine
of Literal Prophecy consider'd

divine Will of God to the World; that ever will
be vouchsafed to them, and with respect to its
continuance with the World, as it is to last with
it, is here said to be everlasting, this you explain
away by translating the Words, "to establish
" Righteousness, that is, according to you, the
" Laws and Religion of the Jews." For so you
tell us by a Note (o) here, upon the Authority
of Father Harduin; As for this both He, and
you refer to the times of Onias the third, because
during his being High-Priest, it is said (p) that
the (Jewish) Laws were kept very well. -----

And What of this after all? ----- This your
noted Obser vance of the Jewish Religion and Laws
in the time of Onias, makes not possibly to the
accomplishment of this predicted Purpose in his
time; Because Even were we to take the here
predicted Righteousness with you, for the Jewish
Law, Yet even in this perverted Sense,

First, It was not more established under Onias,
not to take notice of any other times after the
Jews return to build their Temple, than it had
been doubtless under their great Reformers Ezra,
and Nehemiah. And

Secondly, Whatever Establishment there was in
the time of Onias, it was but short-lived: As the
times of Antiochus Epiphanes, in whose Reign
Onias was put to Death, were times certainly not
of Establishment, but of heavy, and grievous Per-
secution of the Jews. Nor was the Yoke of the
Heathen (Syrian) Kings taken away from Israel till
the times of Simon (q) the High-Priest, in the

(o) Number 190, p. 1761
(p) 2 Mac. iii. 1.
(q) 1 Mac. xiii. 41. —And it was he, and his Brethren,
and the House of his Father that established Israel and
confirmed their Liberty. 1 Mac. xiv. 16.

170th
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170th Year of the Greeks: Which is no less than 22 Years, or three Weeks, and one year after the Ending of your Seventieth Week. ——

But,

Thirdly, No Everlasting Righteousness was brought in by Onias, or even by Simon, or any of those times. —— The Law however confirmed, and established during the Season of its continuance hath been since abolished; and remains so to this very Day: and is moreover succeeded by Evangelical Righteousness, even the only here predicted Righteousness of the Gospel: Which as by this Prophecy it was to be everlasting, so it hath accordingly continued; and it will continue to the World's end: Even notwithstanding your mighty Efforts to exterminate it.

Nor must I omit here to note that Father Harduin hath said as much of the Righteousness here predicted to be established: Which However he doth in a mistaken primary Sense refer to the times (1) above mentioned, Yet he adds withal, that this was a Type of that Universal Righteousness which was to be brought in by the Messiah.

You should not therefore have been so unjust to that Author, and to your Reader also, as not to have given this a Place in your Note here. ——

—— But to go on. ——

The next predicted Purpose is, as in our Translation, to seal up Vision, and Prophecy: which you render thus, viz. to fulfill Prophecy. ——

—— Be it so. —— And What, or How was that? ——

(r) Viz. In the Year before the V. AE. of Christ 143.
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It was by your Account (1) to fulfill Jeremiah's Prophecy, Chapters xxv and xxix; that is, to fulfill a Prophecy, with which we have not any thing to do here, either in Prediction, or Accomplishment: As I have already noted in part; and as it will be shewn more fully under the next Verse, where it properly comes under Consideration. And so I pass on to

The last here predicted Purpose: And that is in our Version to anoint the most Holy; which Words you explain as follows, viz. to Anoint the Holy of Holies, or set up a High-Priest, and Temple Worship.

And thus this Prophetick Purpose is by you arbitrarily shifted away from our Messias, though without any manner of Proof, or Reason given for your Gloss here put upon it.

We are indeed according to Custom sent to Authors here, (u) viz. to Sir John Marsham, and Harduin.

But as to the former, He hath not given so much as one Reason, any more than you your self have, why the Original Word here which we render the most Holy, should not remain as by us applied immediately, and solely to our Messias. And

As to the Latter, you have basely wronged both him, and your Reader here, as Harduin understands not the Words with you; neither in setting up a Temple-Worship, nor otherwise by applying them absolutely, and wholly, as you do afterwards in Verse 26 to Onias the High-Priest.

Indeed Harduin asserts the direct contrary in many places of his Book, as However he doth apply typically and secondarily to Onias, yet he is

(1) In Not. Number 191, p. 176.
(u) In Not. Number 192.
A Letter to the Author of the Scheme

express in it, that this prophetick Purpose doth directly, and principally regard Jesus Christ the Messias: as it is plain from the Quotations in the underwritten (w) Note.

—— From the Purposes of this Prophecy I now pass on to the main Body, or Substance of it, which you have equally abused, and mis-applied.

And here we read, as in Verse 25,

In our Version thus. In your Explication, as follows,

Know therefore and Know therefore,
Understand that from the and Understand that
going forth of the Commandment to restore, and from the going forth
build Jerusalem unto Commandment
Messias the Prince shall or Word of God to
be seven Weeks, and three-score and two Weeks: the Jeremiah, declaring
Street shall be built again, and promising a re-
and the Wall even in turn from Captivity,
troublesom times.
and a rebuilding Jer-
usalem unto a Prince
Messias shall be 7
Weeks, or 49 Years;
and 62 Weeks, or
434 Years; i.e. there
shall be 7 Weeks to
Cyrus the Messias the
Prince, and 62
Weeks to the Messias
Prince Judas Mac-
cabæus;

(w) In hac gente trad Christus aliquando ungendus est Spiritu Sancto, &c. p. 190. — Onias Christus seu Messias non est, &c. p. 191. Prophétia Danielis directe Christum spectat Unum; Oniam, & similes Typos indirecte tantum, & secundarie, p. 192, &c.
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"cæsæus: and within
"that compass of time
"shall the City, and
"its Walls be rebuilt.
"And after 62
"Weeks, or 434 years
"the Messiah, or Priest
"Messias, i. e. Oianas
"the High Priest shall
"be cut off, and he
"shall have no one to
"help him.

Now whereas in the Text here (ver. 25.) A Commandment is predicted to go forth for the re-building Jerusalem, which Commandment, as it hath been largely (x) shewn, could not possibly be any other than that Royal Commandment which went forth from Artaxexes Longimanus King of Persia in the twentieth Year of his Reign, you have explained it of the word of God to Jeremiah in the fourth of Jehoiakim declaring and promising a return from the Captivity, and the rebuilding of Jerusalem.

And whereas there is a Messiah expressly spoken of in both these Verses, you have multiplied him into a twofold Messiah in the former Verse, and into a threefold in the latter; as you have there given us a third different from your two Messiahes in the former.

Which Suppositions and Assertions both with respect to your adapted Commandment, and your several made Messiah's are most groundless, and absurd:

(x) In Chron. Treat. on Dan. Weeks: And now again in my Letter to Mr. Lancaster.

First,
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First, With respect to your interpreted Commandment here it is without Foundation; as if, It is built upon a Supposition that the Prophetick Commandment is a divine Commandment, or a Commandment immediately from God; as you have (y) told us from Father Harduin that the Original Word which we render Commandment always signifies in the Scriptures a Divine Prediction, or Promise.

Now the Contrary is evident in Scripture, viz. in Esther i. 19. (z) where the Word doth not signify a divine Prediction, or Promise: But it certainly signifies a Royal Commandment.

Nor do we say that the original Word doth always signify a Royal Commandment. And therefore that is false which you also tell (a) us from that Author, viz. That they who are for a Royal Commandment in this Prophecy purpose the Word Commandment in the Scriptures to denote always a Royal Commandment. But we say that the Word doth certainly so signify in the Place now referred to. Therefore we say also that the Word may so signify here. And for Reasons unanswerable, we prove that it cannot possibly have any other Signification than this here also.

Nor doth that make to the contrary which you go on (b) to tell us also from Father Harduin, viz. That the original Word before us signifies the Divine Commandment in Verse the twenty-third of this (c) Chapter.

(y) In Not. Number 193.
(z) The Word here is לְנָשׁי and it is used for a Proclamation, or Decree. The Words are לְנָשׁי אֶבָּרָה הָאָרֹן. Egregiatur Edictum regium. And the Expression in Daniel's Prophecy before us is much the same, viz. לְנָשׁי אֶבָּרָה לְעָבֹד יְהֹואָשׁ from the going forth of the Decree for to rebuild Jerusalem.-What Decree but a Decree Royal?

(a) In Not. number 193. (b) ib. (c) Viz. Dan. ix.

It
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It is allowed with that Author that at the beginning of Daniel's Supplications the Commandment (of God) to his Angel went forth to shew Daniel.

But what was the Angel then to shew him? What but this Prophecy of the Weeks, as it is evident from the Context in what immediately follows?

But there is no manner of Ground for what that Author affirms (d) withall, viz. That the Word of the Lord which came to Jeremiah was that very Commandment which the Angel then shewed Daniel, and that therefore that was the very Commandment predicted in this Prophecy.

Out of doubt this could not be, because Daniel needed not a Revelation from Heaven in the first of Darius to come and shew him the Word of the Lord which was to Jeremiah in the fourth Year of Jehoiakim about some (e) threescore and eight years before. Daniel knew it already from that Prophet's Writings, even before the Angel's coming to him from God with the Revelation of this Prophecy of the Weeks. This is certain from what Daniel himself hath (f) told us with immediate, and express Reference to that Prophet.

(d) As in Not. Number 193, of Scheme of Literal Prophecy.

(e) The fourth of Jehoiakim was in the Year before the V. A. of Christ 666: The first of Darius 538.

(f) Dan. ix. 2. In the first Year of his (Darius his) Reign, (after his taking of Babylon) I Daniel understood by Books the Number of the Years in which the Word of the Lord came to Jeremiah the Prophet, &c. Daniel faith here expressly, that he understood this by Books— It is plain therefore that he wanted not an Angel to shew it him.
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You are without Foundation therefore from hence (g) for your interpreted Commandment its being

(g) As to all that you have gone on to tell us farther from Father Harduin in favour of a divine Commandment being intended in this Prophecy, and against a Royal Commandment, and that in particular which was granted in favour of the Jews by Artaxerxes Longimarus King of Persia in the twentieth Year of his Reign, though it hardly deserveth our Notice, yet as you have filled your Book with it, (viz. in Note 193.) I shall therefore in a Note here also consider, and reply to it.

Now that Author's First Reason here is, "That if we suppose the Weeks to take their beginning from a Royal Decree, and from that in particular which was by Artaxerxes Longimarus in the twentieth Year of his Reign, at so long a Distance of Time, after Daniel, as is that between his having the Prophecy of the Weeks, and the said 20th of Artaxerxes, that in that Case it must be allowed that Daniel himself knew not the beginning nor end of the Weeks, nor understand his own Prophecy: And that though the Angel bid him know and understand, yet he knew and understand nothing.

To which I reply, First, that as to Daniel's Knowledge, and Understanding here, it is what Father Harduin, nor your self, nor any Man living can set any Limits to, with any Foundation for it. What is therefore out of our Power to determine, there is no rational arguing; or concluding from thence, as to the Beginning of these Weeks.

Secondly, Did any Objection really lie here, upon the pretended Necessity of Allowance as above, against the Beginning of the Weeks from the twentieth of Artaxerxes, it lies much more against yours, and Father Harduin's Ending of them in your various, and multiplied Messiah's, as they were all of them (Cyrus only excepted) long after Daniel's time; and even a great many years beyond the twentieth of Artaxerxes. For how could Daniel know and understand such predicted Messiah's any more than he could the predicted Commandment without a special Revelation from the Angel?

Thirdly, I deny the Necessity of the urged Allowance, as the Angel might call upon Daniel to know and understand the Prophecy only in the several express Events, and Purposes of it, and withal in their general Seaons of Accomplishment without entering into Father Harduin's particulars of
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its being the Commandment predicted in this Prophecy, as you have supposed it immediately a Divine Commandment. — Nor

M 2dly,

of knowing the very King's Name, and the very Year of that King, wherein should go forth the Royal Commandment for rebuilding Jerusalem. And certainly so far forth Daniel could not but know and understand the Prophecy.

Consequently 1st, That is false that we are here told from that Author, viz. that Daniel knew and underflood nothing of his own Prophecy. And

2dly, It not appearing from the Prophecy that Daniel's Knowledge, and Understanding of it to which he was called by the Angel was such particular Knowledge and Understanding as is inflected on by Father Harduin, it is without ground made an essentia Part of Daniel's Knowledge, and Understanding here. — Nor

Secondly, doth the next Objection of Father Harduin make against the said Decree, as it is farther noted by you (viz. in Note 193, and again in Page 197) "that the Artaxerxes whose twentieth year is taken notice of in the second Book of Ezra, was neither Longimanus, nor Mnemon, [then] King entirely of the Persians, and Medians] but was the Artaxerxes who was King of Babylons only, whose twentieth year was fifty five years before the twentieth of Artaxerxes Longimanus, as (by your ascertaining here) that Author proves "in his Chronology.

To which I reply,

1st, That as to what is here affirmed that the Artaxerxes, whose twentieth year is taken notice of, by Nehemiah, was not Artaxerxes Mnemon, it is readily granted. But

2dly, That the Artaxerxes of Nehemiah was not Artaxerxes Longimanus but another Artaxerxes, of whom Father Harduin speaks as above, this I absolutely deny; Forasmuch as there could not be any such King of Babylon.

First, Whereas that Author after the Death of Cambyses makes Darius Hystaspis, and an Artaxerxes reigning co-temporary, viz. the former in Media, the latter in Persia, this is most unaccountable, as there was no such division of Government at the time of the said Darius; Media, Babylon, and Persia having been all included under the Government of the Persian Monarchy founded by Cyrus, and after his Death continued in his Son Cambyses.
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2dly, Have you any, as you therefore suppose the predicted Commandment, to be a Commandment

Hist. Vol. I. p. 175 and 275] are mentioned as having been favourers of the Jews in their respective Reigns, Har- 
duin hath understood, and applied the said Text with re- 
spect to Darius, and Artaxerxes of their reigning co-tempo- ary, as above. Than which nothing can be more ab- 
surd: For if it be a reason with that Author, as plainly it is, with respect to the two latter, that because they are here mentioned together, they were therefore co-temporary, then for the very same reason Cyrus who is first mention- 
ed must have been co-temporary with them also.

Thirdly, There was no other Artaxerxes in the time of 
Darius Hyphasis, but the Magian Smerdis, who after the 
Death of Cambyses set up for the true Smerdis the Son of 
Cyrus, and usurped seven Months only, who by Ezra is 
called Artaxerxes; [Ezra iv. 21. He being the Artaxerxes, 
who put a stop to the building of the Temple; Vide Pri- 
deaux Con. Hist. Vol I. p. 174, 175, and 275] till the 
cheat being discovered he was cut off, and Darius Hyphasis 
reigned.

And Consequentially,

Fourthly, No other Artaxerxes reigning but he before 
Artaxerxes Longimanus, and no other reigning after but 
Artaxerxes Menecon, which latter it is granted was not the 
Artaxerxes of Nehemiah, it remains that the said Artax- 
erxes Longimanus, and not any pretended Artaxerxes King 
of Babylon is the Artaxerxes, whose twentieth year is men- 
tioned by Nehemiah. —— Nor

Thirdly, doth that make at all against it; that with Fa- 
ther Harduin, it was matter of uncertainty, as you go on 
to tell us from him, if Artaxerxes Longimanus reigned 
twenty years, or not: —— Because

4. We are assured from the Astronomers' golden Ca- 
non that the said Artaxerxes reigned somewhat more than 
twice twenty years: as forty one years are assigned to that 
King in the said Canon. And the Authority of that Canon 
is uncontestable. [See Prideaux Con. Hist. Vol. I. p. 286: 
also Chron. Treat. on the Weeks; p. 179.] —— It is un- 
deniably so in the years of such Kings Reigns wherein there 
happen Eclipses. For that very reason the Authority of it 
should also obtain elsewhere. Consequentially so in the 
twentieth year of the Reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus.

And 2dly,
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ment to return from the Captivity. For the Prophecy before us mentions nothing at all of such Commandment; but it immediately and expressly speaks of a Commandment for the rebuilding of Jerusalem, the Wall and the Streets thereof: Which Commandment therefore could be no other than a Royal Commandment; and that (b) in particular already mentioned.

— But Even were a Commandment for the Jews Return here implied, Yet

3dly, Your interpreted Commandment cannot possibly be the Commandment from which these Weeks are to date their Beginning, forasmuch as your Commandment is no otherwise made the Beginning of the Weeks, than as of Weeks abbreviated upon God's People. But, as it hath been already noted, in Fact there was no Abbreviation of these Weeks with respect to the Jews, as they did not return from Captivity, nor was Cyrus consequent-

And 2dly, We are farther confirmed by the Authority of Africanaus, in the said twentieth year of that King's Reign. —— As to all that follows after in your Note from Father Harduin by way of farther Objection here, viz.

"That it ought to be out of Dispute that the seventy Weeks expired before the Birth of Christ, if we begin the Calculation of them from the twentieth of Artaxerxes Longimanus, &c. —

It is urged without any manner of Foundation, and is nothing to the Purpose, as we have not to do with the Birth of Christ immediately in this Prophecy. ——

— So that upon the whole it appears that all your's and Father Harduin's Objections against the Prophetick Decree its being a Decree Royal, and against that Royal Decree which was granted in favour of the Jews by Artaxerxes Longimanus in the twentieth year of his Reign its being the said Prophetick Decree are of no manner of force.

(b) See the last Note g; and also the last preceding Note x. ——

M 2
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ly a Messiah to them in your temporal Sense of the Word at the End of seven Weeks of Years, or forty nine Years from the going forth of your interpreted Commandment, but at the End of ten Weeks of Years, or seventy Years unabbreviated.

— You are therefore without Foundation for your interpreted Commandment its being the Commandment intended in this Prophecy.

Nor,

Secondly, To come now to your several made Messiahes in it, have You any Grounds for them, as it will appear by considering,

1st, That however you have pleaded here (i) from Father Harduin, and Sir John Marsham in Favour of your Messiah Cyrus, that he should have been intended in the first Period of Weeks in this Prophecy, because the Name Anointed is given him expressly by the Prophet Isaiah, and also with respect to Judas Maccabaeus, that he should have been intended in the next, as being a Deliverer of

(i) Viz. in Page 182, under Note 195. — In the end of which Note, lett Father Harduin, and Sir John Marsham should not be thought sufficient. You have referred also to King's History of the Apostles Creed, in favour of your use of the Term Messiah as you adapt it to Cyrus, to the making him your first Messiah in this Prophecy.

But how could you presume to bring in this truly learned Author here? — He hath only said that the Word Christ in Greek signifies Anointed, as Messiah doth also in Hebrew.

And what then? — Is he therefore, or is he at all concerned with your Messiah Cyrus? — Doth he not immediately there shew the Messiah-ship of our blessed Redeemer in his pre-eminent, and peculiar Unction different from ordinary Unction of Prophets, Priests, and Kings?

You should surely have not been so bold as to bring in this great, and good Man here with Harduin and Marsham in their professed Application of the Word to Cyrus, of which he hath not one Word.

Israel,
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Israel, and likewise with respect to Ovias the Third, that he also should have been here intended, as being the Anointed High-Priest. Yet nothing appears from all this with respect to this Prophecy, to the proving all, or any of these the Messias of it. Because Confessedly in your Note here (k) from these Authors the original Word מְשִּׁיאָ֣ס applicable as it is to Kings, Patriarchs, Princes, and Prophets, is therefore equally applicable to any other such Messias, as were those you have here immediately given us, if any such were intended in this Prophecy, and the predicted Terms and Circumstances might be found to suit with them: Whereas they do not all to those your Messiaasses. Nor do they to any other Messias whatsoever, but the one only Messias of the Christians, as it will soon appear. —

But,

2dly, You have not any manner of Ground from the Prophecy for supposing so many Messiaasses in it. For no more than (l) one Messias in the plain, and natural, or obvious Sense of it is spoken of throughout. And one only Messias being rationally to be supposed here, not possibly

(k) viz. Note 195.

(l) We have express mention of the Messias in Verse 25, again in Verse 26. In the former Verse we read of him with the Title of the Prince, viz. Messias THE PRINCE: In Verse the twenty sixth we read of him as the Prince. —— And surely by the common, or ordinary Rules of rational, and unprejudiced Contraction one and the same Messias, one and the same Prince, viz. Messias the Prince is the Subject throughout. And the Application to more than one, is, as I am shewing, not justifiable in Any one of them. Would not such Invention, and Application be the Occasion of Scorn, and Ridicule in a like Case in any Author of another kind? —— Wherefore then should such peculiar Criticism obtain here in explaining the Writing of the Prophet? —— Especially as there is no manner of Foundation for it whatsoever.

All
All your various Messiaфессes could be that Messias. Nor
3dly, Could any of them be the Messias of this Prophecy.

First, Because their Times and the predicted Times do in no wise correspond, as you reckon to their respective Times from a Commandment, with which as we have seen, we have not to do in this Prophecy.

Secondly, Even your own Reckoning of the Weeks doth not answer to your two first made Messiaфессes here, viz. (m) Cyrus and Judas Maccabæus. And however it happens to suit with your Third Messias here, viz. your Messias Onias the

(m) Not to Cyrus, as you apply the first Period of seven Weeks in this Prophecy to him, as the Messias, or Deliverer of the Jews. — But, as I have shewn, he was not even such Messias to the Jews at the end of seven Weeks, but at the end of ten Weeks of Years: which is three Weeks of Years more than the first given Period of Weeks in this Prophecy. — Not to Judas Maccabæus, as in your Explication of this Prophecy, you apply the second Period of Weeks in it to him, by reckoning 62 Weeks, or 434 Years from the going forth of your interpreted Commandment to your said Prince Messias Judas Maccabæus. — But in fact he was not a Messias, or Deliverer of the Jews at the end of 62 Weeks, but at the end of 63 Weeks. And so You your self have told us expressly elsewhere, (viz. in Page 188 of your Book) and truly enough, that from the fourth Year of Jēhoakim to the Year of the Græcians 148, in which Judas Maccabæus cleansed the Temple, and restored the Worship of the Jews, there are 63 Weeks, or 441 Years. — Now it is plain that you are not consistent with your self in what you have said here, and, as above, in your Explication. — But it is in your Explication that you are mistaken. — You are therefore by your own Reckoning without any Messia AttributeSetes in the two first Periods of this Prophecy: And however you have after brought in another for the second Period of it, which is again mentioned in the Prophecy, viz. Your Messias Onias the Third, to whom alone your Reckoning happens to suit, Yet, as it will soon appear, there is no place for him also in this Prophecy.

Third,
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Third, or the Anointed High-Priest, yet this accidental Agreement in this respect proves nothing of itself: nor is it capable of proving any thing to your Purpose, As

Thirdly, The predicted Circumstances do in no wise allow of His, any more than they do of the other two, their being at all concern'd in this Prophecy, as the Messiah of it in any Particular. For

1st. Neither of the two former, nor He, nor even All of them put together accomplished the solemn Events, or Purposes of this Prophecy: — Not those mentioned in the twenty fourth Verse of it; All which were immediately accomplished by the Messiah of the Christians:

Nor that important Event of being cut off after the predicted Term, as in Verse the twenty sixth. But the said Event was immediately fulfilled in the Person of the said One only Messiah, and in Him only. — For

2dly, However it be asserted by you, that this last Event was accomplished in the Person of Onias the High-Priest; as you make him to be cut off after sixty two Weeks, and so in this respect you make him the Messiah in this Part of the Prophecy, yet that this is without Ground, as the said Prophetick Event was not fulfilled in him, it is certain,

First, Because however he was put to Death after sixty two Weeks in your Hypothesis, yet that is no otherwise than by your abbreviated Reckoning of this Period of Weeks immediately from the going forth of your interpreted Commandment. But such abbreviated Reckoning is merely arbitrary, and (n) groundless.

Secondly,

(n) You have indeed (in Note 195 of your Book) endeavoured to justify your abbreviated Reckoning of the second Period
Secondly, Were the said Reckoning justifiable; yet it takes its Date from the going forth of a Commandment,

Period of this Prophecy, as you reckon 62 Weeks by themselves, or apart from the first Period of 7 Weeks, both from Father Harduin, and Mr. Mede. —— But as to the former, he hath argued chiefly ex Hypothese in all that he hath said on this Occasion; as he hath argued from his (and your) interpreted Commandment to his (and your) several Messiahs. —— And as to what he hath said immediately against a Succession of Weeks here, because they are divided into 7 Weeks, and 62 Weeks, as he hath therefore told us, that none when they speak of 69 successive Weeks would thus divide them, as none (continues he) when they mean such a thing shall be done in 9 Years, say it shall be done in 2 Years, and 7 Years, this is very fallacious, and merely begging the Question here. Because not one Single Event, but Confessedly two Events are meant under the two several Periods of 7 Weeks, and 62 Weeks. For so it follows immediately in that Author's first Assertion, viz. that each Partition of Weeks ought to have its singular Event. —— It is what is allowed: But it doth not therefore follow according to that Author's Assertion in what he hath immediately added, viz. that it ought to have its particular Messiahs also. —— This is said without Ground. —— And in fact the pretended Messiahs of both Periods in that Author's Hypothese, and Yours, were not Messiahs to the Jews at the end of those respective Periods, (as is particularly shewn in the foregoing Note, and) as they ought to have been, at least in your Sense of their being so, in order to approve even their pretended Agreement with the Prophecy in those Particulars of it. —— And

As to what you have pleaded here also from Mr. Mede, as you say that he hath destroyed a Continuation of Time for 63 Weeks, this is ascertaining more than he hath done. For how hath he destroyed it? —— no otherwise than by his reckoning only 62 Weeks from the going forth of his interpreted Commandment, without any reckoning at all of the preceding 7 Weeks; as he took the original Word which we render 7 Weeks, to denote only Sevens of Weeks; and therefore he render'd this part of the Prophecy, as follows, viz. Unto the Messiah there shall be sevens of Weeks, even 62 Weeks. —— But that modest and judicious Author, however of this Opinion, yet he did not take upon himself in your Language to destroy a Continuation of Reckoning of 69 Weeks in this Prophecy: but he hath left it to the Learned
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mandment, with which, as it hath appeared, we have not to do in this Prophecy. And

Thirdly, Your Messiah Onias was not cut off; as the Messiah of this Prophecy was to be cut off, in the important (o) Signification of the original Word here; as it denotes a cutting off judicially, or by judicial Sentence. — But so Onias was not cut off. He was not brought to his Death by any judicial Sentence passed upon him: but he was taken off in a sudden and clandestine manner. In plain Terms he was treacherously murdered, as we are expressly informed (p) concerning his Death.

He was not therefore the Messiah of this Prophecy, as it is pretended in this respect. —— Nor is this pretended of the two former. And if hath appeared both of him, and them, that not

Learned to consider what he hath offered on this Occasion. —— Nor after all, hath he given Encouragement by his own Hypothesis of the Weeks herein to follow him. The Events doth by no means answer even his way in applying only 62 Weeks to the Messiah of the Christians; which you reject here: as you have not followed Mr. Mede either in his Beginning, or Ending of 62 Weeks. —— And thou' you reckon only so many Weeks together. Yet as it hath been shewn, neither is your Beginning, nor Ending of them corresponding with the Prophecy.

(o) —— The original Word here is נְעֵשׁ. Upon which there is the following Note in my Chronological Treatise on the Weeks; which as you have overlook'd, I therefore transcribe hither; viz. that it signifies to be cut off judicially, either by Man's Judgment, or by the judgment of God. The learned Jews may find that the Word נְעֵשׁ signifies so in forty places of their Scriptures. And it is never used otherwise in speaking of a Person Affirmatively, as it is here in this Prophecy. That our blessed Saviour was cut off judicially both ways. See it particularly shewn ib. —— I add here of your pretended Messiah Onias, that he was not so cut off in either respect. ——

(p) 2. Mac. iv. 33, etc. — And thou' as you note (p. 18s. from Harduin, and both of you from the Text) that he was taken off by an unjust Death, yet that is nothing to the purpose here, as it appears from the foregoing Note.

N

Any
Any of them were so in any other respects. Consequently they were none of them the Messiah of this Prophecy. —— And Consequently also Daniel's predicted Messiah remains to the Messiah of the Christians, who punctually, and exactly accomplished the several events by him to be accomplished as the Messiah of this Prophecy either in his own Person immediately, as the Messiah to be cut off; or otherwise by his People; as in what follows in the latter part of the Verse now before us; wherein he who in the former Part of it is called the Messiah, and in the Verse immediately foregoing Messiah the Prince, is again spoken of as the Prince: which we now come next to consider in your unwarrantable expounding away of this part of the Verse also from him the said Messiah of it. —— The latter part of the said Verse is as follows,

In our Text.  

(26.) 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.  

In your Explication ibus.  

And the Army of the Prince that shall come, that is the Army of Antiochus Epiphanes shall lay waste the City and Temple, and overwhelm all things by their Numbers, and like an Inundation: and to the end of the War Desolations are determined. ——

—— Now here we have a Prince expressly spoken of. This Prince we say was (nor could he be in plain, natural understanding of the Text any other than) the Messiah the Prince before spoken of; even one and the same Messiah, one and
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and the fame Messiah the Prince spoken of throughout.

— But say you, No. — "The Prince here spoken of was Antiochus Epiphanes. — Whereas that Antiochus Epiphanes could not be this Prince, I argue.

First, Because that Devastation of Jerusalem which was by the People of Antiochus Epiphanes did not come up to the utter and final Destruction of the City, and Sanctuary here predicted by the People of the Prince that should come: as I have had occasion to shew particularly (q) elsewhere. Therefore his People being not the People here predicted, nor was He the Prince here predicted.

Secondly, Had Antiochus Epiphanes been the Prince here predicted, He must according to your Explication have fulfilled all the Events predicted in the last Verse of this Prophecy, as you have immediately appropriated them unto him also. But so he did not; as we shall see presently, by looking into the Text, and within your Explication of it. Both which are as follows,

In our Translation,
(v. 27.) And he shall confirm the Covenant with many for One Week: and in the midst of the Week he shall cause the Sacrifice, and Oblation to cease; and for the overspreading of Abomination he shall make it desolate; even until

In your Explication thus;

In one, or in the last Week Antiochus Epiphanes shall allow the Jews to keep the Covenant made with their Fathers, or to perform their Worship; but in the midst of that Week he shall cause their Sacrifices

(q) In Chron. Treat. on the Weeks, p. xiv. Pref. in immediate Answer to Sir John Marsham.
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till the End; and that determined shall be poured on the Desolate.

\[\text{les and Oblations to cease, and upon the Battle, ments of the Temple, and throughout the Land shall be set up the Idols of the Desolator, which shall continue till the end of that Week, and of all the Weeks; after which the Desolator shall have Vengeance paid him in his turn, and the Jews shall again recover their religious, and civil Liberty.}\]

—— Now that Antiochus Epiphanes could not be the Prince spoken of in the foregoing Verse, nor as such could have had any thing to do in this, it is certain, Because that is not true which you have affirm'd of him in the first Words of your Explication (qq) of this Verse, as follows, viz.

"That Antiochus Epiphanes did in the Last Week allow the Jews to keep the Covenant made with their Fathers, or to perform their Worship.

This, I say Antiochus Epiphanes did not do for, or in one Week. It is not Fact even in your own Hypothesis.

For your Last Week ends (r) in the Year 148 of the Græcians; to which is corresponding the

\[\text{(qq) Even by taking the predicted Covenant in your Sense thereof: which could never have been intended in this Prophecy, as it will soon appear from evident Inaccomplishment of this part of the Prophecy, in the said Sense.}\]

\[\text{(r, Scheme of Literal Prophecy considere'd, p. 188.}\]

Year
Year before the V. Æ. of Christ 165: which Year was the second of Judas Maccabaeus, wherein he cleansed the Sanctuary, and restored the daily Worship.

Your Middle of this Last Week (f) is the 145th Year of the Gracians, to which is corresponding the Year before the V. Æ. of Christ 168.

Your Beginning of the Last Week, or first Year of it. Consequently is the Year of the Greeks 142, to which is corresponding the Year before the V. Æ. of Christ 171.

Put these Particulars together: And your Hypothesis in this part of it will stand thus, viz.

"In the LAST WEEK, the first Year whereof was the Year before the V. Æ. of Christ 171, Antiochus Epiphanes shall allow the Jews to keep the Covenant made with their Fathers, or to perform their Worship: — But in the midst of that Week, viz. in the Year before the V. Æ. of Christ 168, He shall not allow them to do so: for then he shall cause their Sacrifices, and Oblations to cease. — That is in plain Terms,

"Antiochus Epiphanes shall, and he shall not confirm the Covenant with Many for, or in One Week. —

Now what is this but Contradiction in Terms? — The Prophecy speaketh expressly of the Party here predicted to confirm the Covenant, that he should confirm the said Covenant for, or in One Week, even in the expressly mention'd Time of one Week. — But your Party here concerned, viz. Antiochus Epiphanes broke the Covenant confessedly in the midst thereof. — How then did he confirm it for, or in the given prophetick Space of Time of one Week? —

(f) In the last Note of Page 185. ib.
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Nor have you made it to appear that this pretended Accomplishment of this Part of the Prophecy by Antiochus Epiphanes was matter of fact in itself; or that the said Antiochus did allow the Jews to keep the Covenant made with their Fathers by any solemn Covenant made with them to that end. To say only that he allowed the Jews to keep the Covenant made with their Fathers comes not up to the Prophetick (t) Phrase here, which imports the actual making of a firm Covenant with many for, or in one Week.

Now take the whole History of Antiochus Epiphanes, as it relates to the Jews, from the Beginning to the End of it, and settle a Week of Years if you can, wherein the said Antiochus confirmed or made a firm Covenant with the Jews; even in your Sense of the predicted Covenant.

Sir John Marsham, and you have variously asserted this of Antiochus his Reign. He of the first seven Years of it: You of the last seven Years of it. Neither of you with any Ground for either.

Not Sir John Marsham for his.

For, to look into the History of Antiochus Epiphanes, He was no sooner settled in his Kingdom, [in the Year of the Greeks 138, and in the Year before the V. Æ. of Christ 175,] but being solicited by Jason to deprive the then lawful and rightful High-Priest of the Jews (v) and to put him into his place, he was prevailed on accordingly. He was also wrought upon by a farther

(t) He shall make a firm Covenant cometh much nearer to the original Word which is in Hiphil: Which Conjugation denotes Interferences of Action, or the doing of a thing with more than ordinary Vehemence, or Earnestness. — Of the Covenant here predicted see Chron. Essay on the Weeks, p. 265.

(v) Onias the Third.
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Bribes from the said JASON to give Licence to him to set up at Jerusalem the holy City a Gymnasium; and an Ephebeum: the one a Place of Exercise, the other for the training up of Youth according to the Usages, and Fashion of the Greeks. Hence a Foundation was laid for the Jews their apostatizing from the Religion, and Usages of their Forefathers, and for conforming themselves to the Manners, Customs, and Rights of the Heathens. And so it happened accordingly. And thereby in the Words of our late learned Dr. Prideaux it came to pass that all those Privileges, which at the Solicitation of John the Father of Eupolemus were by special Favour obtained of King Seleucus Philopator for the securing of the Observance of the Jewish Law in Judah, and Jerusalem were all overborne, and taken away.

Thus what was done in this Year by Antiochus Epiphanes had a direct Tendency in it to destroy the Religion and Worship of the Jews, not to confirm, or establish it.

In the next Year the said Creature of Antiochus Epiphanes, this Apostate Jason introduced Heathen Rites into Jerusalem; and also sent Offerings to Hercules at Tyre.

Here was confirming in Heathenism: but nothing done towards confirming the Jews Religion, and Worship.

In the Year following, which was the third of Antiochus Epiphanes, the said Antiochus in his Progress to Egypt, came to Jerusalem, and was much caressed by the Apostate Jason (y), and the Jews. But nothing that we know of, was
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done in favour of their Religion, or Worship.

— In the *fourth* of Antiochus Epiphanes for filthy Lucre, he deposed the Apostate Jason, and gave the Priesthood to Menelaus Brother of Jason, and Onias. And the said Menelaus run as far into the Ways, and Religion of the Greeks, as before had his Brother Jason. For it seems (1) this Jason having a Party in Jerusalem so strong, as that they would not admit Menelaus, thereupon the said Menelaus with his Friends fled to Antioch: and declaring that they would no longer observe their Country Laws, and Institutions, but would go over to the RELIGION of the KING, and the WORSHIP of the GREEKS, this so far gained them the Favour of Antiochus that he sent them back assisted with such a Power, as Jason could not resist. And so Menelaus being possessed of his Office, he thereupon proceeded to make good all that he, and his Party had declared at Antioch by APOSTATIZING from the Law of Moses to the Religion of the Greeks, and all other their Rites, and Usages: and drawing as many others after him into the said Impiety, as he was able.

So that thus all Encouragement that could be was given to Apostacy; but none at all to countenance and confirm the Jews Religion, and Worship.

— In the *fifth* of Antiochus Epiphanes his Reign we have nothing one way, or other of him, as to our present Enquiry. — But

— In the *sixth* Year thereof, after Antiochus his Conquest of Egypt, while he was there, upon


A false
a false Rumour having been spread through Palestine of his Death, and upon Jason his having again attempted the Priesthood, and taken Jerusalem, and drove Menelaus out of the City, Antiochus hearing of this, and supposing that the whole Jewish Nation had revolted from him, he therefore marched out of Egypt into Judæa (a): and being told by the way that the People of Jerusalem made great Rejoicings at the News which came to them of his Death, he being much enraged thereat laid Siege to Jerusalem, and took the City by Force (b), and flew of the Inhabitants in three Days time forty thousand Persons: as many more he took Captives, and sold them for Slaves.

— So far was Antiochus from confirming the Covenant of their Fathers with the Jews in this Week, that thus in Fact in this the sixth Year of it he sent many of them after their Fathers to the Grave: and others he deprived not only of their Religion, but also of their common Liberty.

— And not content with what he did of this nature, He impiously forced himself into the Temple, and entered into the inner and most sacred Recesses of it, polluting by his Presence both the Holy Place, and also the Holy of Holies: the wicked Traitor Menelaus being his Conductor into both. And to offer the greater Indignity to this sacred Place, and to affront in the highest manner he was able the RELIGION whereby God was worshipped in it, he sacrificed a great Sow upon the Altar of Burnt-Offerings, and Broth being by his Command made with some part of the Flesh, he caused it to be sprinkled all over the Temple for the utmost

---

(a) Prideaux Con. Hist. Vol. II. p. 167 from Josephus, and the Books of the Maccabees; &c.  (b). lb in Note. (z)——

O defiling
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desiring of it. And after this, having sacrilegiously plundered it, by taking thence the Altar of Incense, the Shew-Bread Table, the Candlestick of seven Branches that stood in the Holy-Place, which were all of Gold, and several other golden Vessels, Utensils, and Donatives of former Kings to the Value of eighteen hundred Talents of Gold, and having made the like Plunder in the City, he returned to Antioch, carrying thither with him the Spoils of Judaea, as well as of Egypt (c).

— This as before noted is the sixth Year of Antiochus: [to which is corresponding the Year before the V. Æ. of Chrifi 170]. It is Consequentially the sixth Year of Sir John Marsham's one Week; As he makes the first seven Years of Antiochus his Reign the Prophetick Week of confirming the Covenant with many therein.

— But how could Sir John Marsham give us such an Hypothesis as this of the Prophetick One Week?

— It hath now appeared that from the very Beginning of Antiochus his Reign, He was not only careless what became of the Religious Rites of the Jews, but that indeed he did all that he could by Injustice, Oppression, and invading of the Rights of the Priesthood, by Profanation, and Sacrilege to destroy them.

Especially this appears in this last mentioned Year; to the evident confuting his Hypothesis in this part of it.

And hence likewise it appears how groundlessly you have made the last seven Years of Antiochus his Reign the One Week of this Prophecy in your Hypothesis: Even as this very Year which

(c) Ib. Page 168.
is the sixth of Sir John Marsham's One Week, is the Second Year of your One Week.

For Antiochus was so far from allowing the Jews to keep the Covenant made with their Fathers, or to perform their Worship (d) in this your Prophetick One Week, that you see how notoriously he did what in him lay to the contrary in this the very second Year of it.

——— So again in your fourth Year of it; as in that (e) Year Apollonius was sent by Antiochus to execute his fierce Rage upon the Jewish Church, and Nation who had no way offended him. For upon his returning out of Egypt from his last Expedition thither, by reason of the Baffle which he there met with from the Romans of all his Designs upon that Country, being full of Wrath and Indignation, he vented it all upon the poor Jews: and to that end upon his marching back through Palestine, he detatched off from his Army two and twenty thousand Men under the Command of Apollonius, and sent them to Jerusalem to destroy the Place, and to make to cease the Jewish Worship there (f): which for a time they did cause to cease accordingly.———

——— But all this was in your one Week; in which according to your Explication of the Prophetick Event thereof, Antiochus was to allow the Jews to keep the Covenant made with their Fathers, or to perform their Worship.

Here is therefore in Fact a second glaring Contradiction to your pretended Accomplishment of

(d) As are your very Words in your Explication of Verse 27.
(e) In the 145th Year of the Greeks, and in the Year before the V. AE. of Christ 168.
the Prophecy here in such your unwarrantable Ex-
plication and Appropriation of it to the Times of
the said Antiocbus; and those immediately, as in
your Hypothesis.

And therefore Sir John Marsham could not run
into this Absurdity, which you have here, in as-
signing the last seven Years of Antiocbus his Reign
for his Prophetick one Week; but chose rather
(by throwing in an additional Half-Week to the
Seventy Weeks, which Half-Week he began from
the Profanation of the Temple in this Year,) to
fix his one Week to the seven preceding Years of An-
tiocbus, when as Yet the Sacrifice and Oblation had
not ceased: tho' this, as I have shewn, cannot
serve his turn, even in his Sense of the Covenant
here predicted, forasmuch as it doth not appear
that Antiocbus in those seven Years of his Reign did
confirm any such Covenant with the Jews, or did
any thing in favour of their religious Rites, or
Worship, but on the contrary, as it hath appear-
ed from undeniable Matters of Fact in those first
seven Years of his Reign no less than in the whole
thereof, he was more, or less, all his Time a
most dreadful Persecutor, and Oppressor of the
Jewish Church, and Nation.

And for these Reasons most probably Your
other Advocate Father Harduin, (to speak now to
him) could not come into any such Exposition of
this Part of the Prophecy, by referring at all the
Completion of the predicted Event of the One
Week to Antiocbus Epiphanes, as Sir John Marsham,
and you have variously done, but went a different
Way from both of you: however, you have
quoted him here also, as if you were altogether
in one, and the same Sentiment.

— The said Harduin makes indeed the last
seven Years of Antiocbus Epiphanes his One Week of
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of the Prophecy, as you also have done. But then he makes not Antiochus to confirm any Covenant with the Jews, but the Jews themselves to confirm it one among another in those seven Years. — But that this is merely arbitrary, and groundless, and even in no manner of Agreement with the Prophecy it appears, because (Even taking the here predicted Covenant in Harduin's Sense of it, Yet) the said Covenant confessedly was not made till after the Beginning of his Half-Week, as it is plain from the (g) Places here referred to by that Author.

Whereas the Prophecy is express in the immediately predicted Event of confirming the Covenant with many, that it was to be in, or for One Week: not in Half a Week, where Harduin in Fact hath placed it; and which Half-Week hath expressly also an Event of its own: which Harduin hath thus incongruously placed in actual Accomplishment, even before that of the predicted Event of the said One Week.

— And thus it appears that neither of your favourite Authors here, nor Your self have made any thing of this part of the Prophecy, by applying it to the Times of Antiochus Epiphanes; any more than (as above it appeared, that) You have of the foregoing Parts of it, whether in Agreement, or Disagreement with those Authors, with both or either of them; As you have sometimes gone hand in hand with One, or with Both of them; or have otherwise left either one, or

(g) viz. 1 Mac. ii. 27, and 2 Mac. viii. 1. —— But the History of both those Places was after Apollonius his causing the Sacrifice, and Oblation to cease in the 4th Year of Harduin's One Week. And the History of the latter Place was not till two Years after.
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the other, or both: In which latter Case, as we have lately seen, it hath been for the worse. —

But be that as it will: —

The Prophecy before us is, as we have seen in the several Parts of it, with no manner of Conformity, or Agreement applicable to the Times of Antiochus Epiphanes.

So far is that from being the Truth here, that you have roundly (h) said of it, viz. that it is to be extended no farther than the State of the Jews after the Death of the said Antiochus.

And yet such groundless Assertion you have endeavour'd to confirm by much such another from Sir John Marsham, viz. "that the Vision of the Weeks is no other than the Chronology of the three other Visions of Daniel, and that all four give Light to one another: —

But with how little Truth, and even Appearance of it, that Author made this Observation, and you have repeated it from him, it hath now appeared from the Light, which he formerly in his Hypothesis, and you since in yours have given to this the Vision of the Weeks. —

However leaving you here (i) vaingloriously big with your own Hypothesis, and the Reader to judge of the Justice of your Character

(h) Scheme of Lit. Proph. p. 188.

(i) As you tell your Reader with the greatest Assurance, that you have explained this Prophecy by an Event; which may more reasonably be supposed to be intended, and is more naturally conformable to the Words [which, as you add in a Parenthesis, are undoubtedly ambiguous, and obscure] than any other Event that can be assign'd, &c. —

I note here only as to Your Observation in the Parenthesis, that it is no wonder that You have occasion to make it, as you have done all that in you lay to darken the Prophecy. But still the Messiah of the Christians is, and will remain clearly discernible in it: unless with you we willfully, and resolutely shut him out of it.
of it. I go on with you, as in what follows you immediately argue against the Prophecy its being applicable to the Event of Jesus Christ, (our blessed Saviour, as you have been bold to say,) "that "he cannot be found here without doing the utmost "Violence to the Text in every part of it. —

This you have attempted to shew by divers Arguments: But of what Force they are, it will appear by looking into them.

As to your three first Arguments here, they are merely ex Hypothesi. They have been all severally considered, and have been found groundless. And Consequentially, as they prove not the Prophecy applicable to the Times of Antiochus Epiphanes, which is the immediate Use you would make of them, so they make nothing against its being referred to the Times of Jesus, nor against the Computation of the Weeks their answering to his Times.

As to Your

Third Argument in particular against our referring the Prophecy to the said Times, and in favour of your referring it to the Times of Antiochus, viz. As you assert, "that the Matters to be accom-
"plished within the Compass of seventy Weeks (as in "Verse 24.) do visibly relate to the setting up, and "continuance of the Jewish State, and Policy in "those Times; tho' this be said with the greatest Assurance of a visible Relation here, Yet it is said without Proof, and nothing can be said with less Grounds. For, as it hath been above particularly shewn, under an immediate Enquiry, and reply to your interpreted Sense of the several Purposes in the said Verse, they are so far from having a visible Relation to those Times, that they cannot possibly have any the least Relation to them: Even because not Any One of the said solemn Purposes had
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had their Accomplishment in those Times, nor by Any of your several pretended Messiahs: Where as all of them had their respective Accomplishment in the Times of the Messias of the Christians, even immediately in, and by Him.

Consequently nothing more needeth to be added here to shew the groundlessnes of this, or the two preceding Arguments inconclusive as they are to your Use, or Purpose of them.

Your Fourth Argument comes next under Consideration. And this as it consists of divers Parts, I shall consider, and reply to them in their Order.

And (First) it is here urged with respect to that part of the Prophecy, which relates to the Destruction of the City, and Sanctuary by the People of the Prince that should come, against its having relation to the Times of our blessed Saviour, as follows, viz.

"That the City and Sanctuary were not destroyed by any Army under Jesus, in whose Time there was no War against Jerusalem.

Which is as if you had said,

"During the Abode of Jesus Christ upon Earth, Jerusalem was not destroy'd; Therefore

"The City, and Sanctuary were not destroy'd by any Army under Jesus Christ.

To which I reply against Your Consequence, That tho' it be true, as you urge, that Jerusalem was not destroy'd during Christ's Abode on Earth, Yet it doth not therefore follow, that, as you here infer, the City and Sanctuary were not destroy'd by an Army under Jesus Christ the Messias.

Because the only Ground, and Support of such Consequences is that of a supposed Necessity here of
of the Prince predicted his personal Appearance with that Army:—Whereas the said Supposition is without Foundation. As

First, It doth not appear from the Prophecy. For that is expressive of the predicted Destruction, that it should be by the People of the Prince that should come: But not expressive of that Prince his coming immediately himself, or in Person to that Destruction. Nor is there any thing in the Prophecy in any respect necessarily implying such personal Appearance.

Secondly, Antiochus Epiphanes your Prince Messias here (as it hath been (k) shewn negatively) being not that Prince, and Consequently the said Antiochus his People being not the here predicted People, and the Messias of the Christians being the said Prince, and the Roman People being the said Prince's People, (as it hath been also (l) shewn in the affirmative) it follows that the personal Appearance of the here predicted Prince should not have been intended in the Prophecy. — And therefore

Thirdly, The Army here predicted as the Army of the Prince which was to come should be no otherwise predicted as His Army, than as in ancient times Armies immediately executive of the divine Vengeance are said in (m) Scripture to be the

(k) Pref. to Chron. Treat. on Daniel's Weeks, p. xiii. &c. and now again supra.

(l) Ib. p. 5. 257, & 265.—See also Mr. Mede, p. 708. Ed. 1672: Also Mr. Lancaster's Essay on the Weeks, p. 7.

(m) So the Armies of Israel under King Saul are expressly called by David: 1 Sam. xvii. 26, 36. viz. the Armies of the living God. So in this respect immediately King Nebuchadnezzar is called by God himself, My Servant, Jer. xxv. 9, xxvii. 6. & xliii. 10. And his Service against Tyre (Ezek. xxix. 18.) His Service for God, as they wrought for me, saith the Lord God,
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the Armies of God, they fighting in effect under God.

Thus in the like Scripture Sense the Roman Army in the Destruction of Jerusalem destroying the Jews, the Enemies of the Messiah the Son of God (n) being His Army, It follows that the City, and Sanctuary were destroyed by an Army under Jesus: —— Or, (if you will,) take it in the Words of the Jews against St. Steven, (Acts vi. 14.) thus Jesus of Nazareth destroyed that place.

You needed not therefore to have excepted, as you have in no less than two (o) Places of your Book against this Exposition, and Completion of the Prophecy in this Part of it, that it is unaccountable.

—— But to go on with you, as it is here objected,

(2dly) “That the predicted Destruction cannot relate to the Destruction of the City, and Sanctuary by the Romans seven and thirty years after Jesus his Death: Because the Seventy Weeks must have been expired four Weeks, or eight and twenty Years before that time: &c. ——-

——— Now whereas this is an Objection which hath been immediately considered, and replied to in One (oo) of the foregoing Letters, It is therefore become needless for me to enter into particulars of Answer to it here. And I may only refer

G. d, v. 20. —— And therefore well might our learned Mr. Miele say, as he doth upon this very occasion (p. 708. Edit. 1672.) that the Roman Army under Titus was the Army of the Messiah.

(n) Even the King’s Son, who sent forth His Armies and destroyed those Murderers, and burns up their City. Mat. xxii. 74

(o) Viz. p. 185 & 198

(oo) Viz. in that to Mr. Lancaster.
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for you to what hath been there said at large in order to obviate it. ----

I go on therefore to your next Objection, as you add (Thirdly) in the following Words,

"Beside, this Destruction in the Prophecy can’t not be that Destruction of the Romans; because the Deformation mentioned in the Prophecy was to be followed with Vengeance on the Destroyers, or Desolators, and a Restoration of the Jewish Affairs: Neither of which hath hapned. ----

----- And what though as yet neither of these hath hapned? ----- The Fulness of Time (p) is not yet come for their Accomplishment. ----

But because these things have not as yet hapned, doth it therefore follow, as it ought to do, to give your Argument any force here, that in God’s appointed time they must not, they will not fall out, or be accomplished? ----

If you are capable of proving this, then indeed you might argue with some Foundation from your objected Inaccomplishment. ----- But that these things have not as yet hapned, it is surely no Proof that they shall not hereafter happen. Nor is it Consequentially any Proof against the Destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans its being the predicted Destruction. ----

That the Romans were the only predicted Desolators here, this hath been fully made to (q) appear. The predicted Vengeance is therefore necessarily yet future; as is likewise the predicted Restoration of the Jews. And Consequentially upon the whole your negative Argument here appears to be of no manner of Force. ----

P 2

Nor

(p) Vide Chron. Treat. on the Weeks, p. 267, 268.

(q) lb. p. 257, &c.
Nor is that any more to the Purpose which you have yet objected against the Destruction of the City and Sanctuary by the Romans its being the predicted Destruction, as you have told us under this Head.

(Lastly) That it cannot be so for the following Reason also, viz.

"Because the Romans levelled the Temple to the Ground, and did not and could not fix any Idol on the Battlement thereof, as it is affirmed of the Destroyer in the Prophecy, and was true of Antiochus."

To which I answer

First, Negatively with respect to Antiochus, that however the like Event hapned in his time, in correspondence with, or to the completion of another (r) Prophecy of this Prophet, yet that cannot possibly prove the here immediately predicted Destruction to be, as you would have it that Destruction of Jerusalem which was in the time of the said Antiochus, because as it hath been above shewn, not the Event of the One Week of this Prophecy was fulfilled by Him; nor had Any the predicted Events of the other Parts of it possibly their Accomplishment in his Times.

And

Secondly, I reply in the Affirmative, with respect to the Romans, that they, as it is affirmed of the Destroyer in the Prophecy, did actually, and most (s) remarkably fulfill this Event: However you have stuck not to assert the contrary of them, viz. That they neither did, nor could do it.

But

(r) Ch. xi. 31. & loc. para. fulfilled in the year before the V. A. of Christ 168.

(s) Vide Chron. Treat. on the Weeks, p. 277.
But that it is matter of Fact that they did do it, even that they did fix the predicted Idols, viz. their Idolatrous Ensigns, having on them painted the Images of their tutelary Gods on the Battlements of the Temple, we have the Testimony of the Jewish (1) Historian, who hath been careful to record this very Event in his History.

It were needless therefore to say that they could do it, only as you have made this Note necessary by your objecting expressly to the contrary.

But methinks you should have given us a better Reason than that which we have from you, as the Ground of this Objection,

"Viz. That the Romans levelled the Temple to the Ground, and therefore could not fix any Idol on the Battlement thereof.

——— Alas! What a collusive way is this of arguing your Reader out of the true Sense, and Accomplishment of this Part of the Prophecy? —— But 'tis an Ingenuity this that runs throughout your Arguments.

——— But How I pray, did the Romans their levelling the Temple after that they had destroyed it, hinder as to their previous setting up the predicted Idols upon the Battlements of it, while it was yet standing? ——— We do not say that the Romans first levelled the Temple to the Ground, and after set up their Idols. But there was a possibility surely of their doing so before the Temple, and the Battlements of it were actually demolished? ——— Nor doth it appear that the Idol was to be set up, and the Temple not be levelled with the

(1) Vide ib. in Not. and Joseph. in bel. Jud. vii. 13, or in Edit. HUDSON. p. 1283.
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the Ground: —— On the contrary, It was to be utterly destroyed, and the Idol Consequently was to be set up either before, or immediately in, or while It was actually under such its final Destruction, as in fact (as just now observed) It was accordingly in its last Destruction, or that Destruction of the City, and Sanctuary which was by the Romans: Which Destruction therefore remains to be the Destruction immediately predicted in this Prophecy. ——

I go on to your

Fifth Argument against the Prophecy its having relation to the times of the Messias of the Christians, as you tell us

"That Jesus cannot be said to have confirmed the Covenant for one Week, subo confirmed it by his Doctrine, and Practice all his Life. ——

To which the Answer is very short and easy with respect to the late Bishop Lloyd's Hypothesis of the Weeks, with which we are immediately concern'd, That not the Messias, but His People are the Party to accomplish this Event: And which, as it hath been particularly shewn in the said Hypothesis, they did accordingly. And Consequently, the Objection affects not the said Hypothesis in the explained Accomplishment of this Part of it in the times of the Messias. ——

It is objected

Sixthly, "That Jesus did not cause the Sacrifice, and Oblation to cease by any positive Injunction, as (according to you) is here manifestly implied; and as Antiochus did; Nor did he do it virtually by his Death: &c.

To which Objection I answer

First, Immediately to that Part of the Argument, wherein it is urged, that our blessed Saviour did not do this by any positive Injunction, that
that there is nothing in the Prophecy giving ground to suppose any such Injunction to be implied in it, in order to the accomplishment of this predicted Event, however by you it be asserted to be manifestly implied. —— And

Secondly, As to its being also urged, that Anti-ocheus Epiphanes did this by a positive Injunction, I answer that However be did cause an interruption of the Jewish Sacrifices, or their ceasing for a time, yet that Interruption could not be, as it is pretended, the Accomplishment of this predicted Event, as for the Reasons already given from the evident Inaccomplishment of the other preceding Events of this Prophecy, so also because not a partial, but a total Cessation, not an Interruption only, but a Privation of Temple Worship is here predicted: As it appears from the Context that Jerusalem was now to be utterly destroyed, and the whole Jewish Oeconomy in Church and State of course to be dissolved, and be no more. Which final Dissolution hapned not 'till that Destruction of the City, and Sanctuary by the Romans.

Thirdly, With respect to that Part of your Argument here, wherein it is asserted that our blessed Saviour did not virtually by his Death put an end to Jewish Sacrifice, and Oblation, I reply that However this Assertion be pretended to be proved from a (v) Passage of St. Paul, yet the said Passage proves nothing to your Purpose: As it were ealy to shew; and it might be shewn here, were it not foreign to my purpose; as it is, because if the Argument were truly grounded; yet the late Bishop Lloyd's Hypothecis in this Part of it would not be affected by it; forasmuch as in the said Hypothesis we are not immediately

(v) Acts xxv. 8.
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ly concerned with a Virtual, but only with the actual ceasing of Jewish Sacrifice, and Olation. And therefore in that Hypothesis not the Messias, but his People, as in the concomitant (w) Event of the Half Week of the Prophecy are the Party necessarily accomplishing this Event also of it, of causing Sacrifice, and Olation to cease: And which they did accordingly.

I go on therefore to your

Seventh Argument; which in the main of it immediately concerns the Beginning of the Weeks: As you object against the seventh, and also against the twentieth year of Artaxerxes Longimanus, and insist upon the first year of Cyrus for their Beginning.

Now the late Bishop Lloyd in his Hypothesis of the Weeks, having not to do with any other Beginning of them than that from the twentieth of Artaxerxes, this is all that I am here immediately concerned with. And this hath been formerly (w) prov'd at large, and now occasionally, in this, and the foregoing Letters.

Nor is there any thing in this Argument of yours of any Weight to the contrary: As it will appear by looking into the several Parts of it.

And here we are told by way of inlet

"First, " That though a literal Interpretation " of this Prophecy be pretended, yet those who be- " gin the Weeks from the twentieth (as well as " those who begin from the seventh) of Artaxerxes " Longimanus, are obliged to understand the re- " cultivating, and building Jerusalem in a figurative " Sense. -----

----- Now

(w) Viz. Of causing the Abomination of Defolation to stand upon the Holy Place.

(w) In Chron. Treat. on the Weeks, Part I. Ch. III. p. 115, &c.
of Literal Prophecy consider'd. 113

----- Now that you should have thus affirmed of those who begin the Weeks from the twentieth of Artaxerxes, this is really most surprizing.

Forasmuch as you cannot but know the direct contrary of this Assertion to be the truth here, as you have read my Treatise on the Weeks: As it appears that you have from your Observations upon it. But there is one whole Chapter in the said Treatise (x) on this very occasion shewing immediately that the Words of the predicted Commandment are necessarily to be taken in a literal Sense.

--- That is not a little strange therefore that you should have asserted, as above.

----- And whereas you have gone on here to object, that, "if the Words of the Commandment "be taken in their literal Sense, in that Case no o-"ther Commandment than that of Cyrus can be "the predicted Commandment, I have little else to do here by way of answer, than to remind you that there are no less than two Chapters (y) in the said Treatise immediately shewing the contrary; and withal shewing that the Commandment granted in favour of the Jews by Artaxerxes Longimanus in the twentieth year of his Reign can alone be the predicted Commandment.

You have not thought fit to reply to any of those Arguments. ----- You have only declared here in favour of Cyrus's Decree, without giving Proof sufficient for it.

For that is surely no manner of Proof,

First, As you tell us here (z) from Pagnin's Version of the Words of the Commandment, that he renders the Words A Commandment to return from Captivity, and rebuild Jerusalem: ----- Q

(x) Part the first, Chapter II. p. 102.
(z) As elsewhere also, viz. in Page 179 in Not.
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----- For what though he hath thus render'd the Words? ----- His Authority is no Proof here: The Original (a) Words being much more properly, and truly render'd by the late Bishop Lloyd only, to rebuild Jerusalem.

And that the original Words should be so render'd with him, and not with Pagnin, I prove as follows, viz.

1st. Such Version is immediately justifiable from other (b) Places of Scripture. And

2dly, and more especially as the very same Phrase is again used here in the very same Verse, and can denote only, or barely a Rebuilding: As it is said with respect to the Street, it shall be rebuilt, or built again.

But according to what you insist upon from Pagnin in the former Place, the Words should be render'd in this, the Street shall return again from Captivity, and be rebuilt. There is as much expressed of the Captivity in one Place, as in the other; that is, none at all in either.

The Version therefore in the latter Place being undeniably the true Version, it is most rationally, and almost upon a certainty to be concluded that the very same Phrase in a former Part of the same Verse should have been intended only in the very same Sense; and Consequentely ought to have the very same Version.

Nor

Secondly, Is it pleaded to any more purpose in favour of Cyrus's Decree, "That it was first in Point of Time, and the Foundation of all the subsequent Royal Decrees, or Commandments in favour of the Jews,"—Because However these Affertions be true in themselves, yet they yield

(a) See here Chron. Treat, on the Weeks, p. 100.
(b) See particularly, ib.
yield no manner of Proof of that which you ground upon them, viz. as you tell us, "That therefore Cyrus's Commandment merits only the Name of the Commandment in Question. They cannot

1st. Because Cyrus's Commandment to the Jews imported only their return from Captivity with express Licence to rebuild their Temple, but not to rebuild their Wall, and Street, as in the predicted Commandment: As it hath been (c) shewn at large in the Treatise referred to.

2dly. The Computation of Time from the first of Cyrus to the Times of the Messiah, however you have cited divers Authors here in favour of Cyrus's Decree, admits not of it for the Decree beginning of the Weeks, as it is evident from your own immediate Authority under your second Observation in the very next Page, where you tell us, as follows, viz. "That a Computation of the seventy Weeks, or 490 Years cannot begin from the Date of Cyrus's Decree: Because from the Date of Cyrus's Decree to the Death of Christ is 568 Years; Whereby the Seventy Weeks, or 490 Years will be expired a great many years before the cutting off, or even the Coming of Jesus, &c.--

Now this being very true, and granted on all Sides, your Version of the Words of the predicted Commandment is so far from being justified by your numerous Authorities, that both it, and they are overthrown even by your self in this Observation.

Nor do I see to what purpose is this, and the other two Observations with it in the same (d) Page.

Not this, 'tis plain, because 'tis granted equally on all Sides. -----

(c) Chapter III. Part I. Page 115.
(d) Scheme of Lit. Propb. considered, p. 193.
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Not the first of the three; Because the contrary hath appeared under the consideration of your foregoing Arguments (e).

Viz. That the predicted Commandment cannot but be understood literally, and most rationally of a Royal Decree to rebuild Jerusalem, and also cannot but relate to a Royal Decree, or Commandment issued out by Artaxerxes Longimanus; even to that which was issued out in favour of the Jews, in the twentieth Year of his Reign.

And as to the Last Observation, it needeth no other Answer than to be return'd you in the Negative,

As it doth not appear, however roundly you have asserted it, that the predicted Commandment is a Commandment to return from Captivity, according to the Hebrew: But on the contrary in the plain, obvious, and rational Sense thereof, is, as we have seen, immediately and only A Commandment to rebuild Jerusalem, the Wall and the Streets thereof. And consequently the predicted Commandment pins us down in such manner, as renders the Computation of the Weeks from the twentieth of Artaxerxes, (when, and when only such Commandment went forth,) not only possible, but even necessary to be applied to the times of the Messiah: Whose times therefore could not but be designed in this Prophecy.

And so I may have done with these Observations, and with your seventh Argument, on which they are built without any Foundation from it.

Your Eighth and Ninth Arguments are wholly made up of Objections against the twentieth year of Artaxerxes its being the Year beginning

(e) Particularly under the Consideration of your interpreted Commandments, and in the Notes with it.
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ning of the Weeks, grounded on the use of Lunar Years in such Computation.

For so you tell us immediately in your entrance into your eighth Argument, "That the Bishop (meaning our very learned Bishop Chandler) in computing the Seventy Weeks, or 490 Years from the twentieth of Artaxerxes reckons by Chaldee Years, that is (as you add) Lunar Years consisting of 380 Days, in order to complete sixty nine Weeks, or 483 years, at the Death of Jesus, or in the thirty third Year after his Birth. ———

As to which I remark

First, The manifest injustice you have done that learned Bishop, as contrariwise to your Assertion, when he reckons from the twentieth of Artaxerxes, he could reckon by no other Year than that used by the late Bishop Lloyd in his Hypothesis of the Weeks, viz. the ordinary Chaldee Year, or the antient common Eastern Year of three hundred and sixty Days to the Year: As it is evident from his Lordship's immediate Reference (f) to the late Bishop Lloyd's Authority in his computation of Weeks from the twentieth of Artaxerxes.

Secondly, The said Chaldee Year being not your Lunar Year of three hundred and eighty Days, but of three hundred and sixty Days only, you have manifestly imposed upon your Reader here by confounding the said Chaldee, and your Lunar Years, or by speaking of them both together, as the same.

Thirdly, The late Bishop Lloyd having not to do with your Lunar Year in his Hypothesis of the Weeks, and also Whereas whatever you have urged farther on this occasion by way of Objection immediately from the late Dr. Prideaux, as

(f) Defence of Christianity in Page 139, in Margin.
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as to the Year of Computation intended in this Prophecy that in every particular hath been considered, and replied to elsewhere (g), I may of course dismis these Arguments as making not against the said Bishop's Hypothesis in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes Longimanus, as the Year beginning of the Weeks.-----

I go on therefore to your

Tenth (b) Argument, Wherein it is yet objected against such Beginning, as you tell us "that " in reality the Artaxerxes mentioned in Ezra, and " Nechemiah, was Artaxerxes King of Babylon, " as (you say) Father Harduin proves.-----

----- Now as to this, it is nothing more than a Repetition of what you had said before (i) from that Author: And I have already taken occasion to reply (k) to it.----- The asserted Reality here hath there appeared to have no other Foundation than the Imagination of him who hath said it; and who either did not, or would not know any thing truly of these times: As otherwise he might have known better from the Chronologer's fairest (l) Guide in these times the Astronomer's Canon.

In vain therefore have you here gone on to oppose Father Harduin's twentieth Year of his pretended King of Babylon in the times of Ezra, and Nebemiah to the twentieth year of Artaxerxes Longimanus, above particularly proved to be the true twentieth year of that King, and Consequent-


(b) Scheme of Lit. Proph. p. 196.

(i) lb. p. 170.

(k) In Note g above, under the consideration of your interpreted Commandment.
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ly as such remaining the Year beginning of the Weeks.

And so I might dismiss this Argument, were it not for a remarkable Parenthesis here, as you have told us with respect to the King in question, "that Mr. Whiston says it should be Xerxes."

---- A weighty Note this truly! ----

But I pray, Do you your self credit Mr. Whiston herein? ---- If you do, then it is plain you discard Father Harduin. ---- If otherwise, you do not give credit to Mr. Whiston here, to what purpose is it that you have quoted (m) Him? ---- Especially as you have notoriously given up Mr. Whiston’s Authority. ---- However you might with equal Reason credit him, as Father Harduin in what you have been thus careful to tell us from them. ----

---- But not to dwell upon trifles, I pass on to

Your Eleventh Argument.

And this contains nothing more than a repetition of former Charges immediately against the Separation of the Seventieth Week of the Prophecy from the sixty ninth Week of it; as such Separation seems to you unreasonable, and unaccountable, and to Mr. Whiston, weak and absurd, as you

(m) As you have also elsewhere; (viz. in Note 196, of Scheme of Lit. Proph.) where you most unreasonably argue against the Authority of the Prophecy, and the possibility of a true Explication of it from Mr. Whiston’s unwarrantable Alteration of the Number of Weeks in it: &c. ---- But where is the Force, or even the Ground of such Reasoning?

Or How doth it follow, either that this Word of Prophecy is ever the less Sure, because Mr. Whiston hath been thus groundlessly bold with our Scriptures; Or that because He is mistaken in his Explication of the Weeks, that therefore every Man else however differing from him must necessarily be mistaken likewise? ---- If so, to what Purpose is it that you have attempted an Explication of the Weeks? ---- But it is highly probable that you mean to except your own here. —— think
think this Observation from him also worthy of your Reader's notice.

To which I reply, that not one reason is here given either by your self, or from Mr. Whiston to support the Charges.

And if to insist upon Authority only were sufficient in the case, as it should seem to you to be, by your insisting much upon your own, and Mr. Whiston's here, you must give me leave freely to declare that the late Bishop Lloyd's Authority may very well stand against Mr. Whiston, and your self, as to the objected Separation; forasmuch as However the same hath appeared to your self, and to him as above, yet it did not so to that learned Bishop.

But this Objection being only a repetition of what you had said before under your fourth Argument, and it having been made one likewise by the Reverend Mr. Lancaster against the said Bishop's Hypothesis, to which I have already replied, and also taken liberty to refer you by way of answer to it, there needeth not any thing more to be said under this Argument.

I go on therefore to your

Twelfth Argument: Which you have raised in your favour from the Conclusion of the Prophecy in Bishop Chandler's rendering of it; As you would thence infer not a total Destruction of the Temple, which was by the Romans, but only a Ce
dation of the Worship there, as in the times of Antiochus, to which times you apply, and confine the Prophecy.

For whereas the Bishop's Version of the Words of the Prophecy referred to, is as follows, "viz. "Upon the Battlement shall be the Idols of the De-
"solator, until the Consummation, (viz. of God's "Wrath,) and that determined shall be poured up-"
of Literal Prophecy considered. You have put an interpretation upon the said Version as importing an actual Continuation, or remaining of the Idols unto the Punishment of the Desolator, and the Restoration of Jewish Worship.

But to such misapplication, and inference from the Bishop's Version, I beg leave of that learned Bishop to reply to you, that he could not possibly intend the meaning which you wrest here from these last Words of the Prophecy: As it is (n) plain that he could not from what he hath expressly said as to the predicted Destruction of the Temple, that it was to be total, and final: As the said Destruction was to be, as it appears from the (o) Prophecy. Consequently, as to the Idols set up upon the Battlement of the Temple during its Destruction, even while it was in (p) Flames, there could not possibly be any longer standing, or remaining of the Idols upon it after it's Destruction. And Consequently also there could be no more Sacrifice, and Oration in the Temple. Which is the very Reverse of what you would prove from the Bishop's Version before us.

In which Version therefore, these particulars being noted, which you could not but know, the Bishop could not intend, nor have you cause to interpret more than as follows, "viz. that the Sanctuary thus profaned, and thus destroyed should remain in Profanation, and Ruins, untill the Consummation (of God's Wrath) and that determined should (in God's appointed time for it) be poured upon the Desolators; viz. the Romans." —

(p) See above the last Note t.

R And
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And it having been (9) proved of that People that they are the only Defolators here predicated, it follows that the latter Words of the Prophecy relating to their Punishment in their turn do necessarily remain yet to be fulfilled: However You have spoken of it, as going a great length for an Hypothesis to suppose a Futurity of Accomplishment in this part of the Prophecy. — Nor Consequently is there any force in saying that this is yet future. It is the Prophecy immediately that lays the pretended Constraint in the objected Futurity of Accomplishment: which therefore must necessarily be supposed, and said, if we will be consistent with the Prophecy in this, and other parts of it. —

In vain therefore have you gone on here to infinuate, as if this were a very unlikely way "to convert Infidels to tell them of Prophecies that are "not actually fulfilled. ——

For with your Leave, this is not the true State of the Case here. —— We tell you of this Prophecy as a Prophecy, which hath been already most surely, and most exactly fulfilled in all the several preceding parts of it; As they were to have their previous Accomplishment in their respective Seasons: which Accomplishment they had accordingly. —— And as to the last remaining part of it as yet unaccomplished, it is for no other Reason so remaining than as in the nature of it, it is impossible that it should be as yet fulfilled: even because the Fulness of Time for its Accomplishment is not yet come.

But the former parts of the Prophecy having been fully accomplished in their appointed Seasons, Consequently for that very Reason so shall also the Latter in its due Time. For the previous fulfilling of those, what is it but a pure Earnest

(9) Under the Consideration of your Fourth Argument.
that this also shall have its Accomplishment, when God's appointed Time is come for it? —

Therefore, However You have here objected to the contrary, this is no other than a rational Argument; Which may, and by the Blessing of God will be effectual among others to the converting of Infidels: such I mean as being enlightened and influenced by the holy Spirit of God working in them shall be enabled to discern, and to receive the things thereof: Even tho' the Natural Man receiveth them not, neither will he, nor can he know them, because they are spiritually discern'd.

It remains only, that I consider what you have said against the Prophecy before us its having relation immediately to the Messias, and the Times of the Messias under your Thirteenth Head, with which you conclude your Observations upon this Prophecy.

And truly there is hardly any thing under this Head that deserves to be called an Argument.

For what of that which you tell us here (r) of the mistaken Expectation of the Jews in Christ's Time in relation to the Messias, that he should never die? —

This their mistaken Conception proves not as to the Prophecy before us, that it hath not relation to the Death of the Messias, whatever they thought of his Death: As that (however contrary to their Expectation, Yet) in fact hapned in Agreement to what was pre-determined concerning him; viz. that he was to suffer Death, before he enter'd into his Glory. —— But the thing to have been prov'd here in order to have given your Observation the force of an Argument is that the expected Messias ought not to have died. In that case indeed Your Observation were to

(r) Scheme of Lit. Prophecy, p. 199 initio.
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purposes: but otherwise it is to none at all.

And what tho' we are also farther told here,
that even the Apostles, and Disciples of Jesus
thought Jesus could not be the Christ, when they
saw him suffer, and die?

Alas! Were not the same Apostles, and Disciples afterwards convinced of the contrary,
even that he was the Messias, tho' he did suffer and
die? Nothing surely but their Continuation
in their previous Opinion were of service to
you here: but their after Conviction makes evi-
dently against you.

You have indeed with some colour of an Argument
gone on to tell us, that neither Jesus him-
sel', nor the Evangelists and Apostles when they
came to be convinced that Jesus was the Messias,
ever cite, so far as it appears, this Prophecy to
the Messias bis Death: &c.

But as to this negative Argument, it will
appear of no force, if it be confider'd that our
blessed Saviour himself (7) interpreted the pre-
dicted Destruction of the City, and Sanctuary im-
mmediately of that Destruction of both which was to
be, and which was accordingly after his Death by
the Romans. And Consequently this Reference
doeth necessarily prove the Relation of the Prophecy
in this part of it to his Times, as the Times of the
Messias. And therefore the Prophecy in this lat-
ter part of it relating evidently to bis Times, it
follows that the Messias, in the preceding parts of
it predicted to be cut off nececessarily remains to
the purpose of the Messias bis Death in the Person of
Jesus, or in his being cut off as the Messias of this
Prophecy, as in the preceding part of it.

And that the predicted Destruction hath relation
to th. Times of the Messias, even Sir John Mar-
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sham hath not denied: tho' he hath allowed of it only in a secondary Sense; merely for the sake of his Hypothesis of the Weeks adapted in the Primary to the Times of Antiochus Epiphanes.

But, for the Reasons above given from the evident Inaccomplishment by Antiochus Epiphanes, or by any other Person either before, or in his Times of the general Purposes of this Prophecy in the twenty fourth Verse of it, and of the grand Purpose of it of the cutting off of the Messiah, as in Verse the twenty sixth, and also of the predicted Character of the one Week, it appearing that the Prophecy cannot with any manner of Agreement with the Text, in the plain, obvious, and literal Sense of those several Events be applied to him, or his Times, and Consequently the predicted Characters of the Half-Week also not possibly having any (t) any relation to those Times, I say for these sure Reasons the Prophecy remains even primarily and only, or wholly to the Messiah, and the Times of the Messiah of the Christians.

And therefore what of Sir John Marsham, and your other Authors not only Christian, but Jewish also that you bring in here, in what follows under this Head?

As to Jewish Authors, those in particular which you have here named, and many (u) more you

(t) Because if those Express Characters could have any such Relation, or could have had their immediate Accomplishment in the Times of Antiochus Epiphanes, it necessarily follows in that Case that the Event of the One Week of the Prophecy, and the several preceding Events of it must have had their previous Accomplishment also either before, or in these Times: which Accomplishment, as above shewn, they had not. And therefore Evidently, the falling out of the like Events with those of the Half-Week of this Prophecy, in the TIMES of ANTIOCHUS could not possibly be otherwise than in Correspondence with, or to the fulfilling of another Prophecy of this Prophet (vii. Ch. XI. 12. &c. loc. para.) immediately relating to those Times, as above noted. (u) As you may see in Defence of Christianity, &c. p. 147, 193.
might have brought in to equal Purpose, What tho' as you here tell us, One of them with the wise Men of his Nation makes the Messias first mentioned in this Prophecy to be Cyrus? Another makes him to be Zorobabel? —— And what of their Unanimous Sense which you also tell us of, by way of Conclusion, from Rabbi Abarbanel? ——

—— Alas! this is neither arguing, nor proving anything to the purpose, to give us the groundless Sentiments of prejudiced, and partial Jews, who however unanimous against the Messias of the Christians, Yet are confessedly divided who he was who is here predicted by that Name. And Consequentially they are not of any Authority in the Case before us. —— Let me therefore advise that You meddle not any more with Jewish Authorities in the Negative, till they become unanimous also in the Affirmative, by agreeing among themselves who He was that is here predicted. ——

—— But for you thus to have insulted over us for our Christianity in Jewish unanimous Language, which in truth is returnable only upon them, and our Anti-Christian Adversaries, who attempt to explain away this Prophecy from the true, and only Messias of the Christians, such Treatment is indeed as unbecoming, as it is trifling, and insignificant. It is acting a Part not unlike that of

*SOLOMON* s (w) Madman, who casteth Firebrands, Arrows, and Death: for so is the Man that deceiteth his Neighbour, and saith, Am I not in Sport? ——

And as to your Christian Authors, Sir *John Mar*lj*m in particular, and others (w) whom you

(1w) Prov. xxvi. 18, 19.

(2w) Elisha among others is One you name here: And yet your Friend *Hardwicke* hath immediately animadverted upon him for having confined the Prophecy to the Times of Antiochus Epiphanes, and Judas Macabaeus: [Hard. Chron. Vet. Tert. 4to Ed. p. 203.] —— the very Attempt which you have now also made.
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cite as referring this Prophecy to the Times of Antiochus Epiphanes, the Number of which you also have now increased, they all stand confused with your self: forasmuch as the Reverse of what you have very roundly, but most groundlessly asserted, hath appeared to be the Truth here, viz. That the whole Application of this Prophecy to Antiochus Epiphanes, (and not, as you affirm, the Application thereof to Jesus the Messias of the Christians) is grounded on most palpable Mistakes of the Intent thereof which relates (not as you say, wholly but indeed) not at all to Jewish Matters in Antiochus bis Times. 

And consequently, Your Charge (x) in Sir John Marsham's Words upon us as wresting, and perverting Chronology, and Times in our applying it to the Messias, and bis Times, is truly and only chargeable upon your self, and upon those who with you have vainly attempted to explain it away from our Messias, and his Times, by your screwing it into those of Antiochus: with which it is plain from your own Hypothesis of the Weeks, it hath not possibly to do.

Upon the whole therefore give me leave to expostulate you to consider the Rashness, the Unprofitableness, the Shamefulness, the Sinfulness of the Attempt.

Strange! that you should have had no more Regard to your Christian Country, than to be found writing against the Religion of it!

Strange indeed! that you should have thus bestowed your Time and Learning, both the Gifts of Almighty God, and Talents one Day surely to be accounted for, in fighting against God, and his Christ! - that you should have thus daringly gone about to set at nought that Revelation

(x) Scheme of Literal Prophecy consider'd, p. 199.
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which hath approved itself by many infallible
Proofs to be from Heaven.

Give me Leave therefore yet to exhort, and in-
treat you to beg Pardon of Almighty God in the
first place, and then of all good Christians for the
many Prevarications, and Falsehoods, Indecencies,
and Blasphemies against our blessed Lord, and his
holy Religion that have appeared in your Writings:
by a sincere, and publick Retraction of your ma-
ny groundless, unreasonable, and Anti-Christian
Sentiments; which is the only Reparation also
that you can make to your Christian Country; and,
I add also, a necessary Method for you to
take, for the plucking out of the Fire that Soul,
and Body of yours, which you will assuredly find
to be immortal; even according to that Revelation,
which by your treating of it, it should seem as if
you despised, and rejected. — Otherwise mark
the end, if it can be Peace with you at the last.

That the God, and Father of our Lord
Jesus Christ of his great Mercy in and through
him, may open your Eyes to the Acknowledg-
ment of the Truth as it is in Him, and to his For-
giveness, and Acceptance of you in, and through
him the said Jesus Christ, our ever blessed Saviour,
and Redeemer, are the sincere Prayers of

Sir,

Your unknown Servant,

Naunton Gloucester.

BEN. MARSHALL.

March 25, 1728.

FINIS.