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The Author of the following Notes declares, that nothing can be farther from his intention, than by them to lessen, in any degree, the just veneration of the public for these inestimable remaines of antiquity: He rather thinks it wonderful, that in the course of so very many ages, thro' remote and ignorant nations, the oldest books in the world, writ in a language, which has been dead above two thousand years, should have been no worse corrupted. That they have suffered some corruptions, is now generally agreed by men of learning and judgment; is partly acknowledged by the Jews themselves collecting many hundreds of various readings; and has been abundantly proved by the learned Louis Cappel, in so many more examples of differences from the present text in the oldest versions, as are sufficient to confute that fond notion of the constant incorruption of the Hebrew; which in the last age prevailed abroad so far, as to be erected into an article of Religion, and that to be subscribed.
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ADVERTISEMENT.

subscribed by all the candidates of the ministry. It was indeed afterwards, upon better consideration, repealed, there being little reason to imagine, that Providence had taken a more peculiar care of the Old Testament, than had ever been supposed of the New, or that Jewish transcribers had any prerogative of infallibility above Christian printers. Nor can there be any good ground for us to give more credit to the Masoretic editors of the Bible than to the oldest translators of it, and sometimes even to the authors of the New, who writ several ages before the Jewish correctors.

To wipe away, therefore, some of these spots, which obscure the face of Scripture, and to restore the original meaning of the text either by interpretation, or by alteration of the words, where the sense and the old versions would warrant it, seemed an attempt, that might possibly be of use to pious readers, who may, at pleasure, reject such conjectures as are found frivolous or unnecessary. The author will be most glad, if anything here will provoke the learned and ingenious Dr. Hunt to take the trouble of correcting it, and, instead of these imperfect essays, to publish the valuable
ADVERTISEMENT. vi
able dissertations of this kind which he has prepared.

In the few comments on the New Testament, tho' the aim be to display the truth for the benefit of all with desire to offend none, that perhaps, in a world full of parties and prejudices, may be a vain expectation. If undeserved wrath arise, the best reply to Protestant and Papist will be St. Paul's, If I would please men, I should not be the servant of Christ.

But one thing ought not to be forgot; that these Notes will be of little use to any that will not take the pains first to read in his Bible the passages refer'd to.
ERRATA.

Page 4. l. 3. for into land read into the land.
8. l. 27. respective read respected.
15. l. 29. read read.
22. l. 5. read read.
33. l. 7. dele people.
40. l. 7. read read.
50. l. 19. dele the point.
21. translators, read translators.
51. l. 5. for true read original.
55. l. 6. for we with read we are.
56. l. 22. for the read that we may.
63. l. 6. add head.
94. l. 11. before Tho' add 3.
95. l. 3. here, is dele comma.
97. ante pen. for quotations, are read quotations are.
98. l. 2. for copies read copiers.
21. in his read in a.
103. l. 5. for worshipped them read worshipped them.
137. l. 9. after are add now.
CRITICAL NOTES
ON SOME
Passages of Scripture.

Gen. iv. 7.

THIS verse is by some commentators better translated thus, If thou dost well, is there not acceptance; and if thou dost not well, sin (or the punishment of sin) lying at the door? For to thee is his (Abel's) desire, and thou rulest over him. This seems to be the meaning of the admonition and caution, which God, in his goodness, offered against Cain's jealousy and rage at his innocent brother.

— 8. And Cain talked with Abel his brother — and it came to pass — The Hebrew يאמר אין אלי סבה and Cain said to Abel— does naturally make us expect to read what Cain said, which in the Hebrew text now is not expressed; but is in so many of the ancient versions, as for instance, the Samaritan text and version, the Septuagint, the Syriac,
Syriac, the Vulgat Latin, the Jerusalem Targum, and Jonathan’s Targum, that it is hard to forbear supposing that thus much was once in the original, as is now in the Samaritan text, *לָלֶךְ בַּשַּׁדָּה* Let us go into the field; for which words some Hebrew manuscripts, Dr. Walton observes, leave a void space, and that the Masoretes add in a marginal note upon the place, that this is one of the twenty eight gaps of this kind which are to be found in the Scripture.

— 14, 15. Cain said— And it shall come to pass, that every one that findeth me shall slay me. And the Lord said unto him, therefore whosoever slayeth Cain, vengeance shall be taken on him sevenfold. Instead of לָלֶךְ therefore, the Septuagint, the Syriac, the Vulgat, Symmachus and Theodotion read in their copies לָלֶךְ כֹּל כֹּל for they translate, Not so, but whosoever slayeth Cain, &c.

**Gen. vi. 3.**

וַיֵּאמֶר יְהוָה לָלֶךְ כֹּל כֹּל דָּרִי נָהָר לְעֵילָם

And the Lord said, My spirit shall not always strive with man; for that he also is flesh: Yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years. It is said that the Hebrew לָלֶךְ may signify shall not strive or litigates. But whether it may or not, the Septuagint with other Greek interpreters, the Targum of Onkelos, the Syriac, the Arabic, and the
the Vulgate all furnish us something more intel-
ligible, _shall not remain or continue_, by which it appeared to Louis Cappel, that their reading then was וַיּוָלֵד but it seems more pro-
bable that it was וַיִּכְאָה which indeed signifies _shall remain or continue_. The latter part of the
Verse, _yet his days _shall be an hundred and twenty years_, is indeed literally translated; but, as it may, at first sight, induce an un-
attentive reader to understand, that God did by those words declare, that men's lives should for the future be reduced to an hundred and twenty years, and in fact they are often so mis-
construed, among others by Josephus; it can-
not be improper to observe, after other learned
men, that such abbreviation of the life of
man cannot there be meant, because, from
that time down to Moses, there is none of
those whose ages are recorded in Scripture
who did not exceed this term of an hundred
and twenty years. But this declaration is
supposed to have been made so many years
before the deluge, and this to be the sense of this verse; _And the Lord [or Jawo] said, My spirit shall not continue always with these
men, because they are carnal: But they _shall yet subsist an hundred and twenty years._

— xxii. 1, 2. And it came to pass after these things, that God did tempt Abraham, and said unto him, Abraham, and be said, Behold here I am. And be said, Take now thy son, thine only son Isaac, whom thou

B 2 lovest,
lovest, and get thee into land of Moriah, and offer him there for a burnt offering, upon one of the mountains which I will tell thee of.

This narrative of that signal trial of Abraham's faith and the issue of it, upon God's command to sacrifice his most beloved son, in which all agree the death and resurrection of Jesus to have been prefigured; in one circumstance of it, namely the place of the sacrifice, has not by any writers, that we know of, been well considered or understood; perhaps thought not to be of any significance, tho' it is to be observed, that the choice of the place was not left to Abraham as indifferent; but he was directed to make a journey of three days to a particular spot in the land of Moriah, which should be pointed out to him by an angel. We have no angel now to lead us to it, tho' it was then so distinguished, but must trace it out by conjecture, as well as we can. Moriah is mentioned once more in 2 Chron. chap. iii. vi. where Solomon is said to have begun to build the house of the Lord at Jerusalem in mount Moriah (it might perhaps be better rendered on a mount of Moriah) by which Josephus and other Jews have been led to think, Moriah was a name peculiarly appropriated to the mount of the temple only, and the sacrifice of Isaac to have been prepared upon that ground.
But Maundrel and other judicious observers have justly applied Moriah to the whole mountain of Jerusalem, comprehending all those mounts of Gihon without the walls, (of which mount Calvary was once a part) of Sion, of Acra, or Jerusalem proper, and of the temple within the walls. Of these mount Gihon or Calvary was, and still is, notwithstanding the alterations of three thousand years, the highest ground to the west; and the mount of the temple, the lowest of them all on the east side of the city. Of this lowness of the mount of the temple, one mark was the brook Siloam, springing out of the side of mount Gihon or Calvary near the western wall, where it entered, and by its channel divided the city of Jerusalem from the city of Sion, passing out to the east near the mount of the temple: And Josephus confirms it, with observing how much pains had been taken, during the reigns of the Asmonean princes, to lower the ground of Jerusalem, that it might not so much overtop that of the temple, as it naturally did. Beersheba, the place of Abraham's residence, was in or near the road from Egypt to Jerusalem, and from that city forty two miles distant to the south west. Conducted in that way by an angel, he came not till the third day to the sight of the destined mount of Moriah, which appeared to him afar off; yet probably
bably was within few miles, as he was to ascend it on foot with Isaac heavy loaded. In this position to the west or south-west, it was impossible but that that mount of Moriah, which was highest and nearest to him eastward, should meet his eye, which in after ages was called mount Calvary, and not that which was beyond it and much lower, on which afterwards the temple stood. It was therefore on this mount Calvary, that Abraham offered his only son, as on this same mount Calvary, about two thousand years after, the Almighty Father decreed that his only son Jesus should be sacrificed for the redemption of mankind. This rocky mount has been taken in and inclosed with the city wall by Adrian or when the Christians became masters there, and is still high, notwithstanding the great pains, that have been taken to dig it down, and reduce it within the compass of a church, called the Temple of the holy sepulchre: In which the cleft rock, still bearing the memorial of our Saviour's passion, is closely joined, and almost under the reputed altar of Isaac, the old tradition, among the Christians of Jerusalem, being that both the type and anti-type were offered there.

And on this very spot, in all probability, after the burnt offering of the ram, and God's gracious acceptance of all with the words, *And in thy seed shall all the nations*
of the earth be blessed, because thou hast obeyed my voice, the faithful patriarch was honour'd and rejoiced with seeing in a vision the intended sacrifice of the lamb of God, and the blessed consequences of it to all mankind, which Christ himself intimated to the unbelieving Jews, John viii. 56. Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it, and was glad.

And by thy sword thou shalt live, and shalt serve thy brother; and it shall come to pass, when thou shalt have the dominion, that thou shalt break his yoke from off thy neck.

These words being part of Isaac's prediction, address'd to Esau concerning the future fortunes of his posterity compared with that of his brother Jacob, seem to carry a sense in our translation unworthy of the prophet. For to say, that, when the Edomites shall get the upper hand of the Israelites, they will no longer be subject to the Israelites, would have been a truth that Esau would have scarcely taken for inspiration. The word **יהיה** **כאמור** **הרוי** **וקרת** **על** **מלגי** **צאנרא**; **may indeed signify thou shalt have the dominion;** but it is so improper here, that the learned Louis Cappel, thought it would be more advisable to follow the meaning of the Targum of Onkelos, in substituting...
for thou shalt have the dominion — when he shall rebel, or apostatise, thou shalt break his yoke, &c. The correction is ingenious, but surely not necessary. For the word in the text has, in the Chaldee and the Syriac, another sense, amend or repent, and if you will allow the Syriac version and the Greek of Symmachus, should be rendered when thou shalt be reformed or amended, thou shalt break his yoke from off thy neck. Which was effected about 865 years after this, 2 Kings viii. 20.

Gen. xlix. 10.

The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be.

Of the sense of this famous prophecy the antientest and ablest among the Jewish interpreters and commentators had no dispute with the Christians that we know of; but agreed that it related to the time of Christ's coming into the world. And accordingly Onkelos, the most respective Targumist of them all, has thus paraphrased this verse. There shall never be wanting a ruler out of the house of Judah, nor a chief judge out of his sons sons, until Messiah shall come, to whom the kingdom belongs, and the nations shall bear
bear or obey him. And as the other Targums, namely that of Jonathan and that of Jerusalem, with the Talmudists, join to give us in substance the very same meaning of this verse concerning the Messiah; the forced interpretations of the later Jews are too absurd and frivolous to deserve so much regard as some learned men have shew’d in confuting them.

But one thing must be observ’d, that the moderns have in this verse found a new name for the Messiah, Shiloh, not to be met with in any other part of Scripture, nor in any of the oldest interpreters or commentators of this place, but coined by the Jewish correctors of the Bible, in what they call their Masora, into יֵשָׁלֹה, a word of no signification at all. Whereas 1. the Septuagint read ὅλος, that is, Λός ὃς it is, he to whom it belongs, [meaning the scepter before mentioned] as Louis Cappe1 well observes; for in the original and best edition of their version, as Justin Martyr b long ago affirmed, this יֵשָׁלֹה was rendered יֵשָׁלֹה, He for whom it is reserved, as it now stands in the Alexandrian manuscript. 2. The Samaritan Copy has יֵשָׁלֹה, the same in the Chaldee dialect as יֵשָׁלֹה. 3. Onkelos, and 4. the Jerusalem Targum, speak the same sense, and so do 5. the Syriac, 6. the Arabic, and 7. Aquila, if not Symm-a-

*Critica Sac. p. 325.  b Dial. cum Tryph. p. 348. chus
It is evident therefore from all these authorities, than which we know of none better, 1. That the present reading was not in the ancient copies, but . 2. That by translating it He whose it is, they took it to be a designation of the person of the Messiah, and not a proper name of him, much less a little town of Samaria, nor any thing else, that is suggested by the trifling Rabbies. 3. That consequently , signifying, be that is sent, or to be sent, which the author of the Vulgate Latin is here supposed to have read, if he did not mistake it) and which Grotius most approves, not being supported by the testimony of any old paraphrast or annotator, can have no right to be admitted upon conjecture only.

In the words following and unto him shall the gathering of the people be, instead of a noun signifying a gathering, or obedience, the Samaritan copy has a plainer and better reading of a verb plural signifying shall be gathered or obey. But the error arising from our translation, must not pass without notice, which renders a noun plural, by the people in the singular, by which people in Scripture the Israelites are generally meant; whereas the Hebrew word in this place certainly signifies all the nations upon earth. To conclude, the whole verse should be thus translated:

The
The Scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor a principal judge from between his feet, until he shall come, whose the scepter is, and until the nations shall obey him. This prediction, as Mede well observes, was afterwards applied and explained by our Saviour himself, in those words, And this gospel of the Kingdom [of Christ] shall be preached in all the world, for a witness unto all nations, and then shall the end come, that is, the end of the Jewish state: and it was historically confirmed before that end by St. Paul, saying, the gospel has been preached to every creature which is under heaven.

Exod. vi. 2, 3.

And God spake unto Moses, and said unto him, I am the Lord: and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob by the name of God Almighty, but by my name Jehovah was I not known to them.

The latter part of this passage, but by my name Jehovah was I not known to them, as it now stands, and has for many ages stood in our bibles apparently contradicts the book of Genesis from the chap. xii. to the end of it: and indeed the third chapter too of this Exodus itself

a Matth. xxiv. 14. b Coloss. i. 23.
When Moses said unto God, Behold when I come unto the children of Israel, and I shall say unto them, The God of your fathers hath sent me unto you; and they shall say to me, What is his name? What shall I say unto them?— And he said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I am hath sent me unto you.— The Lord (or Jehovah, for Jehovah or Javoh is in the Hebrew) the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob hath sent me unto you. This is my name for ever. Moses then is here directed to mention to the Israelites the name of Jehovah, as the signal and seal of his mission, which they would acknowledge. But if the name Jehovah was never known to their fathers, how should these their descendants have learnt it, or recognize it? Yet Moses himself intimates that they had called upon the name of Jehovah in their distress, before Moses was sent to them— The Egyptians evil entreated us, and afflicted us — And when we cried unto the Lord Jehovah [Jehovah] the God of our Fathers, the Lord heard our voice, &c. For it should be observed to an English reader, that wherever he finds the Lord in our translation, the word in the Hebrew is generally Jehovah [or Javoh.] And consequently Jehovah can-

* Deut. xxvi. 6, 7.
EXODUS. 13
not be denied to occur as the name of God, which he declared to those patriarchs, under which he appeared to them in visions, gave them commands and promises, under which name they answered him, raised altars to him, and called upon him, nay, and left this name of Jehovah to the places where he had thus condescended to converse with them. And these instances are found in Genesis to return so frequently, and unquestionably, that a plain negative of them all, in this one passage of Exodus has furnished to the learned sceptics an argument, to prove, that the author of Exodus could not have been the author of Genesis, which he so manifestly disavows, nor even have known it. What relief do the commentators bring us in this great difficulty? Rabbi Salomon has said, that the sentence was not to be expounded literally, but as if God had said,—But my truth (signified by my name Jehovah) was not manifested to the patriarchs by the completion of the promise made to them. This interpretation has been preferred to all others by the annotators of greatest fame, that is Munfter, Fagius, Vatablus, Drusius, Grotius, Cartwright, Ainsworth, &c. Let us examine it without respect of persons. This clause is supposed to relate to the revelation and promise made by God to Abra-


ham,
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And [Jehovah] said unto Abraham, Know of a surety, that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them four hundred years: And also that nation whom they shall serve, will I judge; and afterwards shall they come out with great substance. This promise of a deliverance, tho' expressed to Abraham, yet manifestly relates not to him, but to his seed some ages after him, and, according to the letter, was not to be accomplished before this time, when Moses is charged with this message to the afflicted Israelites. The only meaning therefore of the words, But by my name Jehovah was I not known to them, that these learned annotators can give us, is no better than this: But I never effectually accomplished to them [the Patriarchs] my promise of a deliverance [which was indeed never intended for them nor wanted by them.] Will any intelligent reader be contented with such interpretations? and yet we know of no better. Now if no reasonable, or probable meaning of the words can be made out, the text must have been corrupted, and possibly to the reverse of what it originally signified. For the Israelites gradually sinking into the superstitions and idolatry, as well as the bondage of the Egyptians, and having begun to serve their Gods or Devils, (Leviticus xvii. 7. Joshua xxiv.)
xxiv. 14. Ezek. xx. 8.) which they too
plainly proved again about three months
after this, it seems to have been necessary
that Moses should revive the memory of the
great Jehovah almost lost among them, and
carry this name with the etymology of it
to them as a token, whereby the oldest and
most knowing among the Hebrews might
be satisfied, that he brought his commission
from the God of their fathers. This re-
port of Moses the elders are said to have be-
lieved. But Pharaoh treating them all
with tyrannical fierceness and cruelty, Moses
is sent to them again with fresh encoura-
gement, in which God declares himself to
be the same God, who had been so gra-
cious a protector to their ancestors, who had
appeared to the patriarchs in visions under
the title of בושם הנב the Almighty God;
And who had made known to them, his
peculiar name of Jehovah, [or Javoh] o אָל
the first cause, and principle of all exisitence
in the world, by which he was distinguis-
hed from every thing that was ever called
God: And who had established his cove-
nant, &c.

For such was, in all probability, the origi-
nal reading and sense of this clause, or part
of the third verse, not מְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁמְשַׁם

a Exod. iii. 14. b Ch. iv. 31. c Ch. vi.
d xvii. 1. xxxv. 11. xlviii. 3. f Gen. xv. 7, 8.
xxvi. 24, 25. xxviii. 13. הַל
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And by my name Jehovah was I not known to them: But, with the change only of not into it, And my name Jehovah I made it known to them. Which makes the whole context very coherent and intelligible. I am Jehovah, and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of God Almighty, and my name Jehovah I made it known unto them: And also established my covenant with them to give them the land of Canaan, the land of their pilgrimage wherein they were strangers.

Now the change even of a letter, of ל into迷失, may be thought too bold a stroke of criticism without the authority of ancient versions and manuscripts: And it would be so, if made without the weightiest reasons, and where the context in its present state is indefensible. But Noldius, in his annotations No. 1444. quotes the Jewish Masora for saying that there are no less than eighteen places in which this very change of ל into迷失 ought to be made, and observes that the Chaldee Targum translates them all agreeably to the Masora. The famous Louis Cappel considers every one of these places distinctly, then adds two more parallel emendations out of Buxtorf, and in different places seven more of his own. If this therefore be admitted to be the twenty eighth instance,

* L. iii. c. 10.
EXODUS.

Now the sojourning of the children of Israel, who dwelt in Egypt, was four hundred and thirty years. But St. Paul says the law was given from Mount Sinai four hundred and thirty years after the call and covenant with Abraham. It is plain, therefore, that the sojourning of the Israelites in Egypt, which in reason must not be reckoned to begin before Jacob's going thither to his son Joseph, cannot extend to more than half that time, and consequently the text, in its present state, is not true. But the Samaritan copy gives the verse complete:

Now the sojourning of the children of Israel, and of their fathers, which they sojourned in the land of Canaan, and in the land of Egypt, was four hundred and thirty years. And the Septuagint, in the manuscript of Alexandria, and in Aldus's edition,
Critical Notes on
confirm the same reading: 'H ה וַעֲבַרְנָה
tוֹם הָאָדָם, זַחַּה יִשְׂרָאֵל, זַחַּה וַעֲבַרְנָה
cְוָךְ נַעֲבַרְנָה כְּנַעֲבַרְנָה פָּרָה
cְוָךְ נַעֲבַרְנָה כְּנַעֲבַרְנָה פָּרָה. If this had been known
to be the original reading of this place, it
would have saved the commentators the
very great pains that it has cost to unravel
the perplexity of this text in the modern
editions.

—and xv. 3.

The Lord is a man of war, the Lord is
his name. Who can read this absurd attri-
but of God, without some indignation,
and not be moved to seek out for some ex-
pression that may be less unworthy of him?
And yet it must be confess, that this is the
exact version of the present Hebrew text.
But the Septuagint, the Chaldee of Onke-
los, the Syriac and the Arabic have nothing
to low, and the Samaritan copy gives us
another reading better by far נָבָה כְּפַר
mighty in war, which is preserved too in the
Syriac. The Lord is mighty in war, יְהֹוָּה
is his name.

Num. xvi. 5.

And he spake unto Korah, and unto all his
company, saying, Even to morrow the Lord
will shew who are his, &c.

The
The learned and ingenious Louis Cappel has taken notice of the different reading of the Hebrew in this beginning of the speech of Moses, express by the Septuagint in this manner, Εὐδοκεῖται εἰς ἑαυτῷ τὸ τῆς ὑπότασεως; God inspects and knows who are his. The latter part of which St. Paul seems plainly to quote from this passage in his second Ep. to Timothy ii. 19. And therefore Cappel thinks they read then not ἀνθρώποι in the morning, (in which sense it should have rather been written) but a word not so different in the figure of the letters as in the significance ἐπιστεῖθαι. He might have confirmed this to be the probable reading, by what still remains in the present Hebrew text, and immediately follows, יד וְיִשְׂרָאֵל and knoweth, which seems to imply, that some other verb preceded and was connected with it, and therefore should thus be translated, Jehovah inspects, and knoweth them that are his, &c. But, after all, it must be owned that the Samaritan copy and all the other versions confirm the present reading; so that, if it be an error, it is a very ancient one.
Behold the days come that I will cut off thine arm, and the arm of thy father's house.

Here the Syriac, the Vulgate, and the Arabic render אַתָּר as if it had been writ אַתָּר thy arm, whereas the natural sense of the context, recommends the present reading of the Hebrew אַתָּר thy seed; and that too is further confirmed by the Septuagint and the Chaldee, who both teach us to translate, Behold the days come, that I will cut off thy seed and the seed of thy father's house.

**Psal. ii. ii.**

And rejoice unto him with reverence. The Greek, the Vulgate, and Ethiopian, and our last version say, and exult to him with trembling: Words that will hardly be thought consistent and intelligible. The Syriac renders it hold him, &c. the Arabic praise him, (for all of them add to him which is not in the present editions of the Hebrew) but the Chaldee only, וְלֹא and pray—which would, if it were Hebrew, make a good and clear sense, with very small variation of the letters. But perhaps the original reading, with as little variation, may have been וְלֹא and trust in him, with the addition of וְלֹא to him, as in all the old versions. For this verb, tho' rare, is used in this signification in Psalm xxii. § 8.

He trusted in Jehovah or Javo. And
And may likewise be so here — and trust in him with great reverence.

ii. 12. — If his wrath be kindled yea but a little: But the Syriac renders this passage, as the words will bear, and it seems more agreeable to the context, than our English translation, — For his wrath will soon be inflamed.

Ps. vii. 2.

Lest he devour my soul like a lion, and tear it in pieces, while there is none to help.

What we translate and tear it in pieces, is in all the other translations, except the Chaldee, rendered, and none to redeem; whence it appears they all read differently from the present Masoretic text. And none to redeem, and none to deliver. And that the word פְּרִיק is used in that sense is proved from Psalm cxxxvi. 24. פְּרִיק אֲנִי מִיוֹר and redeemed us from our enemies. and from Lament. v. 8. פְּרִיק אֲנִי מִיוֹר there is none that doth deliver out of their hand. Lest he seize like a lion my soul, while there is none to redeem and none to deliver.

— vii. 4. If I have rewarded evil to him that dealt friendly with me. The Chaldee only, which appears to be the most modern of all the versions that are called ancient, is here and most commonly followed by the English;
For the Syriac, the Greek, the Vulgat, the Arabic, and Apollinarius's translation in verse, carry a nobler sense and more like the Christian doctrine, *If I have repaid evil to him who did me evil*, Ibid. Yea I have delivered him that without cause is mine enemy. Here the Syriac and Chaldee too, read a word near in letters, but different in signification, which seems more adapted to this place, and makes this sense, *Or if I have oppressed them who without cause are mine enemies.*

_vii._iii.: *God is a righteous judge, strong and patient:*  
_and God is provoked every day.*

The former of these two versicles is by all interpreters that I know of, rendered not as in the new version, but as it now is in the margin of our bibles, *God is a righteous judge.* For the words *strong and patient* have nothing to answer them in the Hebrew. In the latter _יָּדוֹ_ being capable of signifying either _God_, or the particle _not_, has been here translated by the Chaldee _God_, and his authority followed in it by the modern translators generally, tho' to complete the sense, it has been commonly thought necessary to express or understand _against the wicked_, which is not in the original. But the Syriac, Greek, Vulgat, Arabic, _Æthiopic_
The verbal translation therefore is only this, God is a righteous [i.e. merciful] judge, and is not very angry every day.

Psalm VIII. 2.

Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings hast thou ordained strength.

It is not easy to excuse our translators here, for following the Chaldee in opposition to all the antient interpreters, and to St. Matthew's quotation of this text in the words of the Greek Version, by which θεόν ἐστιν is rendered thou hast perfected praise, or, as the Syriac expresses it, thou hast established thy glory. For tho' the word ἐστίν be more commonly used to signify strength, it is rendered by praise, or honour, in the Greek and other versions of Psalm xxix. 7. and again xcvi. 7. and lxviii. 34. xcix. 3. Chron xvi. 27. as well as in this place.

Give unto the Lord the honour [new version glory] due unto his name.

And Psalm lxviii. 34. Ascribe ye the power to God: the Greek, the Syriac, the Vulgat, &c. say give ye glory to God. Psalm xcvi. 7. Ascribe unto the Lord worship and power. The same old translators render glory and honour.
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Ps. xi. 1.

Flee as a bird to your mountain; this is of the last corrected version, for that used in our Liturgy says, Flee as a bird unto the hill. The difference between the one and the other is not material, but this corrected version adhering more closely to the Chaldee, shews a text that, by that time, was come to be a little corrupted, which the preceding interpreters knew nothing of; for they render it, Flee to the mountains as a bird, whereby they shew how the text was read in their age, that is

For the foundations will be cast down — And here too, the Chaldee has led our translators to a new reading, and a new sense, unknown to all the oldest interpreters, who rendered the words in this manner: For what thou didst place they have destroyed. What then must they have read? I suppose for foundations thou didst place, a variation very common of one letter, and that scarcely discernible. For the pronoun what in the Hebrew, as well as the English is often understood.

Ps. xii. 5.

Saith the Lord (or Jaho) I will set him in safety from
from him that puffeth at him. In the old translation, I will help every one from him that swelleth against him, and will set him at rest. The great difficulty is in the two last words, as they now stand, and the rendering of this close of the period among the antients and moderns, which is so very various, that one cannot imagine they had the same words before them. The Greek (followed by the vulgar Latin, and Æthiopic) says, I will deal freely with him: The Chaldee, I will testify evil against the wicked. Of the moderns Pagninus’s literal version; interlined in the Polyglot Bibles, expresses it thus, I will ensnare him: The literal Spanish translation of Ferrara [from him that] ensnares him: which is followed in this case by the Italian of Brucioli, the French of Geneva, &c. in which an ellipsis is supposed of more words, than any language probably admits of. But the Syriac, the Arabic, Symmachus, and Apollinaris’s paraphrase in verse, all concur in one sense of openly, or in the light, from whence it is manifest that the verb whether it signify puffeth, swelleth, or ensnareth was not in their copies, but some other word, which those that are better acquainted with the Hebrew, may settle with great probability. But no better conjecture at present occurs to me, for restoring the original reading, than יָנוּשׁ lusitie, I will arise faith the
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the Lord, I will set him in safety with lustre
to himself.

Ps al. xvi. 2.

O my Soul thou hast said unto the Lord, Thou art my God. All the antient versions (except the Chaldee) and with them Apollinarius, concur in reading I said to Jehovah (prjavoh) Thou art my Lord. O my soul is not in the original, and there is no sort of necessity of adding it now to the original or to the version, in order to piece out this error of the Chaldee copy.

My goods are nothing unto thee. Which our last translators render, My goodness extendeth not to thee. The Greek, the Vulgat, the Arabic, the Vulgat, the Æthiopic say, thou hast no want of my goods, all which give but little satisfaction. The Syriac, and Chaldee agree in a meaning not unworthy of the Psalmist, but nevertheless differ a little in their reading of the text: The Syriac renders it, and all my good is from thee [or, is thine] and might perhaps have read וסוחית בָּעָלִי The Chaldee says, my good is not given but by thee: and therefore seems to have reademy good is not given but by thee: The antients being so much divided among themselves, we will leave the choice to the judicious reader, not being
being assured of any thing but that the text is at present corrupted.

— 9. Wherefore *my heart was glad, and my glory rejoiceth.* The Syriac here agrees with the Chaldee in reading *my glory,* which is expounded by the Rabbins to signify the intellectual soul; but as the Greek, the Arabic, the Ἑθιοπικ, the Vulgat, Apollinarius, and St. Peter in the Acts all appear to have read μυκ τονγας, and that carries a much plainer sense, it seems therefore preferable.—Wherefore *my heart was glad, and my tongue rejoiced.*

Psal. xx. 7.

Some put their trust in chariots and some in horses, but we will remember the name of the Lord our God.

Thus the Chaldee version leads us, and the English, and most of the moderns follow it, without reflecting that in the analogy of all languages, such a verb as trust, is never to be supposed or understood, if not express'd a little before or after, and that remember cannot be joined with חס השם in the name; as it ought literally to be rendered. How do the oldest interpreters direct us? Instead of דְנַו we will remember they all found some verb, which signified we will be great or strong except the Vulgat, (if that is
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is come down to us uncorrupted, (for in its present state, *Hi in curribus et bi in equis, nos autem in nomine Domini Dei nostri invocabimus*, it is neither good Latin, nor good sense) but what that verb was, cannot now be known but by conjecture, of which the learned must determine. In the mean time no word in letters comes nearer to נְבֵר than we will be strong or strengthen ourselves, which may fit the former as well as the latter part of the sentence: Some in chariots, and some in horses, but we will strengthen ourselves in the name of Jehovah our God.

Psalm xxii. 21.

Save me from the lions mouth; thou hast heard me also from among the horns of the unicorns. "We and many of the moderns render thou hast heard me, but all the antients, except the Chaldee, seem to have read my low estate, as in 24. for so they unanimously translate: Save me from the lions mouth, and my distress from horns of unicorns.

— 26. Your heart shall live for ever. None of all the antient versions, not even the Chaldee, have your, but their heart or hearts in this place, so that it seems to be only a fault in the transcribing of the Hebrew לַבְנָה יְהוָה, tho' generally followed by the moderns.

— 30. And no man hath quickened his own Soul. This too is from
the Chaldee; the others with Apollinarius give us a very different sense, by which says Louis Cappel, they appear to have read ἡμέρα γενέσεως for they translate, 

my soul shall live to him, and connect these with the following words, My seed shall serve him.

Psal. 24. 6.

This is the generation of them, that seek him, even of them that seek thy face, O Jacob. As it is undoubtedly absurd to call God by the name of Jacob, which is commonly understood, and indeed may naturally be taken from hence to be one of his names; and pretty difficult to make any tolerable sense of seeking the face of Jacob, or Israel; commentators have thought of different words to be understood here for completing the sense, which need not now be mentioned, for the best antient translators, as the Syriac, the Septuagint, Apollinarius, the Æthiopic, the Arabic, and the Vulgate express the word God unanimously as found in their copies, and as it ought to be replaced in our ב, or אלהים. This is the generation of them that seek him, of them that seek thy face, O God of Jacob.

Psal. xxv.

This and the xxxiv, xxxvii, cxi, cxii, cxix, and the cxlv Psalms are alphabetical, that is, all the verses
verses or so many sets of verses are to begin, with the several letters of the Hebrew alphabet in their order; a regulation that might have served for a guide to the hands of the old Jewish copiers, as on the other hand the inobservance of it discovers and demonstrates their negligence. And of this all the alphabetical Psalms furnish but too many instances, and the xxvth, in particular, in which if the letter Beth may be found, yet Vau and Coph at the beginning of their several verses, and parts of some others are plainly wanting. And what is worse, these defects are so ancient, that the oldest versions we now have, will seldom enable us to supply them.

Psalm xxvii. 8.

עַל אֶלֶף לִפְעֵמִי פָּדָה הָאָרֶץ מִלְּחָמָה יְרָם יִשְׁמָעֵאל סִגָּר

When thou saidst, Seek ye my face, my heart said unto thee, Thy face, Lord, will I seek.

In the old translation, my heart hath talked of thee, seek ye my face: thy face, Lord, will I seek. So our last translators have taken the liberty to add to the text, when thou saidst, and to quite transpose the parts of this period. But the two versions differ no more from one another, than the ancient versions from one another, and from the present Hebrew text. For instance, none of them all have seek ye; the Chaldee only, seek thou; the Septuagint (or Theodotion) of the Alexandrine manuscript, or
or the Vatican, or of Aldus's edition, and Symmachus's, and Apollinarius's versions, with the Syriac, Vulgate, Arabic all agree so far as to make this verb not in the Imperative, but Indicative mood sought thee, tho' perhaps with a different nominative case, as my face, or my heart, or I sought thee. It is plain therefore, says the excellent Louis Cappel, that they read in the Hebrew not בַּקֵּשׁ ye, as it stands now in all editions and translations, but בַּקֵּשׁ sought thee. And it is remarkable, that the Syriac, one of the oldest and best interpreters of all, wants this part of the verse, thy face, Lord, will I seek, whether exactly following the copies of that time or not, is not now to be known, all the others have it with some minute variations. Upon the whole we must desire the learned and judicious to decide, how near this reading may be to the true one לָלֵךְ אָמַר לִפְנֶיךָ אָרַח פִּנִּי thus translated: To thee my heart hath spoken, and sought thee, thy face, O Lord (or, O Jehovah) will I seek.

I should utterly have fainted; but that I believe verily to see the goodness of the Lord (or Jehovah) in the land of the living. Here again the Chaldee has interferred into the original text פָּלַח unles", utterly unknown to all the ancient versions, and of no signification or use in this place.
place but to make the sense suspended and imperfect, and from thence putting a sort of necessity on our translators, to supply this apparent deficiency with these words of their own invention, I should utterly have fainted, unless — So that it is more easy to be assured, that the particle אַלֹהִים unless, together with that supplement should not be here, than to explain how it came in. But it is not improbable that אַלֹהִים one half of this word אַלֹהִים was in some old copies, the end of the preceding verse, for the Greek, the Æthiopic, the Vulgat, and the Arabic close it with himself or itself, and the wicked hath made lies for himself; that is, in Hebrew נַנָּת, and with a little more corruption נַנָּת. But it should be translated simply, I trust I shall see the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living.

Ps. xxviii. 4.

It is observable that the Syriac only has in his translation but half of this verse, reward them according to their deeds, and according to the wickedness of their own inventions; whereas all the other versions have the imprecations again repeated; which reading was most likely to be genuine, must be left to conjecture.

—9.— The Lord is my strength: in the new version, the Lord is their strength, without signifying who they are.
are that are so protected. Now all the old versions, but the Chaldee, thus render these words, *the Lord is the strength of his people.* No other reading then was in their copies, but *his people,* changed by the negligent transcriber into *his or their people.*

Psalm xxix. 2.

Worship the Lord with holy worship, or, as the new version has it, *in the beauty of holiness.* This word *beauty* too we have only from the Chaldee. For all the rest with Apollinarius translate the passage, *Worship the Lord in the courts of his holiness,* shewing thereby that they all read instead of בָּרוֹד, *in the beauty,* בַּבּוֹר אֲדוֹן in the courts of his holiness. (as in Psalm xcvi. 9. and c. 4.) *in atrio sancto ejus,* Vulgat.

xxix. 9. — *The voice of the Lord maketh the hinds to bring forth young.* The Syriac seems for בָּרוֹד the hinds to have read בָּיתוֹ the oaks, *the Lord shaketh the oaks,* which seems more coherent with the following words, *the Lord shaketh the oaks, and uncovereth the forests.*

Psalm xxxiv. 5, &c.

*They had an eye unto him and were lightned, and their faces were not ashamed.* Here our translators and commentators in general are bewildered, being utterly
utterly unable to point out who they are, that looked unto God and were enlightened, and what connexion there is with the preceding or subsequent periods. And therefore some have suspected a gap, in the context of this place, and that some words are lost. But the whole difficulty here seems, to arise from the blind following of the Chaldee, who has rendered the whole verse in the preterit, without regarding the other more ancient and faithful versions, who concur in rendering it in the imperative mood, thus:

Look unto him, and be illuminated [or enlightened] and your faces shall not be ashamed.

But in consequence of this interpretation it appears that they read your faces, altered since their time in the Chaldee copy to their faces.

This being one of the alphabetical Psalms, discovers the want of two members of verses after the fifth verse, and that the last verse is supernumerary, and out of rule, after the last letter of the Hebrew alphabet in this Psalm, as well as in the xxvth.

Psalm xxxvii. 20.

As for the ungodly they shall perish, and the enemies of the Lord shall consume as the fat of lambs; yea even as the smoke they consume away. Here again the Chaldee copy and paraphrase mislead, and the moderns readily follow that guide, who too
commonly debases the sense. But Louis Cappel has long ago observed, that what is now rendered: shall be as the fat of lambs, they shall consume, into smoke shall they consume away, was in the Greek: αὕτη σφόδρα, κατεσταράμενα, εἰς καπνὸς ἔξηλον. In their very honour and exaltation (or in the time of their being honoured and exalted) they consume away as smoke: That therefore the text then run: יֵּרֵד רָהָם in being honoured, in being exalted, both being the Infinitive mood or gerund, and on the other hand, instead of יֵרֵד into smoke, יֵרֵד as smoke, as instances of a very frequent interchanging of two similar letters ב and ג. And it may be added, that the other interpreters, concur with the Greek in this sense, and not with the Chaldee. Now so general an agreement of the versions, is hardly to be supposed, if the original context were not the same to all, and is therefore preferable: But the wicked shall perish; and the enemies of the Lord in their honour and exaltation shall consume and vanish as smoke.

Psalms xl. 6.

thoughts which are to usward, they cannot be reckoned up in order unto thee: Or, in the old translation, and yet there is no man that ordereth them unto thee. Both absurd; but the more recent translation of the English,

Critica Sac. p. 200. and 217.
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comes a little nearer to the nonsense of the Chaldee paraphrase. Now since here is no question or doubt about the reading of the place; let us see what sense do the oldest versions give us of it. They are all uniform in rendring, Many, O Lord our God, are the wonders thou hast wrought; and thy thoughts [or counsels] toward us, and none is like unto thee. For the Hebrew word יְרֵעַ has indeed sometimes the signification given here by the Chaldee, orders, disposes, draws up in order, which common sense will tell us cannot be applied to this passage; for one may venture to say, that these words: And yet there is no man that ordereth the thoughts of God unto God, have no meaning at all. But the same word יְרֵעַ having also a very different signification, is like, resembles, is compared to, as in Ps. lxxxix. 6. For who is he among the clouds, that [נְוִי] shall be compared unto the Lord? Job xxviii. 17. The gold and the crystal cannot equal [לָתי אֶרֶב] wisdom; all the other old interpreters, in prose or in verse, have agreed to take it here in this last sense, and with good reason. Many, O Jehovah, our God are the wonders thou hast wrought; and thy thoughts concerning us, none is like unto thee.

PsAL. xlvii. 4.

He shall choose out an inheritance for us, even the worship of Jacob whom he loved.
Thus say our translators, following the Chaldee paraphrast, who thus expresses one of the Jewish conceits, *He will take pleasure in us, so that we shall possess our inheritance, the house of the sanctuary of Jacob, which he will always love.* Now all the antients translate his inheritance not our; and for himself, not for us, except the Seventy and Vulgat. And therefore the Syriac and Arabic seem, best to have preserved the true reading and sense of the original, *He hath chosen us to himself for his Inheritance,* &c.

The princes of the people are joined unto the people of the God of Abraham: For God, which is very high exalted, doth defend the earth, as it were with a shield. In this verse, the oldest translators, differ from one another, both a little in the reading and more in the construction of the text; but De Muis, a learned and diligent professor of the Hebrew language, after considering four of those different interpretations, concludes with his opinion, that all those senses come in effect to this one: *That God is the Lord and King of all the earth, and will in time bring all into one body of the church.* Indeed the princes — are joined — to the God of Abraham, cannot be taken but in the style of a prediction, in which the future time is often most strongly painted in the present tense.

And
And so all the old translators have rendered this passage, except the Syriac, who in the Imperative mood seems to have conveyed the force and spirit of the original better than any of them all; O ye princes of the nations, join yourselves to the people of the God of Abraham; for the territories of the earth are God's, he is most high. It may perhaps be objected, that the present Hebrew text has the shields of the earth, by which the commentators Aben Ezra and Kimchi understand Rulers. But in the other translators printed in the Polyglot, besides the Chaldee, do not render the word shields, but potent men, by which if they meant to explain shields, the metaphor is not easy. 2. The reading which the Syriac translates territories, is, in all probability, at least as old as the other, more apposite to the sense of the context, and therefore likely enough to have been the true one, which is conjectured to have been possessions, or territories.

5. Wherefore should I fear in the days of wickedness, and when the iniquity of my heels compasseth me round about? This rendering is not only ours, but is admitted in the most esteemed versions of the moderns. Perhaps it may pass for one of the dark sayings intimated in the preceding verse; surely the meaning, which naturally results from these words is not a good one, but much fitter for the mouth of a man avowedly wicked, than...
to be read in any book of scripture. For proof of which put the question on the opposite side, and say, *Wherefore should I not fear in evil days, when the iniquity of my own heels shall compass me about?* would it not be allowed to be reasonable? The Chaldee, who has commonly the blame of misleading, here thought so, and turn'd it thus, *Why should I fear in the day of an evil storm, unless when the guilt of my own sin surrounds me?* But the Syriac and Arabic having another reading of *my enemies, for my heels*, have solved the difficulty by translating to this effect: *Why should I fear in evil days, when the iniquity of my enemies hath surrounded me, who trust in their wealth, and boast themselves in the multitude of their riches?*

xlix. 11. - *And yet they think that their houses shall continue for ever, and that their dwelling places shall endure from one generation to another.* their middle, or inward thought, as we have since translated it, is no better than an old blunder of the copiers (as old it may be as the time of Chrysostom) by transposing of two letters ב and ר instead of כּוֹרֶב, a mistake avoided by all the old translators of all ages that one can meet with, even the Chaldee, the word being never used in the sense here put upon it; and yet now generally adhered to by the moderns, who, to accommodate this forced signification of the word to this passage, are obliged to add of their
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their own, without any authority for it, the words shall continue. Whereas the antients are unanimous in rendering the context after this manner, their sepulchres are their mansions for ever, and their dwelling places for all generations.

Nevertheless man will not abide in honour seeing he may be compared unto the beasts that perish. This verse being repeated in the end of this Psalm might have borrowed some amendment from thence, as well as from the Greek, Syriac, Vulgat, Arabic, and Æthiopic versions; but it seems to have been a rule with the moderns to follow the Chaldee, both in the text and paraphrase against them all. abideth not is in the last verse understandeth not, and so it is in all the old interpreters before-mentioned, and Apollinarius's verses, both here and in the last period. And that perish, as we render the word, is not so rendered by any one of all the old interpreters, not even the Chaldee, but all translate it, it is like to [it, or them] and consequently signify that they read here rather for our of them we may deduce this sense, Man being in honour [who] understandeth not, makes himself equal to a beast, and is like it.

For while he lived he counted himself a happy man: And so long as thou dost well un-
to thy self, men will speak good of thee. This latter part of the verse, being an uncommon observation, that we usually praise those who are kindest to themselves, calls us to examine how far the original countenances so strange a proposition. Now we find that all the rest of the old interpreters besides the Chaldee (who yet does not at all favour the moderns, but seems raptured in a strain of enthusiasm) agree to translate it, And he will thank thee when thou dost good to him. And therefore must have read the Hebrew thus:

Psal. 1. 1.

The mighty God, even the Lord, hath spoken. The simple literal version offered us by all the old interpreters has more majesty in it, than this paraphrase from the Chaldee: The God of Gods Jacob spoke, and called. For this guide of the moderns has exceedingly corrupted and perverted the sense of this whole sublime and admirable Psalm, and represented it little better than a chapter of the Koran, and therefore deserves the least regard of any that are called antient.

5. Gather my saints together unto me, those that have made a covenant with me by sacrifice. Thus the Chaldee has read and translated, and ours have followed him: The others differ from one another only in the
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the rendering of the first word, whether it
should be actively or passively, Gather ye, or,
Be ye gathered; in the rest they read for my;
bis and for for me him, in this manner, Be
gathered to him. O ye his saints, who have
made a covenant with him by sacrifice.
Which shews that their copies had for מַלּ, מַלּ.
בריתוֹ בֵּיתֵי, for מַלּי, מַלּי.

Psalm li. 4.

Psalm li. 4.

лемַלּ בֵּיתֵי נוֹדֵד, תְּבִירֵי, תְּבִירֵי
That thou mightest be justified in thy saying, and
be clear when thou art judged. WHICH which
is here translated that, as indeed it commonly
signifies, is by the Chaldee rendered therefore,
and by Noldius, an accurate examiner of the
Hebrew particles, is explained here in the
sense of therefore, or so, as introducing some
consequence of what preceded. וּמַלּי thou
mightest be clear, when thou art judged (i.e.
by us men) is in none of all the old interpre-
ters, except the Chaldee, but instead of it
they translate thou mightest prevail or over-
come, which shews they read מַלּי. So that
the whole should be rendered in some such
manner as this, So that thou wilt be justified
in thy saying, and wilt overcome in thy judgment;
or, when thou art judged, as in the Greek,
Vulgat, and Arabic,

Psalm lv. 14.

אַשֶּׁר יָדֵנוּ מְתִיעֵנוּ מְדִיבָנֵינוּ, אֲלֹּהֵינוּ נְוהֵלֵנוּ
We took sweet counsel together, and walked
in
in the house of God as friends. This sense might well pass without exception, if may stand for as friends, or in company, which, they say, it never signifies but in this only place, and if it did not appear that the ancient versions generally intimate and suppose a different reading, We sweetened our food together, and went to the house of God in concord. So that these may seem to have read for counsel food, and for in tumult we know not what, unless it should be with benevolence.

Psal. lvi. 8.

Put my tears into thy bottle. This low and vulgar expression of the Psalmist's prayer may naturally tempt one to suspect the reading of the text, which is supported by none of the antients but the Chaldee, whereas all the rest for in thy bottle, read before thee, or in thy sight.

Unto thee, O God, will I pay my vows: unto thee, will I give thanks. Or, according to the last version, Thy vows are upon me, O God, I will render praises unto thee. It would not be easy to make sense of these last words, and yet it must not be denied that they are the literal rendering of the present Hebrew text, and equal to the rest of the moderns, French, Italian, Spanish, &c. The corruption appears to be ancient by the old versions: The correction you may have from the note of the
the learned bishop Hare, on this place. _Affixum utique quod ad pertinebat, errore liberarii._ Sed et aliud in hac periodo mendum est; nec tantum versui secundo deest sua quantitas; sed et vero verbum suum; igitur addendum putavi. *Vid. Ps. l. 14, 23. cvii. 22. & cxvi. 17._ To which may be added a confirmation of his conjecture which he overlook'd; for the Syriac has all the bishop's amendments, with so little variation from the Hebrew language, that it may not be amiss to add the words here in the Hebrew characters: לְךָ אֲדֹנָי אֵשֶל מִרְיָם אִרָבָה לָךְ: To thee, O God, will I perform my vows; and with praise will I sacrifice to thee.

Psal. lxiii. 1.

My soul thirsteth for thee, my flesh also longeth after thee, in a barren and dry land where no water is. The learned have long disregarded the inscriptions or titles at the head of the several Psalms, as added by ignorant men in after ages. That of this Psalm is probably taken from this first verse, and is entirely different from the preamble of the Syriac, which supposes David being fled to the king of Moab for fear of Saul, to have made this prayer there. The present reading has nothing to offend, or of ill consequence in it; yet I do not much doubt but the Syriac only
only of all the old interpreters has preserved the original reading: only of all the old interpreters has preserved the original reading.

As a dry and thirsty land without water so have I longed, &c. the Hebrew Letters b for in, and c for as, being so like in figure, that they are very often interchanged thro' all the old testament.

Psal. lxviii. 4.

O sing unto God and sing praises to his name, magnify him that rideth upon the heavens as it were upon an horse, praise him by his name Yah, and rejoice before him.

is here rendered upon the heavens, and indeed God is so often in Scripture represented in the image of a great king, riding on the clouds of the air, as Deut. xxxiii. 26. Ps. xviii. 10. and civ. 3. and again in the 33d verse of this very Psalm, that it is no wonder that our translators were ready enough to take Rabbi Kimchi's authority for rendering heavens, tho' the word never signifies heavens in any other place but deserts, or the west, and is here by the Greek, the Vulgate, the Syriac, and the Arabic translated the west, to which the same versions make the 33d verse answer by rendering it, to him that rideth upon the heaven of heavens [towards the east] tho' the Chaldee and the moderns will have these last words to signify [which were of old.] Now, if they will put heavens in the fourth verse, they ought to have read:
Critical Notes on clouds, instead of deserts. At least it were to be wished, that this low image of the Almighty, as it were upon an horse, which is not in the Hebrew, may be erased from the English. But we must not pass without notice one corruption that runs thro' all the moderns, tho' unknown to all the antients of the Polyglott, even the Chaldee: by his name Jah, where the antients uniformly say יְהֹוָּה is his name, which the Greek scholiast has thus writ in Greek characters ιαθονα.

Psalm lxxiii. 8.

In the old version, They corrupt other, and speak of wicked blasphemy, their talking is against the most high — In the new, They are corrupt, and speak wickedly concerning oppression, they speak loftily. יְהֹוָּה which is by the Chaldee, and now by the moderns commonly rendered corrupted or dissolved, signified to the Syriac, the Greek, the Vulgat, the AEthiopic, the Arabic, and Apollinaris, they meditate, as Dr. Castle observes in his Lexicon. And for loftily, as in our new translation, these antients seem plainly to have read לְמֵרָה that is, as the Syriac directly translates it and our old version, against the most high. The verse would be therefore better represented in these words: They meditate and speak wickedly, they speak [blasphemy] against the most high. And this sense agrees well with the following
ing verse. For they stretch forth their mouth to the heavens.—

lxxiii. 18. Namely how thou dost set them in slippery places: and castest them down and destroyest them. The Syriac, Greek, Latin, Arabic, and Apollinaris must have read a little differently from the Chaldee paraphrast, and from the present Hebrew text, at least in the last word לַשְׁמְעָהוֹ to destruction, which the former five Interpreters render in their very exaltation, or, when they were most exalted, and so declare the reading of their time to have been לַשְׁמְעָהוֹ. 2. מַלְאַךְ them as in our translation, is by them rendered in the dative case to them, as it ought to be. 3. בִּינְלְקִדְרַה which we turn in slippery places, the Greek, Latin, Arabic, and Apollinaris render because of deceits; the Syriac, according to their deceits, which seems best. The whole verse therefore in English might well run thus: Surely thou didst appoint to them according to their deceits; thou didst cast them down, when most exalted.

Ps. lxxiv. 19. O deliver not the soul of thy turtle-dove unto the multitude of the enemies. There are no traces of this metaphor of the turtle-dove in any old version whatsoever, who could not have mist it, at least not all of them, if it had ever been in their copies.
The truth is, it is only the blunder of some negligent transcriber propagated down to us, who took a ר d for a ר r, and so writ ὑμῶν thy turtle-dove, for μὴ confessing thee, for so the antients translate, O give not up to beasts a soul confessing thee; which the Chaldee paraphrast seems to apply to the present situation of the Jews.

Psalm 75. 1.

Unto thee, O God, do we give thanks, unto thee do we give thanks; thy name also is so nigh, and that do thy wondrous works declare.

None of the ancient interpreters, besides the Chaldee, knew of this reading of this latter part of the verse, or of the nearness of God's name; for they prove the reading of their times to have been מִלְחָמָה וַיַּעָשֶׁהוּ וַיִּכְרָא נֹפְרֵךְ To thee, O God, do we give thanks, we give thanks, and call upon thy name, and declare thy wondrous works: for thus they translate unanimously, except that before thy wondrous works, the Syriac, Greek, #Ethiopic, and Arabic insert כל all.

For promotion cometh neither from the east, nor from the west, nor yet from the south. Here again is a division about the sense of this verse, all the antients being ranged on one side, and the moderns on the other, between whom the reader must judge. The latter,
both Jews and Christians, would take the last word מַעֲרָה for an infinitive mood in Hiphil, signifying "to raise or lift up," and so make it a verbal, signifying exaltation or promotion. On the other side, all the antients without exception take it in its most common signification of mountains; but then it must be acknowledged that the sense is imperfect, and makes no entire proposition, quia nec ab oriente, nec ab occidente, nec a desertis montibus; unless the reading of the Syriac be allowed, who instead of מַעֲרָה from the exit [of the sun] has no exit or escaping only (without the particle from) in the nominative case, and so gives us this meaning. For there is no escaping from the west, nor from the desert of the mountains, intimating perhaps by the west the Philistines, by the desert of the mountains Arabia Petræa to the south and south east of Judæa. The very small remains of the Jewish history that are now left us will not enable us to make a particular application of this ode; but as it is thought to have been composed after some success with denunciation of God's severe vengeance on their enemies, the antients interpretation of this verse seems more suitable to the spirit of the whole, than that of the moderns.

Psalms lxxxiii. 1.

Hold not thy tongue,
O God—All the antients, except the Chaldee, agree in reading the beginning of this Psalm
Critical Notes on

for they all translate, O God, who is like unto thee? and at the same time signify that not, was not then in the text.

lxxxiii. 6. What is commonly rendered Moabites and Hagarenes, is in the Chaldee, Moabites and Hungarians, by which some judgment may be made of the age of that Version.

Psal. lxxxiv. 5, 6.

Blessed is the man, whose strength is in thee: in whose heart are thy ways, who going thro' the vale of misery use it for a well, and the pools are filled with water. This whole passage is dark and difficult, perhaps was so originally, as one may collect from the great differences between the oldest translators, and the transcribers, from time to time adding mistakes to what they did not understand, have made it now almost incomprehensible. The moderns having got from Josephus the name of Baca a little village on the edge of Galilee next the Tyrians, which might have been in the road of the caravans to Jerusalem, have turned all the words of several significations here, to describe the conveniences of the pilgrims in that march, and herein agree, as usually, to follow one another; but the Syriac with some small variations of his copies from the present text,
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Viz. of thy ways, for his Heart for their heart, of passed for a well, has led us into a better reading, and perhaps the original sense of this verse, Blessed is the man whose strength is in thee, into whose heart thy ways have passed in deep sorrow; and set their dwelling in it. He becoming a teacher shall even be covered with blessings.

Psalm 1xxvi. 2.

Preserve thou my soul, for I am holy. David Kimchi observes upon this place, that some wonder at this saying, but with little reason; and yet most of the Rabbis, sensible of the offence, offer some excuse, or evasive explanation of the expression as unfit for David or any man, when in God's sight no man living shall be justified. The reading is indeed as old as the time of Apollinarius; yet it is hardly to be doubted, but that the reading found in the Syriac and Arabic should be preferred, and rendered gracious or merciful. Preserve my soul, for thou art gracious.

Psalm xc. 9.

For
For when thou art angry, all our days are gone, we bring our years to an end, as it were a tale that is told. The corruptions of this verse, among many others, teach us, how poor are the remains we have left of the ancient Hebrew language, which has been by some ignorantly condemned as barren, only because there is but one book extant of it. יַעֲשֵׂ לש by Pagninus rendered have declined, by the Seventy, Syriac, and Arabic ἐξελειτων, have failed, or are spent. What therefore must have been the reading in their copies? for never signified any such thing. Perhaps it was מָלַפְע are run out, which is now found only in Ezek. xlivi. 2. tho’ derived into the other languages of near affinity with the Hebrew. The latter part of the verse, which we alone translate, we spend our years, as a tale that is told; (for the word רָאוּב never signifies a tale) others,— as a vapor of the mouth,— as a discourse,— as a word,— as a thought; by all the ancient interpreters besides the Chaldee, is rendered, as a spider’s web, which therefore in all probability was the genuine sense of the original. But we now find no Hebrew word for a spider’s web, unless רָאוּב, or some word near it, from יַעֲשֵׂ to turn in a round, may have that meaning. The word in the Syriac for a spider’s web is יָתוֹ ה, from the same root, and not utterly unlike. The verse then should be rendered, with the Syriac, For all our days are run out by thy wrath, and our years are wasted.
Psalms 53

wafted like a spider's web. The tenth verse sufficiently proves, that the author of it was some ages later than Moses.

But who regardeth the power of thy wrath? For even thereafter as a man feareth, so is thy displeasure. None of all the ancient interpreters have given us this sense of this verse, tho' they are not unanimous themselves in their exposition of it. But the moderns may be excused, if, from the context in its present condition, they cannot make out any meaning at all. For is the wrath of God according to or proportioned to man's fear of that wrath? The passage is corrupted by the Jewish copyers, and by the help of the Syriac and Apollinarius's translation in verse may be restored to its primitive purity. Apollinarius's verses are:

Τις σῶς χαράδρομο μέγας θρόνος νάβιλ ἀνείγνω;
Τις σοὶ ἐξεισαγόμενα ἀμεῖδα δέιμα δυσμᾶσι συμφάσις;
Who hath known in his Mind thy great Power, when angry? Who might number the horrid Terrors of thy Wrath? — (Where, it may be observed, that the Verb number is taken from the Verse following.) The Syriac says, Who knows the Force of thine Anger, and the Terror of thine Indignation? Whence it appears, that the reading of that time was מְכָל עָשָׁה יִמְלָא יִרְאַם עֲבֹדוּל. Who knoweth the force of thine anger, and who the terror of thine indignation? And the senseless words
Critical Notes on words of the Septuagint do in some measure confirm this amendment; for in Hebrew they would be with the difference of only one

Psalm xciv. 7.

For he is the Lord our God, and we are the people of his pasture, and the sheep of his hand. This being the introductory Psalm in our liturgy should not pass without notice of a small transposition of the words the people and the sheep from their proper places interchangeably; for omitting the incongruity of pasture to a people, the same thought being repeated in Psalm lxxix. 13. and c. 3. in the natural association of sheep (not people) to a pasture, it is hardly to be doubted but the Syriac should be followed in doing the same in this place — And we are the people of his hand, and the sheep of his pasture.

Psalm cx. 3.

In the day of thy power shall the people offer thee free will offerings with an holy worship: The dew of thy birth is of the womb of the morning. Hoc loco, says the learned Dr. Muis, non arbitrator ullam obscurorem esse in Psalmirum volumine; and all, it is to be be-
believed, will readily agree with him. The subject, the images, and phrases are all prophetic and divine, and the corruptions great in proportion to the small number of lines of this most sublime ode, which the extravagances of the Chaldee paraphrase seem intended rather to obscure than illustrate, which we wish to do. 1. יִּהְיֶה may signify with thee, as it is rendered by the Septuagint, Apollinaris, the Arabic, the Æthiopic, and the Vulgar; or thy people, as translated by the Syriac and Chaldee: And neither sense improper or inconsistent, but the former seems preferable. 2. פָּעַם by the Septuagint and Arabic is translated government, which Amama, one of the most learned Hebricians we have known, affirms it never signifies; and Castel has it not in his Lexicon; the Syriac turns it into an adjective, signifying honourable or glorious, by which one may suppose he read דֶּשֶׁר which Dr. Castel renders a Prince or King as it usually signifies. 3. קָרָא the Syriac and Chaldee expound holiness, but all the others read פָּרַת thy saints, as appears from their versions. 4. תֵּא עָבְרֶה from the womb say all the ancient interpreters, except the Chaldee, who renders it mercy (and not improperly) and connects it with the words preceding, tho' according to his own conceit. 5. כֵּינָה of old, as the Syriac translates it; before the morning star; as all the others more clearly interpret it; only the Chaldee has thought fit to take no notice of it. 6. ל in this place is
is redundant, as *tibi* often is in Latin writers, which Noldius, in his most useful book of Concordances of the particles, has shewn to be frequent in Scripture, 7. *the dew of thy birth.* Unintelligible words of long standing; for Aquila, Symmachus, and another Greek version had them. But the Syriac, the Septuagint, the Vulgate, the Arabic, the Æthiopic, and Apollinarius have thus conveyed to us the sense of the original: *I begot thee,* my Son. As in Psalm ii. 7. Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee. Which, in great probability, is the genuine signification of the text, of which the Syriac gives us the very words, or at least very nearly. For, tho' here is now no such word as *םלך* or *לָדוֹן* or *לתוֹ* extant for a son or child in the slender remains that are left us of the Hebrew tongue; yet there are such plain traces of the word, or one very near it in the Samaritan, Syriac, Chaldee, and Arabic languages, that the oldest interpreters would never have express'd it in this place, if they had not found it here. If these premises be allowed, we may proceed to make the second and third verses more intelligible in some such manner as this: 2. A scepter of might will *יָנָבָח* deliver thee out of Sion; reign thou in the midst of thine enemies, — 3. And with thee, O prince, in the day of thy power, thy saints thro' mercy clothed with splendor. Before the morining star I begot thee, my son.

\textit{cx. 4'}
The Lord hath sworn and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek. All the ancient interpreters translate the latter part of the verse to this sense, as it is quoted by the author of the epistle to the Hebrews, except the Chaldee alone, who for — after the order of Melchizedek, says — because thou hast been a just king. Who in this may perhaps be followed by Aben Ezra, Kimchi, and some more of the Jewish Rabbis, but by no other of the moderns whatsoever. But, on the other side, the modern professors of Hebrew themselves acknowledge that על רוחר על רוחר יعلاج a phrase most commonly used before a noun to signify for or because of, by the Septuagint made equivalent to ἐνερεβ, or אלי, by Buxtorf in his Concordance, Amama in his note, and Noldius in his Concordance to answer to the Latin propter; and accordingly thus it is rendered in Gen. xii. 17. And the Lord plagued Pharaoh — because of Sarai, Abraham's wife; and again in Ch. xx. 18. And Ch. xliii. 18. Because of the money, that was returned in our sacks — And Psalm lxxix. 9. Help us, O God of our salvation, for the glory of thy name. The same phrase before a part of a sentence with והיה or any such particle, is used to signify because that, and by the Septuagint rendered ἐνερεβ, by the Latin Vulgat quia, et quod, as in Deut. xxii. 24. The damsel, because she cried
cried not being in the city, and the man be-
cause he hath humbled his neighbour's wife.
and Deut. xxiii. 4. Because they met you not
with bread, &c. Nor is there one passage in
the old Testament, in which this phrase
is by the Septuagint translated
κατὰ τὰ ἔργα, or by us according to the order,
excepting this one verse. Therefore Kim-
chi concludes with his version in this form
because thou art a
king of righteousness, as in Psalm xlv. 8.
Thou haft loved righteousness, and hated iniquity,
therefore God, even thy God hath anointed thee
with the oil of gladness above thy fellows. To
which Noldius, who quotes him, replies only,
that in this he contradicts St. Paul, whom Nol-
dius takes to be the writer of the epistle to
the Hebrews. But Mills, in his concluding
note on that epistle, will answer for Kimchi,
that the author of it was so much attached
to the Septuagint, that he makes no refe-
rences but to the Greek version, and often
so unaccurately, that, if his citations in Greek
were to be examined and compared with the
original Hebrew, all his arguments on those
points would be discovered to have no foun-
dation at all; of which he allidges four or
five instances, with an intimation that he could
have given more; and no doubt but Kimchi
would have reckoned this for one of them.

He shall judge among the heathen, he shall fill the
places with the dead bodies. Louis Capel in his
Critica
Critica Sacra p. 367. has, out of St. Jerom's Latin translation, helped us to a better reading of this place, instead of *with the dead bodies* or *in the valleys,* (for it is writ both ways). He shall judge the nations, he shall fill the valleys — corresponding perhaps with the sense of Isaiah xl. 4. Every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill shall be made low. — And smite in sunder the heads over divers countries. None of all the antients had the present reading but or in the plural of many or of the great ones on the earth, and head being in the original in the singular number, He shall crush the head of the great ones on the earth, may in the opinion of Bruccoli, the author of an old Italian translation, be pointed at Antichrist.

Psal. cxxxix. 1.

Aben Ezra says, there is not in all the five books of Psalms, any so excellent as this of the ways of God with a rational soul. Amama observes many Chaldaisms in it, from whence it may be reasonably inferred, that it was writ after the beginning of the Babylonian captivity, as well as most of the rest of the Psalms of this fifth book, the Greek title says by Zachariah.

 فلاشئا رثات مقمني نشبنا لا آوبت لله

Such knowledge is too wonderful and excellent for me, I cannot attain unto it, The Greek, and Apollinarius, the Latin, Æthi-
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Æthiopic, and Arabic read for knowledge and instead of attain, to which there is no word in the Hebrew to answer, the very same expression occurring before in Psalm cxxix. 2. In the judgment of Amama should be translated here, as it was there, and in Jerem. i. 19 prevail against, and the whole should stand thus: Wonderful is thy knowledge and elevated above me, I cannot prevail against it. For hence he pursues the thought of God's omnipresence, Whither shall I go from thy spirit? Or whither shall I go from thy presence?

If I go down to hell, thou art there also. Literally, If I descend into hell, an expression, in this place at least, unknown to all the old interpreters, (except the Chaldee) for they phrase it, If I descend into hell, and therefore probably used a word not very different in its letters if I reach quite to hell, as in Ezekiel vii. 12. the day is fully come and in 2. Chron. xxviii. 9. in a rage that reacheth up to heaven. In which case the words should be rendered, If I go even to hell, to thou art there.

If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea: We never hear of any wings belonging to the morning, but from the Chaldee. The Septuagint and Vulgat read or in the morning,
morning, or perhaps in the same sense; but the Syriac and Arabic help us to a clearer sense by translating what it is to be supposed they read in their copies as an eagle: If I take wings, like an eagle.

13. For my reins are thine. The Greek (as it now stands, ἐκλήσω) and the Vulgat, possediti, join with the Ethiopic and the Chaldee in confirming the present reading of the Hebrew קְנוּת thou hast possessed: Yet one may perhaps without partiality prefer that of the Syriac and Arabic חַנְנוּת thou hast composed or created—which being a Syriac word, as well as Hebrew, stands in so many letters in that version. And if this be the true reading, the Greek ἐκλήσω, thou hast possessed, may be as easily turned into ἐκλήσω thou, hast created. Thou hast created my reins.

14. I will give thanks unto thee, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made: This version is collected from the Chaldee only, which the rest of the antients do not countenance; none of them find (which we, render I am wonderfully made) in the first person, but in the second מָלַלִיתָה, thou art wonderful in terrors, or, according to the Syriac and Arabic, thou hast done wonders in terrors.

cxli. 5, 6. Let the righteous rather smite me friendly, and reprove me. 6. But let not their precious
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Cious balms break my head. The ancient versions, by their variations and obscurities, shew many corruptions crept into this Psalm, in the course of so many ages: let the righteous smite me, say our translators, which is literally, Let the righteous knock me with a mallet. There are commentators, who will labour to make this pass with us, but they dishonour the original, more than any that say it is corrupted; for the latter have on their side the Septuagint, the Syriac, the Arabic, who read let the righteous teach me in mercy, of which is the very word in the Syriac.

2. oil of the head is said by the Rabbis to intimate the best oil, the best being usually applied to that part: probably it was so; but the observation is of no use here, where all the ancients found not head but wicked, which Louis Cappell observes of the Septuagint, and the late learned Bishop Hare thought to be the genuine reading.

3. Which shall not break my head. Was there any danger that balms should break his head? itself is a word nowhere else to be found, and Dr. Castle in his Lexicon under the word to break remarks, that the Septuagint, Syriac, Arabic, Æthiopic, Vulgat, and some of the Hebrews seem to have read in this place bedrop or anoint. In this manner therefore do the

* Critica Sac. p. 286:
ancient interpreters teach us to read this verse: Let the righteous instruct me in mercy, and reprove me; the oil of the wicked shall not anoint my

That our sons may grow up as the young plants. — This is the reading and sense of the Chaldee only, and is continued thro' the two following verses, as a prayer for the internal prosperity of the Jewish nation at home, whereas all the other old interpreters with Apollinarius agree in rendering the same verses, as so many circumstances of the actual felicity of the aliens of their neighbourhood; Whose sons grow up as the young plants, and whose daughters are as the polished corners of the temple: Whose granaries are full, &c. so that wherever the present Hebrew text has עז our, in their time it had עז their, and therefore has received these amendments or changes probably from the hands of later Jews, in which the modern translators generally follow them. And yet the conclusion of the Psalm is in both the same in words, but in the ancient versions to be taken by way of antithesis, as, Happy the people, who have such things: More happy the people, who have Jehovah for their God.
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Psalm cxlv. 14.

Here we may properly insert an extract from the Critica Sacra of Louis Cappell, p. 294.

"Ps. cxlv, qui alphabeticus est, post versum 13 qui incipit a littera Mem, et ante versum 14, qui incipit a littera Samech Septuaginta [ut et Syrus, Arabs, Æthiops, Vulgatus interpretes et Apollinaris] addunt hunc versiculum, qui Hebraice sic procul dubio fuit conceptus. Et recte fane videtur additus; neque enim videtur verisimile in Psalmo illo alphabeticum fuisse omissum versiculum qui inciperet a littera Nun.

In the cxlv Psalm, which is one of the alphabetical Psalms, between the 13 verse beginning with the Hebrew letter Mem, and the 14 verse beginning with the letter Samech, the Septuagint (and with the Septuagint, the Syriac, the Arabic, the Æthiopic, the Vulgat Latin, and Apollinaris's paraphrase in verse, in a word all but the Chaldee) insert a verse beginning with the letter Nun, which in all probability was thus in the Hebrew: And indeed with good reason, for it seems not at all probable, that in a Psalm, where the several verses were to begin with the several letters of the alphabet, that verse only which was to begin with the letter Nun, should have been dropped. This verse, which by the testimony of so many antient
antient translators once filled this place, and ought to be restored to it, would in English run thus: *Faithful is the Lord in his sayings, and holy in all his works.*

**Psal. cxlvi. 5.**

Let them praise the name of the Lord: for he spake the word, and they were made, he commanded, and they were created. Here our old composers of the translation used in our liturgy, have taken a liberty, of which we find no other instance, of inferring these words, *he spake the word, and they were made*, which are not in the present Hebrew text, nor in any other of the modern versions, that we have met with. But on the other side, they are in all the antient versions, except the Chaldee, (if that be antient) and that is a sufficient inducement for us to believe, that they were formerly in the Hebrew text, and nearly the same which are still in the Syriac, *viz.* which are literally rendered thus — For he spake, and they were; he commanded, and they were created.

---

**Isaiah vii. 8.**

*And within threescore and five years shall Ephraim be broken, that it be not a people.*

Louis Cappel a observes that no corruptions of

---

* Crit. Sac. 1. vi. c. 7.
of the Hebrew text occur more frequently than in the numbers, which indeed he has proved by a multitude of instances, and, in conclusion, alledges this flagrant example of Jewish negligence, or presumption; by which a prediction sent to encourage Ahaz and his subjects against the Israelites of the ten tribes, who are here called Ephraim, then confederated with the Syrians; and which, both promises deliverance to Judah, and denounces to Israel a total destruction of that kingdom, within a limited time; is so changed, as to be utterly inconsistent with the subsequent history of those two kingdoms in Scripture. For the prophesy was sent to Ahaz, Ahaz reigned 16 years; and was immediately succeeded by his son Hezekiah; in Hezekiah's sixth year, came the total destruction, and captivity of the kingdom of Israel, from which it never recovered. If then the prophesy were delivered, the very first day of the reign of Ahaz, it could not be full 22 years to the completion of it. But if in the end of the first year of Ahaz, or the beginning of his second, not full twenty one years. Vitringa shews with great probability, that this consternation of Ahaz, and consequently Isaiah's message, must have come in the second year of his reign, after the loss of 120,000 men against Pekah alone, without which victory, the two kings would scarcely have
ISAIAH

... have projected directly to form the siege of Jerusalem, and to depose king Ahaz. And they are called the two tails of smoking firebrands, apparently from the combustion of the preceding invasion. And the same pious and judicious commentator, with greater pains and accuracy than the subject deserved, has confuted first one notion derived from the Jews, to very many of the learned moderns, that the infallibility of the Jewish transcribers being then undisputed, the sixty five years must be reckoned to have begun backwards, above forty years before this prophecy was declared or known; and then another interpretation, which is little better; that the sixty five years, are to be extended as much beyond the real event of the destruction of the Samaritan kingdom, to a term of which there is no mark or mention in the sacred history. But according to either of these constructions, these words must have been unintelligible to those who heard them, even after the event, and lost all force and divine authority.

What then is to be done? Louis Cappel makes no more doubt, than we do, that the text is corrupted, and he would correct it in this manner בוער טש יהוה שנים: within six and five years, that is eleven years — which Grotius, a master in all sciences but chronology, commends as undoubtedly true; not observing how much it clashed with the Scripture history. For if this prophecy was
nounced eleven years before the captivity of the Israelites, that must at the same time be the eleventh of the reign of Ahaz; the eleventh of Ahaz, was above seven years after the death of Resin, and Pekah, who were both so terrible, at the time of this prophecy, to the court and people of Judah. Vitringa being as much persuaded as Cappel, of the corruption of the text, and the necessity of a reform, offers another reading, \(\text{and within sixteen and five years, supposing the letter } \text{ to have been originally writ for the number ten, of which it is the common mark, and by subsequent transcribers joined to } \text{ as part of that word, which, by that addition, would come to signify sixty instead of six. For the sum total of twenty one years, the excellent Professor's conjecture is unexceptionable, as in effect has been shewn a little before. But 1. it will be hard to find a reason, why these transcribers should express the number ten, by a mark, and the numbers six and five, at the same time by words at length. 2. Whereas he justly supposes Isaiah to have made up the total of twenty one years, by the years past in each of the reigns of Ahaz and Hezekiah, before the captivity of Israel; he cannot assign sixteen of the twenty one, to the reign of Ahaz, when he has laid it down, that Ahaz had reigned one year, before the declaration of this prophecy, and yet reigned but sixteen in the whole. 3. Nor can
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the prophesy with good reason be brought to signify within five years of Hezekiah's reign, when it is certain, that the captivity of Israel fell not before the sixth of Hezekiah.

From the event, it may without doubt be collected, that the original prediction of Isaiah, included no more than one and twenty years, from the second of Ahaz, to the desolation of Samaria; and those, in all probability, distributed into the two terms of fifteen years, for the remainder of the reign of Ahaz, and six for the first part of Hezekiah's: And this might have been exprest by וָשְׂשָׂנָה instead of וֹשְׁשָׂנָה שְׁשים שְׁשִׂים, and by the addition of שְׁשָׂנָה תְּשִׁים, the words being ranged according to the course of the events, in this manner: וָשְׂשָׂנָה וֹשְׂשָׂנָה שְׁשים שְׁשִׂים: And within fifteen and six years Ephraim shall be broken, that it be not a people. It has been objected by able critics, that this putting of fifteen and six for twenty one, is a way of reckoning not used by any nation, that we know of; and it must be allowed, that it was not customary even among the Hebrews; but the prophets might, and sometimes certainly did use this mysterious style, when they intended to cover under it some notices of things, that after the events would be opened to all considerate eyes. And beside the instances brought by Vitringa, p. 176. there is a remarkable one, in the seventy weeks of Daniel
Critical Notes on Daniel, where the weeks to be numbered, from the going forth of the commandment [under Ezra] to Messiah, are not said to be 69, as they are, but 7 and 62, because that whole sum was made up of those two distinct periods.

Isaiah ix. 6.

— And his name shall be called wonderful, counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting father, the prince of peace.

It seems strange that this famous passage of Isaiah should by any Christian commentator be applied to Hezekiah, or any king of Judah, when Jonathan’s Targum expresses the Messiah, as the subject of those high titles, which may be said to be given him, not by the prophet, but by the Lord of hosts, as in the verse following, and which are in substance explained again, in the second verse of the eleventh chapter. And the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord. For Vitringa well observes, as many before him had done, that what this child, preordained to sit on the throne of David, will be called, is intended to signify what he will be; he will be wonderful counsellor, or wonderful in counsel, potent lord, father of the age [to come] a prince of peace. Gabriel (of which the name Gabriel is compounded, and
and therefore perhaps the Septuagint rendered, these two words by "Αγγελός, may be translated the mighty God, as in our version, but since the same words in the plural number, אלים ובירי in Ezekiel xxxii. 21. stand for strong and mighty, and cannot there signify Gods, and since the other attributes here mentioned of wonderful counsellor, prince of peace, &c. would rather seem low and mean, if applied to the Almighty; the old Greek versions are perhaps not wrong, in translating them, as in general they do, in the sense of potent lord. יי is made to import in our translation, that the Messiah will be the everlasting father; how much that means, is above our capacity to comprehend; surely the text imports not so much. יי here is agreed to be a noun signifying an age, or eternity: The old Greek Interpreters, and the Vulgat, taking it in the first sense פָּרָה תּוֹ אָיִם added to it as an explanation, תּוֹ μָאוֹנֹת Father of the future age, Father of the age to come, by which perhaps they intended to signify, Lord of all the world for the ages following his ascension; perhaps as much as we should by taking יי, in the second sense of eternity, father of eternity or eternal life, viz. to all his true followers. And either of these senses will make a clear and sublime character of the grandeur and glory of the Messiah.
Isaiah x. 5.

O Assyrian, the rod of mine anger, and the staff in their band is mine indignation: The plain and natural translation of these words seems to be this: Wo to the Assyrian! the rod and the staff of mine anger is he, in their hands is mine indignation. — And when the Lord shall have perfected his whole work upon mount Sion — I will visit the fruit of the stout heart of the king of Assyria, and the glory of his high looks. Shall the ax boast itself against him, that he weth therewith? — An excellent lecture of humiliation, to all the the proud conquerors of mankind.

Isaiah xxvi. 19.

Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust: for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead.

This being part of an address to God, from the afflicted Israelites, represents a restoration of their fallen state, in as lively imagery, as they would have done a real resurrection from the dead: and has therefore been often brought as a sufficient evidence, that the latter was the general belief of Isaiah's time, of which Vitringa makes no doubt, tho' he acknowledges the primary sense here, to be only figurative. But he forgets to reduce the
the words [together with my dead body shall they arise] and in his translation [cadaver meum. resurgent.] to any grammatical construction, or coherence. 

my dead body in the singular number, was not in the copies of any of the antient translators, but their dead bodies. Thy dead men shall live, their dead bodies shall arise. Let them awake and sing, that dwell in the dust, &c.

Isaiah lii. 14.

As many were ashamed at thee — Thus it stands at present in the second person, in the Hebrew text of this famous prophecy of a suffering Messiah, tho' all before and after these words are spoken of him in the third person. It is true that this change of the persons is of little importance, and not uncommon in Scripture, but nevertheless it seems better, not to multiply the instances of that sort farther than the original authorizes them. Here it appears plainly that the Syriac read for at thee that is at this servant of Jehovah, mentioned in the verse preceding: and very probably, that the Chaldee read the same, tho' that paraphrast, in this, and the following chapter, affectedly misapplies to the whole nation of the Jews whatever the prophet affirms of a single person, and by such a perverse interpretation makes it hard to determine what was in the text of his time. And yet he is not much more absurd than Grotius, who would
Critical Notes on
would persuade us to expound all of Jeremiah
and his persecutions.

Isaiah lii. 2.

*He bath no form nor comeliness, and when we shall see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him.*

Here is a little disorder in the end of the verse; *et desideravimus eum,* and we desired him, which is inconsistent with the rest of the context. Forerius therefore would have us understand, the particle not, and we desired him not; which of all particles is never to be understood in any serious writing.

The Syriac says, — *And we saw that he had no form, and we refused [or disowned] him,* as if the word in the Hebrew had been לבראום. The easiest alteration, and most agreeable both to the Septuagint, (who express it by *κοιτήσας αυτον, και ειδεν ευθες φαντασθεν.* *We saw him,* and he had no form nor beauty) and to the modern versions, would be נראות זלא מראות עשה. *We saw him, and his aspect is not desirable.*

— liii. 10. —

*When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed.* — The conjunction  תֹּא  which is generally rendered if, but in this place when, implies a condition, says Vitringa, without which this servant of Jehovah was not to enjoy the privileges annexed, *He shall*
shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand. But it appears much more suited to the divine oeconomy to say that it had been of old decreed, without condition or contingency, that he himself should make his life a free-will offering for sin, and that in the original this was directly, not hypothetically affirmed, as it is still in the Syriac, who for הֵנִּים מֵא reads in one word מַהֲשָׂרִים מֵא in Hithpael, signifying is put or made, and so the sense, without any forced apostrophe to God, as in our translation, will be natural and easy, His soul is made an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, &c.

Isaiah. lviii. 4.

Behold ye fast for strife and debate, and to smite with the fist of wickedness. The latter part [and to smite with the fist of wickedness] is by the Septuagint rendered ἄροτρα κυριακός ταπείνος, and ye smite the poor with your fists, which shews that instead of רֹאש instead of wickedness their copy had רֹאש, a reading more significant and pointed.

lviii. 5. דִּינְאַנ חָיָה זְמוֹנֶה דְּמָע עֲרָבָה יֵצֵא צָלִיל לְפָר לוּף.

Is it such a fast that I have chosen? for a man to afflict his soul for a day? Is it to bow down his head as a bulrush, and to spread sackcloth and ashes under him? This divine expostulation loses much of its force in our translation, as well as the rest of the moderns,

* John x. 17, 18. and xii. 27.
by this improper similitude of a bulrush, of which it is notorious enough, that it is the least apt to bow down its head of any plant; and thence comes into a French proverb, on a man that is haughty and stiff in behaviour, *il se tient droit comme un jonc*, He keeps himself as upright as a bulrush. On the contrary all the ancient translators here and in other places render this word כנף, as a *circle*, *ring*, or *book*; but it seems probable that the first letter כ which stands for *as*, was originally כ signifying in, one of the most common changes of this language, and then the version will run thus, *Is it to bow down his head in a circle?*

**Isaiah. lxvi. 1, 2.**

*Thus faith the Lord, The heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool: Where is the house that ye build unto me? And where is the place of my rest? For all those things hath mine hand made, *all those things have been*, faith the Lord.*

The speech is indeed majestic, and worthy of the Lord of all the world, and the reasoning irresistible; but in the last part, *and all those things have been*, there is a flat tautology, which the oldest and best versions have not, who must have read in their copies לְךָ וְּלָּךְ כָּלַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּהַיַּh

The sentiment exprest by David, upon the
the same subject, as it is recited 1 Chron, xxix. 16. O Lord our God, all this store that we have prepared, to build thee an house for thine holy name, cometh of thine hand, and is all thine own.

Jeremiah vii. 4.

Trust ye not in lying words, saying, The temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord are these. Is this version intelligible? The pronoun they has created to our translators all the difficulty; for, as it stands alone, it can have no signification, but if it be allowed to be connected with the gerund يتما، it may be rendered in that they say, it is the Lord's temple, &c. a populous cry of the false prophets, as if it were to be expected, that God should protect the wicked nation, for the sake of their temple. But all the antient versions take no notice of this word يتما، and without it, give the whole verse thus, Trust ye not in lying speeches of them who tell you, it is the temple of the Lord, &c.

But it is observable, in the following verse, where we now read, For if ye thoroughly amend your ways and your doings — the Syriac says, ye are the temple of the Lord, if ye thoroughly amend your ways and your doings, — agreeably to that divine strain in Isaiah
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Isaiah 4, Thus saith the high and lofty one,
that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is holy,
I dwell in the high and holy place, and with
him also, that is of a contrite and humble
spirit, &c. But it must be acknowledged,
that this insertion from the Syriac, is not
confirmed, by any other old paraphrast or
commentator, and some will not perhaps
allow his single authority to be sufficient,
tho' one of the best of all the antient transla-
tors; yet nevertheless these words seemed not
unworthy to be mentioned.

Micah vi. 8.

He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good,
and what doth the Lord require of thee, but
to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk
humbly with thy God?

Here, as Grotius observes, is a most excel-
lent preparation, and introduction, to the true
spirit of the Gospel, by drawing our princi-
pal attention off, from external and circum-
stantial things, and (as Cocceius very well
adds) from all traditions and precepts of men,
to the practice of sincere piety to God, and
justice and beneficence to our neighbour.
There is indeed a small variation from the
text in the Syriac, Arabic, and Vulgat, but

* lvii. 15.

hardly
hardly worth observing, for instead of He hath shewed, they read ḫבוג and rendered I have shewed or will shew and thereby made it ambiguous, whether these are immediately the words of God or his prophets; the present reading, being the clearer, seems rather the better. And תשמיש being a noun should be rendered, not justly, but justice, tho' it must be confess without any material difference, for the illustration of the sense of this divine and ever memorable declaration. He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth Jehovah thy God require of thee, but to do justice, and to love mercy, and to be humble in walking with thy God?

John xx. 30, 31.

And many other signs, truly, did Jesus, in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book.—But these are written, that ye might believe, that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name.

Grotius, in his note on this place, declares himself to be clearly of opinion, that here St. John concluded his Gospel: But as the last chapter of Deuteronomy, and the last of Joshua were added by the Hebrew Sanhedrin; so was the following xxıth chapter here annexed by the church of Ephesus. In confirmation of this decision, he brings the 24th verse of this last chapter, this is the disciple which
which testifieth of these things, and wrote these things; and we know that his testimony is true. Which can never be supposed to be the language, of the evangelist himself, but of the church after his death. Father Simon, tho' acknowledging that in all appearance, St. John designed to end his history with those words; yet will not allow, that Grotius has alleged any solid proof of what he was so ready to advance. But rather imagines, that there has been some change made in the course of St. John's narrative, and that the last chapter is not in its true place, and that, if any one will consider how little there is of method or order in his whole relation, he will be induced to charge St. John himself with these little defects, which, says he, make no alteration in the truth of his history.

On the other side it may be said, in support of Grotius's judgment, that you will not find, any one genuine Christian writer, of the two first centuries, that mentions or quotes any thing of that xxith chapter. But on the contrary, Tertullian, in his dispute Adversus Praxeam, cap. xxv. concerning the distinction of the person of the Son from the Father, after many quotations from St. John's Gospel, says Ipsa quoque clausula Evangelii propter quid confessit hæc scripta, nisi ut credatis Jesum Christum filium Dei? "And the very conclusion of his Gospel, for what end does it seal up those writings, but that ye might believe, says he, that Jesus is the
"the Christ, the Son of God?" Which are the words of the last verse of the xxth chapter, and consequently shew, that Tertullian knew of no xxist chapter, nor of any Asiatic hyperbole at the end of it. And if any question be made of the proper signification of the word clausula, Rigaltius in his note on De Idololatria, cap. 9. will tell you that it signifies the end or close of any thing, and indeed Tertullian never uses it in any other sense.

Galatians i. 8, 9.

Ἀλλὰ οὐκ ἡμεῖς ἢ ἄγιλες εἰς ἐγκαίνωνοι ὅπαι ὑμῖν ἔφη οἱ Ἰησοῦς παρὰ τὸν ζωτικὸν γὰρ οἱ Ἰησοῦς ἔφη, ἀναθεματισμοὶ ἦσαν. Ὡς γὰρ οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐλεημοσύνης ὑμᾶς ἐκτιθέμενοι ἔσοντας, ἐπὶ τὸν ἐπιτύμβιον μισθὸν παρασκεύασατε, ἀναθεματισμοὶ ἦσαν.

But tho' we or an Angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you, than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you, than that ye have received, let him be accursed.

St. Paul had but lately converted the Galatians from Paganism to Christianity, and this they had gladly embraced. But, soon after his departure from them, some Judaizing Christians had persuaded them, that it was necessary, or at least expedient, to superadd to their Christian creed, the observance of the Levitical rites of the Jews;
which was to mislead them from their faith in Christ, to trust in the works of the Mosaic law.

Dr. Whitby remarks, that Grotius and Obadiah Walker* (and probably many other Romanists) note that the Apostle here speaks only of doctrines, contrary to his gospel: For that the particle in this place signifies not besides or different from (as all the versions antient or modern, that are come to our hands, render it) but contrary to his Gospel. And by this construction, the greatest innovators, and corruptors of the faith once delivered to the saints, so long as their systems are not directly contrary to the doctrine of Christ, may flatter themselves, with being covered from this denunciation. Now indeed it must be allowed, that may have sometimes that sense, according to the nature of the subject, to which it is joined. But let it be applied so here, and we shall see how little it fits this place: But tho' we or an angel from heaven, preach unto you a gospel contrary to the gospel, which I have preached unto you, let him be accursed. Is not this to make St. Paul most irrationally supposing of himself, that he might recant, and contradict all that he had before taught them as God's Apostle. Which, were it possible to be the case, the Galatians would not want much to be cautioned against giving him any credit.

* In the paraphrase and annotations said to be corrected and improved by bishop Fell.

But
But the Galatians might not, perhaps, think it so absolutely absurd and impossible, that St. Paul might, in process of time, add some article of doctrine, to what he had at first preached, or permit other missionaries to do the same. It is against this imagination that all his reasoning is bent. He labours to convince them, that, as his doctrine came immediately from Heaven, he has not, will not, cannot make any variation from it, or addition to it, nor should they admit of any from any man living, nor from any authority whatsoever. For the literal and natural translation of this passage is this: But the or an angel from heaven, should preach to you for gospel any thing, besides what we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, if any one preach to you for gospel, any thing besides what ye have received, let him be accursed. An Anathema of great importance, and very extensive in its consequences, not only to the churches of Galatia, or of Asia, nor to the bishops or preachers only of that age, but to all the pastors and bishops of Christendom then present or to come, and is with good reason so applied by many of the reformed churches, absolutely forbidding all, to add any new doctrines of human invention, any articles of religion not taught by St. Paul. For if it prohibits the admitting, or annexing to the gospel of Christ, the ritual law, which had once been delivered from heaven, by the hand
of Moses, and had been observed by Christ himself, and his Apostles in general, down to the time of this epistle: how much more does it preclude, and forbid all subsequent additions of doctrines, all new creeds, all new articles of religion, which would be only the precepts and decisions of men? Against all such attempts of ecclesiastical ambition is this denunciation levelled, after the manner of that in Deuteronomy, iv. 2. Ye shall not add unto the word, which I command you: And that in Revel. xxii. 18. If Jesus testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book; if any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book. Dr. Whitby observes here, that the Fathers thus understood, and thus applied this declaration of the Apostle, Chrysostom and Oecumenius among the Greeks, and Augustin among the Latins, who has this note, He faith not, If they preach things contrary, but if they preach things never so little different from the gospel which I have preached unto you. And others might easily be added, if there were any need of authorities, to support so clear, and certain an interpretation.

Nor is this express with more terror than justice. If a mighty emperor grants a free pardon to his revolted subjects, on condition only of repentance and returning to their allegiance: shall his officers, without his licence or
or consent, dare to limit his gracious offer, and annex many other conditions of their own devising, making the poor people believe that the Lord's pardon is void, unless they be satisfied as well as he? If they do, they have nothing to expect but the effects of his indignation, for usurping the sovereign's prerogative, defeating his intended clemency, discouraging and burdening his subjects, and dishonouring his administration. So when our Lord had by his Apostles published to all mankind his Gospel of peace and salvation upon no harder terms than of believing a short creed of few articles as inducements to piety, and those easily comprehended, and of a holy life for the future; if any man of whatsoever dignity introduces a doctrine of his own invention, not taught by those apostles, nor recorded in their writings, and especially if he lays it on the consciences of men under the penalty of damnation; as he is guilty of satanical impudence, in taking the place of Christ our only Lord and Lawgiver, he deserves to incur this anathema of St. Paul and all its consequences.

Yet, alas; in what age, or nation of Christendom, ever since Christianity has been the reigning religion, have the bishops and teachers of mankind stood in awe of this divine prohibition, and abstained from confounding vulgar minds, with their own metaphysical refinements on obscure subjects, from binding on men's consciences their own conceits, about the nature of the Deity and his
86 Critical Notes on his ways? How often have they, especially the inventive Greeks, in pack’d synods, where the majority was always of course the orthodox party, contrived to add to the common creed, some dark and captious article or term, to which their adversaries in dispute were to submit, on pain of anathemas, imprisonment, or exile? Till at last, the doctrine of Jesus, from its original simplicity, whereby it was calculated for the understandings of all, even the meanest of mankind; receiving continual additions, from the presumptuous theologues of many ages, as if our Lord had left it deficient for them to mend, is swelled into a voluminous, litigious, and difficult body of opinions, which is called faith, and imposed on all. And yet such unnecessary additions to the gospel, so enforced by faction and persecution, are said, by wise men, to have been the immediate cause of the desolation of all the churches of the east, of the propagation of Mahometism in those regions, and of infidelity in ours.

To say nothing now of that great mother of abominations, the deceiver of men, and blasphemer of God, I heartily wish the superior clergy of the reformed themselves may not all have incurred this tremendous anathema, by delivering to their people for divine truths, many more doctrines, than St. Paul ever taught the Galatians! For tho’ all have praised and espoused that position of Luther, that neither the church nor the pope have
have power to make articles of faith; tho' all have professed to make Scripture the only rule of their belief, as containing all things necessary to salvation; and that neither men nor angels have any right to add to the doctrines of it; yet have they all prescribed and taught some additional articles of religion, neither plainly contained in Scripture, nor plainly deducible from it.

To mention a few: That our Lord has the very same body, flesh, and bones now in heaven, in which he suffered on earth: That all the descendents of Adam, even infants, if unbaptized, by their original sin, deserve and incur God's wrath, and everlasting damnation: That the very good works of pagans are undoubtedly sinful: And some of them say That all men are absolutely and unconditionally predestinated to eternal happiness or misery: These and others are the traditions and decrees of our protestant doctors, unknown to the apostles of Christ, which they have annexed to the Gospel, declared them to be taken thence, and have required unfeigned assent, from all within their power, as if they had that infallibility, which in words they disclaim. But for the doctrine of the Trinity, they have not only pretended the same divine authority, but proceeded to denounce everlasting perdition to all, that do not hold it, as it is proposed in the Creed bearing the name of Athanasius: That we should worship one God in
Trinity — That in this Trinity, none is afore or after other, none is greater or less than another: But the whole three persons are coeternal together and coequal. — That it is necessary to everlasting salvation, that we also believe rightly the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. For the right faith is, that our Lord Jesus Christ is perfect God and perfect man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting, equal to the Father as touching his Godhead, and inferior to the Father as touching his manhood, &c. These additions are called essential, fundamental, and necessary parts of the Christian faith, and so become indeed mill-stones, hung on the neck of the gospel, and perpetual impediments of its propagation.

But before we proceed any farther on this subject, it will be proper to distinguish between believing in the Trinity, and believing the doctrine of the Trinity; phrases, unknown indeed to Scripture, but yet frequent in vulgar use, which differ more widely in signification than they do in sound. For by the former we mean not merely believing the existence (for the devils themselves do as much) but believing and trusting also in the wisdom, truth, and goodness of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; pursuant to that only precept about the Trinity, which Christ at his departure left with his apostles, Go ye and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father.
Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: for so the Greek should be rendered. All nations therefore did by the profession of that belief at their baptism, says Grotius, submit and devote themselves, to the instruction and discipline of the one God, and Father of all (to use St. Paul's style) one Lord, and one Spirit; thus endeavouring to fulfil the prophecy, that all should be taught of God. This he justly takes to have been the first Christian creed, and all the most ancient forms of that nature, now extant, are in effect but so many paraphrases of it; And tho' in process of time it has been somewhat enlarged, by the addition of some things, which had been usually demanded of the converts when preparing for baptism, yet the substance and ground-work of the original still remaining intire, it has acquired the name of the apostles creed, and from some the rule of faith, being universally received by all nations of Christendom, from the first ages down to ours, and by the wisest and best of men, taken for a complete summary of the articles, necessarily to be believed by Christians in order to salvation. Such was the judgment of the incomparable archbishop Usher on this subject, That in those propositions (that is the apostles creed) which without controversy are universally received in the whole Christian world, so much truth is contained, as being joined with holy obedience may be sufficient to bring a man to everlasting salvation.
Critical Notes on salvation. And Chillingworth commenting on that declaration, added: This saying deserves as much applause as any saying, it being as great and as good a truth, and as necessary for these miserable times, as possibly can be uttered. This is the belief and trust in the Trinity, which was prescribed first by Christ, and repeated afterwards more than once by St. Paul.

But this faith and trust in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, must be certainly an act extremely different from the belief of the doctrine of the Trinity, which is giving up our understandings to men, who attempt to describe the Trinity: For that doctrine is in truth, but a composition of human conceits and hypotheses, concerning the persons, the substance, order, modes of existence, properties, unity, coeternity, and coequality of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost: and those notions ill drawn in part from Scripture, but mostly the creatures of imagination, formed by vain men aiming to be wise above what is written, and to intrude into things which they have not seen. Such knowledge is too great and sublime for our understandings, and even if we had revelation of those matters, our minds in their present state would want capacity for them. But as that doctrine would be no use or tendency to a good life, our Lord hath never, in any place of Scripture, made it our duty to be so curious in speculations infinitely above us; he hath not required us to search out the Almighty
Almighty to perfection, or to comprehend the most high that dwelleth in light inaccessible, much less to define the nature of the infinite one, in any words but what himself hath taught us.

Now since neither our Saviour, nor his apostles have charged us with the duty of believing this circumstantial doctrine and description of the Trinity, but on the contrary have forbid us to admit any doctrine, which they had not taught: Since the modern advocates of it, professing to shew that it is sufficiently insisted on in Scripture, to be deemed a fundamental doctrine, have not produced so much as one sentence of Scripture to prove it fundamental, or even important: Since it hath not served to the edification of Christians, but rather to excite fierce and scandalous contentions among Churchmen, who have often employed one branch or other of it, as a test to exterminate their adversaries and competitors: What impious presumption must it be, for any principal pastors of the church in the open defiance and contempt of St. Paul's anathema, denounced by the Spirit of God, to impose on the minds of the faithful, such various perplexed and disputable conclusions about the natures, diversities, and properties of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and to assume God's authority, without his warrant for damning all his servants, who may question or deny such opinions! Can it be a good spirit that teaches those who
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who understand not the Athanasian Creed,
(that is, almost all mankind that repeat it)
not to spare direct anathemas to one another,
and indeed to themselves, for none can be said
truly to hold this Athanasian faith, and to
keep it whole and undefiled, who do not com-
prehend it! So that Christians, whom their
Lord forbids to judge, are thus blindly
brought to pronounce without any remorse,
a sentence of everlasting damnation against
millions of Christians, for unavoidable igno-
rance of some things, which perhaps may not
be at all warranted by Scripture, perhaps not
be true, or, even if true, yet not be required
of us to believe.

And thus have the pastors even of the reform-
ed declared to their inferiors and their flocks
terms of salvation, unthought of by Christ and
his Apostles, to the great offence of Mahome-
tans, Jews, and Pagans, and increase of infide-
licity in the Christian world. How long, O
Lord, wilt thou suffer this usurpation of thy
authority, corruption of thy gospel, and mis-
leading of thy people? O let thy kingdom
come and thy will be known and done on
earth, as it is in heaven.

1. Tim. iv. 1, 2, 3.

To δε σωμαία ῥηγύσ ηγεί, ὅτι ἐκ ἰσέροις καιροῖς
καταστάσεις τινες τῆς πίσεως, ἀφεσθοῦσας ἀναμα-
σι πλάνοις ὡς διδασκαλίαις δαίμονίων.

2. Ἐν υποκρίσεις ψαλτολόγων κακαφηλασμένων
τῆς ιδιαί σωμείδοσιν,

3. Kω-
In our English translation thus:

1. Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils.

2. Speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their conscience seared with a hot iron.

3. Forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received, with thanksgiving of them, which believe and know the truth.

Here is a signal and important prophecy, declared by St. Paul to Timothy, of a dreadful revolt and apostasy of Christians from the faith of Christ, which would appear in after ages.

But wherein was this apostasy to consist, for it is neither intimated, nor supposed to be a total denial of Christianity? The Apostle affirms the prediction to be express and plain, and doubtless it was so, as he gave it forth. But in the present state of the context, it has not in many ages been understood, nor does any thing appear, that can be construed to high a crime, nothing being added towards an explanation, but that it would come to pass εἰς ὑποκρίσεις ἰδιολόγων, thro', or by means of some impudent vendors of lies, who would be prohibitors of marriage, and of certain meats. 1. Now prohibiting of marriage
marriage and meats are, as Mede says, in comparison only the smaller, and, if I may so say, almost circumstantial errors of the latter times, which cannot be supposed to deserve the charge of apostasy. 2. This apostasy was to appear in the latter times. But the restraints from marriage and meats were introducing in the apostles own times as may be collected out of their epistles, and therefore cannot be the things principally intended, or foretold. Tho' our translation confounds the persons in the first verse, with those in the second and third, as tho' the apostle were continuing to speak of the same men, viz. That they should be speaking lies, forbidding marriage, &c. the grammatical syntax evidently shews, that those in the first verse προς ἕξων giving heed to, &c. being the nominative case, must be a different set of men, from those in the second and third verses; ἡδολογοῦν, παράνοιαν γυμνῶν, &c. impudent liars, forbidding to marry, &c. being in the genitive case; who would in time seduce the former to apostatize. Here is, therefore, no distinct description of the nature of this great apostasy, as the apostle's introduction would make us expect.

Yet Mede, at length, more by his own sagacity and long meditation on the divine economy, than from the words of this passage, discovered, that the prophecy, pointed out a new kind of idolatry, the invocation of saints, that would in time arise among Christians, tho'
Tho' his proofs are hardly sufficient to support his exposition. For he lays it down for his principle, that δαυμονιων here, is to be taken in the Platonic notion of Demons, that is, the deified souls of worthy men after death, since no Christians do, or ever did, says he worship Devils formally, or as Devils. He might have added, no, nor Pagans. But not one of his instances from Scripture come up to the point, the Demons in Scripture are always evil Demons. And Origen (cont. Celsum, p. 234, and 403. edit. Cantab.) maintains, that Christians knew of none but of that sort. And in this all commentators ever since have agreed. Now if Demons here, be not allowed to mean deified saints, Mede will not have one word of this passage left him, whereon to build his exposition of the prophecy, that in future ages, some will be worshippers of the dead, together with all the train of reliques, images, &c. And accordingly himself confesses p. 636. That none of the antients did expound it in his sense. It cannot then be denied, that this prediction itself must appear to mankind imperfect and obscure; imperfect, whilst it is not at all specified, in what respect, degree, or manner men will apostatize from the faith: and obscure (what St. Paul says is plain) since none of the antients understood it thus; no, nor any of the moderns since the reformation, when they most wanted such a testimony, against the Saint-worship of the Romanists.
But Mede’s elaborate discourse on this subject has produced one out of Epiphanius, which tho’ slightly treated by him, may, if well considered, perhaps be more satisfactory than all.

For Epiphanius, in his 78th Heresy, recites a long pastoral letter of his own at large, which he had published some time before. In this he much laments the general tendency of his time to all novel opinions and doctrines, which he calls heresies, mentions a great variety of them, which induce him to think, that his were the very times, those ύστεροι καιροί intended by St. Paul, in the first verse of this chapter: And towards the conclusion, upon occasion of some Arabian Christians, who were making a goddess of the blessed virgin, and offering a cake to her, as to the queen of heaven, he adds: “Which is altogether impious and abominable, utterly different from the preaching of the Holy Ghost; so that the whole is a diabolical operation, and the doctrine of an unclean spirit. For upon these also is that of the apostle fulfilled: Some shall apostatize from sound doctrine, giving heed to fables and doctrines of Demons. For they (says the apostle) shall be worshippers of..."
the dead, as in Israel also they worshipped them." And then he subjoins two examples more of such worship of the dead; one of the Sichemites, who had a saint, under the title of Jephthah's daughter: And another of the Egyptians, who adored Thermutis, the daughter of Amenoph, the Pharaoh of that time, she that took up Moses and educated him.

Against the authenticity of this additional clause of Epiphanius, Mills, much more famed for his diligence, than for his judgment, determines, that it is nothing else, but a marginal comment or explanation of the doctrines of demons, taken from some place or other of the old Testament, which the transcribers afterwards thrust into the text in a wrong place. But 1. by this account, this explanation must have been inserted before Epiphanius's time, that is, before any Saint-worship was heard of in the world, and would therefore have been not an explanation, but a prophecy. 2. Mede has before observed, that none of the antients ever took the place in that sense. If so, they never made any such marginal explanation, as Mills imagines. But Mede himself objects 1. That Epiphanius either used a very corrupt copy, or quoted very carelessly. Mills says, that his copy seems in general to have been good, tho' with some faults; of which Mills takes this place to be one; that his quotations, are usually made by memory, as is common with the Fathers. In truth it is hard to say what
what are Epiphanius's own mistakes, for his copies and editors, not excepting Petavius, have left his text full of faults as they found it.

Mede objects 2. That perhaps Epiphanius added this clause only for an explanation. But Epiphanius on the contrary directly professes the clause to be St. Paul's own words, with the word ὅπως, He [the Apostle] says, as Beza and Mills himself allow: And indeed Epiphanius insists upon them altogether, as his only argument and indisputable testimony against the idolatry then growing in his neighbourhood. Now Tillemont, tho' offended with Ephiphanius's warm opposition to the worship of saints and images, yet allows him the highest character of piety and sanctity of any in that age. Is it possible, therefore, to believe that the good old bishop should have forged this testimony out of his own brain, adapted it to the context, and, in his pastoral letter, twice imposed it on the Christians of Palestine and Arabia round, for a piece of St. Paul's prophecy? Had he been capable of such a fraud, Petavius a Jesuit, and advocate for saint-worship in general, and who (as his panegyrists tell us) had a most tender affection to the Virgin Mary, as if she were his mother, would scarcely have past it in his edition, as he has done, without the severest lash of his severe pen.

Mede objects 3. Hath any of the fathers beside Epiphanius mentioned this reading.
of his? Answ. We know of none. But yet we must not immediately condemn the clause as spurious on account of their silence. Suppose it possible that the fathers themselves should be found to have been the chief propagators of saint-worship, and you will not wonder, if they carefully avoided quoting any such verse, in which their crime is foretold, and called apostasy.

For even in Constantine's time a notion was commonly infused into Christians, that martyrs and other saints after death became good Demons; just as Plato directs of those who died bravely in war, or had lived long with eminent virtue, that they should be regarded as Demons still existing, and their sepulchres honour'd, and adored accordingly: and, as Hesiod had said of the worthies of the golden age,

*These o'er the earth preside, pure Demons made, Kind guards of men, and ready to their aid.*

For these passages of Plato and Hesiod Evsebius *quotes to shew the conformity of Pagans with Christians on that subject, and adds:* "These ceremonies are proper to be used upon the death of the favourites of God, whom you may well call the champions of the true religion. Whence it is our custom to assemble at their tombs, and make our prayers at them, and to honour their beatified souls.

*Præp. Evan. l. xiii. c. 11.*
After this false persuasion had once taken root, that the saints after death knew the distresses of mankind, and had will and power to relieve them; the next step would soon be taken, to pray to them; indeed it would be hard to have stopt such a motion. But the monks, pretenders to extraordinary purity and mortification by abstinence from marriage, and from meats, were the great instruments of introducing saint-worship by old wives fables, by impudent lies of miraculous cures, and deliverances wrought by apparitions of the saints in dreams, by the touch of their sepulchers, their bones, and other reliques. These were by credulous monkish bishops, out of superstition, and sometimes for worse reasons, published to the people with all the pomp and ornament of eloquence; and who then would forbear applying to the saints as mediators and as protectors, who had given such evident tokens of their ability and readiness to assist mankind?

"Mede spares (he says) to name the authors, not willing to discover the nakedness of the fathers. But who so reads them will admire to see so truly verified what the spirit foretold should be in the latter times."

Yet Theodoret Mede himself judged to deserve some distinct censure for his zeal in advancing this impious worship, and his com-

---

* See Augustin De Civ. Dei, l. 22. of which the 8th chapter alone will furnish as many as any judicious reader can easily digest. ** pag. 641. **
plaints of the people's slowness to believe his legends. And Sir Isaac Newton* thinks no such regard to be due to any of those, who either taught to pray to saints, or led the way to it by lying miracles, but brings them forth to shame: Paul of Egypt, Antony, Athanasius, Basil, Hilary, Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory Nyssen, Ephraim Syrus, Chrysostom, Jerom, of those in the east only, for his scheme in this part extends not to those of the west. But these he shews to have been diligent teachers of superstition and idolatry. Such fathers of saint-worship therefore, who gave so much occasion to Julian and Eunapius to blaspheme, may well be excused, if, while they were every day fulfilling St. Paul's prophecy, they took care never to quote it to their own confusion. Nay will it be absolutely unjust to suspect, that some of these saints, these great saints, as they called one another, might have had a hand in effacing so many of the apostle's words as most plainly pointed out their crime? Surely if a rasure were discovered in a record of consequence, the first inquiry would naturally be made after the man, cui bono fuit, for whose sake and service such rasure was made. But we forbear to accuse upon conjecture, where no testimony can be expected against an overruling party, which in the fourth century prevailed over most of the east, in the fifth over

* Observ. on the Proph. Ch. 14.
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the west, and in the sixth saw their idolatry established in public litanies by pope Gregory, called the Great, as you may learn from Siganius and others.

Since therefore this prophesy of a future apostasy among Christians has been shewn to be hitherto indistinct and undefined, and therefore imperfect: since what St. Paul declares to be plain, has now for very many ages been understood by none: since Epiphanius has supplied the clause that was wanted to make the prophesy both perfect and plain: and since he, with an undisputed character of probity and truth, has vouched this clause to be St. Paul's own words: tho' none of the other fathers have mentioned it; we make no doubt of concluding that it ought to be restored to its place in the context, as it is quoted by Epiphanius.

1. Now the spirit faith plainly, that in

2. De regno Italiæ ad an. 591.
the latter times some will apostatize from the faith, giving attention to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils:

2. For they will come to be worshippers of the dead, as in Israel also they worshipped them, thro' the hypocrisy of men given to lying with seared consciences,

3. Of men forbidding to marry, commanding to abstain from meats, which God created to be received with thanksgiving by them who have believed and known the truth.

Revelations xiii—xviii.

In this admirable book of prophesy, our Lord has been pleased to prefigure to mankind the various states of Christianity in the world, more particularly in Europe to the utmost extent of the old Roman empire, from the times of the apostle to the final consummation of all things, under the most severe and dangerous trials, and with astonishing scenes in prospect both of the blackest horror denounced to the followers of the beast, and of transcendent glory for the steadfast disciples of Christ. This he requires all, that are capable, to study with attention and diligence, in order to prevent the influence of the false prophet, to establish their confidence in God in all times, and to confirm their patience and perseverance under the longest reign of prosperous iniquity. Those are even declared blessed, that will read, understand, and observe these
Critical Notes on these predictions and precepts. Can it then be of little importance to us to know the artifices and the terrors of that beast, to whom all kings and nations would submit and adore, whose mark all sorts and conditions of men would bear; when we are told by an angel, that whoever shall worship him and receive his mark, shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, and be tormented with fire and brimstone for ever? Is there not great reason to inquire carefully about this great and wicked Babylon, this mother of abominations, when a warning voice from heaven cries aloud, Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues? None therefore surely ought to be despised, who seriously endeavour to explain these visions, for the instruction and admonition of mankind, which being generally delivered in mystical representations and expressions were sometimes difficult even to St. John himself without a divine expositor.

Sir Isaac Newton, in his Posthumous Observations upon Daniel and the Apocalypse, has remarked, "that there is already so much of the prophesy fulfilled, that as many as will take pains in this study, may see sufficient instances of God's providence——Among the interpreters of the last age there is scarce one of note, who hath not made some discovery worth knowing; and thence I seem to gather, that God is about opening these mysteries."

The figure in chap. xiii. arising out of the sea...
sea to St. John’s view is a wild beast having seven heads and ten horns, with all the terrors of teeth, paws, force, and roar of the most savage of all beasts. His appearance and description, that all the world admired and worshipped him, and thought none able to make war with him, shew, that he is a mighty empire invested with power over all kindreds and tongues and nations: He would be impious, as having his seat and great authority given him by the dragon: arrogant with a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies: apostatizing from God to idolatry, as causing all the earth to worship himself, and opening his mouth in blasphemy against God, and them that dwell in heaven: tyrannical in compelling all, upon pain of excommunication and death, to receive his mark: deceiving mankind with false miracles, and cruel in persecuting and making war with the saints. In another view in chap. xvii. upon this same beast fits the great whore and forceress, with whom the kings of the earth commit adultery, holding a cup of wine for philtres to intoxicate those kings and and nations, and bring them into subjection, she being herself drunk with the blood of the saints and of the martyrs of Jesus. This whore the angel interprets to signify the great metropolis of the mighty empire before-mentioned; and its grandeur, extensive power, and distinguished situation upon seven hills discover it to be Rome.

Thus far is agreed by all, by antients and moderns,
Moderns, by Romanists and their adversaries, that the beast signifies the empire of Rome, which in other places of this book is called Babylon, the great city, and the great whore. And that, in which all parties do so consent, must be allowed to be plain and clear. But there is no advancing one step farther without dispute and opposition, and therefore we must be longer in our comment.

The next and main question is, whether Rome under the pagan emperors be here designed, or Rome after it was called Christian. The Romanists in general, as might well be expected, say pagan Rome, with Bossuet the famous bishop of Meaux at their head, the most able and artful advocate of that side, who glories in finding some learned Protestants of his opinion, as Grotius, and Hammond, and Bullinger too before them both. But almost all the rest of those, who have separated from the church of Rome, in former or in latter ages, believe that Rome spiritual, or since it has professed Christianity, is meant by the angel, the metropolis of this bestial empire: and they may for that opinion allege these arguments:

1. That pagan Rome had been rising many ages before the date of this revelation, and even before St. John's birth, and was by that time ascended to the highest degree of grandeur and power that it ever reached: whereas the beast, which St. John saw had then no existence but in vision, but was μικρόν ἀναβάνω, was
was to arise gradually in some subsequent age, chap. xvii. 8. And therefore could be no other than Rome when called Christian.

2. In ch. xvii. ver. 6. St. John was seized with excessive astonishment and admiration upon seeing the great whore [Rome] drunk with the blood of the saints and of the martyrs of Jesus. And what indeed to pious eyes could be a more monstrous and confounding object, than a body of pretended and seeming Christians, glutted and gorged with the blood of Christians? But would he have been surprised at such a view of pagan Rome, after he had lived himself to see two of her persecutions under Nero and Domitian?

3. Power, it is said, was given to the beast to continue forty and two months, that is, in the prophetical account, 1260 years: whereas it is not affirmed, nor can we find in history any ground to imagine, that the pagan religion continued openly in Rome, even so much as 400 years after the date of this Revelation.

4. Babylon, or the great whore, is said to have corrupted the inhabitants of the earth, and to have made them drunk with the wine of her fornications, to have deceived all nations with her sorceries, to have drawn the kings of the earth to commit fornication, and to live deliciously with her. All characters most unsuitable and unlike to the iron government of pagan Rome, and to her severe methods of subduing,
Critical Notes on subduing, and keeping the nations in her obedience. And what kings, and where were they, that Rome should court and debauch to her own religion? We have no traces remaining of any kingdom inveigled and seduced by her, to her idolatry, but that she sometimes invited and imported, and always easily admitted all sorts of foreign gods and superstitions, without distinction or preference.

5. It is said of Babylon [or Rome] that it is fallen—that she shall be utterly burnt with fire—that the kings shall bewail her, when they shall see the smoke of her burning. A prediction, which bishop Bossuet has thought fit to pronounce accomplished (but tells us of no kings that bewailed that fall) in A. D. 410. Indeed if pagan Rome has been utterly burnt with fire, it must have been done many ages ago, even before A. D. 410; for paganism had then long ceased to be the religion publickly professed at Rome. Now we read of no such event in history, and long since the extinction of paganism, we have no other intelligence from Rome, but that she still sitteth a queen, and glorifieth herself and liveth deliciously. But if what Bossuet affirms were to be allowed him, that pagan Rome was fallen, and utterly burnt with fire by the hand of Alaric in A. D. 410, tho' contradicted by all the writers of those times, and known to be false; what, according to the prophecy, was to be the consequence of that fall? The words immediately following in the context of
of chap xviii. and which are in great measure copied from Isaiah's prediction of the final destruction of old Babylon, are, That Babylon [or Rome] should become the habitation of devils and the hold of every foul spirit, &c. Must not then the same Romanists acknowledge, that, if Rome was by Alaric as totally wasted as Babylon, it must, from the time of that desolation, have never been inhabited but by devils?

6. The ten horns are said to be ten kings which have received no kingdom as yet, but receive power as kings one hour with the beast. If the beast be Rome, or the Roman empire, as bishop Bossuet supposes, and the ten horns are members of the beast, and grow out of him; the ten kingdoms here mentioned must by analogy be ten members of that empire, not ten bordering nations commonly at war with Rome. Now no ten kingdoms are to be found in history within the compass of the Roman empire whilst it was Pagan, no nor any one kingdom that was not tributary, and in a precarious and dependent state with power derived from Rome. The ten kingdoms therefore were to arise, as we know in fact they-did, not till after Rome had ceased to profess paganism, and then to receive power together with the beast. For then too, that is, after the breaking of the old Roman empire, was Antichrist the man of sin, the son of perdition, the opposer, and exalter of himself above all that is called God, to be revealed,
7. Another argument to prove, that the beast cannot be the representative of pagan Rome, is the deadly wound she received long after the extinction of public paganism, viz. A. D. 547. For in that year Totilas king of the Goths, having taken Rome by surprize, from Justinian the Roman emperor, resolved at first to raise it utterly, and turn it to a sheepwalk, had set his army to the work, burnt great part of the buildings, and demolished in different places full one third of the whole circuit of the city walls. But, upon a letter from Belisarius Justinian's general, shewing him the folly of laying waft the greatest city of the universe, which way soever the fate of the war was to turn at last, and leave either Totilas or Justinian in possession of Italy; he forbore labouring any more in the destruction of the place, but made it be so effectually evacuated, that the great Rome had not within her walls so much as one living soul. This was as deadly a wound by the sword, and as true a death as a city is capable of; nor is there in all history, any other instance of a deadly wound by the sword given to Rome. When Alaric took it in 410, and
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Genseric in 454, it was pillaged only, but left standing and inhabited, without many violent marks of conquest upon the buildings; but Totilas burnt it, dismantled it, and made it a desert.

Now it is out of dispute, and universally agreed, that the beast signifies Rome. If then these evidences are sufficient to demonstrate, that it cannot represent Rome when pagan, it will unavoidably follow, that it must signify Rome, since it has professed Christianity, and is under an ecclesiastical power.

This beast had on his head a name, or names of blasphemy. That is, openly assumed blasphemous titles, and claimed divine honours and powers. Of these the instances are not easy to number: but a few may be sufficient to verify the text. In general it has been asserted by the Romish casuists, That the honour due to Christ, as God, is due to the pope, because the honour is due to the power: but the power of Christ, as God, and of the pope is all one. He has suffered himself to be called Pontifex Maximus, and head of the whole church on earth, which St. Paul appropriates to Christ, vicar of Christ, vicar of God, king of kings, lord of the whole world both in temporals and spirituals, omnipotent, to whom all power in heaven and earth is given, infallible, another God upon earth, Pope Nicolas III himself having said, that Peter [and consequently Peter's successors] hath been assumed into the

* Heidegger, Myst. Babylonis M. Diff. 10.
Society of the undivided Trinity*. Much more might be added to exemplify this most obvious sense of the word blasphemy: But these seem to be sufficient to fill any Christian heart with indignation and abhorrence.

The other sense of blasphemy, that is idolatry, as Grotius, Mede, and Vitringa expound it, it will be more proper to enlarge upon at ver. 5, 6. where St. John says more of the practice of it, for here he only signifies, that it was openly marked on the front of the beast, and it was indeed so notorious, that it may seem trifling to mention one memorial of it, a mitre preserved at Rome as a precious relique of Pope Sylvester I. richly but not artfully embroidered with the figure of the virgin Mary crowned, and holding a little Christ; and these words in large capitals underneath, AVE REGINÆ CELI, Hail queen of heaven, in the front; of which Father Angelo Rocca, keeper of the Pope's sacristy, and an eminent antiquary has given a copper plate in the third vol. p. 490 of the works of pope Gregory I. and it seems more probably to have belonged to Gregory; because he is said to have first instituted at Rome the litanies to the virgin Mary.

* Rivet. in Jesuita va pulans, c. 7.
which is here rendered **power**, is commonly used in the Septuagint for **army**, and they doubt not but that it signifies so here. Accordingly Vitringa interprets it, of those prodigious numbers of volunteers, who crossed and devoted themselves to the murder of all such poor Christians in France, as rejected the abominations of Rome: One of which of 300,000 such pilgrims, under the conduct of the pope's Legat, stormed Beziers, and there butchered 60,000 souls in one day, as if such a sacrifice of blood were acceptable to the Almighty. But as those were only occasional levies of assassins, called out to the slaughter of the innocent, upon a promise of pardon for their own crimes, and were to be on foot but a very few months at a time; we can hardly believe that by **armies** here St. John meant such Crusadas, as raged and made havoc but seldom, at uncertain times, and in few centuries; but are rather led by the words to think of some visible standing militia of Rome, some established army. And what can that be? I know of none that can any way bear that figurative name, if it does not belong properly to the universal body of monks or regular clergy; nor would I now have suggested this notion, if I could have found any other at all probable, and adequate to the text, For I tremble to think of passing so many millions of men into the number of the devil's troops; for they are here said to be the devil's own, and that he
Critical Notes on

consigned them to Rome. But we presume not to make any judgment of our own, but only to display the sentence of him, who cannot but do right. The general style of the foundation and history of the several orders runs in military metaphors; they are said to serve as soldiers of God, or of Christ; but they take oaths and vows of implicit obedience to the Pope as their emperor, and are required to revere him, as if he were Jesus Christ in person upon earth. And their effectual devoting of soul and body to the pope's service, and zealous execution of all his commands, not spiritual only, but civil and military too (of which innumerable instances occur, in the history especially, of the middle ages) made them an army far superior in force to all the legions and auxiliaries of ancient Rome, as well as in numbers, which Sandys about the year 1609 computed to be above a million. These are the men distinguished by St. Paul with the mark of forbidding marriage and flesh meats, who, by their frauds and lies of miracles wrought by dead men's bones, relics, and images, and by transubstantiated wafers, had, according to Mede, been principal instruments of filling the world with idolatry in all its branches, and of bringing mankind, by subjection to the beast, to the worship of the old dragon. This spiritual kind of militia was begun to be raised in Egypt and the East, and had been greatly increased; before the beast appeared in possession
on of the devil's throne, (and therefore perhaps
the transferring of the army may be mentioned
before the throne) so that the Beast had little
to do but to form and regulate it for the pur-
poses of his empire. Accordingly by procu-
ring for all his clergy immunities from tri-
butes and taxes, and from all the other bur-
dens of the laity, by exemptions from the
civil courts and jurisdictions, by frequent
and ready interpositions in their defence
against all great men, and even their own
natural sovereigns, the Pope made it the interest
of all ecclesiastics in the universe, especially
the regulars, to seek his patronage, and come
under his obedience. Thus was his spiritual
army prodigiously multiplied, and power was
given him over all kindreds, and tongues, and
nations, as early as A.D. 600. For when
the primate of Byzacene in Africa, being ac-
cused by his suffragan bishops, acknowledged
himself subject to the correction of the apo-
stolical see of Rome: Gregory I. answered,
As for his saying, that, if a bishop is culpable,
he is subject to the apostolical see, I know of
no bishop in the world, that is not subject to it.
And as the times were beyond measure igno-
rant and superstitious, by attaching to him-
felf the clergy, he led the laity like sheep,
and bewitched silly princes to desire the
monk's habit, and to imagine their sins were
well covered, if at death their bodies were
wrapt up in Benedict's coul.
And there was given unto the beast, a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies—And he opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his name, and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven. What is this witchcraft of idolatry, that the best masters of history observe to have spread among Christians, the farthest and the fastest of all the corruptions of religion? That the Apostles should find it necessary so often to caution the faithful, against the abominations long ago forsaken by the Jews, and which the very Mahometans might afterwards teach them to reform! But the Romanists will tell you, that they detest idolatry, that the church of Rome never hath been, nor is, nor will be guilty of it, tho' the honour, belonging to God only, is every day paid to a creature, or perhaps even to a non-entity. For Rome has in nothing more, or longer deceived the world, than by infusing false notions of Idolatry, persuading men, that, if they worship the one true God, though they join with him a thousand saints or inferior deities, none incur the guilt of idolatry, except such as worship stocks and stones; nor they neither, if they direct their thoughts to the persons represented in such materials, which may easily be supposed to be within the capacity of the most stupid votaries. Thus have they explained away all the sin of idolatry: But God is not mocked, who hath

* Alcasar in Revel.
said, Thou shalt have none other God before me. Besides me there is no God. The crime extends much farther than the worship of images, tho' the word carries no more. St. Paul has taught us, that covetous men are idolaters, as setting their affection, their hopes and dependence only upon riches. Does he sin less, who imagines divine virtue in the supposed relic of a supposed saint, and applies to it for cures of ailments, or deliverance from dangers? He who prays Angels and dead men only to intercede to God for him (which is the more common subject of the Romish litanies) does he not directly dishonour and reject the Son of God, and disobey the Father, who hath appointed the Son to be the only mediator, in order to introduce in his room an idol-mediator of his own fancy? This was the first and most modest step of Idolatry to make saints intercessors: But afterwards the beast opened his mouth wide in blasphemy and dishonour against God, and his tabernacle, (which Vitringa expounds of Christ) and against them which dwell in heaven, by making them so many deities, and teaching men that it is impious to refuse praying to angels and saints, the number of which is become almost infinite, with the various powers and offices assigned them by men who have deified them, having the virgin Mary at their head, perpetually called by Romanists the mother of God, and the queen of heaven,

b Exod. xx. 3. c Isa. xlii. 6. d Ephes. v. 5. e Conc. Trident. Sess. 25. Catech. ad paroch. in Decal. whom
whom Mahomet for that reason, took to be meant for the wife of God, and to be one of the Trinity.* Upon the whole (as Daillè well observes) the modern Roman theology, or disposition of the divinity, as Tertullian expressed it, of many inferior Gods under one supreme, resembles that of the old pagan philosophers to such a degree, that it would be hard to shew any material difference. And because some have said, that the manner in which the church of Rome invokes their saints cannot pass for idolatry, tho' the vulgar have sometimes been in danger of it; her Missal and Breviary will furnish instances without number, not only of praying the saints to intercede to God for them, but of begging of them directly all manner of graces without any mention of God the Father; expressly requesting the Virgin Mary in particular, the queen of angels, of prophets, of apostles and evangelists, "Be merciful, O lady, spare us; O lady, deliver us from all evil; O most merciful lady, we beseech that thou wouldst vouchsafe to preserve the holy church, &c. Mother of God, queen of heaven, Lady of the world, have mercy.

Al. Koran ch. iv.  b De Relig. cultus objecto, l. iii. p. 25.

"On us." p. 358. *ibid.* and on All Saints day, together with her all the angels, fathers, prophets, apostles, martyrs, priests, nuns, and princes of heaven, for protection, aid, and remission of sins; in a word, for all things that man can ask of the Almighty. Such are the prayers offered to saints by that church, on every day of the year, and on every solemn hour of the day, in open affront and blasphemy to God, by assigning him a partner of his throne, and to those that dwell in heaven, by giving them forbidden honours, and by assuming a power to increase their number by canonizations. And if this be manifest apostasy and rebellion against the Most High, it will be trifling in the Romanists to dispute whether it be literally idolatry, or not.

If the first beast signifies Rome, since it has been called Christian, with all its blasphemy, the second beast coming up out of the earth with horns like the lambs, and speech like the dragons, who puts in exercise and execution, all the power of the first beast, and brings the whole earth, except those that are written in the book of life, to obey and worship the first beast; what can he be but the head of that church, presenting at first with lenity, his horns, that is, his clergy regular and secular, but afterwards giving out a voice of terror, who in other places hath the title of the false prophet, and who therefore labours industriously in bringing mankind to adore the church of Rome, as having himself principally the real fruit of that adoration?

I 4 Pope
Pope Gregory the First, "expounds the first beast to be Antichrist, and the second to be the multitude of the preachers of Antichrist, who assume the appearance of the lamb, that they may have opportunities of infusing the poison of the serpent. At the same time he cautions his audience not to suppose such wicked preachers, to arise only in far distant times; for some, he said, did even then preach Antichrist in speeches, and most in their morals, deceiving the world with their hypocrisy and pretended miracles." So near was he to seeing a truth, which, if seen, must have confounded him.

This second beast is said to come up out of the earth, perhaps because the great prelates of those times were commonly made out of monks. For the humour of those ages, running much into spiritual retreats, men of all ranks went from the court and the camp, into caverns and cells, pretending penitence and mortification, who were then called converts, and from thence often found a way to return to the world, and rise to the highest dignities of the church.

The second beast, or false prophet, would cause mankind to make an image of the first beast so wounded as before, and to give life and speech to it, and power to kill all that would not worship it. This image of the first beast by Vitringa's conjecture is well enough made.

*Expositio Moral. l. xxxiii. c. 26.*
made out to be the type of the office of inquisition, which was introduced among the blind vulgar, as a popular scheme, and warmly recommended by the Dominican and Franciscan monks, at first without any voice of command, or power of execution. For at the beginning, says Limborch, the inquisitors had no tribunal, but only commission to inquire into the numbers, qualities, powers, and practices of the heretics, and to report them to the bishops, the sole judges at that time of ecclesiastical matters, in order to some process and judgment of the spiritual court against them. Sometimes they would inflame the populace with calumnies and reproaches, and sometimes the Princes to insult and persecute them. So that, during that state, the image had itself no life, no breath, or speech to declare what doctrines should be current, to pronounce decrees, and see them executed; till after the year 1250, when courts of inquisition were erected independent of bishops, and judges, officers, familiars, prisons, and tormentors appointed, who should put to exquisite punishments, and deliver over to a cruel death all that would not submit with implicit obedience: And so incredible numbers of all conditions, ages, and sexes perished. But long before this the false prophet had even literally ordered (as in ver. 17.) that no man might buy or sell, or carry on any commerce, or inherit, save he that had received...
received the mark of the beast, that is, openly taken upon himself and owned that symbol and profession, which Rome required of her subjects.

The name of Antichrist, tho' not mentioned by St. John in this book, but in his first epistle, yet is by the commentators on this chapter generally supposed to be most in his thoughts, tho' they do not all agree whether it should be applied to the first or to the second beast. And therefore something must be said to it. Antichrist hath been used in two senses, which yet in the end do not much differ from each other: The most common and obvious meaning is that of the adversary to Christ: The other is one personating Christ, or putting himself in the place of Christ: Or, in the words of Grotius, he who falsely calls himself Christ, or takes upon him Christ's office: For no man is more an adversary to Christ, than he who calls himself Christ, as none more directly opposes the king, than he who takes the title of king.

That learned man having in vain endeavoured to reconcile protestants to popery, as he would have it moderated, and meeting with opposition from some able Calvinists, he forgot the part of mediator, and became a warm advocate for the Romanists in a dissertation, De Antichristo (subjoined in the Cri-
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tici Sacri to the xviith chapter of the Apocalypse in which he labours to shew that the name of Antichrist cannot with any justice be applied to the pope. Now as deputy consul or proconsul is in Greek ἀνθώπος, a vice-king or king's deputy is in Greek ἀνθέας; so Christ's vicegerent or representative, in Latin Christi vicarius, is in Greek ἀνθέας. If therefore any Pope takes the title of vicar of Christ, he does thereby directly call himself Antichrist. And by calling himself the vicar or vicegerent of Christ, without any leave or commission from Christ, he must, according to Grotius's own reasoning, bid defiance, and become Antichrist in the first sense of the word, that is, an adversary to Christ. If we pass now from the analogy of words to the offices and authority of Christ declared in Scripture, the Pope's ambition will be found invested with the highest of them, to claim them as due, and thereby make sure of a right to the name of Antichrist. 1. St. Paul has in many places declared, that Christ is the head of the universal church on earth: Pope Gregory I. affirmed to Mauritius the Emperor, that the pope, as successor of St. Peter, had the care of the universal church committed to him: The pope then taking upon himself Christ's office, according to Grotius's definition, made himself Antichrist. 2. To Christ all power in heaven and earth hath been delivered of

* Regist. 1. iv. ep. 32.
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the Father*, and his apostles proclaimed him to be the appointed Lord of all the world. But Boniface the eighth b said himself was lord of all the world, both in spirituals and temporals. 3. Christ is king of kings and lord of lords c: Leo X. had the same title given him in the Lateran council. 4. Christ is our only lawgiver d: But the popes have long assumed an unlimited power of making new laws, new articles of faith, and new terms of Salvation e, and all with a claim of divine authority. 5. Christ had on earth power to forgive sins f: The popes have pretended to the same power in themselves, and even to delegate it to every priest. 6. Christ hath declared, that we must all appear before his judgment-seat, that every one may receive according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad s: The Popes have neither thought fit to wait for that day, nor to leave that decision to Christ, but have beatified, canonized, and proposed for public worship what dead men they pleased; and with a high hand sent to hell all dissenters. And more might be added, if these marks be not sufficient to point out and distinguish Antichrist.

It is said of the beast, that it was and is not, and yet is, or (according to another read-

* Matth. xi. 27. John iii. 35. and xiii. 3. Acts x. 36.
c Revel. xvii. 14. and xix. 16.
d Jam. iv. 12.
e See Rivet. in Jesuita vapul c. vii.
 Matth. ix. 6.
 f Matth. xxv. 31.
 g 2 Cor. v. 10.
This explanation of the angel is itself enigmatical and perplexed, for which affected obscurity no doubt there was good reason, and perhaps a sort of necessity. For a plain prediction of ruin to the empire of the great, the eternal Rome, as the old Pagans often styled her, might have provoked the Romans to attempt the extirpation of all Christians, as enemies to their state. The true sense of the prophecy seems to be this:

A time shall come, when it shall be said, that the Roman empire hath been, but is now broken to pieces, and is no more. Yet out of the blind superstition and profound stupidity of the barbarous nations, as out of a sea, it shall emerge again to its old seat of sovereignty, tho' in a form entirely different from the last or any preceding monarchy, and may be called the spiritual or ecclesiastical empire of Rome, to the extreme amazement of all mankind, except the faithful few to whom revelation had notified the change. For it will be a prodigious revolution unheard of before, and without any example in the annals of all former ages, and in all appearance without any parallel to come. Its throne shall be transferred to it by the devil, who will see it more exalted and adored than ever, with the title of Pontifex Maximus from the Caesars; but in royal pomp and magnificence far surpassing the proudest of them all, and particularly in habits and decorations of purple, scarlet,
Critical Notes on the Pope’s court will far outshine that of Augustus: Its dominions will be at least as widely extended: Its standing armies of ecclesiastics much more numerous: Its gods as many, and of human creation, as the old ones were: Its frauds and cruelty more dangerous and terrible.

This papal monarchy is more marked in the thirteenth chapter from its arrogance, force, conquests, and tyranny: In the seventeenth the characters are more taken from the whorish arts, with which it began, of pomp and splendor to create reverence, luscious doctrines of licentiousness, easy pardons, lying miracles, and idolatry to attract and intoxicate its followers. Her fury to destroy all that would fly from her snares or oppose her authority, which was hinted in the thirteenth, is indeed properly repeated again in the seventeenth, and painted in true colours of horror: The whore was drunken with the blood of the Saints, with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus. And he must be little acquainted with ecclesiastical history, that has not known this to have been fulfilled up to the measure of this most shocking idea. For if we omit the outrageous and numberless slaughters of innocent Christians, on account of religion in Italy, Spain, the Netherlands, Bohemia, &c. the massacres of France only, and particularly of the Vaudois and Albigeois, (which Pe-
from the best authorities tells us amounted to a million of souls) will probably make above ten times the number of all the Christians, who were slain in all the ten persecutions of the Caesars put together. So that Rome might well appear perfectly gorged with blood, and almost drowned in it.

The seven heads are said to typify two different things, the seven hills on which Rome is seated, and seven kinds of sovereigns of Rome, not coeval, but in succession, of which five were past before the time of the prophecy; the sixth, which we take to be that of the emperors then standing, but the series of them to be afterwards interrupted by a heterogeneous intruder, Odoacer king of the Heruli, who was to continue but a short space, and then again to be replaced by Theodoric in the name and right of Justinian, who was then the Roman emperor in the East; and in Justinian's time the beast began to rise.

The beast is said to be of the seven sovereigns abovementioned, and yet might be reckoned for the eighth. The history of papal Rome in those times will help us to a probable solution of this difficulty. For in the year 533, Justinian by writ directed to Epiphanius, patriarch of Constantinople, declared, that his holiness the pope of old Rome was the head of all the most holy priests of God. The year following Justinian sent to pope John of Rome, two bishops as his ambassadors, with his own profession of faith, desir-
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ing the Pope's approbation and prayers. In the preamble of which he declares, "That he had always earnestly laboured, that the whole clergy of all the east should be subject and united to the see of his holiness, and that he suffers nothing to be moved concerning the state of the churches, tho' never so clear and unquestionable, without communicating to his holiness, who is the head of all holy churches." Pope John accepts this declaration, with commendation of the emperor's due reverence to the see of Rome, in subjecting and uniting all to it: For that the rules of the fathers, the statutes of former princes, and Justinian's own testify, that that see is truly the head of all churches.* And indeed the superstitious emperor made it no insignificant title by persecuting with incapacities to buy, sell, make wills, &c. with confiscation, banishment, or perpetual imprisonment, all that his holiness declared heterodox or heretics.

This spiritual power the pope effectually exercised with a high hand over the bishops and clergy of the whole empire, deciding ecclesiastical controversies of the greatest consequence without appeal, depriving bishops made by the Emperor's direction without the Pope's approbation b, and annulling the decrees of councils at Constantinople, called by the emperor c. He carried it even to all countries, that had ever submitted

* Cod. 1. i. tit. 1. b Gregorii 1. Reg. 1. iv. ep. 34. c Gregorii 1. Regist. 1. iv. ep. 36.
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to the Cæsars, tho' then perhaps revolted from them. For the barbarous nations of the North, when they tore away vast provinces from the Roman Emperor, yet, being generally wild and ignorant Christians, they soon submitted to the Roman Pontif, who was commonly gaining as much as the other lost. From hence therefore, Mauritius the Emperor seems to have suspected Pope Gregory the first, that he might have done more towards destroying the Lombards out of Italy, if he had pleased to exert himself. The Pope frankly acknowledged it; and at the same time had evidently such a sway over the Lombards, then at war with Mauritius, (between whom he afterwards mediated a peace) that the Milanese clergy and commonalty, by the Pope’s advice, chose Deusdedit for their Archbishop, without regard to the recommendation of their own King Agilulfus. And such veneration was paid him in Italy, that if the Exarch, that is, the Emperor’s lieutenant in that country, took a fugitive priest or nun under his protection, the Pope threatened him with his indignation and punishment: If the Exarch went to Rome on any occasion, tho’ he entred in pomp, the ceremonial required his going directly to adore the Pope as if he were his Lord.

The Pope then might justly be said to be of the seven, as having, in effect, a coordinate jurisdiction, whilst the Emperor kept any shadow of power in Italy: When that was totally

* Gregory i Regist. l. vii. ep. 1.  
* Ibid. l. viii. ep. 65.  
* Ibid. l. iv. ep. 18.
lost, as in fact it was A.D. 727, the Pope then became the eighth, and so continues.

And the ten horns—are ten Kings, which have received no kingdom as yet, but [will] receive power as Kings one hour with the beast. This part too of the revelation having been long ago notoriously accomplished, gives a full attestation to the veracity of the divine interpreter, and of S. John the reporter, and great light at the same time to the other parts of the prophecy. For none want now to learn, that the old Roman Empire hath been long ago broken or divided into about ten several kingdoms or governments, which were not distinguished as so many several kingdoms in S. John's time, nor thought of before that dissolution of the Empire. Yet different authors having a little differed in the computation of the particular states, it should be premised, that none can properly be reckoned a horn which did never grow on the head of the beast, that is, that no kingdom can be admitted into the number of the ten here intended, which had never been a part of the old Roman Empire; nor any that was not for some time devoted with the rest to the spiritual power of Rome. These limitations, which some commentators have disregarded, will lead us to count out the ten kingdoms in the gross, tho' some of them have received considerable alterations since the first division, as 1. Ireland. 2. Great Britain. 3. Germany, south of the Elbe. 4. France. 5. Spain. 6. Lombardy.
with Istria, Sardinia, and Corsica. 7. the Pope's Patrimony, with Romania and Tuscany. 8. The two Sicilies, or kingdoms of Naples and Sicily. 9. Pannonia, or Hungary. 10. Illyricum, remaining to the Greek Emperor, now called Turkey in Europe.

Now if these Kings receive power, as Kings, with the beast, history will compel us to confess, that the general division of the Roman empire into the ten kingdoms was not later than the sixth century: For most writers agree to begin it higher; and the context shall receive with the beast] seems plainly to make the rise of the beast nearly contemporary with that division; which not only Romanists deny, and bishop Bossuet calls uncharitable, but the candor and benignity of old Vitringa's heart would not suffer him to suppose, that the church of Rome, then comprehending the generality of Christians of all nations, could so early be said to revolt from the faith of Christ, and be seduced to all the abominations, which characterise the beast. And therefore he concluded, that the beast arose not before, but in the noted Hildebrand, called Gregory the seventh, tho' at the same time he says, after Mede, that the Papal arrogance and impiety were then at the height. But if they were at the height about the year 185, which cannot be denied, it was not all at once, but by many degrees, that they ascended so high, and the rise, therefore must have commenced long before. Was it not
the beast that received the deadly wound with a sword upon one of its heads, and do we know of any other deadly wound by a sword besides that aforementioned to have been given him by Totilas in the year 547? That wound, therefore, tho' healed again, has left an indelible mark both to distinguish the beast, and to fix the time of his appearance in the world.

But it will be said, that none ever charged Rome in the sixth century with all the odious articles, that make up the description of her in the xiiith and xviith chapters. Nor will we with all of them; it is more probable that these foul characters were not intended to appear upon the beast at first, nor all at once, tho' so enumerated, but successively, as it is expressly said of it's seven heads: That he began with apparent lenity and meekness, deceiving, corrupting, and intoxicating all kings and nations, and discovered not the cruelty and terrors of the leopard, the bear, and the lion, 'till all were subdued and under his paws. The frauds, impostures, and idolatries even of that age were boundless; but the tyranny and persecutions not yet so merciless and bloody.

Let us, to avoid all suspicion of partiality, take our instances chiefly out of the life and writings of Gregory, the first of the name, and commonly reputed, after S. Peter, the greatest Saint and Pontif of the whole list, the director and exemplar of all his successors in that throne.

He cannot be excused of idolatry by any
that believe the worship of saints and of their relics to be idolatrous. For he made litanies to them, and, as he told the patriarch of Alexandria, he celebrated masses every day in veneration of the martyrs; to propagate which more effectually he wrote himself, when Pope, four books of dialogues between himself and his deacon Peter, containing nothing but strange stories of miracles wrought by Italian saints, and their relics, both before and in his own time (probably to vye with the fables of the Greeks) and vouches for the veracity of his informants; to all which deacon Peter answers with wonder. Johannes Diaconus, who writ Gregory's life about 270 years after, says very seriously, that no such miracles as Gregory's had been wrought by any one since Gregory's time, which one may easily believe. But it will be better to give a small specimen, than any character of this legend.

A dead child brought to life by the old buskin of abbot Honoratus, i. 2. An imitation of what Elisha did with Elijah's mantle. A monk of the same convent ordered a serpent to watch their kitchen garden, and he did it punctually, i. 3. Bonifacius by prayer multiplied his corn and wine, i. 9. Fortunatus, by making the sign of the cross, restored sight to the blind, and tamed a mad horse: With holy water in a moment consolidated a broken hipbone, and by prayer revived on Easter day.

\[\text{Regist. I. vii. ep. 27.}\]
one that died the day before, i. 10. Pope John, as he was entering Constantinople, gave fight to a blind man, iii. 2. Pope Agapet cured one lame and dumb in virtute Dei ex adjutorio Petri, iii. 3. A Bishop took poison unhurt from his archdeacon, and the archdeacon himself, tho' he took it not, died of it, iii. 5. Sabinus, bishop of Placentia, sending a written order to the Po not to overflow, was obey'd, iii. 10. Eutychius, wanting a shepherd, set a bear to lead out and bring home the sheep of the monastery, at the hours appointed, who did it exactly as long as he lived, iii. 15. And if his coat was carried about the fields in dry seasons, it would presently bring rain, ibid. Benedict could not be burnt by fire put round his cell, no nor in an oven, iii. 18. Orthodox bishops, after their tongues had been cut out by the Arians in Justinian's time, spoke plainly all, except one, who lost his speech by his incontinence, iii. 32. Two monks sung after they were hanged, iv. 21.

He affirms that he had known great benefits done to departed souls by the sacrifice of the host: That a priest near Civita Vecchia knew one of his parish, who after death was condemned to come and serve as a waiter in a bagnio, of which he had been the owner, till the priest, finding out his distress, procured him a release by offering the host for him a week together.

Another instance is of one Justus, a monk of Gregory's own monastery, who, by practi-
ing physic had got three pieces of gold, and, contrary to the rules of the house, presumed to keep them. These being discovered in his sickness, Gregory, in indignation, ordered, that none should attend him in his last hours, that his body should be buried in a dunghill, and his gold thrown upon him, all crying out, Thy money perish with thee. Justus hearing this order, dy'd with sorrow. But Gregory, afterwards relenting, directed the host to be offered for his absolution, thirty days together; at the end of them he appeared to his brother Copiosus of the same convent, who asked him, What is the matter, brother, how art? Justus answered, Hitherto I have been ill, but now am well; for to-day I received the communion, iv. 55.

He maintained, that not only the dead bodies of the supposed saints would work miracles, as well as the living, cure the sick, free demoniacs, send devils into those that were perjured, cleanse the lepers, and raise the dead, iv. 6. but that the scraps, and reliques of reliques, which had touched the bodies, would operate as much as the bodies themselves. He sent therefore to all the Princes of Europe, to the Empress Constantia, and to her women, to Recared, king of the Wisigoths in Spain, to Childebert, king of the Francs, to queen Brunichild of the Francs, to Aldibert and Aldiberga, king and queen of the Angles, &c. a blessed key from the body of Peter, or some other

Reg. 1. iii. ep. 30.
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_brandeum, or scrap, including some supposed filings from a supposed iron chain of Peter or Paul, (for he owns to Constantia, that often no filings come from it) with some such addition as this, That what bound Peter's or Paul's neck, may loose yours from all your sins, and multiply all things with blessings. That it may hang about your neck and defend you from all evils. That you may be defended from the evil one.

He besought the empress Constantia, that she would seek to get and preserve the good grace of St. Peter, who might both now be her aid in all things, and hereafter might forgive her her sins. And to queen Brunichild of the Franks much in the same style. And to the empress Leontia wife of Phocas. Now S. Peter, says he, is still in his successors, sitting in that chair.

If then the saints, and the relics of saints, can effectually accomplish whatever is desired, even to forgiving of sins, as Gregory then taught men to believe, what is there left to be asked of God? But if any should believe that all these stories came from the hypocrisy of liars of seared consciences, and were forged to deceive the simple, in order to exalt the dignity and authority of all the officers of Rome's spiritual monarchy (for we have not observed one lay saint:) Gregory himself has suggested reason enough to suspect the truth.
of them all. For in his xxviiith homily on the words at the end of St. Mark's gospel, And these signs shall follow them that believe; in my name shall they cast out devils, they shall speak with new tongues, they shall take up serpents, and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them. They shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover. He adds, What, my brethren, will not ye believe, because these miracles are no longer wrought? But these were necessary at the beginning of the church, &c.

For the worship of images, Gregory's sentiments appear in his letter to Secundinus, a favourite recluse. Secundinus had begged of the Pope to send him the image of Christ, with the virgin Mary, Peter, and Paul. The Pope answers, "That he is extremely pleased with Secundinus's request, as knowing that he is seeking him, whose image he desires to have in his sight. And we do not wrong, if we by visible things represent the invisible. He knows that Secundinus has not begged the image of our Saviour in order to worship it as God, but that, on occasion of the remembrance of the Son of God, he may be rekindled with his love. And that he himself [Gregory] prostrates himself before the same image, not as before the Deity, but that he is adoring him, whose image presents to his remembrance his birth or his passion, and his sitting now on his throne." This for the clergy. For the laity, he said,

\[\text{Reg. I. vii. ep. 54.}\]
should have images, as books of history, even tho' they should be in never so much danger of worshipping them. Therefore when Serenus, bishop of Marseilles, seeing his people actually worship images, had justly broke them, and thrown them out of the church; Gregory, tho' acknowledging, that nothing made with hands ought to be worshipped, with sourness rebuked his zeal, as having exceeded his duty, and directed him to set them up again to gratify his people, and then to dissuade the worship of them a.

The second commandment says, Thou shalt not make to thy self any graven image, nor the likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, &c. Gregory says, We do not wrong if we by visible things represent the invisible. Is this an exposition, and not rather a flat contradiction and repeal of God's law, and but ill covered with that poor evasion of not worshipping the image of God? The learned Pagans pleaded full as well for their idolatry; that they adored not the stone, or the painting, but the Deity represented by it. And what did the Israelites, as Mede observes, do worse, when they made to themselves calves and images of men, and committed whoredom with them, as Ezekiel styles it, tho' they meant not thereby to revolt from Jehovah their God, but still called themselves his people? And yet the unparallel'd plagues and vengeance they suffered for this sin, can hardly yet

*Reg. l. vii. ep. 111. and l. ix. ep. 9.*
yet be read without horror, and astonishment.

Arrogance is another of the characters of
the beast, and a mouth speaking great things.
But this, however notorious in most of the
successors, neither Romanists, nor even many
of the reformed divines, will suffer to be im-
plicated to Gregory. They mention, with ho-
nour, two signal instances of his humility and
modesty, that he first taught the Pope to style
himself Servus servorum Dei, a servant of the
servants of God: And that he rejected for
himself the title of œcumenical patriarch, or
universal bishop, which the patriarch of Con-
stantinople assumed. But they misunderstand
both the cases. Servus Dei is always used
by Gregory to signify a regular ecclesiastic,
monk, or anchorite; the secular ones he calls
sacerdotes or clerici, as in that declaration of
his in Regiar. Lib. iv. ep. 32. Ego cum totum
sacerdotum servos sum, in quantum ipsi sacer-
dotaliter vivunt. In both which expressions
servus has not its old Latin sense of a slave,
but the modernized one of humble servant, or
friend; and so the qualification, which Pope
Gregory took to himself, signified, in truth, no-
things else but the friend or protector of all
Monks. A title that declared his policy at
least as much as his humility.

The other instance of Gregory's humility
is not much better. John of Constantinople,
from his frequent mortifications called the
Faster, had for some years before Gregory's
149 **Critical Notes on pontificate, with the Emperor's consent taken the empty title of *œcuménical patriarch*. Pope Pelagius II. had warmly opposed this, and annulled the acts of a synod at Constantinople for giving this title to their patriarch John. Gregory succeeding Pelagius, takes up the quarrel, and writes against John to the emperor Mauritius, and to the empress Constantia, with ridiculing John's hypocritical austerities, and pretended self-denial, desiring them to reduce his pride, and suppress that title, which he calls singular, novel, foolish, proud, perverse, profane, wicked, scandalous, and blasphemous; that it destroys the truth, and the peace of the world, tears out the bowels of the church, and sets John above the Emperor himself, &c.

The Emperor, labouring for peace between the prelates, Gregory condescended to write to John *amicably*, as he says, praying him to quit that haughty, rash, insolent, abominable word, *œcuménical*, or he will break communion with him: That by assuming this new name, by which no true saint ever presumed to be called, he proves how little sincerity there was in his former pretended humility, and flying from the bishopric: That in this ambition he imitates him, who, not content to be numbered with the Angels, said, *I will exalt my throne above the stars of God—I will be like the most High.* (For that passage applied by Isaiah to the king of Babylon was mistaken by Gregory to be

*Reg. I. iv. ep. 32. and ep. 34.*

meant
meant of Satan; which has occasioned the vulgar error of making Lucifer one of the names of the Devil b.)

The patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch he begg’d to think themselves as much interested in the dispute as himself, not to give John that title, nor admit his letters with that subscription, but to stand stout against all adversities from the Emperor, and rather to dye as martyrs than gratify John’s pride; to which, it seems, he could never persuade them c. For the patriarch of Antioch disapproved his passionate conduct, as appears by Gregory’s reply, wherein he confesses, that the Emperor had many times endeavoured to pacify him with the same consideration of giving no scandal on account of such a frivolous title d. The patriarch of Alexandria signify’d his compliance, but in the same letter gave to Gregory himself the very title in dispute, which Gregory having so many years treated as impious and detestable in any that should take it, could not now accept, without confuting himself; and so he refused it.

But that Gregory may not be suspected of any humility in this matter, and that you may see his abhorrence was to any kind of aristocracy of patriarchs in competition with himself, who claimed a monarchy over all; in the letter to Mauritius, before cited, he plainly set forth his right to that supremacy: That by Christ’s saying to St. Peter, the holy and principal apostle of all the apostles, Peter
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Lovest thou me? feed my sheep, &c. Cura et principatus totius ecclesiae, the care and presidency over the universal church was committed to Peter [and to his successors of course.]

In the same letter, declaiming against John's arrogance, he unwarily affirms, that by such a title John set himself above the Emperor. For if the name of œcumenical patriarch set John above the Emperor, where was Gregory to stand, who claimed a right to be superior to John? Whether Mauritius observed this or not, he found by experience, that all his authority could not obtain from Pope Gregory peace and communion with the patriarch of Constantinople as long as he held this title, tho' given him by the Emperor himself.

Yet the ecclesiastical historians assure us, that the allegations on Gregory's side are false in fact; that the title of œcumenical was neither new nor singular, as he charged it. For Basnage has shewn that Dioscorus, patriarch of Alexandria, had taken it first, about 150 years before this time; that Leo, Hormisdas, and Agapetus, Popes of Rome, had kindly accepted it themselves; and that bishops, councils, and emperors had given it to the patriarchs of Constantinople, for the time being, for 70 or 80 years before Gregory called it new and singular. Gregory, therefore, for his excuse must be supposed to know as little of ecclesiastical history as he did of Greek, both which defects he acknowledges on other occasions:* or else he must take to himself,

*Regist. l. vii. ep. 29. and l. ix. ep. 69.
what he intimates more than once of John, that he is somewhat given to hypocrisy and lying. 

Thus much of Roman imposture, idolatry, blasphemy and arrogance appeared in the sixth century; and thus were the western nations, who loved strong delusions, left in their superstition and ignorance to raise the empire of the beast and false prophet to a stupendous height, and he established his throne upon the vices of mankind, and the ruins of Christianity. And the same corruptions were overspreading the east, when an illiterate Arab, calling himself a prophet, but without any proof of his mission, effectually destroy'd idolatry in those parts, while nominal Christians were industriously propagating it in the west, and prospered till he brought all who came under his law, that is, a multitude now far superior to that of the Christians, to worship the one true God. Will not he, who taught piety and virtue, tho' he had but a glimmering, and knew nothing of the Old or New Testament but by hearsay, arise in judgment and condemn those ministers of Rome, who had so great a light, and yet chose darkness for themselves, and for all beneath them? One story is told of Mahomet, as it is of Gregory, that he had a dove taught to come to his ear, as if the Holy Ghost frequently conversed with him in that form. Of Mahomet it is a fable without any foundation, says Prideaux: but of


Gregory,
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Gregory, Johannes Diaconus the writer of his life, reports, that the Romans after Gregory's death having concluded and begun to burn his writings (for what reason is not told us) his old companion and deacon Peter, in order to save the remainder, made oath, that he had very often seen the Holy Ghost perched upon the head of Gregory like a dove, while he was writing. From whence, says our author, it is customary to paint Gregory writing with a dove over his head. And thence, too, perhaps somebody thought it as proper a circumstance for Mahomet as for that artful Pope, as taking one to be as dextrous an impostor as the other. But to return to our comment.

It is said, the ten kings receive power as kings, with the beast, µίαν ὡραν, which by the Vulgar, and by the moderns in general, seems not well translated in one hour. For grammarians will tell you, that the word being in the accusative case, should signify duration or length of time, and should be rendered, as Bugenhagius only has done, They shall receive power as kings for one length of time with the beast. If then the beast arose in the sixth century, as hath been collected by the arguments preceding, and if the forty two months appointed for his reign in chap.xiii. ver. 5. are to be computed in the prophetical manner, in which a day commonly stands for a year; 42 months, of 30 days each month, will make one thousand two hundred and sixty years from the rising of this wonderful
wonderful empire to its downfall, when its great capital, Rome, is to be utterly burnt with fire, by some of those kings whom she had formerly bewitched and intoxicated, while the rest of those kings [or kingdoms rather] shall bewail her fate. But let it be seriously remembered, that, as the ten kings rose together with the beast; so, by our interpretation of the text, are they to sink with him. When, therefore, this great Babylon, this mother of the whoredoms and abominations of the earth, shall be brought to utter destruction; that event will be a signal to all the ten kingdoms, that their dissolution is approaching.
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THE PREFACE.

The principal Point which Pope Gregory XIII had in View when he altered the Year, was to settle the true Time for the Celebration of Easter; for so zealous were the first Christians that it might be rightly observed, and in the same Night the Sacrifice of Prayer be offered for the Resurrection of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, that great Divisions arose amongst them. The Asiatic Christians did continually celebrate the Pascha on the Fourteenth Day of the Moon, or at the same
same Time the Jews did; but the Eastern Churches never celebrated it except on the Lord's Day, that they might not seem to have the Solemnity in common with the Jews, and at the same time looked upon their Solemnities not as indifferent things, inasmuch that they condemned one another for neglecting the Punctilios of Time; and so high was it carried, that Pope Victor, as well as other Popes, thundered out their Anathema's against the Greeks, which, proving of no Effect, was the Occasion of the meeting of the Nicene Council, to moderate the great Heats that arose between the Eastern and Western Churches, and to fix a certain Time for the Celebration of Easter; when to prevent all future Contests about it, it was agreed upon to this Purpose, That Easter Day should be that Sunday which falls upon or next after the first Full Moon, which happens next after the Vernal Equinox.

Hence
Hence, and by the Help of the true Lengths of the Julian and Solar Years, it will be easy to find at what Time the Equinox will happen, in any Year past or to come, and consequently the true Time for the Celebration of Easter; for from the Length of the Julian Year 365 Days and 6 Hours, take the Length of the Tropical Year 365 Days, 5 Hours, 48 Minutes, and 57 Seconds, and there will remain 11 Minutes and 3 Seconds, for the annual Anticipation or Recession, which being multiplied by 100, will give 18 Hours and 25 Minutes for the Alteration in 100 Years; this therefore being added to, or subtracted from, as the Cafe requires, the true Time of the Equinox in any Year, will give the time of the Equinox required. For Example, Suppose the Time of the Equinox in the present Year 1747, to happen on March the Ninth, at 37 Minutes, 16 Seconds after Eleven in the Evening; and it be required to find
find when it will happen in the Year 1847 which is 190 Years hence; from March the Ninth, 11 Hours, 37 Minutes, and 16 Seconds, take 18 Hours and 25 Minutes, the Recession in 100 Years, and it will give March the Ninth, at 12 Minutes and 16 Seconds after Five in the Morning, for the Time of the Vernal Equinox in the Year 1847.

To the Time thus found I have subjoined a Calculation of the Sun's Place from Mr. Flamsteed's Solar Numbers not yet published, by which it will appear to what degree of Exactness this Method of Computation may be depended upon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Motion</th>
<th>1847 - 9 21 20 27</th>
<th>17 Hours - 41 53</th>
<th>16 Seconds - 1</th>
<th>Add - 1 54 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 8</td>
<td>2 06 02 18</td>
<td>12 Minutes - 30</td>
<td>Sun's Place - 11 29 59 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perihelion</td>
<td>3 10 17 48</td>
<td>11 28 05 09</td>
<td>Sun's Corrected Place - 29 59 39</td>
<td>Whence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Whence it appears that the Time last found, is short of the true Time of the Sun's Ingress into the Equinoctial Point 21 Seconds in Motion, which in one Hundred Years makes an annual Error of 5 Seconds in Time, and this in 1000 Years amounts to 1 Hour, 23 Minutes, and 20 Seconds in Time, which shews that it is sufficiently exact for the Purpose intended.

For the more ready and expeditious way of finding the Time when the Equinox, or any other remarkable Day, will happen, in any Year past or to come; I have added the following Table, by which it may be found with the greatest Ease.
Let us now suppose the Equinox in the present Year 1747, to happen on March the Ninth, at 11th 37' 16" p.m. and it be required to find at what Time it happened in the Year of the Nativity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>Seconds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To 7 Days, 16 Hours, and 10 Minutes, the Anticipation for 1000 Years, add 5 Days, 8 Hours, and 55 Minutes, the Anticipation in 700 Years; also 7 Hours, and 22 Minutes, the Anticipation in 40 Years; and 1 Hour, 6 Minutes, and 18 Seconds, the Anticipation in 6 Years; the Sum 13 Days, 9 Hours, 33 Minutes, and 18 Seconds, the Anticipation in 1746 Years, being added to March the Ninth, 11 Hours, 37 Minutes, and 16 Seconds, will give March the Twenty-third Day, at 10 Hours, 34 Minutes, after Nine in the Morning.

Again; supposing the Winter Solstice to happen this present Year on December the Eleventh Day, at 17 Minutes and 25 Seconds after Four in the Morning, it will be found by adding 13 Days, 9 Hours, 33 Minutes, and 18 Seconds, the Anticipation in 1746 Years, to have happened in the First Year of Christ, on December
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December the Twenty-fourth Day, at 50 Minutes and 43 Seconds after One in the Afternoon, which is the Day set apart by the first Christians for the Solemnization of the Birth of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Again; suppose it were required to find the Time of the Equinox in the Year of the Passion 33, which is now 1714 Years ago; to 7 Days, 16 Hours, and 10 Minutes, the Anticipation in 1000 Years, add 5 Days, 8 Hours, and 55 Minutes, the Anticipation in 700 Years; also 1 Hour, 30 Minutes, and 30 Seconds, the Anticipation in 10 Years; and 44 Minutes, and 12 Seconds, the Anticipation in 4 Years; the Sum 13 Days, 3 Hours, 39 Minutes, and 42 Seconds, being added to March the Ninth Day, 11 Hours, 37 Minutes, and 16 Seconds, the Time of the Vernal Equinox in 1747, will give March the Twenty-third Day, at 16 Minutes, 58 Seconds, after 3 in the Morning.

And
And proceeding after the same Manner it will be found that in the Year 325, when the Nicene Council met, it happened on March the Twentieth Day, at 9 Hours, 30 Minutes, and 22 Seconds, in the Evening; and in the Year 1582, when Pope Gregory reformed the Calendar on March the Eleventh, at 31 Seconds after Six in the Morning.

If the Times of the Equinoxes thus found, as also the Time of the Winter Solstice, be compared with the reputed Times, they will be found to differ; but whoever will consider the great Corrections made in the Motions of the Luminaries since the Invention of Telescopes, and good Time-keepers, ought not to be surprized, but rather wonder that the Ancients came so near the Truth, considering what poor Helps they had.
A Table for adjusting the New and the Old Style, shewing in how many Years, &c. they will differ a certain Number of Days.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>Seconds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>651</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>782</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>912</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1042</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1173</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1303</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1433</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1564</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1694</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1824</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2085</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2215</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2346</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2476</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2606</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By
By this Table it appears, that in 782 Years they will differ 6 Days nearly, in 1173 Years they will differ 9 Days nearly, in 1955 Years they will differ 15 Days nearly, and in 2607 Years (wanting 4 Days) they will differ 20 Days; whence it comes to pass that in 11731 Years they will differ 90 Days; when the Spring Quarter will become the Winter Quarter, the Winter Quarter will become the Autumn Quarter, and the Autumn Quarter will become the Summer Quarter.

Hence the Difference between the two Styles being known, or given at any certain Time, the Difference at any other Time past or to come, may be easily found.

The Reformation of the Year by Pope Gregory, though it arose from a superstitious Motive, yet it was a good thing, as it tended to bring back all the grand Fasts, Festivals, and other remarkable Days, to their proper Seats in the Calendar, according to the true Intent.
Intent of their original Institutions; and if instead of Ten Days he had struck out Twelve Days, and ordered that every Thirty-third Leap Year should be deemed a common Year, he would have made it always to have begun nearly with the Commencement of the Christian Era, from whence Astronomers, Historians, and all public Acts take their Dates.

The Reason why it was not then received, was, because it was enjoined by the Authority of the Pope, for as at that Time the Reformation was in its Infancy, they were very unwilling to show the least shadow of Submission to the Pope's Bull, and this was the principal Reason why Dr Wallis so warmly opposed it in the Year 1700, when most of the Reformed Churches abroad complied with it; which in my private Opinion was ill judged, for Truth ought to prevail let it proceed from what Cause, or come from what Quarter soever.