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PREFAE.

SEEN many have lately wrote on these Subjects, I sometimes suspect, as my Papers have been two Years in the Hands of Booksellers, that they may have excited others to like Attempts. For my Part, I have endeavoured to be everywhere new; and if any of these late Writers agree with me, I have not stolen from them, for I never read one of them.

I persuade myself, that I have made Sir Isaac's general Interpretation unquestionable.

My Interpretation of Daniel's seventy Weeks may be called new, though compounded of Sir Isaac's and Marshal's Schemes.

I treat of the Trinity in my Notes on Revelations i. 8. iii. 14. vi. 10. xix. 12. xxii. 8. and in two Places in the Appendix. I am often ready to cry out, but
but I must first know whether the Learned agree with me.

As these Notes were written at different and often very long intervals, the Reader will sometimes find a Diversity of Opinions; but the Learned will generally see which of them is the last Result of my Judgment. The several Parts of even the same Note sometimes want, for the same Reason, a clear Connexion; but the Studious, for whom alone I write, will not fail to see my Meaning. These small Imperfections will, I hope, be pardoned, especially as my numerous and most necessary Avocations permitted not greater Regularity.

In my Appendix, where I give Notes on Revelations iii. 14, and xxii. 16. I forgot to cite Acts xvii. 28, 29. and Jer. iii. 4. ii. 27. I said something there about the Innocence of Adam, and Infants, which I dislike. Finding many Opinions in my Papers on this Head; I hastily transcribed one, which I afterwards discovered to have been rejected by myself. The Innocence of Adam and Infants consists in something else,
else, than an Exemption from Punishment. See Matthew xix. 14. Romans viii. 20. ix. 11. What I quote from the Apocrypha agrees with my Scheme. Children die and suffer Pain, for the same Reason that Brutes do, and for many others. Adam proved, that when they came to act in a moral Capacity, they, without the Help of Christ, would not, with Safety to the Universe, be fit for eternal Life. It seems probable to me, that tho' Adam had not eaten the forbidden Fruit, his Children would have sinned as much as now, unless prevented by extraordinary Grace. As Sons of Adam, that is, as Men they sin to such a Degree as to merit Death, and that eternal, excepting such as are released by Christ. Infants, who have done neither Good nor Evil, merit not Exemption from Death, much less eternal Life. A Resurrection to eternal Life and Happiness is the free Gift of God in Christ, to such as fulfill Christ's Covenant, which commenced with the Fall of Adam, and to innocent Children. Men suffer not for Adam's Sin, but for want
want of personal Merit. Adam, by communicating to them his peccable human Nature, is a public Witness against them; and in this Sense they suffer through him. It answered wise Purposes thus to prove the Peccability of the whole Race, and to permit them to die, without Hopes of a Resurrection, and a consequent happy State, unless by Means of Christ's Merits and Covenant. But of these Things more another Time. In Morals, I follow Husbeson, whose Scheme, I think, wants no Correction, as I shall shew in a Work soon to be published.

In transcribing my Remarks on Esdras, I overlooked some Things. I dislike some of them; and perhaps, if I saw all Whiston's and Lee's Pieces, should reject more of them; but they may all, in some way or other, be serviceable to a Writer on Esdras.

Compare Revelations xxii. 2. and Esdras. Isaiah xl. 15, 17, and Esdras vi. 56, 57. Esdras i. 38. and Hermas seem to explain the Word, East, in Revelations vii. especially as the Sealed are there called Jews.
Jews. I like the Reading found in the French Bible quoted. There are twelve Prophets mentioned. See Matthew viii. 11. When Christ said, the Kingdom of Heaven draweth nigh, the Jews understood him. See Esdras, and another Apocryphal Book. Vide Luke xvii. 20. xiv. 15. Paul seems also to speak of the Effects of Adam's Sin, as of a Thing known to the Jews, and well understood. See Lee's Dissertation, where he quotes Esdras viii. 32. Compare Esdras ii. 15. and Revelations iii. 12. See Revelations xxi. 10. and Lee's Dissertation, Page 93. Paradise, which is John's New Jerusalem, was said by some to be removed from the Earth. She is the Mother and the Bride. See Esdras vii. 26. See Esdras iii. 19. and Hebrews xii. 18. See Esdras iv. 7. 8. and my Note on the Word, Abyss, in Revelations. Perhaps it follows not necessarily from Esdras iv. 51. that the Angel did not know, but that the ordinary Duration of a Man's Life might extend to the Events there mentioned. Is Christ's Passion, and the rending of the Rock at that Time men-
tioned in Esdras v. 5. In v. 9. Ezekiel is perhaps alluded to. The sweet Waters of the Gospel shall not heal all Nations. Whether Henley in his Discourse on this Subject agreed with this Notion, or the other one, I know not. Does Christ partly point at the Signs of Esdras, where he reproves the Jews for not considering the Signs of the Times? What is meant by the Word, Token, in Isaiah xliv. 25. and the Word, Sign, where Moses says, *If a Prophet shew thee a Sign?* For the Time of Esdras's Signs, see Esdras v. vi. 20. vii. 26. viii. 63. ix. 1. xiii. 32. Is the Time of the Appearance of the Bride, in Esdras, the first or last Period of the Messiah's mediatorial Reign? May four Years be the right Reading in Esdras vii. 28?—The Remainder I must reserve for another Time.
Observations
On some Passages of Daniel.

Chap. xi. 43.

The phrase, Seed of Men, seems to be explained by that in Genesis, Daughters of Men. They who erected the ten Kingdoms, were Sons and Daughters of Men, i.e. Barbarians, Heathens, or newly converted. They came in among more ancient Christians, the Sons of God.

V. 44, 45. Made points these Verses otherwise.

Ch. vii. 6. Sir Isaac seems to have made a little Mistake here, in confounding the Heads, and the Wings. See his Chapter on prophetic Language, the Wings and Heads mentioned in the Revelations and Esdras.
V. 8. Sir Isaac saith, The Horn had Eyes in order to denote the infallible Bishop. If you do not like this Interpretation, tho' probably right, then you may consider, that, Oculus in Sceptro, was an ancient Hieroglyphic of a King, and that Osiris was thus represented. By the Mouth, Sir Isaac understands his Pretensions to be a Lawgiver: Yet you may perhaps chuse to explain this of his daring Wickedness and Idolatry. The Beast, in the Apocalypse also, opens his Mouth in Blasphemy; which, faith Mede, is an Hebraism for Idolatry. I think Mede is right, for such is the Scripture-stile. Here the 11th Horn, or Pope, is said to speak great Words against the most High.

V. 9. I beheld until the Thrones were placed, or set, as Mede renders the Word. Mede's Explanation of the several Allusions, in the Description of this Assembly, is very satisfactory.

V. 13. Christ declareth that he will come in this Manner, to take Possession of the Kingdom here mentioned. His coming with Clouds is also mentioned in the Revelations. This second coming is called by Christ the Kingdom of Heaven. He elsewhere terms it, the Regeneration; for in the Verse, where this Word is used,
used, we should prefer that Pointing which gives this Sense. It is called also, his appearing, the Day of Redemption, the Restoration, the Restitution, and refreshing Presence of the Lord; which God hath spoken of by all his Prophets. It has many other Names, and it is to be noted, that the Prophets mention it in a thousand Places hitherto little understood.

V. 17. Observe that the four Beasts are called four Kings. Some not taking Notice of Daniel's Use of the Word, King, have made great Mistakes. In the Revelation also, the Word, King, is evidently put for Kingdom, and for a Succession of Kings, or a Dynasty. See Garret.

This Way of representing Kingdoms by Beasts is very convenient and beautiful. It also shews us one Reason, why Reigns are denoted by prophetical Numbers; it being according to Deorum to assign to Beasts, when signifying Kingdoms, a Reign, or Life, of only few Days, Months, or Times.

It seems also not improbable, that not only the Prophets, but the Jews in general, called seven Years a Week, and a Year a Day, being led into this Way of speaking by their peculiar Customs. Enquire.

Note
V. 25. The Phrase, changing Times and Laws, is well explained by Ch. v. 21. Mede’s Interpretation, applying to the Pope’s Gregorian Stile what is here said of the Times, is wrong; because Daniel himself explains the Phrase otherwise in the Place referred to. See also 1 Chron. xii. 32. Esther i. 13. It is said of the Men of Issachar, that they understood the Times. Will not this Interpretation of the Phrase in Daniel explain that better, than a Note of Whiston on Josephus?
V. 26. The Body of the Beast was said above to be burned. So also the Body of the Eagle, in Esdras, is given to the burning Flames. The Eagle is also rebuked by the Lyon of the Tribe of Judah. I will elsewhere give you my Reasons for quoting Esdras. At this Time, faith John, not only the ten, but all Kingdoms shall submit to Christ.

Note on Note. Why the ten Kings are considered as Part of the Roman Empire, Whiston explains very well.

Ch. viii. 9. Here you have the Abomination of Desolation spoken of by Daniel the Prophet. Let him who readeth understand, you have in both Matthew and Mark. Do not these Words imply, that the Abomination mentioned by Daniel was or would be falsely understood of the Attempts of Antiochus Epiphanes? The Jews made miserable Mistakes in their Interpretation of Ch. xii. 11, 12. See Mede's History of this Affair.

I confess I sometimes suspect, that, by the Expression of the two Evangelists here quoted, may be only intended the Resemblance of the Roman Abomination to that of Antiochus. According to this Interpretation, the Christians of those Days are not referred to Daniel, but are only
only desired to observe well what Christ had prophesied concerning the Destruction of Jerusalem, and to leave the Place when Armies approached it, or the Roman Abomination was set up.

What leads me into the Suspicion here mentioned is, that Jesus seems to say, that the Father alone knew the Time of restoring the Kingdom to Israel. Now if Jesus understood Daniel's desolating Abomination, why could he not detect the Time of this Restoration, by computing from the Time wherein it was set up? For is not the cleansing of the Sanctuary the same Thing with Restoring the Jewish Kingdom? I acknowledge indeed, that they may be different Events.

Note on Note. These Things I hope to explain more to your Satisfaction in the last Note on the Revelations, and the Appendix.

The Jewish General was called Prince of the Host. Here Christ is the General.

V. 14. All Israel shall be saved, saith Paul; for the Calling and Gifts of God are without Repentance. All Israel shall be justified, says an antient Prophet. As I have not consulted Commentators on that Verse in the Prophet, I know not, I confess, but that, only, is understood.
stood before, Lord; which would give another Sense of the Words. But the Thing seems easily proved. See Hosea, Ch. iii. The Conversion and Return of the Jews cannot be expected, without a Miracle, until Antichrist, and probably also, the Mahometan Powers are destroyed. The Fullness of the Gentiles must come in, before the Jews obtain Rest. Neither literal nor figurative Jews shall have Peace, until the Times of the Antichristian Gentiles are fulfilled.

It is said, in Verse 17. At the Time of the End shall be the Vision. In Verse 19, I will make thee know what shall be in the last End of the Indignation. In Verse 26. The Vision shall be for many Days or Years; and therefore shut it up. See also Chap. x. i. and other Texts. All these Expressions cannot surely be meant of Antiochus Epiphanes, but must reach much farther.

The Days are probably called, Evenings-Mornings, because Daniel is treating of the Evening and Morning-Sacrifice. In Verse 26, he says, The Vision of the Evening and Morning is true; which some may interpret thus: The Vision of the Day is true, and may be so called, because the preceding one was a Night-one; but the former Interpretation pleases me. The word Sacrifice is elsewhere omitted by Daniel,
Daniel, where he speaks of the daily Sacrifice. Daniel, probably, computes not by Weeks or Years, because treating of the daily Sacrifice.

Note on Note. If I can find a better interpretation of this Prophecy, I will give it in the Appendix. In the mean time, take the following unconnected Hints. Some say, a Day is here called, Evening-Morning, because Daniel, in every other Place, calls a Year by the Name of a Day. I sometimes suspected that our Version is bad, but I cannot find, that Willet, Grotius, or others, think so. There are other Readings here, for which, consult Whiston, even in his Margin, on Josephus. See his Account of the Temple, printed in his Memoirs. See also Willet and others. 1150 Evenings, and as many Mornings, make but 1150 Days. If this be right, and the Days of Antiochus be pointed at, then they are typical of Jerusalem's Destruction by Titus, and also of the Romish Antichrist. Markwick has many whimsical Things here, and on other Passages in Daniel, and the Revelations. I am told, that many of the best and newest Writers understand these Evening-Mornings of Antiochus Epiphanes, as well as the Days mentioned in the last Chapter; and I have seen a considerable Author, who thus interprets these Days. But I cannot remember what Epocha he chose,
chose, nor do know which ought to be chosen. Some, perhaps, may chuse to extend the Evening-Mornings, or the Days of last Chapter, to the Death of Antiochus. Nay, some may think it eligible to extend them to the Death of his Successor, or a considerable Event in his Reign. In some of these Periods, the Sanctuary, they may think, was justified, or fully proved to be so. Consult Grotius and others on the Word rendered, cleansed. Many, among whom is the great Newton, have thought, that is impossible to accommodate these Numbers to Antiochus.

The Time of the Rejection of the Jews is very long, and probably was somewhere foretold; because God, according to Amos, doth nothing (of great Consequence) without revealing it to his Prophets. Now, the other Prophets have spoken of it but obscurely; especially as to the very great Tedioufness of it. Therefore we may the more reasonably expect to find this remarkable Perfeffion predicted in plain Terms by Daniel; the clear and distinct Prophet. His Writings have been called the Prophetical Calendar. The Prophecies concerning such Things were thought to obscure, that many Jews have said, that after they were the second Time expelled from The Land of Promise, they should
should never return. See Josephus. Many Christians also have imagined, that very few of them will ever be converted. See Hammond on Romans. The Destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans seems, at first View, to be denied by Jeremy. See Mede. The Author indeed of a Prophecy ascribed to Zechariah seems to mention it. And Esdras saith, the House, or Temple, shall be desolate. But Daniel is sufficiently explicit, both with respect to the Destruction and rebuilding of Jerusalem; according to my present Opinion.

V. 25. The Policy and military Skill of the Greeks and Romans is well known. Their Monopoly of Learning is also acknowledged; which Daniel calls, understanding dark Sentences. The Phrases of Daniel are to be studied. See Chap. v. 12. for the Phrase. In Chap. xxviii. of Deuteronomy; where Moses says, The Lord shall bring a Nation against thee from the Ends of the Earth, as the Eagle saith, a Nation of fierce Countenance: One would incline to think, that Moses there prophesies of the Event described by Daniel. Jeremiab indeed borrows some of Moses's Phrases, when foretelling the Babylonish Captivity; which might seem to restrain Moses's Discourse to that Event: Yet the last Verse is plainly applicable to
to the Affair of the Romans. See Whiston's Josephus.

Note on Note. Observe the Phrase fierce Countenance, both in Moses and Daniel. I find it highly probable, that Moses there speaks of both the Events here mentioned; for the Prophets often predict many Things together in such a Way, that an ignorant Person would think only one Event to be foretold.

Here the Kingdom of the Greeks begins to be mighty by the Power of the Romans. They are now united to the Romans, and at length led against Judea by a Prince from the East. Read Sir Isaac here.

Even by Peace shall destroy. Even, is often understood in Scripture.

He shall be broken without Hand, that is, by the Stone cut out of the Mountain without Hands. See Esdras, who calls this Mountain Sion. Observe also, that this Stone falls on the Toes of the Image, or on the ten Kingdoms, towards the End of the Roman Monarchy.

Note on Note. Consult Whiston on the Revelations, Page 259, where he has an Observation, which he seems to have borrowed from Sir Isaac Newton.
Chap. ix. 20. You now see, why the Angel Gabriel was also sent to the Virgin Mary.

Some may question, whether the Vision here explained be not the former; for, consider the Vision, faith Gabriel, and yet there is no Representation made, as in the preceding Visions. But observe, that the next Prophecy is also called a Vision, tho' entirely narrative, and is not, probably, so called, because interpreting a former one. Consider the Appearance, or Vision of the Angel, with his Errand.

I find, that even since Sir Isaac wrote, other Interpretations are given of this famous Prophecy. Whiston pities Sir Isaac's Weakness here. The only Thing I undertook, was to defend his general Interpretation, which does not seem to be affected with my Solution of the present Prophecy.

Note on Note. In my Appendix, I hope to give you a satisfactory Account of this Prophecy. In the mean time, it is to be observed, that Sir Isaac does not pretend to tell when the Day of Judgment shall be, as some ignorant Persons have imagined. You may object against him, that the City and Wall were built before Nehemiah's coming. I answer, that something indeed was done, even as to the Wall, as we might naturally expect; but the Texts, which

Sir
Sir Isaac quotes, prove plainly, that Nebuchad found the greatest Part of the Work unfinished. Some explain the Phrase, People of the Prince who shall come, of the Romans, who shall become the People of Christ; because one of Christ’s Epithets, in Scripture, is, He who shall come. But this Interpretation is very improbable; and Christ seems even to allude to this Place, where he says, The Prince of this World, i.e. the Heathen Emperor, Vicegerent to the Devil or God of that Age, shall come, and has no Alliance or Correspondence with me. Christ’s Epithet, ὁ ἐξουσιάων, is taken from other Texts. I once suspected, that we should read seventy, instead of seven Weeks, seeing there are other Readings here, and the Days of cleansing the Sanctuary vary in different Copies. But I am now of Opinion, that the Prophecy of the seventy Weeks was never, in this Particular, corrupted. It seems probable, that God gave no Prophecy, which either has not been, or will not be understood by somebody. When Heathen Nations are prophesied of, the Prophecies are generally plain, because such Prophecies will not be frustrated by a Heathen’s reading them. Other Prophecies, especially those relating to the Messiah are, on purpose, made obscure, lest they should become Pelones de s. Yet I say, notwith-
notwithstanding this Obscurity, it seems probable to me, that every Prophecy, when fulfilled, may be understood by the Wise, so far as to beg a moral Certainty. If, therefore, you find an Interpretation built upon Chronology, in a Point, which cannot be tolerably ascertained, you should, generally speaking, reject it for that very Reason. God, probably, intended, that his Church should receive stronger Conviction. Sir Isaac objects against other Interpretations, that they extend not this Prophecy to the second coming of Christ. But doth not the Destruction of Jerusalem, unto the End, or Consummation, extend to the cleansing of the Sanctuary by Christ, and consequently reach as far as Daniel's other Prophecies? The Word, τελεσθαι, in 1 Thess. ii. 16. and Matt. xxiv. 7. seem to point at the Word, End, in Daniel. See Willet, Moore, Pool, and others, on the Phrase, Anoint the most Holy. That holy Thing, which is born of thee, you have in Luke. See also Matt. i. 20. See συντρίμ, in John i. 5. and the Hebraism in Isaiah xli. 2. Consult Commentators, for there are Variety of Opinions concerning this Prophecy. I knew one who was fond of the Interpretation given by Xeres the convert Jew. These Hints may serve some valuable Purposes,
tho' only some of them are subservient to the Explication, which I give in the Appendix.

Chap. x. 1. Observe, that, tho' Daniel saith, he understood the Vision, he sometimes knew not the Meaning of his own Prophecy. See Chap. xii. 8. Consult Lowth on the Inspiration of the Scriptures. Esdras also saith, that the fourth Beast was not clearly expounded to Daniel. Compare this Note with what you find in Willet.

V. 13. Here days are put for Years. You may consider the Duration of Daniel's Fast above mentioned, and whether Numb. xiv. 34. and Ezek. iv. 5, 6. be applicable here. Hayter's Arguments will not perhaps affect this Point.

V. 21. Was there a Book here given to Daniel, as to John? Or, does he point at the written Vision here commented on, I mean that of the daily Sacrifice, said before to be true? Or means he the Book of God's Decrees? Or does he point at the whole Book of God, called the Scriptures, as hinting at such Things? See Mede and Fisher the Quaker on the Phrase, Scripture of Truth. Sir Isaac seems right. The old Prophecies and Types are meant. The Sub.
Flame of Daniel's and John's Prophecies are found throughout the whole Book of God. See Mede on Edom, and Sir Isaac on the Book with seven Seals.

Consult Dryden’s Preface to Juvenal, concerning this Dissention of the Angels, and compare him with Commentators.

Chap. xi. 20. See Prideaux’s Explanation of this Verse, and particularly observe his Note on the Phrase, within few Days.

V. 30. The Roman Ambassador, and his Company, embarked in Grecian Ships.

V. 36. Here the Emperor of the Greeks commences Antichristianism in good earnest. The Spirit of Antichrist was, indeed, come in John's Time; but not he himself, as Hammond would have it. By Antichrist, I mean him, who principally deserves that Name. The Greek Empire introduced the Doctrine of Celibacy, and Worship of Mahuzzims. The Pope of Rome got those Doctrines; and by imposing them upon all the World, became the notorious Antichrist, or Man of Sin. John, you may also object, faith, that he is Antichrist, who denieth Christ to be come in the Flesh, and that such Antichrists...
Sorts of Antichrists, of whom some were already come; and others to come. Doth not John likewise say, that Antichrist denieth the Father; which no Man ever did, except practically? John, indeed, seems to say, that Atheism, or something like it, followed from their Doctrine, though they might not know it. It followed, that God was a Being of no Veracity, or that there was no God, because evil Spirits, or Magicians were not hindered to work Miracles, in his Name. Does not even this King in Daniel despise every God, and yet worship a God? Therefore some of these Antichrists, mentioned by John, may only virtually deny Christ. You may even say, that any Species of Infidelity may be made by John a Type of the great Line of Antichrists. In truth, this Cavil of Papists is only a Dispute about Words. And as for their Notion, that Antichrist will, in the End of the World, seduce the Bulk of Mankind with lying Wonders, and yet continue only three Years and a half, it is contrary to both Reason and Scripture. They say, that God will give him Power to deceive the whole World with Miracles, I know not, whether true, or false ones. They also say, that he shall make himself Master of Libya and Cush, besides other
other Places, in the small Space of three Years and a half. These Absurdities made Hammond and Grotius (the latter of whom was famous for the Love of a Synchretism or Re-union with Rome) to seek for new Schemes, quite different from those of the first Christians; though the first Christians, as far as we know, erred only in certain Particulars, concerning Antichrist, saying, in other Respects, such Things concerning him, as Protestants now believe. Protestants do not err, when they say, the Pope is Antichrist, nor differ herein from the Fathers; though the Fathers err, when they make his Reign to last only three Years and a half. Tho' Antiochus Epiphanes should be a Type of Antichrist, and prevail over the Jews about three Years and a half, yet it does not follow, that the Type should be so exact, that Antichrist should reign no longer; for Antichrist's Years may, in this Case, be prophetical ones. This you may apply to the wild Beasts destroying the Jews, during three Years and a half, or Daniel's half Week, in the End of the Jewish World, or Age. I will say more on the Opinions of the Fathers, concerning Antichrist, hereafter, and do recommend the perusal of the Fathers, on this Subject, to Papists.

Note
Note on Note. Whiston thinks, that the lying Miracles of Rome, are such as evil Spirits only seen to perform, and that they are not real. Others may think, that this Nicety is not the Thing meant, where Rome's lying Miracles are mentioned, but only that some of them, especially modern ones, are forged, as others were actually wrought by Satan. Yet in 2 Thess. ii. 9, 11. Whiston's Notion seems to be asserted; the second, xai, in Verse 9, not pointing out forged Miracles different from the foregoing ones. There also, in Verse 11. Paul speaks of a deceiving Possession or working of the Devil.

Upon revising that Passage in Thessalonians, I think, Whiston's Notion, whether true or false, is not asserted. Paul points at Miracles confirming a Lye, or falsely urged to prove a Divine Commission and Doctrine. So also, ἡλευτα there signifies.—τεύω, is repeated in this Sense. By the by, observe the Grammar there, in τεταυται τεύων, and ἡπροκειται ἡλευτα. Genitives have often the Force of Adjectives. I even suspect that the Article before, τεύω, shews the fundamental Doctrine of Antichrist to be pointed at. That, or so as that they shall believe the Lye, that they may be all condemned who believed not the Truth, but were pleased with, &c.

V. 38.
V. 38. You will be wonderfully pleased with Mr. Mede's Account of the Mahuzzims. It seems even probable to me, that the Baalim about Judea were commonly called Mahuzzim. Read Moses's Song, and search the Scripture for the Use of the Word. It may not be amiss to add, that I have seen an old Bible, wherein the last Verses of Chap. i. of Isaiah are thus rendered.

For they shall be ashamed of the Oaks which ye have desired, and ye shall be confounded for the Gardens which ye have chosen. For ye shall be as an Oak whose Leaf fadeth, and as a Garden that hath no Water. And the Idol (in the present Version the Strong) shall be as Tow, and the Maker of it as a Spark; and they shall both burn together, and none shall quench them. May not these Gods have been worshipped under the Type of Oaks? See the Universal History in many Places concerning the Progress of Idolatry, particularly the Chapter concerning the Celtes and Gauls, who called the Oak the Strength of Jove. I have not leisure to consult Commentators on that Verse of Isaiah, in order to shew whether there is just Reason for quitting the old Translation.

That Temples are called Strong-holds, is not surprising, for they were used as such: And again, their Fortresses were converted into Temples,
pies, by placing there the Images of their strong Protectors.

The Phrase, such a God as his Fathers knew not, is found elsewhere in Scripture. The Anti-christian King worships Mahuzzim with a God whom his Fathers knew not. That is, he worships the Wafer, the new God, along with them, or offers the Wafer to them. Or this God, whom his Fathers knew not, may be the Christian God, before unknown, in some Respects, to the Greeks. A third Meaning may please some. The true God may be represented by an Image, and worshipped in a Way entirely heathen, and not practised by the first Greek Christians. There is a fourth Interpretation, which seems best. As the Jews, when Idolaters, are said to worship a God whom their Fathers knew not, so idolatrous Christians may be said to do the like, when they worship Images of God and the Saints. The heathen Gods were called Devils working Miracles, seducing Spirits, and Authors of Sorceries and Witchcrafts; and therefore the Anti-christian Gods are said to be guilty of like Crimes by the New Testament Writers. See the following Notes on Revelation, and observe, that Daniel and John call the Anti-christians Gentiles, and the Saints Jews.

Antichrist
Antichrist here exalts himself above the true God, and also, as Paul expresses it, above every Thing that is called God. Not only the true God and the heathen Gods are said there by Paul, as some will have it, to be opposed, but also the Roman Emperors. See Limborch de Antichristo, where he speaks of the Greek in the Thessalonians ii. 4. and the Emperor being called οὐσίωνς in Acts. Observe also that Limborch has confuted Grotius on the Passage here cited. I also saw the Title-page of an old Piece written against Grotius on the Revelations. See also Garret.

Note on Note. See Whiston on the Revelation. Whiston praises Cressener on this Subject, but Cressener I have not seen. It is more worth while to read these Books than one would readily imagine; for when they confute other Interpreters, such as Hammond, Grotius, and the Papists, and even prove that such make these Prophecies of little Importance, they plainly point out the Truth of the Protestant Notion of Antichrist.

V. 39. Read Mr. Mede. He says, the Land shall be divided between the Mabuzzim, or tutelar Saints, who preside over each Country and Land.
As for the Character of this King, (or Kingdom) that he should avow Celibacy, Sir Isaac proves it even from Constantine, who almost venerated such Persons as never married, but devoted themselves to the Divine Philosophy. Now the Spirit expressly speaketh, faith Paul, that Men shall arise forbidding to marry. Mede observes, that the Spirit mentions this nowhere but in Daniel. Yet indeed it is possible, that this may be meant of his own Spirit, and that of the other Apostles propheying of Antichristianism. They all, and probably Christ himself, at least in Types, speak of the great Apostacy. Any one who covets to understand the general Drift of that Prophecy of Paul should read Mede, who makes it evident, that Paul is there describing and characterizing the whole Apostate-Church, and not confining himself to a few ill-instructed Heretics of his own Times. Such Heretics were only Types of the great Apostacy. Christ was prophesied of in Types; and also Antichrist was so spoken of, least the Prophecies should, by their Plainness, disappoint themselves. Observe that I said Heretics of their own Times were Types of the great Apostacy. They also gave Birth to the grand Apostates. Some Protestants do not consider rightly the Phrase, last Times, or latter Times,
Times, which denotes the whole Age of the Messiah, as in Heb. i. 1. 1 Cor. x. 2. Jude 18.
2 Tim. iii. 10, 9. If you consider the Stile of the old Prophets, and Verse 9th, in the Place last quoted, you will find that these Heresies were actually begun, and that the Apostles only prophecy of the Continuance of Heresy, tho' in some Measure to be suppressed for a while by the Apostles, and Destruction of the Judaizers along with the Jews. Such Protestants therefore mistake, who make that Heresy, which Paul and Peter speak of, not to be actually set on foot in the Apostles Times. Yet it is not necessary to say, that the Apostles prophesied that the very same Heresies should continue, or rise again without the least Variation. They were only very expressive Types of the great Apostacy, which should also take its Rize from them. To make them Types of Protestants would be quite forced and unnatural, because diametrically opposite in Principles. Jude 18, will not prove that these Heretics did not arise in the Days of the Apostles; for observe, as I said, the Phrase, ἐρχεται κρίμα. They, said Jude, knew from old Prophecies, that in the last Days Heretics would arise, saw them actually begun, and prophesied of their Continuance. You ought to consult Mede on the
Phrases, last and latter Days and Times: See also Hakewell's Apology, where he treats of Antichrist. The Mystery of Iniquity then wrought, faith Paul; the Spirit of Antichrist was already come, faith John.

Add to what I said before concerning the Prophecy of Paul in 2 Thessalonians, that it is misunderstood by Papists; tho' he there describes the Anti-christian Kingdom in the Words of Daniel, and says, the Roman Emperors hindered it to appear in its full Shapes at Rome. I told you, faith Paul, when I was with you, what prevents the Appearance of the Man of Sin. He did not commit it to Writing, says Augustine, lest the Christians should be destroyed for foretelling the Downfall of the Roman Empire. See, also, other Fathers on that Passage in TheSSalonians; or see the Collection of Passages taken from them by Hakewell, on this Text. This Prophecy of Paul's contains an Expression, often cited by Papists, to prove the Certainty of Tradition; and yet this particular Tradition, which was of the highest Consequence, is lost in some Measure to them. I say, in some Measure; for the Papists say the same Thing with the Fathers on this Head, but falsely think the Roman Empire still to subsist. Paul thought not of the German Empire.
serve also, that Hammond on the Revelation has a Criticism on Irenæus, wherein he makes Irenæus say, that after the other Visions John had at length revealed to him the Meaning of the Number of the Beast, but would not commit it to writing. But to come to an Examination of the Phrases in this Prophecy of Paul's. Popes are not said to reign, but sit. This Criticism has some little Weight. He shall sit in the Temple of God, shewing himself for God. He is called the Man of Sin, as Antiochus is called in the Maccabees; and a Man like Judas, the Son of Perdition; who will be destroyed for apostatizing and betraying his Master. A Succession of Popes is called the Man of Sin, as a Succession of Emperors is called, he who letteth, or hindereth. The first Line in that Chapter of Paul confutes Hammond, unless Hammond's Gnostics are typical of Papists, which cannot be admitted there. There is a curious Piece, containing Discourses on the Chapter here commented on. My Copy wanted the Title-Page. See also a Sermon of Mr. Gill.

Paul again, in his second Epistle to Timothy, speaketh of the Apostacy, as I before observed, and faith, it began already to work, and was supported by Men, like James and James, who wrought Miracles, in Opposition to the Truth,
"Truth, in Egypt. They would debauch ignorant Women, insinuating themselves into their Company under Pretence of instructing them. He says indeed, some of the present Ring-leaders should be detected and overthrown; but it does not follow, but that the Doctrine should continue or revive, and be made the Basis of Anti-christianism.

Peter also says, that Men should arise among themselves practically denying Christ, as the fallen Angels deny God, and as the false Prophets denied him, changing their Redeemer for Baalim. It seems also asserted, that such would deny Christ before Infidels. They are to speak evil of Dominion spiritual and temporal, chiefly, I think the latter. They will not tremble when they blaspheme even Glories, i.e. will tell ridiculous and blasphemous Stories of Angels themselves. By the Word Glories, Kings, Apostles and Prophets cannot be meant. There were such Heresies already begun, and about to continue. They not only despised earthly Dominion, but told talmudical and blasphemous Stories of Angels themselves. Such silly Stories are frequent among Papists to this Day, as well as Contempt of crowned Heads, and I may add of the Apostle's Writings. Christian Sadducees can scarcely be meant, as ridiculing Angels by burlesque
burlesque Stories of them. They shall bring in damnable Hereisies privily. They shall resemble the Devils, and Antediluvians kept in Chains of Darkness, in order to be severely punished at the last Day. The Antediluvians are said to be now in the same Prison with the Devils, because they listened not to Noah, called for this Reason in the second Epistle a Preacher of Righteousness.

Note on Note. See Garret on this Blaspheming of Angels, who, I think, errs a little. They do not here intend to praise Angels, but having taken for granted that they govern human Affairs, they afterwards fell into ridiculous Fables concerning them, in their Transactions with us.

Jude exhorts us to contend for the Faith; for that, as the Apostles, (Peter in particular, whom he comments on,) had foretold, there would be an Apostacy. Even in his own Time, those filthy Dreamers, i.e. Devisers of fabulous Legends, or perhaps ignorant Dotards, as called in 2 Pet. ii. 12. like some silly Jews, denied Obedience to heathen Magistrates, and told ridiculous Stories of Angels themselves. They should resemble the Apostate-Angels, Sodom, Cain, Core and Balaam. Enoch may be said to prophesy to them, for he prophesied to their Types,
Types, the Antediluvians, saying, that Christ would come to destroy them, attended with Myriads of Angels. Observe by the by, that if Enoch wrote not this Prophecy, yet that it is true, that he did prophesy such Things. So also the Story of Michael and the Devil must be true, tho' the Author was not canonical. The same may perhaps be said of the material Parts of the Testaments of the twelve Patriarchs.

To conclude this long Note, let me ask the Papists where the Protestant Herefy is prophesied of, either expressly or in significant Types.

V. 44. The Russians and Persians are here meant, says Whiston, as I saw him quoted in a News Paper, and now find it in his Memoirs.

V. 45. Holy Mountain, is a Phrase before used by Daniel. The Tabernacle of his Palace seems to be a Royal Pavilion or Tent. So Temple of Tabernacle of Testimony in Revel is one resembling a Tabernacle. Whiston is wrong, when he confines not the Phrase, Holy Mountain, to Jerusalem. I find he renders the Phrase, Tabernacle of Palace, Royal Pavilion, but proves not the Idiom. I sought for this Meaning of the Phrase, because the Turks kept not their Court as yet at Jerusalem. Neither
did Antiochus Epiphanes make it his Royal Seat. Whiston says, without Proof, that the Turks will make some Part of Judea the Seat of their Emperor. If so, why then is the Phrase, Tabernacle of Palace, used? It seems to be only meant, that the Royal Pavilion, and Standard of the Turks was to be erected there. Time will tell.

You may read the Universal History, where this Chap. is commented on, and almost the whole latter Part wonderfully accommodated to the Actions and Fortunes of Antiochus Epiphanes. You should also read Prideaux and others, comparing fairly their Arguments with those of Sir Isaac. I confess what I read in some late Writers made me waver for a Time. See my Notes on next Chap.

Chap. xii. 1. Michael, who seems to be the Guardian Angel of the Jews, and is by some thought to be Christ, fights also for the true Israel of God; in Revel. See Chap. x. 21.

The Book of Life is also mentioned by Moses, David and John. See Howel's Account of this Book in his History of the Bible. V. also Isai. iv. 3.

After describing the Downfall of the Turks, Daniel seems to predict the Conversion and Return
turn of the Jews. This will, probably, coincide with, or be one of the Effects of the Battle of the great Day of God Almighty mentioned by John, or of that proclaimed by the Angel in the Sun, in case the former Battle comprehends not the latter. This Affair of the Jews will, probably, be a signal Event, accomplished at once, and not done by slow Degrees. Compare Lock, Taylor, and Whiston with Hammond on Romans. Others have of late wrote on this Subject. Then Daniel proceeds to describe a Resurrection.

Antiochus Epiphanes is not here prophesied of; for this Prophecy is said to be borrowed from the Scripture of Truth. Now the Scripture of Truth chiefly predicted Christ's two Comings, especially as Sir Isaac observes, the latter. Antiochus Epiphanes was but obscurely spoken of by any other Prophet. That in Zachariah, thought to be spoken of him, is said by many to have been written after Daniel. The last Destruction of Jerusalem was also only obscurely hinted at, and therefore the present Prophecy cannot be well called a Commentary on the Scripture of Truth, if it speaks only of Titus's War. This Argument may, indeed, be evaded, by saying, that the Destruction of Jerusalem extended to the End; that is, to the second Coming of Christ.
See my Notes on the seventy Weeks; where I consider an Objection of Sir Isaac's, against the common Interpretations of that Prophecy. This Evasion, you will, however, I believe, acknowledge to be a very poor one. You may, indeed, think it possible, that these Affairs may be added to the Prophecy concerning Christ.

The miserable Destruction of Jerusalem is expressed in much the same Terms by Christ, not, probably, because Christ thought it to be predicted here, but because the Terribleness of it resembled what is here described. See also Jerem. xxx. 7. If, however, upon the account of Christ's and Daniel's Use of the same Phrase, and the Duration of the last Jewish War, which might agree, perhaps, with Verses 7, 11, and 12. you should suspect that Daniel speaks here of the Destruction of Jerusalem, and joins it with the Day of the Lord, as Christ evidently does, making the former typical of the latter: Then you must suppose that Daniel returns, from the Destruction of the Turks, to the Times of the Roman Arms standing up, and casting down the Sanctuary of Truth. But this Interpretation is highly improbable; because the present Prophecy is a Commentary upon the Vision of the Ram and He-goat, which extends to the cleansing
cleansing of the Sanctuary, and mentions it. Consider also the following Notes.

Observe, that Christ himself speaks, at least in Types, of the terrible Wars and dangerous Deceits of the Antichristians. Esdras also mentions those troublesome Times.

V. 7. Neither the Jewish War, nor the desolating Times of Antiochus, are described here; for John uses this solemn Way of describing the Destruction of Antichrist by the coming of our Lord, and finishing the Mystery according to Promise. There the Angel swears, that God will put an End to such Abominations; and that Times or Things done in Time, shall be no more. In the Days of the Voice of the seventh Angel shall be finished the Mystery foretold by the Prophets. Kau, there is an Expletive, or signifies then; and this Criticism reflects a Light upon other Texts at present ill-rendered. But this by the by. Does not John there point at the great Mystery spoken of here by Daniel in particular, seeing he uses Daniel's Stile.

The Power of the Antichristian Kingdom shall continue for a Time, Times and a half, i.e. 1260 Years. Daniel told us before, that Nebuchadnezzar should continue in a State of Folly and Brutality seven Times, i.e. seven Years.
So also John explains the Phrase. If you do not read Mede on Daniel's and John's Numbers, you will not only miss of many Curiosities, but will be unable to see the whole Force of Sir Isaac's Arguments, for the Truth of his new Interpretation. For the Word, Time and Phrase, Time, Times and a Half, you have other Meanings, in Tillinghast, Hayter, and the Universal History. You may compare them with Sir Isaac's Explanation.

V. 8. As Daniel here professes, that he understood not his own Prophecy, we may conclude, that he knew not, when the little Horn should begin to reign; and possibly also doubted about the way of computing, mentioned in the preceding Verse. Jesus himself, as I observed before, seems not to have understood the prophetic Numbers: for, though he should have erred with respect to Daniel's desolating Abomina- tion, (which, however, is improbable) yet if he had known, that a Day in those Prophecies signifies a Year; this would have prevented his contracting the Duration of the World. The End, even in the common Way of interpreting Daniel, was not to come until 2300 Years after Antiochus Epiphanes.

Note
Note on Note: When I wrote those Papers, I imagined with Mr. Lock and others, that Christ and his Apostles contracted the Duration of the World. I now find evidently, that Christ and his Apostles made no Mistake in this Matter. Christ, indeed, faith, he knew not the very Day and Hour; yet he knew many Events must precede, which required a long time. When Christ faith, he will soon come, he imitates the old Prophets, who called the whole Age of the Messiah his coming. He calleth, particularly, any signal Deliverance or Conquest, his coming, and this also in the Stile of the Old Testament; where such Things are called God's appearing, or Visitations. Where the last Day is expressly said to approach, you must explain it with Peter, and call it a short Space, compared with the Eternity of God. By the by, Peter there seemeth to allude to the Jewish Tradition concerning the Duration of the World. Since, faith he, the whole Millenium is called a Day of the Lord, his coming may not be very near, though by him said to approach. When he had said in a former Epistle, that the End of all Things was at hand, he recollected that this might be mista...
Ghost, and cutting off by temporal Death, are
called his Coming and Commencement of the
Kingdom of God, and of Heaven. The old Pro-
phets, I said, often speak of the whole Age of
the Messiah as his coming, not distinguishing the
two remarkable Advents. Mal. Chap. last, is an
Instance. And this obscure way of speaking
was not understood by many Jews, and there-
fore they believed not in Christ; they not being
able to distinguish the last Advent from the first,
nor knowing the Events peculiar to each. Christ
and his Apostles often spoke in the same manner.
So Christ seemingly joins the Destruction of
Jerusalem with the last Day, calling both his
Coming. Peter may well be supposed to do the
same, where he says, the End of all Things ap-
proacheth. The Destruction of the Jews is pe-
culiarly called his coming, and described as the
Day of Judgment, because it commenced God's
severe Punishment on unbelieving Sinners, con-
tained a Proof, that such Punishment would, at
the last Day, be general, and was attended with
a Deliverance of the Elect, and a great Acce-
sion to the Church, Christ's Kingdom. Christ,
therefore, not only describes it as the last Day,
but takes occasion also to foretell, that the last
eminent Day approached (and that, doubtless,
for the Reason given by Peter) and seemeth to
join
join the Destruction of Jerusalem with the last Judgment, in Imitation, as I said, of the old Prophets. Peter seemeth to make the Transfiguration of Christ an Argument for both first and second Comings of Christ, calling both one Coming; though he immediately restraineth the Phrase to his second Coming; of which, faith he, Prophecy is a stronger and more permanent Proof, at least to such as were not Witnesses, than the transient Voice in the Mount. I find many great Difficulties in Scripture to be easily solved, by observing this Stile of the Writers. Paul as well as Peter expressed himself dubiously in 1 Thess. on this Head; and in 2 Thess. he also obviates Mistakes. In Rev. xix. 6. the Destruction of Babylon is called Christ's beginning to reign; and in that Prophecy it is often said, The Time is at Hand, and Christ approacheth; for the Reasons mentioned. My last Note on Revelations has more on this Subject. See also Taylor on Romans; though he misapprehends some Texts in this Affair. Surely Christ, even exalted, would not err in this Point. In Rev., he says, I come quickly. So the Angel says, in Esdras, That the End of the World was near. The Angel there points at the End of the Jewish Age or Dispensation.

Note
Note on Note. Whiston on the Revel. and
Lock and others, make gross Mistakes in this
Matter. See Lowth on the Inspiration of the
Scriptures.

V. 7, 12. Sir Isaac has not attempted to ex-
plain these Verses; but why I cannot tell. You
may see Mede's Attempt, who dated the Number
of Days here mentioned from Antiochus Epipha-
nes. I observed before, that some Jews fixed
the Time of the coming of the Messiah, by
computing so many Years from this Antiochus.
The History of the Mistakes the Jews com-
mitted in these Matters, is very curious. By
the by, Kidder, in his Demonstration of the
Messiah, invited them to publish, in Latin, their
Reasons for disbelieving Christ; yet I do not
find, that their Writings of that Kind, are very
numerous. Consult Mede's curious Note; and
try whether his Arguments are not valid, when
he says, that Days are put for Years here, as
well as elsewhere in Daniel. The Papists make
Antichrist reign, during only the Number of
Days here mentioned; which are to be succeed-
ed by happy Times. They are under the same
Delusion, with respect to Antichrist, that the
Jews are under, with relation to the Messiah.
The short Duration, which the Papists give to
Antichrist
Antichrist was; besides the Improbability of it, scarce worth mentioning so often, as they think it to be in Scripture. But if what is objected to Papists be true, their own Apostacy was a Thing of Consequence, and therefore might be expected to be circumstantially revealed. You find the Events of the Jewish Church constantly predicted, and that often to a Year, and once to a Day: And would God leave the Christian Church, without sufficient Notice of a most tedious and dangerous Apostacy? Will it be possible, as I said in a former Note, for Antichrist to deceive even Papists (which as they hint he will do) for three Years and a half, especially when, according to Papists, such plain and frequent Warning has been given? Will God then relinquish his Church, and not work Miracles, in Opposition to those of Antichrist, which must surely, if successful, be surprising and notorious? Such Absurdities follow from the Papish Notion of Antichrist. When Antichrist will deceive, will he not, probably, attempt it, as Rome does; for to deceive so grossly, and yet effectually, by any other means, seems impossible.

Some, as I observed before, may think the Duration of the last Jewish War to be here pointed at. Others take both Numbers of Days here
here mentioned to denote precisely the Times of Antiochus's afflicting the Jews. Whether History is conformable to this last Opinion, I cannot well tell, thro' Defect of Books. This Scheme makes Daniel return to the Time of the Roman Arms opposing Antiochus. But why should Daniel express either this, or the last Jewish War again? It is true, that other Prophets use Types, and sometimes prophesy of many Things at once, making one the Tyre of another. But it does not seem probable, that Daniel uses Types, and Days he elsewhere puts for Years. Such a Construction, as would make Antiochus to be mentioned here, would make the whole Prophecy confused and disorderly, and indeed make a great Part of it, for ever, somewhat ambiguous; so as that its Accomplishment could not be well proved. Now it seems probable, that God has contrived every Prophecy, so as that, when fulfilled, we may be morally certain, that it is so. These Verses seem to me to be the only ones that cast a Cloud on Sir Isaac's Interpretation. Indeed, in Case the Days of Antiochus should be here mentioned, it is more reasonable to make them typical of so many Years of Antichrist, or rather a Type of Antichrist's Persecution in general, than to explain them in any other manner. I will give you
you what Hints I can, in my Scarcity of Books, for unriddling those Verses.

Have the Jews been tampering with those Numbers?

Has any Copy such Numbers, as reach from the Abomination set up by Titus, or Adrian, to the Times of destroying Antichrist, mentioned by John, or of cleansing the Sanctuary, mentioned by Daniel? I find no various Readings here.

Antiochus's Times are said by many to be the Time, Times, and half, spoken of a little before; and why are not those Days, in the Text, exactly the same?

The Jewish War lasted three Years and a half, and might appear to some, as typical of the prophetic Years of the Reign of Antichrist: And why, you may say, may not the Days of Antiochus's afflicting the Jews be also a Type?

I will now give you an Explication of those Verses, which once pleased me. Computing from the Abomination set up by Adrian (for the Words Desolation and Cessation of Sacrifice seemed to point at Adrian) the End of the 1290 Years will perhaps fall on the Time of the Convocation, assembled at London, against the Followers of Wickliff; who were, at that Time, exceeding numerous, and grown very dangerous to the papal Interest. And the 1335 Years will perhaps agree
agree to the Time of the Invention of Printing, or the Time of printing the first Bible. Blainville, in his Book of Travels, and others have endeavoured to ascertain the Time of the Invention of Printing. According to this Interpretation, the Time is shewn, when the Wise Woman is to begin to understand rightly, what is meant by Antichrist. This Scheme once seemed plausible to me, but not so at present, for two Reasons: First, I find Daniel elsewhere, and Christ in the Gospels, rather pointing at Titus, than Marian, when the Abomination of Desolation is mentioned. Secondly, It would be difficult ever to prove, with a proper Degree of Conviction, that my Explication is right, because the Time of the Invention of printing cannot be exactly settled. The Time of the Duration of the last Jewish War cannot be probably, meant here, because, also, its certain Number of Days cannot perhaps be ascertained, or are not those of the Text. I observed before, that no Explication can be good, which is not capable of being tolerably well proved. God, probably, gave his Prophecies in such a Way, as that some time or another, the Knowledge of their Accomplishment would amount to a moral Certainty. The Time of first print-
ing the Bible, in case it could be known, seems not sufficient enough to be pointed at.

Note on Note. I now find that Whiston on the Revel. has an Interpretation of those Days not unlike mine.

Here they, who explain those Verses, concerning Antiochus Epiphanes, have the Advantage, in case that they can plainly prove, that his Persecutions lasted so many Days.

I once thought of taking this Abomination for the Antichristian Kingdom set up at Rome, or for that of Mahomet (the Greek Church being much spoken of by Daniel) but I now reject such an Hypothesis.

When you read the Universal History, it will make you doubt of Sir Isaac's Interpretation, in those Places where he denies Antiochus Epiphanes to be mentioned, even as a Type; for in that History, the Craft of the King, who sets up the Abomination, and most of the Things, which Daniel, according to Newton, ascribes to the Anti-christian King, are wonderfully applied to Antiochus. Yet I have a strong Suspicion, that, if you use Diligence, and get a sufficient Number of Histories, you will be able to explain the Days here mentioned in the Text, without having Recourse to a Type.
Why Daniel says not here Weeks or Years, I have shewn in Note on Chap. viii. 14.

Note on Note. Many of these Notes are erroneous in some Particulars, yet I have suffered them to remain in the Copy. This Chapter, I flatter myself, I have clearly explained in my Appendix, whither I refer you.

V. 13. Daniel is put in mind of Mortality. Mede thinks the Custom of Priests officiating by Lot to be here alluded to. He therefore probably thought that Daniel would have his Lot in the first Resurrection. In the Chapter of prophetic Language Sir Isaac makes a Resurrection to signify the Revival of a dissolved Dominion; but perhaps he points at some other Prophecy, and not that of John. And tho' he should point at the first Resurrection in Revelations, yet might he not hold such a figurative Explanation as not very certain? But I shall say a little more of the first Resurrection in the Appendix. In the mean time observe, that they who deny a first Resurrection will probably say, that no unconditional Promise of a Place in the first Resurrection was ever before or since given to any Man, it being a Prerogative of the last Saints in the Opinion of the Millenarians. The Millenarians may indeed evade this Argument thus:
thus: *Daniel* shall have his Lot in the first or second Resurrection, according to his Desert.

Some may interpret thus: You shall rise to Glory, or Contempt, according to your Desert. But it seems rather meant, that as he now went away, and died, so he should have another Lot, that of rising and appearing again. This seems to me to be the best Interpretation. See also my Appendix concerning this Chapter on the first Resurrection.

The End of the First Part.
OBSERVATIONS
ON THE
APOCALYPSE of JOHN.
OBSERVATIONS, &c.

CHAP. i. 2.

SOME will have it, that John here mentions his Gospel, and consequently that it was written before the Apocalypse; which is contrary to Sir Isaac's Opinion. But the Testimony of Jesus may be the Spirit of Prophecy, as it is called in Chap. xix. 10. and whether by the Word of God Christ be meant, or rather his Doctrine, (as probably it should be understood in V. 9. and Ch. vi. 9.) yet there is no Necessity for understanding this Expression of John concerning his written Gospel. I say his written Gospel, because tho' John should point at his bearing Record of Christ's Actions and Words whilst upon Earth, and not meerly of what he saw in the present prophetical Vision, yet where is the Occasion to imagine, that he here intended more than his verbal Testimony? See Chap. xx. 4. Besides, tho' John should have written his Gospel before his present Work, yet Sir Isaac's other Arguments, together with Hammond's, seem unanswerable, for the Writ-
ing the *Apocalypse* so early as the Time of Nero.
If *Jerusalem* had been destroyed, this signal Af-
fair would probably have been here mentioned,
as a Warning to the Church. Indeed *John’s*
Mention of *Antipas* is a strong Objec\ion;-
where see my Note.

Note on Note. Hayter endeavours to prove
that *Hammond* erred, as to the Time of writing
the *Apocalypse*. I know not whether Sir *Isaac*
saw this Piece. The newest Writers are, I be-
lieve, of Hayter’s Opinion.

V. 3. The Blessing is chiefly on those who
keep the Words, for otherwise the Article would,
probably, be repeated before τοιοούσιοι. Such
Idiom is common. Among many Places, see
the following. In Ch. ii. 20. interpret as if it
was said, in teaching to seduce my Servants.
Try whether the Phrase, return and build, in
*Daniel*, means to rebuild. In 2 *Peter* iii. 12.
you should perhaps translate thus: Expecting in
a Hurry, or with hasty Preparation. Σπενθε, I
find, indeed, sometimes to be rendered, affects,
and we are desired to love the Appearing of
Christ, but the Terribleness of it there expressed
seems to forbid such a Version. In *Matt.* v. 19.
the Curfe is laid chiefly on teaching to deny the
least Commandment. This Criticism extends
to Nouns. See a future Note on Spirit and Bride. Blessed are they, who, when they read, keep the Words.

V. 8. Observe, that, admitting Dr. Clark's Demonstration of the Existence of God to be true, (which the best Metaphysicians deny,) yet it is absurd to say, that God necessarily exists, or exists by Necessity. Such an Expression can have no Meaning, except one of these three: That Necessity made him from all Eternity; or that nothing can annihilate him; or, lastly, (provided Clark's Argument be good,) that he exists necessarily with respect to us, i.e. that we must necessarily believe his Existence. But the Doctor meant none of these Things. I wonder so great a Reasoner should so far neglect Locke's Advice, as never to define his Terms, either when treating of the present Subject, or when laying down the prima Regula Morum. I would not, however, be thought to reject all demonstrative Arguments for the Being of a God. All that I contend for is, that it seems improper to say, that God necessarily exists, in any other Sense, than in the two last Senses I have given. I had a Manuscript of Hobbeson the Moralist's, on this Subject, which, for any Thing I know, may have been printed. Clark proceeds
proceeds farther, even so far as to infer the Unity of the Deity from the same Argument; but Hucbenson seems justly to deny the Inference, at the same Time not denying the Force of other Arguments for this Unity.

V. 7. Every Eye see him. καί may perhaps be best rendered yea, or even. See the Family Commentary, where you have a Criticism on καί, in ii. 24. See καί τα, in v. 13. Unless, πάρεμ, be a living Creature, and, πάρεμ, include the inanimate; which probably it does not. Observe also καί in xvi. 14.

V. 10. On the first Day of the seventh Month, Christ appears in the Form of the High-Priest, trimming the Lamps. This Affair is alluded to by the sending seven Epistles to the Churches of Asia, which illuminated the primitive Church. See Hammond on the seven Churches, both here and in his Notes on John's Epistles. This will be of great Use.

The seven Amarcholim of the Temple are alluded to in the seven Angels. Observe also, that the Jews had their Angel of the Synagogue. We find Angels acting the Part of Priests in the ensuing Prophecy.

The
The High-Priest wore his Girdle about the Papa, but others about the Loins.

Chap. ii. 1. Whether these Epistles are prophetical, I mean so as that the seven Churches are made typical of the successive States of the whole Church, is much disputed; tho' to me it appears highly probable that they are so. At the same time, I do not conceive, that it will affect the general Scheme, to look upon them as merely descriptive of those Things which then were. But may not the Things, which then were, be confined so as only to express the Appearance of Christ in the Temple, the Description of those Nations and People of whom he is about to prophecy, with the several Emblems? See Chap. iv. 1. And if you will extend the Expression to the State of the seven Churches, why may not that State be represented in such a Manner and Order as to become prophetic? Is it probable, that John would send them this Prophecy, along with a tedious and tautological Admonition, and not rather with an Epitome of the prophetical History of the Church Catholic, by Way of Prevention of Apostacy? Besides, can any one imagine, that this was really the present Condition of the seven Churches, and that it only accidentally agrees with the several...
veral successive States of the Church? The ten Years Persecution of Dioclesian is also here expressly mentioned, and why should the other Persecutions be omitted, unless Smyrna represents the whole Church? Indeed, I confess it possible, that this Persecution of Dioclesian (for John alludes to it, as he often does to something in the future Prophecy) may be put figuratively for any other great Calamity. You may also possibly thus explain the Hour of Temptation, mentioned in the Epistle to Philadelphia. The following Observation must, I think, be granted, that the Epistles cannot be prophetical of the seven Churches, unless the seven Churches represent the whole Church: for is their general Fate, or are their several Fates here described? Sir Isaac tells us, that only two of these Churches are represented in a State of Persecution, namely, Smyrna and Philadelphia; and yet the Church of Ephesus is said to labour, or, at least, to have laboured. Indeed the Church was often severely handled, especially by Decius; and yet she was in a tolerable State of outward Prosperity at the Commencement of the great Persecution of Dioclesian; which the Heathens boasted to have quite extirpated the Christian Superstition. See Sir Isaac's Quotation from Eusebius. The Church was, at the Time mentioned, in worldly Prosperity,
Prosperity, and began to quit her first Love; for which she is here reproved, and finally spewed out of Christ's Mouth. Sir Isaac observes Smyrna and Philadelphia to be alone prais'd. John speaks not of their other Perfections, but of their patient Suffering alone. Does John overlook their other Failings, on the Account of this one great Virtue, or was the Church also less erroneous in that Period mentioned by Sir Isaac? The Apostles eradicated many Heresies before their Death, and the Judaizers, the principal Heretics, were daily destroyed by the Romans along with the Jews. They shall proceed no farther, says Paul, tho' indeed we have found, that the same Heresies, or others very like them, have since revived, and universally prevailed. See Hammond's Notes on Judaizers. Brightman built on a wrong Criticism; for which see Hammond here. See my Note on iv. r. I insist not on the Phrase so often repeated here, He who hath an Ear, let him hear what the Spirit faith, as if a mysterious Prophecy was intended. See also xiii. 9. Άκουε, some may think, signifies, in both these Places, Obedience, or perhaps understanding the figurative Descriptions of present Things, and the figurative conditional Threatenings and Promises. Consult a Commentary often by me referred
referred to. I collected these Hints in order to
detect whether these Epistles are prophetical; and
tho' written with little Connection, they
may be of Service to the Reader. If I make
any farther Discovery, I will communicate it in
the Appendix.

V. 7. The Expressions in these Epistles gene-
 rally allude to something in the succeeding Pro-
 phecies; and it would answer valuable Purposes
to make a Collection of such Parallellisms. Even
the hidden Manna perhaps alludes to the Food
of the Woman in the Wilderness. See ωομαινε, in vii. 17. In Verse 9, he says, Jews for
Christians, as in the future Prophecy. Com-
pare Verses 14, 15, 20. with xiv. 4, 5. I have
seen no Author who takes Notice of ουτος, in
xxi. 7. Observe there the Article before ουτος.
He shall be as the Son (Christ). This is often
said by John. They shall be Kings and Priests
(as Christ) he says in i. 6. In ii. 27. he says,
the Saints shall rule (as Christ) with a Rod of
Iron. In iii. 20, 21. they shall, in some Sort,
be equal with Christ, and sit on his Throne.
So the Christian Emperor is said to ascend to
God's Throne, and to rule with an Iron Scep-
ter. The Witnesses ascend, as Christ, in a
Cloud. In the Millennium, the Saints sit on
Thrones,
Thrones, and reign, as Aſſeſſors, with Chriſt. Paul also speaks in this Stile. We ſhall, says he, judge or govern Angels. This partly com-
mences before the great Day of Judgment, and even before the Millennium, for the Kingdom of Chriſt is partly come. The Aſſo-
cles judged and commanded evil Spirits. Chriſt gave them all Power before his Departure, calls God their God as well as his own, and said he would no longer call them meer Servants but Friends; that he bequeathed to them a Kingdom, that they ſhould, when they had received the Power from on high, begin to ſit on Thrones, and judge and govern the twelve Tribes of Iſrael. In 1 Cor. xii. 12. Chriſt includes the Church. In Gal. iii. the singular Number is used, as by John, because it is there ſaid, that thro’ Chriſt we become Sons, and are in Union with him, the Head. The Spirit of Chriſt in our Hearts makes us one with him.

V. 10. The Time of the Martyrdom of Antipas, if rightly recorded, makes Sir Iſaac’s Ac-
count of the Time of writing this Book doubt-
ful. Whifton on Josephus makes Antipater to be Greek for Antipas. There might be many of theſe Name. They who wrote Martyro-
logies, thinking John was not in Patmos so early
as Sir Isaac thinks, might therefore fix the Martyrdom of Antipas too late, in order to make it seem fresh in John's Mind, and much affecting him. Or the Transcribers of Martyrologies might alter the Date of his Martyrdom for the same Reason. It seems absurd to think, that John prophesies of him here. Yet as the Epistle seem'd to be prophetical, why may not even Antipas be prophesied of? See the Family Commentary before referred to. Hayter's Arguments should be perused on this Affair. One of them is indeed ridiculous, and will appear so to any Reader. I shall not repeat it, because it is better that you should consult Hayter himself. John knew the State of the seven Churches by Hear-say or Vision, and describes it. Yet John, acted by the Spirit, may recite the particular State of each Church, in such an Order, as to represent the Fate of the Church catholic. These unconnected Hints may be of some Use, until we make better Discoveries.

Note on Note. Antipas is not, probably, prophesied of; for after John's writing this, at the Time pitched upon by Hammond, Persecutions became so great and common, that his Martyrdom would be no Rarity, and consequently would not be alone predicted. Besides, such a Prophecy of his Name would make the Time of John's
John's Writing quite uncertain, as he hints not that it is a Prophecy; and this might cause a greater Obscurity in some Things in the Revelations than God probably intended. See the Appendix.

Hammond will tell you, why this Place is called the Throne of Satan.

V. 17. The Lamb will feed them with this hidden Manna. See Chap. vii. 17, and xix. 9. The new Name is also hidden. So are the Song of the Saints, and the seven Thunders. The Name of Christ, tho' shewn in Writing, is said to be known to himself alone. See Note on Chap. x. 3. and xiv. 3.

Observe, that the new Name implies a new Dignity; as you will find both in the New Testament and Old.

The White Stone is well explained by Hammond. One would be almost tempted to think, that there was a religious Symbol of this Sort.

V. 24. Consider John's Stile. These Men call such Opinions, the Depths of Philosophy, and Depths of God, but I call them the Depths of Satan. Christ, who searches the Reins and Heart, expects not from them Vows of Celibacy, nor any other popish external Professions of Sanctity.
Sanctity. But perhaps the following Interpretation is better: The Council of Jerusalem professed to lay no other Burthen on the converted Gentiles, than such necessary Things as, abstaining from Meats offered to Idols, Fornication, &c. Now some subtilized in these Particulars, and ate such Meats, knowing them to be so offered, and giving Offence. They also encouraged Celibacy; which led to Fornication; a Crime much practised among the Heathens, principally at such Festivals. Christ therefore assures them, that he sees thro' their Dissimulation; and since his Yoke was easy, and his Burthen light, will severely punish them for their Idolatry and Fornication. Now this Species of Idolatry may be put for that of Worshipping Christian Images, and the Celibacy taught in John's Time, for the professed Celibacy of the future Church. See Chap. xiv. 5. and my Note on Daniel xi. 36. John, as well as Paul, describes the Apostacy, as begun early. Paul says, it should receive a Check; yet it was to revive. The Errors here described by John, and those described by Paul, gave Rise to a resembling grand Apostacy.

Chap. iii. 4, 5. These Garments are mentioned by Esdras, and so are the Crowns. The Saints shall be both Kings and Priests. The Jewish
Jewish Priests, as well as Kings, wore Crowns. See the Universal History.

Note on Note. See Whiston on the Revelations, concerning these Crowns. Observe the Word Pillar. So Paul desires Timothy to consider himself as a Pillar, or designed for a Pillar, in the House of God. For surely he does not call the Church, both House of God and Pillar. Paul elsewhere calls Apostles, Pillars; and such Way of speaking was frequent among the Jews. I flatter myself, that, in another Work, I shall fully prove this Interpretation of Paul in Timothy. But this by the by.

For the Hereticks, who said they were Jews, yet were not; try Hammond's Interpretation. Such as Hammond mentions, would tell some Christians, that they were of their Party, and so would be easily detected: What Sense can you give to this Verse, in Hammond's Way? John rather means, that they professed themselves to be Christians, and yet were not. Such may, as a Type, denote future Hereticks resembling them. They were of the Devil; which Phrase, in Scripture, frequently denotes Idolaters.

Some may chuse to explain, the open Door, of a promised Deliverance, or a new Supply of Grace; but Sir Isaac is perhaps right; for here is everywhere an Allusion to the Phrases in the suc-
succeeding Prophecy. Christ has the Keys. He makes them Pillars. Hence Sir Isaac calls the Witnesses two Pillars. In the next Prophecy they are seen in the Temple. Tho' Opening to let them out of Danger, or Prison, be meant, yet why may not also an Admission into the Temple be afterwards expressed? See Door of Faith in Acts xiv. 27. It seems probable, that, an open Door, denotes a Liberty of Ingress, and not of Egress. Search the Concordance.

Note on Note. May open Door, in Col. iv 3. express Egress of the Word, alluding to his present Bonds?

V. 12. This, some may think, alludes to the ancient Inscriptions on Pillars. There was one in Patmos.

Where this Church is said to have a little Strength, some may be for understanding it, of spiritual Strength. In Chap. iii. 2. the Church of Sardis is desired to strengthen or confirm those Things (yet compare the Greek) which were ready to dye; which they may allege, shews John's Train of Ideas at this Time. Christ, therefore, according to these Men, only means, that the Church of Philadelphia, now in Distress, adhered to him pretty well, making Abatements for human Frailty. But if you will understand the
the Words of outward Strength, then paraphrase the Place thus: Thou hast but very little outward Prosperity or small Power, and yet has kept my Word. See last, καθιστήμου, in Verse 1. This latter Interpretation is to be preferred, because, only, is very often understood, in the sacred Writers. See δυναμιν, in xvii. 13.

V. 14. I imagined at first, from John's Use elsewhere of αὐτοῦ, with a Genitive, that it here meant, the first Thing created. Yet this Interpretation may be wrong, though it should be true, that Christ was a created Being. Whatever Title Christ assumes in the Superinscription of each Epistle, it always alludes to something said in that Epistle. His having the Key, may happen to extend to the Door of the Temple. See ἀλονσίω, in ii. 1. and 5. See dead, and yet liveth, in ii. 8. and, Death, there in 10, 11. See, Sword, in ii. 12. and in 16. The fiery Eyes, in ii. 18. are explained in 23, by seeing and killing; and perhaps even suggested the Use of the Word, Morning-Star, below. Christ's Anger is expressed by fiery Eyes, and Legs like Fire. This, by the by, helps to make me think, that Anger is expressed in xv. 2. by Fire. In xix. 12. Anger is plainly expressed by fiery Eyes. The Word Spirit, in iii. 1. and the Word
Word Star, denote Christ’s Penetration and Purity afterwards mentioned. So, the Title, ἀγγελικά, here, seems to signify, that tho’ Christ was the chief of the Creation, and its Head, yet Saints should be taken into a Sort of Equality with him, as is said in Verses 20, 21. First-born of every Creature. I find one interpret that in Paul, agreeable to my Conjecture here. One existing before, and surpassing every Thing created by God. John saith not ἀγγελικά, as in Chap. i. 5. and therefore means something else. See also, ἀγγέλω, elsewhere in Revel. I had collected many other Hints for explaining ἀγγέλω, but do chuse, upon revising these Papers, to determine nothing. Yet, as to the Doctrine of what is called the Trinity, I will venture to give my Opinion; and do imagine, I have something new to say on the Subject. Though Christ should be a created Being (which seems to be the Truth) yet he was, probably, created from Eternity. No Being is, properly speaking, born of God, but Christ; because God’s Spirit dwelleth in him without Measure; and there is a compleat Resemblance, upon that account, as between Father and Son. The Holy Spirit seemeth also to be created from Eternity, sed medianti Filio; and therefore is not, properly, a Son, tho’ equal to God, as God’s Spirit is fully trans-
transmitted to him by Christ, through whom God created all Things. Believers are, indeed, frequently called Sons of God, because the Spirit is given to them (for in Generation, a Substance and Likeness are communicated) yet it dwelleth not compleatly in Men: Compare Rom. viii. 11. with Col. ii. 9. They are not Sons in that high Sense, in which Christ is said to be such. Neither are they derived immediately from God, as Christ is, but through the Agency of Christ. Christ is not God, merely as Moses to Aaron, nor as Magistrates, nor as Angels, but as one, in whom the Fullness of God dwelleth; as one from Eternity constituted in the Form of God; as one with whom God was (compare Acts x. 38. with Acts vii. 9.) as one born before, and surpassing every Creature (his Creation alone being worthy of the Name of a Birth;) and as one, who is one Thing, Nature or Substance with God, by means of God's Inhabitation. Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, are not said directly in John's Gospel, x. 30. nor in his 1 Ep. v. 7. to be one Thing by Agreement, as \textit{eipai}, signifies, in 1 Cor. iii. 8. but to be one Substance, and therefore to agree in all Things; nay, so far as to give a single Testimony. So the Apostles and Believers in general were to be one Thing or Body,
Body, by Christ's one Spirit in them, and therefore to agree in Love and Doctrine. In Col. Heb. Phil. and elsewhere, it was intended to say the highest Things possible of Christ; and why was it not said at once, that he was what the Moderns call him? The Jewish Converts took him for the Shechinah, or Temple of God. The first ill-instructed Hereticks might not know his eternal Generation, or pre-existent State, and compleat Union with God, and therefore deny them such Heresies the Apostles may have wrote against, but seem not to have asserted the modern Doctrine, for that would have immediately met with the strongest Opposition; and, if true, would have been religiously guarded by the Apostles, and delivered without Ambiguity. Where Christ is said to be exalted, at his Resurrection, it may not mean, that he then received any Addition to his Power; but that it was then to all proclaimed, that God was in him, and to be worshipped in him; for in Scripture I find the Phrase, to be made, often put for, known to be made. Yet there is another Explanation of this Promotion. See Notes on ii. 17. xix. 12. xxii. 8, 9. I have not drawn out this Note as distinctly as it should be, but the Learned will not be at a Loss to see my Arguments. If I find that they, with some others,
which I shall give hereafter, are thought insufficient by the Protestant Churches, I will recant; for I have the highest Opinion of their Abilities.

V. 15. He alludes to the Marriage-Supper of the Lamb in the next Prophecy. The Metaphor is continued thus: When I vouchsafe to sup with you, I expect better Entertainment than lukewarm and nauseous Things.

Render not sonna, I stood; for I knock, not knocked, follows. It is one of the Verbs which are used as, novi, in Latin.

Some may imagine the Name Christ to be here alluded to; but if intended, it would be more plainly expressed.

Laodicea had enriched herself with fine black Wool, but is here counselled to choose white.

Chap. iv. 1. See Mede and the Universal History on the Use of Trumpets among the Jews. Some tell us, that this Verse proves the seven Epistles not to be prophetical. You have meta tauta twice in this Verse. You had it before in i. 19. May it not be meant that future Things would be shewn here as well as before? See the English Margin in Daniel ii. 45. and the Greek in John xiii. 7.

The Appearance of the Deity, in this beautiful Drama, is very surprizingly, and, I believe, truly
truly explained by Sir Isaac. At first Sight, his Interpretation appears a little whimsical. But you must observe, that a prophetical Dream, or Vision, is only an Impression on the Imagination, along with the Prophet's certain Apprehension of its supernatural Origin, (tho' indeed this latter Part may perhaps happen sometimes to be left for other Proofs,) and that it frequently resembles a common Dream, or Reverie, in this Particular, that such Images will arise in the Fancy as the Prophet has been lately conversant with, or such as have made a strong Impression. Consider also, that a Painter, if not confined to a Face, will draw one, not of a foreign Nation, but such as he has been accustomed to, and this undesignedly. For the same Reason, you must not think it ridiculous, when Sir Isaac imagines the two Witnesses to be represented by the two Legs of the Angel. This is also one Reason why the Prophets so very often use one another's Words. It is natural to use such Expressions as we are accustomed to hear or read. Thus we find the Greeks, on all Occasions, using Homer's Expressions. Preachers, who read the Scriptures, are prone to fall into a Scripture-Stile. We find most of the sacred Writers alluding to Words and Phrases of their Predecessors; which is very natural,
natural, as they read little else. They very often allude to them, where very good Commentators see it not. There is indeed, sometimes, another Cause of this Agreement in Words found in the Prophets. They did it in order to prove their Mission, by thus pointing more directly to Passages in other Prophets foretelling the same Events. One Mark of a Prophet was, his harmonizing with the rest; and therefore this may be one Reason why the false ones are said by Jeremy to steal Words from their Neighbours. This last Remark is only conjectural, for I have not consulted Commentators there. It appears from what I have been saying, that the Deists must not allege that those, whom we call true Prophets, were Impostors, and used such ambiguous Expressions as had before successfully deceived the World. These Things I hope to treat of another Time with greater Accuracy.

The seven Lamps represent the seven Spirits of God sent forth into all the Earth. We were also told before, that they denoted the Bishops of the seven Churches. Again, the seven Spirits are seven Angels attending upon God; or are the one Spirit of God; or rather are meant of both. The Spirits before the Throne are represented in Scripture by various Numbers, which are always evidently accommodated to other Numbers.
bers mentioned in these several Places. Thus in Zecchariah there are in one Place four Spirits in the Heavens; in another, two anointed ones; and in a third, seven Eyes of the Lord. The Notion of seven Angels in Tobit, here also probably alluded to by John, may be borrowed from the seven Counsellors of the King, mentioned in Ezra and Esther. This Way of adapting Numbers is used by John on other Occasions. The fourth Part of the Earth is afflicted by the fourth Horseman; and thus the Whole was afflicted, each of the Horsemen afflicting his Quarter. Or the fourth Part was afflicted by the four Plagues of Ezekiel there mention'd. Consider also the Number of the Sealed, the Measures of the new Jerusalem, and the three Frogs.

V. 6. The four Beasts stand East, West, South and North. Sir Isaac tells us, they represented the Standards of Israel. Howel, in his History of the Bible, places Seraphin in the Tabernacle. Whiston on Josephus speaks of four Cherubims in the Holy of Holies. Josephus, I think, denies that the Jews had such Standards. Had the Pharisees abolished them? or says he only, they should not have such? or that the Jews worshipped them not? I have not now his Writings, nor can find some Remarks I made on
on that Passage. The Cherubims guarding Eden are Angels, and Ezekiel's four Cherubims act the Part of Angels. Might the Cherubims primarily represent the Standards of Israel, and by Custom the Angels? Tho' the Angels might be primarily called Cherubims, yet were the Temple-Cherubims formed so as to represent the Jewish People; the Temple being typical of Heaven? Perhaps the Standards of Israel were decorated with angelic Forms. John seems to me to make them represent both Angels and People; as the seven Lamps signify seven Bishops, seven Spirits, and the one Spirit of God. I do not know any Scripture-Proof for Sir Isaac's Opinion concerning the Beasts; but consider, that there are many Things relating to the Jewish Antiquities omitted in the Bible. Perhaps indeed Ch. xxxiii. 17. of Deuteronomy may be applicable to this Purpose. There is mention elsewhere of Ephraim's being chastised as a Bullock. John, I confess, distinguishes them from the People in Chap. vii. 9. but he may confine the Name to the chief Priests, or make the Beasts act a separate Part, only to give a greater Variety and Dignity to the Vision. Where the Beasts give the Vials, or Drink-Offerings, to the Angels, are the Angels Levites, or the Beasts chief Priests, or the People in
in general, for a Reason given in the *Family Commentary* on the *New Testament*? or are they an higher Order of Angels? or because described as nearest God by the other Prophets, so also are they in *Revelations* described as his more immediate Ministers? Some imagine the *Egyptians* worshipped Animals, because they had successfully used their Images for Standards. Others may think they carried the Images of their Gods in order to procure Victory. See the *Universal History*. Now if it be fact that they used such Standards, perhaps the Calf was the Chief, which the *Hebrews* called *Cherub*, as some may think appears from *Ezekiel*, in one of his Descriptions of those Animals. The Name might be afterwards transferred to Images of other superior Beings, or to other Sorts of Standards. For the Etymology of the Word *Serpent*, see the *Universal History*, where treating of the Fall and Fiery Serpents in the Wilderness. See also a Piece called *Moses and Aaron*. Does it appear from *Ezekiel*, that there were different Forms of these Animals in the Temple, or are the Emblems in his new Temple prophetical and not literal? If you consider what I said before on Prophecy, it would seem probable, that the Prophets took their Descriptions from what was visible in the Temple, as *Moses* imitated the Cherubim
Cherubim which he saw in the Mount. Some think the Seraphim were seen rather than the Cherubim by Isaiah, because of God's fiery Zeal there expressed. This may be true, but a better Reason may be taken from the different Genius of Authors. Ezekiel seems, like Homer, to have had a Fondness for Mechanics, and therefore saw more complicated Figures. He also was a Priest, and so might be accustomed to see such Animals. Perhaps these Memorandums may help some Person to give us a better Account of the Cherubim and Seraphim. I wrote these Hints in a careless disorderly Way, and some of them, perhaps, with little Foundation. You will find more Hints in some future Notes.

Note on Note. Read what follows along with all that I say on this Subject. I have since seen a Scheme of the seven Heavens in Whiston's Memoirs; which speaks of seven Angels, or rather Archangels; of their offering our Prayers; of Angels bringing Answers to Archangels; and of the Prince of the Air. If the Jews held such Notions, perhaps John meaneth to express the same. The Angels are also described, both in the Old and New Testament, as present in Christian Assemblies. According to this Scheme we see who the seven Spirits before the Throne are; who he is who offereth the Incense; and why
why the Vial is poured into the Air, yet not excluding my Interpretation of that Vial. The Devils are called in Ephesians Inhabitants of the heavenly Places, alluding to a former Passage, where the Devil was called Prince of the Air. In this Scheme of Whiston, two Cherubim, and two Seraphim are placed in the Holy of Holies; by whom, probably, the highest Orders of Angels are denoted. Perhaps the sealing Angel may not be Christ, but one deputed by him, or his Representative, as also the High Priest was; and comes or ascends from the East, to the Temple built on high, with an Information of an intended Invasion from that Quarter. So also elsewhere, the Angels are said by John to fly in the Air, with Errands and Proclamations. In Chap. i. 4. the Holy Ghost may be omitted, as in John's 2 Ep. i. 3. and elsewhere; unless the Holy Ghost may be obscurely mentioned, as acting in the seven Spirits or Angels. An Angel may offer our Prayers, as well as an earthly Priest. The Jews spoke of an Angel of Prayer. Yet the offering Angel, in John, seems to be a Type of Christ. I shall say no more on the four Beasts, but only endeavour to remove one Difficulty, in case they are Angels, or represent not the People; I mean their Redemption mentioned. In Colossians, Paul, after mentioning
ing the Angels in Heaven, adds, that Christ, by his Cross, reconciled all Things, in Heaven, and Earth; and the Meaning cannot be, that he reconciled the good Angels to sinful Men, by giving them a better Opinion of Men. He only seems to mean, that he reconciled to God all who were reconciled, i.e. the Saints in Light before-mentioned, and those on Earth, both Church militant and triumphant. He might express himself with a seeming Carelessness, because he imagined, none would think Angels to be so great Sinners, as to make a crucified Redeemer necessary. John also might express himself, with less Caution for the same Reason. Nay, upon second Thoughts, I find, that the Beasts are not said by John to be redeemed; for parallel Grammar may be easily shewn to prove it. Add that the Angels have not such a Song in the same Chapter. See my Appendix. There newly is published a Piece, on the Cherubim, but I have not seen it.

Concerning the Word, ram, you have many Opinions in the Universal History.

V. 8. Some think, that the Seraphim, in Isaiah, repeat the Word, Holy, thrice, in order to honour the Trinity. But this Notion is whimsical, seeing every Author gives some Hint
to prove his Allusions. Sir Isaac’s Interpretation may please; yet it was perhaps a Jewish Custom to repeat, Holy, thrice, for a Reason which may be conjectured. The Sealed, in Ch. vii. serve God Day and Night, i. e. at the Morning and Evening-Sacrifice. The Phrase, indeed, even in John, sometimes signifies, continually, but probably not here. Hammond places a Comma after, Six Wings. Have any objected to his Opinion? Prostration, was both a Christian and Jewish Custom, V. i. Cor. xiv. 25.

V. 11. It is not here asserted, that God acts with a View to himself; and tho’ it may be true, that the Deity does pursue a private Gratification, as other Texts, in the Opinion of some may prove, yet it appears highly probable, that this private Pleasure results from Beauty and Glory alone. Now these Pursuits can never counteract his kind Intentions, and infinite στοιχεῖα towards his Creatures; because a World contrived for our good is as beautiful as any other Contrivance, and will also bring him a greater and truer Glory. This Remark is of the highest Consequence to us, and you may have these Things more fully explained by Hucheson, in his Treatise on Beauty, and other Works.
The Sentiment is common in *Paul*. See *Phil.* ii. 13. In *James* i. 18. Good-will is meant. See Dr. Clark's Version of δίκα, Hammond's Index for δίκα, and the Greek in 2 *Peter* iii. 12. ii. 2. It seems to me to differ little from δίκα δικαίος, by reason of thy Will. Upon the account of it. Say not, for the sake of thy Pleasure, least a Reader should suspect, that Selfishness or Caprice was intended. Thou art worthy, because, &c.


οὐδὲν, is ill translated. No Person, not even an Angel merited to be Head of the Church, and consequently to give a Spirit of Prophecy. Some think the Phrase, Lion of *Judah* took its Rise from *Judah*'s Standard before-mentioned. *Esdras* calls Christ the Lion.

Note on Note. *Lee* on *Esdras* says, the Lion, there is not Christ.

V. 8. See *Lowman* on these Censers or Cups. This is the Royal and holy Priesthood of *Peter*, and alludes to the Kingdom of Priests mentioned in *Exodus*. *Thou hast made us Kings and Priests*, E 3

The Lambs being said to be worthy of Riches is a trifling Proof of a temporal Reign in the Millennium. Riches, is put for, Prosperity. See Chap. ii. 9.

Ch. vi. 1. Thunder is the Voice of a Cloud, and a (darkening) Cloud implies a Multitude. Is it not then very natural to make the People, on the Eastern Side, represented by the first Beast, to desire John to look on.

Tho' it should be allowed, that the Beasts do not signify the People, yet I do not apprehend, that it will make any Change in Sir Isaac's Explication of the Horfemen; provided you make the Position of the Beasts to be such as I before described. Now the Voice from the Throne, in the midst of the four Beasts, and John's Description of their Situation, make it evident, that they stood, E. W. S. N. A Voice from the Throne is elsewhere mentioned; and the Cherubims speak not in V. 6. Consider also the Situation of the Temple, that of the Oxen under the Molten Sea, John's New Jerusalem, his four Winds, and Zecchariab's four Horfemen. I have not indeed consulted Commentators on Zecchariab's Horfemen. It is certain also, that the
the Standards of Israel had such a Position. Ezekiel's Cherubims, as described by Sir Isaac, are not here to be forgotten. We before saw Priests called Angels, and will find Angels acting as Priests in the Temple, in future Chapters. Yet if you imagine the Beasts not to represent the People, but an higher Order of Angels, worshipping as the Jews asserted, along with Men in the Temple, I shall not contend much, as I said before, provided the Position of the Horsemen be accounted for from that of the Beasts. Lowman's four Horsemen might, perhaps, with a little Management, be accommodated to any Kingdom. Sir Isaac proves the Position of the Beasts from iv. 6.

Mede, says Sir Isaac, has well explained the first four Seals, Dynasties, or Horsemen, excepting that he would rather continue the third to the End of the Reign of the three Gordians, and Philip the Arabian; and begin the fourth with the Reign of Decius, and continue it to Dioclesian. Mede makes the first Horseman to be Christ, because he rides on a white Horse, at the End of the Prophecy. Add, that the Arrows of Christ are mentioned in the Psalms, and also his riding prosperously. But are not the Horsemen acted by the Dragon or old Serpent? and do not they all carry the Name of Blasphemy?
phemy? How then can Christ be the first Head? You may say, indeed, that Christ, at this Time, assisted the Romans, in conquering the Jews his Enemies, and that this Affair was sometimes called even the Coming of Christ. But is it not more probable, that the first Horseman denotes all the Emperors before the second Horseman, or particularly those who immediately after the Vision destroyed Jerusalem? The Julian Family boasted, that it was descended from an Eastern Prince. Vespasian indeed was not born in the East, but was in the East, when encouraged to assume the Imperial Diadem. If indeed you imagine, that John wrote the Apocalypse in the Time of Domitian, then Domitian, one of this Eastern Family, as I may call it, seems to be the first Horseman. The Bow was chiefly used in the East. The Whiteness of this Horse, if it be any thing more than a Mark of Splendor and Prosperity, may denote the great Virtues of these Conquerors of Jerusalem. White Horses were chosen for Triumphs. The Blackness of the third Horse denotes not Wickedness. Domitian was famous for the Bow. See next Note.

V. 5. Finding great Difficulties in explaining the Horsemen, I wrote the following Hints without
without any Order: Oil and Wine were scarce, and therefore not to be injured. They were not to be hurted, least they should be scarce. Kæ, may signify but; and the Meaning may be, though Grain will be scarce, yet I give no Commission to the third Horseman to hurt the Oil and Wine. Can Lowman's Account of this Horseman be accommodated to Sir Isaac's general Scheme? See the Bishop of Clogher on Prophecy, and the Family-Commentary on New Testament. Severus built Granaries (the first remarkable Thing of the Sort in Rome) in order to prevent a future Famine, and caused the Oil to be laid up in Store-houses, at a vast Expence. If a Famine alone was pointed at, the particular Price of Grain would scarcely be mentioned, any more than in other Prophets. Severus probably found a Famine, when made Emperor, and it is here described with his building of Granaries. Hayter contends, that Plenty is here described. See him in two Places, where he is very critical, and perhaps was never confuted. See Henry More, who throws great Light on Mede here, and in many other Places. Barley was apparently not very scarce. Prices were fixed on Provisions, in order to prevent Frauds, and produce Plenty. Many Authors think Plenty to be here mentioned. If there was a Famine
Famine in the beginning of Severus's Reign, or during his whole Reign, the Blackness of the Horse may denote both it, and an African Extraction. The black Horses of Africa were in great Request. Are the Roman Emperors represented by Limners, on Horses of different Colours? Is it possible, that the Birth-places of all these Emperors should not be pointed at? Nerva was not born, East of Rome. Are some other Marks sometimes given them, in order to distinguish the Times of their Reigns? See Gill's Sermon. Christ is the first Horseman. So in sixth Seal, he brings Judgment on the Empire. He conquers gradually. At first he has a Crown, then a Golden Crown, and at last many Diadems. He is not considered as one of the Heads of the Beast, but as over-ruling them all. The Empire is called a Dragon and Beast, only because generally persecuting and idolatrous. Perhaps the foreign Extraction of some of the Emperors is taken Notice of, in order to shew how Christ began to weaken the Empire. I have not Time to inquire, whether the Horsemen in Zech. denote not Angels settling the Affairs of Empires, as well as Emperors themselves. Consider, in third Seal, both Measure and Ballance. Did the Jews or Romans ordinarily weigh Bread? Eating Bread by Weight denotes
(83)

denotes Famine in Ezekiel, and one might think Ezekiel was in John's Mind, because he proceeds to mention Ezekiel's Plagues. Why does Ezekiel express Famine by, weighing Bread? Why, I said, is also a Measure here mentioned? Tho' Famine should be pointed at, why not also the Justice of Severus, and his wise Regulations? He seems evidently to be pointed at, though the Birth-Places of none of the Emperors should be described. May we therefore partly adopt Lowman's Interpretation? Does the Word τραγων, prove that Judgments were expressed under each Head; and is consequently Famine denoted, in third Seal? This will not follow; because in first Seal, though the Conquest of the Romans should be denoted, yet also Christ's afflicting Heathenism, and breaking its Power is also expressed: And this Remark I thus apply to the third Seal. Tho' Justice and Plenty should be pointed at, yet Christ still persists in overturning Heathenism. Add that a Famine found at the beginning of Severus's Reign, may be considered as an Affliction. Also before this Seal is finished, the Empire might suffer many Calamities. You must allow, that in second Seal also, the Empire is weakened and damaged, tho' the Jews are destroyed.

Note on Note. Whilst I thus laboured to remove Difficulties, I got Whiston on the Revel. which
which gave me much Satisfaction. I then added the following Hints. In the first Seal, Whiston seems to have expressed himself a little confusedly. He seems to me to make both Christ, and the Flavian Family to be denoted. I find by two of Whiston's Quotations, that Severus found Bread scarce; yet I hardly think both Famine and Justice to be pointed at, but Justice and Plenty, without preceding Famine. Quære. As to duus, Mede and he are mistaken, for John always uses it with an Accusative, for hurting, or damaging a Thing. The Objection mentioned in Whiston may be removed by xiv. 14. and my Note on the Difference between ὀρθανος and διαθεμα. I shall add no more, because I think, the reading Whiston, and my foregoing Notes will prove Sir Isaac's Interpretation of the Horsemen.

V. 8. If you are not willing to admit, Beasts of the Earth to denote Invaders or Rebels, you may understand them to be literal Beasts, which generally abound, during such Depopulations. See Mede on ἐνατος. Beasts of the Earth, is an Old Testament Phrase. Ἀποκτεινον ἐν θησεις, is not perhaps an usual Phrase, or elegant, and therefore avoided. If αὐτοι, be the right Reading, it refers to, Death, and Hades. The Carelessness shewn
shown in transcribing this Verse, and \( \tau \tau \alpha \upsilon \tau \rho \), found twice so very near, make me suspect, that, \( \tau \tau \rho \), should be read for \( \tau \tau \alpha \upsilon \tau \rho \), where applied to the Earth: and if so, the Note on iv. 5. is here useless, and also the Note on xii. 4. I have not leisure to examine the *Family-Commentary* here, which seems, on my slight Reading it, to differ from my Interpretation.

V. 9. Sir Isaac observes, that the succeeding Parts of the Empire could not conveniently be represented by Horsemens. See *Mede*. Lowman cites *Hammond* to prove, that the whole Scene of the Vision was the Place of the Altar of Incense; and yet he himself describes the Angel, as standing at the Altar of Burnt-offerings, in viii. 5. Do I misapprehend *John*, or those Writers? The *Family Commentary* takes no notice of *Hammond's* Opinion. If I remember, the Papists make a Handle of this Place; and if so, the Protestants doubtless are copious in their Answers. *That John* prophesies of Altars built on Graves of Martyrs, is quite improbable. *Paul* says, his Blood was about to be offered by pouring out; and elsewhere he says, poured on the Sacrifice: But in 1 Cor. he denies himself, or any Man, to suffer for Men, in the Sense, that Jesus did, and so not to merit
a Headship over the Church. By the by, as the Socinians are there confuted, so also are the Papists, not only in making the Virgin suffer for Sinners, but also in asserting that Popes, are Heads of the Church. Was Paul (or will he, or any Man be) crucified for you? Is Christ divided? Is his Dower divided, or are there more Heads of the Church than one, especially discordant Heads? Peter is there denied to be Head of the Church. Jesus alone was sinless, and obedient to his Father, even unto Death. He therefore alone was a proper Sacrifice. He proved, in his Person, that Man, by the Aid of God's Spirit, might be so far reclaimed, as to be forgiven with Safety to the whole, and without encouraging a future Violation of God's Law. As Adam proved all Men to be sinful, so Christ proved a Possibility of their Amendment. He alone offered himself by Compact with the Father, and by a direct Commandment. As he was the best and most beloved of God's Creatures, his Suffering was fitter, than that of any other, to shew God's Indignation against Sin. The Death of such a Being was sufficient to make Atonement, and answer every Purpose better, than the Death of a God. See Hucheson the Moralist on Justice, who alone teaches
teaches us to speak—and reason on these Subjects. See my Appendix.

V. 11. I need not tell you, that white Garments were worn by Jewish Priests, Singers and Nobles. V. Ezek. ix. and Dan. Note also, that at the Close of the Feast of Expiation, the Jews dressed themselves in white, or at least put on clean Cloths.

12. You have not any Reason to think, that the Day of Judgment is here described. See Joel ii. 10. If. x. 4, and xiii. 2. and other Places. The Lamb's Wrath. He is here over-turning the Heathen Religion, and advancing his own to the Imperial Throne.

Chap. vii. 1. The four Winds are the barbarous Nations, who had began to invade the Empire, but were restrained, during the Reign of Theodosius.

The High Priest comes at this Time from the Eastern Part of the Temple. Or did the High Priest then going to pray, or going to cast the Lots ascend from the Eastern Part of the Temple? See Ezek. on the Eastern Gate of the Temple. Sir Isaac says, the High Priest read the Law, on the Day of Expiation, at an Eastern
May more Reasons than one have given Rise to the Expression?

The Jews were said, on the Day of Expiation, to be written in the Book of Life, and sealed, as Sir Isaac observes. Esdras speaks of the Number sealed, in the Feast of the Lord, and afterwards of those shut up in the sealed Book. Quære, Whether the Jews sealed the Beasts destined for Sacrifice, as the Egyptians did? Hammond, in his Notes on Eph. faith, that Servants of old were sealed in the Forehead, or some other Part of the Body. Whiston says, when Hands were laid on after Baptism, in order to confer the Spirit, it was called, Sealing. It is probable, indeed, that the Imposition of Hands, mentioned in Heb. was such Confirmation; and the Spirit is often called the Seal of the Saints, and even of Christ himself. Yet it is more probable, that my first Reason, for this Allusion in John, is best, or at least principally intended.

Read what Mede says about John's way of numbering the Tribes. See also the Family-Commentary. Dan. is also omitted in the Chronicles; one Reason of which, some say, was their Idolatry. However that may be, it seems to be the Reason here, and the Objection found in
in the Commentary mentioned is trifling. You now see, why Papists, and, if I remember, Jews say, that Antichrist is a Son of a Whore, and of the Tribe of Dan.

V. 9. Observe that, tho' in Jesus's Time on Earth, few were saved, i. e. as some explain it, entered into the Way of Life, yet that in the End of the World, or last Day of the Feast of Tabernacles, there will be an innumerable Company of the Converted or Saved. That the Number, which John saw sealed, were literal Jews, and that the Multitude afterwards mentioned were Gentiles I see no Argument to prove. If the Prophecy was clearer, it would become Felo de se; so that you must not stagger at Sir Isaac's Interpretation here. You may consult the Family-Commentary here. It brings no Arguments against Sir Isaac's general Scheme, as far as I could learn by a cursory Reading; but gives you many other Opinions, without subscribing to any. This Way of proceeding will make some suspect, that the Learned saw no great Force in Sir Isaac's reasoning on these Matters; but it has another Effect upon me, by making me conclude, that the Learned had little to oppose to Sir Isaac. This Phrase, the sealed Jews has much Difficulty in it, yet I believe I shall
shall give you Satisfaction in the Point, in my Note on First-Fruits to the Lamb, and in my Appendix.

Note on Note. In the mean Time, see Garret on the Reasons, why they are called Jews. See also Whiston on the Revel. The old Prophets, whom John comments on, call Christians, Jews. Observe, that besides the Multitude sealed or saved, there are also Myriads of Myriads of happy Angels; of which Remark take particular Notice; for Antichrist has infected all Christendom with mean Notions of the Deity. It is generally believed, that there is some superfine Thing called, Goodness, which is different from Benevolence. Laying this rotten Foundation, they build on it this Absurdity, that God may be good, though he did not all the Good possible. Marcus Antoninus, Leibnitz, My Lord Shaftesbury and Hucheson, should be consulted on this Subject.

On perusing these Papers, I thought proper to add what follows. The Sealed may not all obtain eternal Life, but are of the true Religion, or Way of Life. Many of them may be also slain, but it is for their Advantage. See 1 Pet. iii. 13, 14. Christ promised, and the Apostles mention it, that, in the Jewish Wars, the Elect should be preserved, and they are desired then to lift up their Heads. Yet bad Christians perished, and
and probably also some good Ones were cut off, and taken away, as the Prophet expresses it, from Evils to come. This at least is certain, that many suffered as Martyrs. Apply all this to the Sealed in John. So also Antichristians in great Numbers escaped those temporal Judgments, and even Damnation, though they professed a Religion, which is the Way of Death.

Whether it is here, or any way in Scripture asserted, that any are predestinated to eternal Life, I shall not now inquire. If this be here implied, or included in the Word, Sealing, then only some of the Sealed were thus predestinated, and the rest only united with such Elect against Rome. For surely it is not meant, that they should all be actually saved, who testified against Rome.

It appears probable, that Christ meant, that few would be saved, though Dr. Clark thinks otherwise; and also Hammond, if I remember. Some may think, Christ only speaks of Adults. Others, of the Age, wherein he lived. He complained, say some, of few then embracing the Gospel, called by way of Eminence the Way of Life. But Esdras says roundly, few shall be saved, and yet he says, God loves his Creatures, more than one Man can love another. Esdras's Words cannot, I think, be confined to the
the Salvation of few of his Countrymen. Neither do I think Christ's Words can be explained otherwise than as I said. It indeed seems implied in John, that, in the Millennium, the Numbers of the Saved would considerably increase.

Hammond's Explanation of ωτηρία, seems to be confuted by xix. 1. Why may we not wish for the Continuance of God's Happiness? Have we no benevolent Desire towards God, but barely a Delight in thinking of his Happiness? By the By, Why may we not pray for the Continuance, or even Increase of the Joys of Saints departed, though little doubted of? Indeed the Purgatory invented by Papists is dismal, and seems repugnant to the Gospel-Scheme. When they are pinched by our Arguments, they make the Pains of Purgatory little more than a Pæna Mora, or Delay of Reward, until Christ comes. They also then describe Limbos Patrum et Infantum, as tolerable States; such as some Protestants assign to good Heathens. But, at other Times, they speak in another Strain. That Anxiety belongs to many departed Saints, as uncertain about their Salvation, seems contrary to Scripture, tho' indeed a Pæna Mora may be granted. Their present Ease in a future State, and even their final Salvation may, I think, be prayed for,
for, and be partly effected by the Prayers of the Church. Saints are made eternally happy, partly in order to diffuse Joy among other Saints, and to prevent their Grief. You may compare Humphrys's Collection of Fragments with Sherlock on Death, concerning these Matters.

Note on Note. I now find  to signify, the Glory of saving us. So, Root of David, signifies, one partaking of, belonging to, or springing from that Root. See Root of Jesse, in Rom. xv. 12. Power on her Head because of the inspecting Angels, means what belongs to Power, a Badge of Authority. Christ says to Peter, For my Part, I say unto thee, thou art, or shall be called, Rock, or Peter (not a Rock) because thou hast a rocky Faith, because rocky Faith belongs to thee, because thou partakest of the Nature of a Rock, or because thou hast a rocky Principle, and on such a Principle I will build, &c. At that particular Time, it was difficult to believe in Christ, but the Father had revealed it to Peter. See also John vi. 68, 69. therefore, by a Scripture-idiom, may mean, what belongs to our Salvation. By the by, Peter's doubting afterwards will not overthrow what I say here of him. The Virgin Mary, Christ's Brethren, John the Baptist, and all the Apostles doubted sometimes in many Particulars,
ficulars, if not in all. This doubting I will account for, in another Work. In John xvii. 6, 7, 8. you find the other Apostles once strongly believed, and yet they afterwards doubted.

The Beasts are here distinguished from the People, as I observed before. They are, at the same Time, distinguished from the Angels and Elders. Here the People begin the Worship before the rest, and the Beasts and Elders are nearer the Throne than the Angels. This may serve for an Answer to one of Lowman’s Objections against Sir Isaac’s Notion of the Beasts. V. also xix. 1.

Note on Note. I have since considered Josephus’s Words, and know not how Sir Isaac could have confuted him. There were no Images on the Jewish Standard, in Josephus’s Days. Were not the Cherubims in the Temple so constructed, as to be emblematical of Israel? The Temple resembled Heaven, and is so called by John. Could it happen merely by Chance, that such Figures may be accommodated to the People of Israel, in Sir Isaac’s Way? Is it possible, that these Things should prove, that John sometimes points at the People of Israel, when he mentions those Beasts? I suspect it to be otherwise, though many others are of Sir Isaac’s Opi-
Opinion. Are the Cherubim pointed at in that Psalm, which Mede cites?

The Jews took the Feast of Tabernacles to be typical. It might not only be in token of Joy, but because of their looking on that Feast as typical, that they carried Palms before Christ, and said, *Blessed is he, who cometh,* &c. which Words were quoted from a Psalm, foretelling principally the second Coming of Christ. Christ tells them, they should soon cease to see him, until the Time, when they should say, *Blessed is he, who cometh,* &c. Esdras also mentions the Palm-bearers, crowned by Christ on Mount Sion. Zechariah calls the Day of Redemption, that is, the Age of the Messiah, but chiefly the latter Period of it, by the Name of the Feast of Tabernacles; for he can scarcely mean, that even this long-neglected Feast should be afterwards observed; as I may shew elsewhere. See also a Piece called, *Moses and Aaron,* where this Feast is proved to be typical. See also an English Piece, called *Stricturae Lucis.*


The Blessed will be grieved for the Damned; for as Christ tells us, in *Matt.* v. 45. and vii. 7. the
the Goodness of God himself, and consequently of Saints departed, is the same with what Men call, Goodness. See James i. 5, 13, 17. and observe the Connection there. Now Goodness is nothing else, but public Affection. The Trouble of the Saints in Light will, notwithstanding, be inconsiderable, and almost drown'd in Joy, if I may so speak; and this Joy will in a great Measure arise from seeing Happiness predominant in the Universe, not indeed infinite in Quantity, for that is impossible, but prepollent in Intenseness, and infinite in Duration. If they could feel Joy in another State of Things, they would not be good. There is no Consolation, nor Ground of Hope for any Man, if this Doctrine of the Prevalency of Pleasure among our Fellow-creatures, and the Notion of Goodness here delivered be not true, if Happiness was not prepollent even in this World, why should that be said, which you find in Acts xiv. 17? Plutarch exhorts to undertake the Affairs of the Commonwealth, because, says he, the Gods themselves delight in nothing else. There cannot be two infinitely perfect Beings, and therefore all created Beings must now, and hereafter, be deficient in Happiness. By the by, they must also be deficient in Goodness, though arrived
arrived to a Pitch of Virtue called, Innocence. See Hucheson's Works.

Note on Note. I confess it is possible, that the Saints departed may have their Natures so altered, that Uneasiness may not attend their Desires, as it generally, if not always, attends ours. Their Natures may also be so far changed, as not to desire what cannot be obtained; as we often do. Hucheson did not chuse to define Desire by, Uneasiness, as some have done.

Chap. viii. 1. See my Note on Revelation xx. 3.

Do not the Words, in the Angels Hand, and, before God, prove, that this was the High Priest? Consider John's concise and obscure Stile elsewhere, and perhaps you will not wonder, that the Holy of Holies is not expressed. Consult the newest Accounts of the Golden Altar, and Place of the Golden Censer, and when used. As the High Priest is not here represented in a pompous Dress, as elsewhere, this may be due to the plain Dress of the High Priest, when he entered the Holy of Holies. Some criticise on the Word ἀλαξία, as if it signified another Sort of Person, but whether justly, I know not. See Zech. Chap. ii. and iii. See Rev. xiv. 14, 15, 19, and vii. 2. In x. 1.
Christ is called an Angel. You may try Low-man, and the Family-Commentary. Why may not Christ be here represented as High Priest, as well as in x. 1?

Perhaps the Custom of the Jews, waving the Palm-branches towards the four Winds, partly suggested the Image of Wars from the four Winds.

For the Phrase, Burning Mountain, See Jer. li. 25.

Note on Note. See the Rev. Mr. Newton on the Word Mountain, in the Prophet quoted; and on the Word Sea, there also used. See also another Text quoted by him, wherein the Word Sea is used. Apply this to another Note, where I speak of the Trade of Old and New Babylon.

V. 10. Esdras mentions the third Trumpet, and therefore may be imagined, to point at the Fall of the Roman Empire; which paved the Way for the Appearance of Antichrist. Then, says he, the World shall be turned topsy-turvy, and Iniquity shall abound. The Man of Sin may be thought to be the Person there said, not to be looked for. If this Interpretation of Esdras should be just, it might make many think, that he had read the Apocalypse. Yet who can readily believe, that the seven Trumpets were
of old revealed to him, in the same order as to John, whilst the third alone is mentioned? But by the third Trumpet, Esdras may mean the last; for the Jews founded their Trumpets thrice, in their Temple-worship, and therefore the third may be the last. I will give you another Conjecture. At the third Trumpet, the Jews locked the Doors, laid the Meat for the Sabbath on the Tables, &c. Now Esdras might call the Millenium the Sabbath. But this latter Exposition I like not. The Man not looked for, may be Christ himself, who was to surprize as a Thief in the End. This End may be his coming to destroy Jerusalem, or to judge the World, or both.

Note on Note. May there be Errors here in the Copy, or Version of Esdras? May the Man looked for, be the right Reading? May he mean, that after the third Watch in the Night, the Sun should be seen? Can it be admitted, that Antiochus Epiphanes is here spoken of? Or are he, the Romans, and Antichrist all spoken of together, as seems to be the Case in Daniel? May Esdras allude to the strange Phænomena said to happen before Antiochus afflicted the Jews, and also to those said to be fore-runners of Titus’s War against them? I heard that Whiston looked on Esdras as a true Prophet, which
which made me study Esdras; and before I publish this Work, I will endeavour to get Whiston, and then perhaps write something better on these Subjects. The Angel professes that he knew not, whether Esdras should live so long; which might make one think, Antiochus was prophesied of. But perhaps the Angel could not even expound the Prophecies concerning the Time of Christ's coming. The Angels look into such Things, with a Desire to unriddle them, is, I believe, what Peter means, where he speaks of the Obscurity of Prophecy relating to Christ.

V. 12. It is not here meant, that the Sun and Moon disappeared, for a third Part of their usual Time; but that they entirely ceased to appear to the third Part of the whole Scene of the Prophecy. "τουταρι", is understood before, την του την, or rather κατα. Sir Isaac seems to have made a little Miftake here. See also his Chap. of prophetic Language.

Thus the Effects of the four Winds are very naturally explained by Sir Isaac. One would imagine, that the Angel, coming from the East, had been there giving Orders to restrain the Eastern Wind; but I prefer another Interpretation. It seems still more improbable, that the Birthplace of Christ, or his Religion is pointed at.

Note
Note on Note. Upon a further perusal of these Papers, I find it difficult to assign the Reason, of the Angels being said to ascend from the East. Perhaps there are more Reasons than one. Whiston on Revel. Should be compared with Sir Isaac, concerning the four Winds.

V. 13. The 7th Verse of Chap. iv. seems to have caused here an Error in some Copies, and this is more probable, than that the Eagle, the Symbol of the Roman Empire here, laments. V. xiv. 6.

Chap. ix. 1. The Locusts are let out by a fallen Star. See Beverley, and consider, that the Article is wanting before, Star, and fallen. For the Star, which fell, in viii. 10. see Is. xiv. 12. The Angel here said to have the Key of the Abyss is doubtless the same who is called Angel of the Abyss below. See the Word Abyss, in Hammond’s Index, and elsewhere in Revel. Consult also the Homily of Josephus, with Whiston’s Notes. In Tobit, an Angel is bound in the Red Sea.

See the Collection of Lowman, concerning these Locusts. Read also that Passage in Nahum, Thy crowned are as the Locusts, with Meniochius’s Notes, and you will find complete Satisfaction; especially if you consider, that a Crown was the distinguishing Ornament
ment of great Courtiers in the East. John indeed points at the Head-dress of the Saracens. Howel also, in his History of the Bible, where he treats of the Plagues of Egypt, has a Quotation from Jerom, and another from Aldrovandus, very much to the purpose. See also Pliny, and the many printed Accounts of the Locusts, in the Years 1748 and 9. Great Armies, in Scripture, are often compared to Locusts, and some say those of Arabia, as the present Saracens were, are called Locusts in the Old Testament. The military Law of the Saracens forbidding to cut down Fruit-trees, is the same with Moses's Law; but I think it is not here pointed at, the Locusts being forbidden to hurt the very Grass. I look upon 4th and 11th Verses as designed for a Clue to the Prophecy, by acquainting us, that they are Men, who are here described; for that, if they were real Locusts, they would injure green Things, and would have no King. See Commentators on that Verse, Locusts have no King, yet go forth by Bands. The Stile is also frequent in Scripture, as where Paul says, I was not sent (principally) to baptise. They principally hurted Men. Their not killing Men, means what Lowman tells us, or rather the great Calamities of those Times, excluding frequently even the Benefit of Death. So one of the
Prophets use the Phrafe, of Men's wishing often in vain to die, in their Distress, where he expresseth the most deadly Calamities. The Word killing in 15, applied to Mahometans, confutes Lowman. It is scarcely meant, that they should not overturn the Christian Empire, and thus slay the third Part of Ten, as the Turks are said, in 15, to do; because Men are here said to wish for Death. Can it be meant, that they even wished to see the Empire destroyed, and themselves involved in its Ruin, but could not obtain their Wish? Beasts of the Earth, is a frequent Old Testament Phrase, and found elsewhere in John, and therefore Hammond's Criticism, on Verse 3, is wrong. The Sara en Way of invading, during eight Months at a Time, will not explain the five Months, tho' Lowman will have it so. It will not seem very strange to one who considers John's concise and designedly obscure Stile, that he did not say plainly, five Months, and other five Months. When they do invade, they continue five Months, and such Invasion may be repeated. Some perhaps will allege, that they hurted five Months with their Heads, and five with their Tails. That a false Religion is intended by the Stings in their Tails, can hardly be admitted, because the Phrase, of false Doctrine carrying a Sting
Sting in its Tail, seems unusual and strange. See another Interpretation, in Note on Verse 19. Mede treats very curiously on the Name Abaddon. Upon revising these Papers, I consulted the Family-Commentary, but found it has nothing on the Word Abaddon; tho' it may help to show, why the five Months are not repeated, in such a Way, as one would expect. See More on both these Points. See John's concise Stile in xvii. 15, and 17, with my Note there. Perhaps the Difficulty in the five Months was designed for a Veil over this Prophecy.

Note on Note. I find Whiston on Rev. gives much Satisfaction on the Difficulty in the five Months. In other Points I follow Sir Isaac. Whiston endeavours to prove, that the true Saints were not then hurted; but, probably, this was not intended to be expressed here. See my Note on those who were sealed, in order to preserve them from the four Winds. Paul in Tim. hopes with Confidence to be delivered from every evil Work, or Machination, tho' probably, he expected a violent Death.

V. 13. Do not be surprized, when Sir Isaac tells you, that the four Horns of the Golden Altar denote the Quadrangular Situation of the capital Cities of four Kingdoms. Such an Observation
ervation rather shews his Sagacity. Some may even imagine, the gilded Crescents of the Turks to be alluded to. If you will not allow the Altar to be typical of four Cities, then the Meaning may be, that a similar Voice came from each Horn of the Altar, directed to its corresponding Capital; the Situation of the four being quadrangular. So in the Acts, they cried, μάκαρον. When I consider this Note, I believe this is all that Sir Isaac meant.

The Angels were bound at, or upon the Banks of the great River Euphrates. See xxn, in xiii. 12, and elsewhere. See xx, with a Genitive, in V. 13.

An Angel denotes a Priest, and accordingly their Kings were Priests, until it was thought good Policy to create a Mufti. I only say this upon Memory, and, if a Mistake, it will not, probably, be difficult to shew another Reason, why they are called Angels. There may be an Allusion to the Angel, in Tobit, bound in the Red Sea.

Both Saracens and Turks were remarkable for Horse, in their Armies. Can he intend to express here the whole Number of Horse maintained by all the Mahometan Powers, though not brought into the Field at once? I had an anonymous Piece, which numbered those belonging to the
the Ottoman Empire. See Lowman. The Number of the Angels, in John, is not precise. He saith, he heard the Number of them, only because he learned it by a Voice; as he says of many other Things in this Book. Tho' he saith, he heard the Number of the Sealed, yet the Number is not precise. Perhaps, indeed, by Number, two, the two great Sects of Mahometans may be denoted; or two Races of Turkish Kings; or the Forces of Oub-arstan and Melechsebah. John puts a definite Number for an indefinite, in numbering the Angels.

Why not more plainly prepared for 391 Days? I answer, that perhaps the Prophet intended to express the Steps of these Conquests. In the first thirty Years, they conquered the Nations upon Euphrates. Melechsebah dies, and is succeeded by a little Child, and then the Kingdom breaks into four. Now the Hour, the Day, and the Month may perhaps signify the thirty Years-War, and the Time of the little Child. I have not any Turkish History, and therefore do only recommend to others an Inquiry into the Truth of this Conjecture. The thirty Years-War is expressively proved by Sir Isaac. Some will be apt to imagine, that the Years are here divided, only to let us know, that the Conquest of the Greek Empire should be effected
effected gradually by the Angels, who had been prepared for that purpose; and that the Degrees are, in the Prophecy, expressed by every Denomination of Time. If any one should like this Interpretation, though a very improbable one, yet he must, at the same Time, acknowledge the Sum total of the Hour, Day, Month, and Year to be agreeable to History, and that this was intended to be expressed. One Cause, doubtless, of expressing the Time thus, was to cause a necessary Obscurity. The Family-Commentary has various Readings, and Notes on this Chap. which you should see. Sir Isaac makes the Year of the same Extent, everywhere in Daniel and John. See Tillinghafter.

Note on Note. Whiston on the Revel. and in his Piece against Sir Isaac, on these Prophecies, differs from Sir Isaac here, but I believe the Learned will acknowledge Whiston to err.

V. 17. Read Mede and the Universal History, about the Cannon, employed in taking Constantinople. They were very remarkable and new to the World. Hayter’s Objection is trifling. See Mede, concerning, the Tails. Some may take them for those of the Cannon, and say, that they resemble Stings in Serpents Tails. Are the Horse-tails, or Tughes, described by Motraye, here
here meant? They had a Head like an Apple. The Story of the Amphipæna is held to be a Fable; and though it should be true, yet probably, was never heard of by John. Add that the Tails alone are compared to Serpents with one Head. Others may be for explaining those headed Tails of Algiers, Tunis, and Tripoli, with the other Dependents of the Porte; especially since those Places are hinted at in Daniel. The Tails may be described with Heads, only to make them look like Serpents, and consequently terrible. The Tails of the Locusts, armed with Stings, may also denote no more. See Note on xxii. 2. which, I think, best explains, why the Tails seem to be those of Horses, and yet are Cannon. They hiss like Serpents, and seem to spit Fire, Smoak, and Brimstone. The Smoak may be Charcoal. Why Salt-petre may be called Fire, you may perhaps be satisfied by reading Spectacle de la Nature. The Colour of the Jacynth is well known. The Smoak, Fire, and Brimstone seem in Vision, to proceed out of the Horses Mouths; and the Breast-plates of the Riders seem to be coloured with these Ingredients. You may try, whether such Interpretation is given by any. It seems new to me, and yet justifiable. Do the Words, Mouths like Lions, point at this Kingdom's Situation? See Dan.
Dan. and Revel. xiii. 2. The terrible Gaping of Lions seems alone to give Rise to the Expression. See Mede and More.

V. 20. When the third Part of Men was slain for Idolatry, the rest, i.e. the Latin Church would not take Warning, in order to prevent the overturning of the Western Empire; which, in John's Phrase, is slaying another third Part of Men. Their Sorceries, and not their Poisonings, are pointed at. See the Word in viii. 23. and elsewhere. The Antichristians are often denoted by such Phrases, as the Gentiles are by the old Prophets. They worship Devils, work false Miracles, or rather such as confirm a false Doctrine, teach Doctrines of Devils, and work Inchantments and Sorceries. Their Celibacy led to Fornication. Their Knavery and Thefts are sufficiently known, tho' England is called by the French, the Country of Robbers. The great Torrent of Vice has its Source in Rome; and nothing is more evident, than that Protestants are often led into great Crimes by Papists, either directly or indirectly. There are, doubtless, many other Causes of the Wickedness of Protestants. The best and most successful Argument of Papists, is England's Immorality, and therefore it should be remedied as far as possible.
possible. The first step to a Reformation should be the Removal of Papists. See also Markwick on the Word, Thefts.

Chap. x. 1. For the Rainbow, see iv. 3, and Ezek. i. 2. The Lion, and the Book you had before. You have also the Cloud, and the rest of the Description elsewhere. The Loudness of the Voice may perhaps be explained by one, who has been in a Jewish Synagogue.

The Roll is said to be little, by way of Decorum, John being to swallow it; or because, as you have seen, the whole History of the future Church was epitomized in it. See Note on xvi. 13. The Roll is now entirely opened, and ends with the 7th Trumpet and Thunder. It is not said, the Prophets foretold, the Mystery should be finished with the seventh Trumpet; but it is barely asserted, that this Mystery, predicted by the Prophets, should have an End. See Lowman in two Places, on the Word xvi., in Verse 7, for he err there. So Hammond on James ii. 4. knew not second xai, to signify, as often, elsewhere, then, or to be an Expletive. Then are ye become Judges, &c. By the by, Hammond partly rectified our common Version there, and in James iv. 15. by repeating, xai. The Earth and Sea, some may think, denote, besides the
the Molten Sea, and Ground of the House, the whole Scene of the Prophecy, the Fate of which is here described. Josephus says, that the Holy of Holies denoted, Heaven, and the rest, the Earth and Sea. See Note on xxii. 2.

Note on Note. Compare Josephus there with Whiston's Scheme of the seven Heavens.

What if the Voices of the seven Thunders were not written, because they contained plain Arguments against Popery? We are told afterwards, that others could not learn the Song of the Witnesses; which Words may signify, that others were so blinded, that they could not understand the Religion of Protestants. Indeed we have elsewhere a Thanksgiving Song of theirs. Nothing is more certain, than that many Things are obscurely treated of in Scripture, lest the Prophecies should disappoint themselves. Lowth and More give great Satisfaction in this Particular. Christ kept his Mother, in some respects, ignorant. It is said, that Mary pondered these Things in her Heart, and that she understood not some Speeches of his. When his Brethren said, he was beside himself, we find Mary going with them, to bring him home. It was, probable, this Affair of his Mother and Brethren, which made him say, A Prophet has no Honour among his own Kin, and in his own House.
House. It is said plainly elsewhere, that his Brethren believed not, and Christ tells them, they were of this evil World. Not only his Designs were sometimes concealed, but some of his Miracles were ordered to be kept secret, and others wrought privately, lest he should not be put to Death, or lest the Time or Manner of it should be altered. Some think, tho' indeed I believe not this, that the Name of the Beast was revealed to John, but that he was not suffered to divulge it. See a Quotation of Hammond's from one of the Fathers. Paul had acquainted the Thessalonians with the Time of the Rise of Antichrist, but would not commit it to Writing. Notwithstanding the Obscurity of these Prophecies, we are required to keep the Words of them, i.e. not only the general Precepts contained in them, but to beware of Antichrist, Idolatry, and Worship of Angels. The wise, i.e. the Religious had all along some Knowledge of the Meaning of these Prophecies. Daniel calls such Wise, and John makes it a Point of Wisdom, to know the Characteristics of the Wild-beast. A Man may firmly believe a Thing, and yet not be able to answer all Objections against it. The Objections drawn from Prophecies by the Papists are like those of the Jews against us. It is given for one Reason, to prove the Forgery of the Sybiline.
bylline Oracles, that they speak too plainly of Christ. But if there was no better Argument against them, they might be received; because, being delivered to Heathens only, they could not frustrate their own fulfilling. Christ seldom spoke so plainly, as to the Samaritans, concerning his being the Christ. The Prophecies are seldom obscure, except for the Reasons before alleged. This may serve for an Answer to a Defender of Bolingbroke, who objects the Plainness of Daniel's Prophecy, concerning Antiochus, a Heathen. Many Prophecies are, indeed, obscure, and are like a Candle in the Night, until Christ brings perfect Day-light; yet are of divine Original. And the Reason of their Obscurity is, the wise Appointment of God: for he, not the Prophets themselves, gave the Words of all Prophecies. By the by, tho' either Hammond's or Sir Isaac's Interpretation of that Place in Peter, may please at first Sight, yet neither agrees with Peter's Words. ἐκλυμένος, there signifies, wording, expressing, composing. By Prophecy, Peter means, the Subject-matter, which was not left to be explained in one's own, i.e. the Prophet's own Words. The Word, γνωται, found there, agrees with my Exposition; but I will elsewhere more fully prove my new Interpretation. God himself gave all the Words of
of Prophecies; or watched the Prophets Expressions, least they should use such, as answered not his own Purpose. The Prophets often understood not their own Prophecies.

I find that others before me took the Thunders for the Gospel. John calls the Voice of the first Animal, Thunder. In viii. 5. Voices and Thunder are joined together. See also xiv. 19. In xiv. 2. you find the same, with the Addition of the Word, Waters; and Waters, he elsewhere says, denote a Multitude: See xvi. 18. and particularly xix. 6. The Thunders, therefore, are plainly the Voices of the People, or Witnesses, in the new Temple, built at the Commencement of the seven Trumpets. They prophesy therein against Rome, and are not understood by Papists. See my Note on the new Name. Daniel says, the wicked Antichristians should not understand these Prophecies. V. also 2 Thessalonians ii. 12. on the Man of Sin. Seal up what is uttered by the Thunders. The Arguments against Popery shall not be made plainer. They are sufficiently plain to all well-inclined Men.

For the Phrase οὐχ ἔσται ἐτὸς ἡγεμόν, you have various Interpretations. See Lowman and Hammond. For my part, I like our common Version. See many Places in the Revelations for the Phrase
Phraſe οὐκ ἐσται εἰπ. John says not, ο οὐκ ἐσται, though he uses these Words elsewhere.

V. 9. If you like not Sir Isaac's Interpretation here, you may say, that John found the Book sweet, because of the Honour done to him, and the Hopes of satisfying his Curiosity, but was afterwards disgusted by a View of the great Apostacy. See Ezekiel iii. 1. and Jer. xv. 16, 19. which seem to prove my Interpretation.

You must prophesy, not before, but concerning People. See Hammond on xxii. So Hayter observes, that in xxii. 16. should be rendered, concerning, or with regard to the Churches.

Chap. xi. 1. Here you have something which will be very apt to create a Doubt about the Meaning of these Prophecies. The new Temple, at first Sight, appears to be built between the sixth and seventh Trumpets; but consider, that it was certainly built long before, at the very beginning of the Apostacy, and is so represented in the Commentary; where John mentions the Temple, representing the Tabernacle of the Testimony. Christ, therefore, after the six Trumpets, comes only to give John the Plan of another.
another Prophecy, concerning the Beasts and the Witnesses; which Witnesses, faith he, are to have a new Temple of their own, before the Trumpets have their Effect, and therein will prophesy against the Beast. Christ must not be supposed to tell John, that the new Temple should not be built, until after the actual fulfilling of the Plague of the 6th Trumpet. The seven Thunders, uttered also at this Time, prove this Interpretation. You will find John, in the next Prophecy, making various Representations of one Transaction, and therefore you may the less wonder, that the building of this new Temple should be synchronal to the sealing of the Witnesses, mentioned in Chap. vii. and denote one and the same Thing. Consider also, that the Anger of the Antichristian Gentiles, or Nations, mentioned at the Time of the seventh Trumpet could not be explained, without John's giving a previous Account of the Opposition made to the Saints by the ten-horned Beast. Thus, before the last Vial, there is a Preface, shewing the Opposition made by the Beast and Dragon, before Christ's coming.

Concerning the measuring of the new Temple, compare Mede, Lowman, the Author or Authors of the Family-Commentary, and others with Sir Isaac. Men measure in order to build, not to
The Word  in Verse 2, is but a slender Proof of Jerusalem's Destruction being alluded to, as past.

Josua and Zorobabel are alluded to, the two anointed ones, or Sons of Oil, who brought the Jews out of the literal Babylon, and built the new Temple. Both single Persons and Churches, are called Olive-trees in Scripture; and that, as Commentators say, for more Reasons than one. They are the two Olive-trees, which feed the Candlesticks by means of their Angels, Witnesses, or Pastors, and are themselves Candlesticks or Churches. These two Churches were pure, and illuminated others. The Papists tell you, that Enoch and Elias will come to denounce Judgments, and be themselves killed: but verily the Witnesses here mentioned are already come, and they have done, and will do unto them whatever they like. That Elias will come, they cannot prove, for the Restoration effected by Elias, was John Baptist's commencing the Age of the Messiah, called the Re-Stitution of all Things, tho' indeed so called, chiefly with regard to Christ's second coming. Christ, said the Samaritan Woman, will tell us all Things. The Jews spoke so of Elias, and Elias has already prophesied.
The Witnesses are called, two, in Allusion to the two Churches formerly praised. There may be also more Reasons for using the Number, two. The Article is used before ðuo, which helps to prove Sir Isaac's Interpretation. The Article shews, they had before been spoken of. In Verse 11. render the Words, the three, &c. In Verse 7. the Article is also to be observed, and in xii. 14. The Article shews, the Beast and Eagle had been before (obscurely) treated of. See my Note on xiii. 11.

Some Readers will perhaps think it providential, that the Witnesses should now be called, Protestants, a Name of like Significations. What if the mention of the Thunders, and new Temple was deferred until now, partly in order to point out the Reformation, in this Period, that is, after the fulfilling of the six Trumpets? Compare the Plagues here mentioned with those of the Trumpets and Vials. See Esdras, where Christ is represented, as blowing Fire out of his Mouth. Paul also faith, He shall destroy Antichrist with the Spirit of his Mouth. Perhaps it was that saying in Esdras, or another in a canonical Prophet, or both, which made Barcobab, the false Messiah, learn that juggling Trick of blowing Fire out of his Mouth, in case the Story be true.

V. 8.
V. 8. Observe here a concise and obscure Stile, as often in John. Which spiritually is called, Sodom and Egypt, and also spiritually called, the City (Jerusalem) where our Lord was crucified. The Word spiritually, means figuratively, or mysteriously. The Romans themselves frequently called their Emperors tagia, or Wild-beasts. The Witnesses are said to lie in the Street, or Area of Rome, as the Jews in Jerusalem, under Titus; for the Metaphor is still carried on. For the Word, here rendered, Street, and what it implies, see some future Notes.

V. 9. Three Days and half, according to our new Commentator Lowman, are here mentioned, because Christ lay three Days in the Grave. Some may think, there is an Allusion to the Duration of the War, which destroyed Jerusalem; or that of Nero's Persecution. Some think the Phrase to be used, because Bodies begin to stink in three Days, and are said never to revive after the third Day; whereas some do revive within that Time. According to some, the three Days and half signify 1260 Years. If so, they are thus called, by Way of Decorum, because Bodies stink in a short Time. If the three Days and half signify, a short indefinite Time, then the 1260 Years, called also Time, Times, and
a half, suggested the Use of this definite Number; or it took its Rise from Titus's War, especially as the Metaphor is thus well carried on.

The Witnesses once plagued and tormented the Papists, but the Papists now rejoice. Therefore the Witnesses lie not dead 1260 Years.

The Phrase, fourth Part of the Earth was suggested by the mention of four Horsemen, or Plagues. A Notion prevailed of old, and is followed by Papists, that Antichrist will continue only three Years and a half; and this Verse favours it more than any other in Scripture. Perhaps, indeed, his chief Power will last so long. Whilst they shall be preaching and giving a perfect Testimony, some render the Words. The Scripture-Greek seems to me to be different elsewhere. Some render the Phrase, when they shall be about to finish. But would not John express this otherwise? When they shall (almost) finish it, is rather meant. See the Stile in *John* xiii. i. xii. 31. *Matthew* xxiii. 39. *2 Timothy* iv. 6, 7. They are slain, yet they shall prophesy a little longer with success, i.e. in the Persons of their Successors.

Note on Note. If any Thing new occurs, I will give it in Note on xvi. r9. or in my Appendix. Neither Mede's nor Whiston's Explanation pleases me; for the Death of the Witnesses...
neſſes seems to be yet future, unless you may chuse to interpret thus: At the Reformation, when Anticriſt is compleatly discovered, and the Testimony is thus finiſhed, the Witneſſes shall for some Time be discomfited, but shall recover their Power. But even this Conjeſture satisfies me not.

V, 18. See διάφως, in viii. 9. or in xix. 2. See the Greek in 1 Corinthians iii. 17. 2 Peter ii. 12. in both which Places there is a sudden Change of the Signification.
A NEW PROPHECY OF JOHN,

Representing in another Manner, and explaining some material PASSAGES in the former.

Aliusque et idem nasceres.
A NEW PROPHECY, &c.

CHAP. xii. 1.

THIS Prophecy explains the former, and begins in the last Verse of the preceding Chapter. There the Temple is again opened for a new Vision; for see Temple opened in iv. 1. xv. 5. xix. 11. Sir Isaac observes, that Daniel also uses to give first a Vision, and then a Commentary. If you object, that this cannot be an Interpretation, because obscure, then consider how frequently the Interpretations of the other Prophets are obscure. Esdras faith, Daniel had not the fourth Beast expounded to him, because the Interpretation given to Daniel was not clear. Again, the Interpretation given to Esdras himself is full of Difficulty.

Christ had opened the whole prophetical Book; but it was necessary, having mentioned the Beast, the Witnesses, and the great City, to enlarge upon them. This Part also more fully explains Daniel, than John's former Prophecy; which was partly the Design of the Apocalypse. In order to explain the Nature of the Beast, and his
his killing the Witnesses (which Things were barely hinted at in the preceding Part, and the explaining the Effects of the last Trumpet required indeed such a Hint) it was necessary to shew the Rise of the Beast, and the Time of the Church's degenerating. To comment at large on the four Horfemen was needless; and they are, consequently, very lightly touched upon in this second Part. See latter Part of 19th Verse of Chap. xi.

Lowman, who will not allow one general Interpretation of the whole to be here given by John, and despises Sir Isaac's Synchronisms, is yet forced to make John give several Representations of one and the same Thing. Hammond, whose Scheme is quite unlike ours, yet imagines the Apocalypse to contain many Visions of the same Signification, and those even given at several Times. Here indeed begins a new Vision, which interprets the former, but probably the Interpretation was not deferred, as Hammond imagines. It is worth while to consult Hayter on this Point. Daniel and Esdras received both the Text, as I may call it, and Commentary together; and so, I believe, did John. Observe the Connexion. When the Temple was opened in Heaven, John saw the Woman in Heaven. Some make xi. 19. and xvi. 2. to be synchronal, because
because of some resembling Expressions, but Sir Isaac seems right. Consider iv. 5. viii. 5. Are those Places synchronal?

The Word σημαία, signifies a wonderful Appearance. By the by, I think it has the same Meaning in Matt. xxiv. 30. If it there signifies a Sign, then Christ himself is the Sign of Jerusalem's Destruction. The wonderful Sight, the Son of Man, seems a better Version.

John saw the Church exalted in the Heaven, even above the Moon, and contiguous to the Stars. Also the Sun seems opposed to the Moon. The Sun is more glorious, and less mutable. The Gospel is everlasting, and the Church shall stand for ever. Jewish Ceremonies may happen also to be included in the Word Moon. She brought forth a Son, a (victorious) Male-Child.

The Dragon's Religion is considered as that of the Empire, and therefore Popery is also called the Religion of the Empire, or Beast, and not that of the Whore.

His Tail drew the third Part of the Stars of Heaven, and cast them to the Ground; not by Serpentine Doctrines, as Hammond would have it, but by Force of Arms. You have an Expression like this in Daniel. See also Verse 9th below. The Tail seems to point at nothing
particular, but was his best Instrument for sweeping them down.

Why John calls the Roman Empire the third Part, Sir Isaac has explained sufficiently. Only observe here, that John gives it this Name, even when including the other Parts. You may perhaps imagine, that, in some respect, the Roman Empire might be called the fourth Part of the Scene of the Prophecies, and that John used that Division in vi. 8. But it is improbable, that John would vary so, and the Division into three Parts answers all John's Purposes. The Interpretation there given of the Phrase, fourth Part, seems good. Indeed, upon perusing these Papers, it occurred to me, that the Interpretation of that Phrase may possibly be improved. A fourth Part may signify only some Part, not expressly considering the whole as divided into four Parts, but taking a definite for an indefinite Number, and choosing this particular Number, because suggested by the mention of four Horsemen, or Plagues. If this Interpretation be good, it takes away one Difficulty in explaining, how the four Horsemen are said to afflict the Empire. See my Note there. Indeed the Word, Earth, which is used there, should not probably be confined to the Empire.

John
John sees afterwards this Woman in the Wilderness, or Desert, converted into a Whore. You have the Article before ἄρμ, in xvii. 1, which shews he had mentioned the Whore in the Desert before. She flew thither from the Dragon, as the Jews from Pharaoh, who was also called a Dragon by another Prophet. This Allusion removes an Objection which may be made against Sir Isaac's Interpretation from the Phrase, God prepared her a Place. The Christian Church was good at first; and this is one Reason why it is said, God prepared her a Place; but there is another, and probably the chief Reason, taken from God's feeding the Jewish Church in the Wilderness. Now the Jewish Church, though there miraculously fed by God, sinned, and perished in the Wilderness, being not permitted to see Canaan, the Type of the Christian Rest. Thus also the Christian Church apostatized at Rome. Let me add that God fed them both, as designing to obtain a good Seed from both these Whores. Apply here my Note on wv, in xxii. 6, and the Greek in xiii. 4.

V. 7. Some may think these Angels are Men, particularly Priests; others may be of Opinion, that neither they nor the four Beast do any where in the Prophecy denote Men, tho'
introduced as doing such Things as are peculiar to Priests. In the Epistles indeed, Bishops are called Angels, and Men you may imagine to be so called here, in Allusion to a War which had happened in Heaven. Yet as John has frequently an Eye to Daniel, and even good Angels are thought to dissent there; Why may he not rather mean, that the good Angels now assisted Men against the bad ones? The Devil was cast out of his Throne, and was wroth, because his Religion, Heathenism, was to be of short Continuance.

I observed in Daniel, that he reckons by Days sometimes, rather than by Weeks, because then treating of the daily Sacrifice abolished. Doth not John also say, that the mourning Witnesses preached so many Days, because the figurative Jerusalem was trodden under Foot, and the Christian Service despised? Daniel indeed might have more Reasons for not computing by Weeks in such Places. John changes his Stile to Months, or four Weeks, and to Times, in order to shew, that he is interpreting Daniel.

Note on Note. See Mede and Whiston on the Revelations, concerning the Word, Time.

The Hebrews called the Devil, the Old Serpent. His Name διάσολος, signified an Accuser. Is this Name alluded to in Ecclesiastic. xxi. 27? See
See Lowman and Hammond's Index. He accused at this Time the Christians, of Unwillingness to suffer for Christ. Or, he continually accused them, before Heathen Magistrates, of Profaneness. The Phrase, before God, shews the Preference of the former Meaning. John alludes to Satan's accusing Job before God.

V. 14. He seems to allude to God's carrying Israel on Eagle's Wings, in the Wilderness. I have not Time to consult Commentators, on Zechariab's Woman carried to the Land of Shinar.


Chap. xiii. 5. The best Copies, faith Hammond, leave out ἀληθήν. Yet is not now, here explained by ἀληθήν ἀληθεύει, in Verse 7? Doth John imitate the Septuagint of Daniel, where he hath the Words, do, act, practise? I want at present the Sept. Bible.

V. 8. In the Book of the slain Lamb. The Article is wanting before slain. See xvii. 18, and my Note on xxi. 1.
V. io. I find the Phrase here used always to signify, gathering Captives, not to restore them to Liberty, but to detain them in Servitude, and to that End carrying them away in a Body.

V. ii. Lowman objects, that the Greek Church contended for Supremacy with the Latin. But consider, that this Prophecy was contained in a little Book, and that consequently John overlooked such Circumstances, as unnecessary to his principal Design. How concise is John, where he speaks of the great Affair of the Reformation? Daniel also barely hints at it; where he says, the Wife shall understand in the End. The Arian Controversy is also omitted, though commonly esteemed an Affair of great Importance. Mahomet's forging a new Revelation, is not mentioned, unless very obscurely. The Smoak of the Locusts seems to be explained by the Word Darkness in the corresponding Vial, and not to point at darkening Men's Minds with Error. The Words, Angel of the Abyss, may indeed denote a false Prophet. No Piece of History is found in the Revelations which is not of the highest Consequence, or else absolutely necessary to shew the Connexion of the Prophecy. The Origin of Christian Idolatry was to be treated of. The Greek Church was the Christian
Christian Balaam, the false Prophet, and Teacher. She wrought the first Miracles in favour of Superstition. Idolatry was propagated among Christians from Egypt, an old Mother-land of Superstition. These Gentile Doctrines overspread the Eastern Church in the fourth Century, and before the End of it, began to overrun the Western. This new Christian Polytheism and Idolatry prevailed so much, that the Greek Empire did, at length, by the seventh general Council, establiſh the worship of Images and Mahuzzim. There is nothing in John's Prophecies, if not here, concerning this important Affair, the Rise of Christian Idolatry; which must be a surprizing Omission, especially as it is evident, that John is commenting on Daniel, who mentions the Greek Empire's introducing the Worship of Mahuzzim; which is the Religion of the ten-horned Beast. Mr. Lowman therefore should not have thought it strange, that John makes the Greek Church to procure Submission to the Latin. Her project- ing Idolatry, and the Affair of Irene justify our Interpretation. The two-horned Beast became Factor to the ten-horned beast in religious Matters, or, in John's Stile, procured him Worship from all Nations, though he contended with the Pontiff of the ten-horned Beast for Supremacy.
One Cartwright, of Dublin, had read Mede, and not being satisfied with his Account of the two-horned Beast, endeavoured to prove this Beast was Mahomet. See Fell on Thessalonians, and Willet on the ten-horns of Daniel. See also an Extract of what is called a Work of Bishop Mountague, printed in the End of a Piece written against Salters-ball Sermons. Laying aside every other Argument, one may even a priori confute such Pieces. Little was intended to be said about Mahomet's Imposture, in the Scriptures, because such Prophecies would be almost useless. No Christian of tolerable Education or Honesty would embrace the Religion of Mahomet: and no Mahometan would be converted by such Prophecies, because he would not read them. For many other convincing Reasons, Mahomet is not Antichrist, the eleventh Horn in Daniel, Paul's Man of Sin, nor John's two-horned Beast. You will find many other as groundless Conjectures about the two-horned Beast in Lowman, besides a new, but very unsatisfactory one of his own.

Limborch's Notion seems at first Sight plausible, but I cannot relish it, though followed by many others. See Dent writing against that Notion. As the little Beast rose out of the Earth, or in Greece, he advise those of the Earth to call a Council.
Council. That a Council is here called an Image, appears from this, that there follows no Account of the Defeat of this Image. Councils were also in John's Mind, for he mentions their Acts in Verse 17. Read carefully Sir Isaac on the two-horned Beast, and consider well the Word, speak, in Verse 15.

Note on Note. The Words, before him, and some other Things have raised some Scruples in my Mind about Sir Isaac's Interpretation. He sometimes speaks as if he took the two-horned Beast to be the Pope of Rome. If any Thing new occurs which may remove these Difficulties, I will give it in the Appendix.

If you doubt of Sir Isaac's Account of the Horns of the Lamb, though, probably, a very just one, you may conclude, that the Horns are only mentioned to compleat the Description of a meek Lamb in Appearance, or a single Christian Church. The Horns cannot I think denote the Greek and Latin Churches. It was proper to shew Antichrist's Rise in the East, by saying that he had two Churches there, and yet spoke as the Dragon now removed to the East. The Words imply, that, the Horns were like those of a Lamb. So in Matthew v. 20. understand the Words, as if it was said, more than that of the Scribes and Pharisees. That of, is under-
understood before συν, in xxii. 11. and in John v. 36. As the Article is wanting before ἀγων, so it is wanting before ἐκαυρ. See Hammond in the Margin. As the Dragon before mentioned is pointed at, so also is the Lamb. Christ, like a natural Lamb, has now only two Horns, and Antichrist has also got two Horns like his. The Horns are Churches, or spiritual Kingdoms, for Christ's Kingdom is not of this World. The Antichristian Lamb spoke as a Dragon, that is, was an Idolater, and blasphemed the God of Israel, and Christians who dwell in Heaven, that is, in the Kingdom of Christ upon Earth, frequently called the Kingdom of Heaven. For the Word spoke, see the Word Mouth, with my Note in Daniel. Persecution is also implied. See Sir Isaac, and how he explains the Word, speak, in Verse 15. Many Meanings may be included.

The Greek Churches making Fire to come down from Heaven, may denote the Excommunication mentioned by Sir Isaac. But if you think this Interpretation strained, because it seems to be reckoned among the miraculous Works of the two-horned Beast, then you may understand it of the great annual Miracle of the Greek Church, which is described by Thevenot. The Latin Church, out of Spite, decried in-
deed that Miracle; yet by Means of such Greek Miracles, the Beast's Authority in religious Matters came to be worshipped. I rather chuse to think, that by this Phrase, any of those great Miracles, which the false Prophet wrought before the Beast, may be denoted.

There seems to be an Allusion to the Speaking Images of the Heathens. The killing here mentioned, may signify literal killing; for tho' the Image, or Council representing the Beast only excommunicates, yet it delivers over to the secular Arm.

Both here, and in xvii. 9. John tells you, that it requires Wisdom to know such Things, and here means not, that it is a Mark of Wisdom, to study such Things.

This is the most proper Place to take Notice of the several Ways of marking, mentioned by John. Where God's Servants are said to be marked, there is probably an Allusion to a Passage in Ezekiel. Observe also, that the Syrians, and the neighbouring Nations marked Servants. The Thracian Custom of marking the Forehead as a Sign of Honour cannot be alluded to, because, probably, little heard of: much less the Mark of the Cross on Cain, because that Place is misunderstood of marking. For the Mark of the Cross, said to be mentioned in Ezekiel, see Pro-
Protestant Commentators. As for the Mark of the Beast, Sir Isaac thinks it alludes to a Custom of marking the Votaries of certain Gods. See also Spencer, where he mentions those Words of the Prophet, I have received these Wounds in the House of my Friends. Mede and Hammond treat curiously of the Marks of Soldiers and Slaves. Hammond gives a satisfactory Account of the Ancients writing in Numbers the Names of their Gods, and marking themselves with such Numbers. There is afterwards mention of the Mark of the Beast's Name; and in xv. 2. I find no in the latter Part of the Verse; which, if a right Reading, makes the Number of the Name to be at least one Mark. Consider also Verse 17. preceding.

Allow for John's concise and obscure Stile, and you will find, that here by the Number of the Beast, he means the Number of his Name; and that he gives us to understand, it was the Number of the Name of a Man, or a successive Body of Men, tho' here called a Beast. So he tells you elsewhere, that by the Measure of an Angel, he means that of a Man. I confess I have not consulted Commentators on the Words here quoted. Daniel calls an Angel a Man. Daniel says, the fourth Beast had a Horn, which had Eyes like a Man; and John often points at the
the very Parables of Daniel. Daniel calls the Greek Empire a King. Paul calls the Roman Emperors, the Man who letteth, and a Succession of Popes, the Man of Sin. Take Notice, that the Whore is not, properly speaking, the Pope; and consequently that Daniel's Horn, which had Eyes like a Man, is not the Whore, but the Pope. You have therefore a little Mistake in Sir Isaac, where he faith, the eleventh horn had the Eyes of a Woman.

Some may paraphrase thus: 'I mark the Name by Numbers, as is an usual Custom among Men. The Number is 666. What therefore is his distinguishing Name? It is quite unnatural to interpret the Words, as if John had said, It is a Number which may be detected by Man. My first Interpretation is to be preferred.

Now this Number is found in the Word Latin. See Dent, and the very Words of Irenæus. Hayter endeavours to shew, that it is not found in this Word, but is not followed by the Learned.

If it was not a little minute and whimsical, one might venture to allege, that those said to be marked with the Number of the Name were concealed Papists. Yet such must shew the Mark to Papists, before they have leave to buy and sell.
You will find many Opinions in Cowper and Louman. Mede, More, and Potter shew much Ingenuity here, but Sir Isaac's Interpretation is very satisfactory.

See Limborch, where he mentions Augustin's Opinion concerning the Mark of the Beast. I find that he and other Fathers took the great Antichrist to be a Christian, who would mark with the Name of Christ, and with his Cross, and even abolish Idolatry. I imagine, they meant the Heathen Idolatry, interpreting thus Daniel's Description of the King, who did accordingly to his Will; or gathering it from such Prophecies as mention the ceasing of Idolatry in the latter Days; or lastly, taking it from Paul's describing Antichrist as sitting in the Temple of the true God.

Note on Note. See Whiston on the Revelations and the Family-Commentary, comparing them with Sir Isaac's Opinions. Some object, that finding the Number of a Name cannot be meant, because that is easily done; and yet John says, it requires Wisdom. I answer, that it was difficult to find what Name was here pointed at, as appears by the Disagreement of Interpreters.
They stand on Mount Sion in the Temple. See Hammond on the Phrase, New Song.

They follow not the defiled Woman Rome, but the Lamb their Husband. Some may understand the Words literally, so as to make Charity stand for all the Virtues, but this is very improbable. It seems a little whimsical to understand the Phrase, follow the Lamb everywhere, of their not confining him to Rome. You may see Jerome's Account of it in Burnet's Explanation of the Articles. The Phrase, they have no Guile, some may understand, as when elsewhere spoken of Christ. By Falsehood, Lying, and lying Vanities, the Jews understood Idolatry; and this may suggest another Interpretation. But as I before observed, many Expressions in the seven Epistles suggest others in the succeeding Prophecy; and therefore you may explain all those Phrases by a Proneness to Heathen Idolatry and Fornication, quitting the Profession of Christianity, and denying Christ in Time of Danger. Now in a Note on the Epistles, I said, that Men who do so, are Types of Antichristians, the latter being all along called Gentiles, and the Followers of the Lamb Jews. The Sealed are called a First-fruit, in Allusion to a Jewish Custom, for the Metaphor is still pursued.

The Gospel is called everlasting, because reviving in this Period, tho' perverted and hidden by the Babylonian Papists. Christ had promised that his Church should not be suppressed for ever. The Gospel is proclaimed in this Period openly by an Angel flying in the midst of Heaven, and all are exhorted to quit the idolatrous Communion of Babylon now about to fall, and to worship the true God alone. I observed before, that the Antichristians are likened all along to Gentiles, who knew not God, the God of Israel.

The Phrase, have no Rest Day nor Night, seems to prove an Eternity of Punishments. I shall say little at present on this Subject, but give some unconnected Hints, in such Order as they present themselves to my Mind. *Scot*, of Norwich, writes very ingeniously on this Subject. *Whiston* denies an Eternity of Punishments. I find *Taylor of Norwich* saying, What have the Wicked to do with Immortality? The *Family-Commentary* gives an uncommon Account of the Belief of the *Jews* on this Head, in Note on Actis xxiv. 15. There are many new Pieces on this Subject. *Helmont* wrote in
English very earnestly against the Doctrine of eternal Punishments. The History of the Belief of the Jewish Church in this Particular will be of great Use. See Esdras. Some Authors quote the Place mentioned in Acts against some Jews who deny the Resurrection of the Wicked, and allege against them, that the ancient Jews held it. It is there said, that the Resurrection of the Wicked was asserted in the Law and the Prophets. In case the Jews denied eternal Punishments, then Christ might possibly use the Phrases, everlasting Life and everlasting Punishment, in their Sense; but otherwise would not speak so, least he should lead his Hearers into Error. In the Eve of the general Judgment, John calls this Punishment inu. The Phrase inu, inu, which you find here, John elsewhere applies to God himself. You may object, that John or some other sacred Writer might have said, inu, a Phrase in Jude; but this Objection seems inconsiderable. The Huchisonian Scheme, which I follow, may shew an Eternity of Punishments to be advantageous to the Universe. Such a rectifying Object may retain the yet upright Angels in their Duty, and prevent the Fall of Saints departed. All other Ways of accounting for it from Reason are ridiculous. If this Doctrine therefore is revealed, we
we should not reject it as contrary to Benevo-
lence and Justice. The noble-minded Tillotson
imagined a Possibility of an absolute Pardon, but
God's Veracity, who seems unconditionally to
threaten impenitent Sinners, will probably be of
such Use to his Creatures for ever, that he never
will give them the least Handle for suspecting it.
See Humphry's Collection of Fragments.

Blessed are the Dead, who die in the Lord. Ro-
bert Fleming has written an elaborate Discourse
on this Text. You should consult him and
Mede. Tillinghast says, Mede has given a forced
Signification to ἀνάστις.

V. 18. The Priest appointed by Lot to take
Care of the Fire on the Altar, was called the
Priest over Fire. There was also probably an
Angel of the Waters, who is mentioned in Ch.
xvi.. The Angel, who answers him in that
Chapter, out of the Place of the Altar, seems
to be the one, who pours out the fiery Vial en-
suing; and is consequently the Angel here men-
tioned, a Burner of Babylon.

Tillinghast makes the Angels supplicate, and
cry unto Christ, to proceed to the Harvest and
Vintage. Christ, when in the Flesh, was mi-
nistred unto, was strengthened, and delivered
from his sudden and human Apprehensions by
Angels,
Angels, and why not now receive a Message concerning finishing those Things, some of which God, as to their Times, had kept in his own Power to know? Yet the Fullness of God perpetually dwelt in him to as high a Degree as possible.

Christ has in this Chapter a golden Crown; but afterwards is said to have many Diadems. See Hammond's Index for στέφανος.

The Allusions of an Harvest and Vintage seem to be taken from Joel. Some here imagine an Allusion to a Custom of placing great Wine-presses out of Cities. A great Effusion of Blood is said by Esdras to rise to the Camel's Houghs. Mede makes Peter's Patrimony of the Extent here mentioned. Try whether the Author said in the Family-Commentary to oppose Mede in this Chapter, or any other Author has confuted Mede in this Point. I lost a little Extract which I made from that Commentary. Tillinghast denies not Mede's Account of the Furlongs to be exact, though he prefers the Opinion of Mayer, who makes the Land of Canaan to be 1600 Furlongs in Length. Notwithstanding his and Mayer's Arguments, Canaan cannot be here meant; for John had been speaking of Babylon, here called the City. If it was possible, that Canaan should be here-measured, it must be a

figura-
figurative Description of Christendom. So the treading the Holy City under Foot was a figurative Description of the Antichristians oppressing the Witnesses. Daniel and John call the Witnesses Jews, and their City Jerusalem. If you observe not this, you will commit many Errors. Napier's Account of the Furlongs is ridiculous. So also is their Interpretation who think only a great Space to be meant. John uses not such Numbers for indefinite ones. See Garret and others concerning John's Numbers.

Remember Sir Isaac's general Account of this Chapter, and observe that seven Angels are also employed in it.

Chap. xv. 1. You may take John to be very irregular in returning to the Times of the first Trumpet, here interpreted by a Cup or Vial. But, after giving a general History of the Church and Roman Empire, down to the Fall of Babylon, he returns, only in order to tell you the several Steps of this Downfal. He had told you, in the former Chapter, that all Nations had drank of the Wine of her Fornication, and immediately subjoiaed, that God would repay her with his Wine-cup. Now he shews you, that this Punishment was to be distributed into seven Cups. For the Metaphor of the Cup, see Jeremiyah.
The Word rendered, Vial, signifies a Censer, like a Cup, and also a Wine-cup. See Lowman on V. 8.

The Sea of Glass appears mingled with Fire, because of the Proximity of the Fire of the Altar. Some may think the Appearance of the Sea, when God looking through the fiery Pillar, confounded the Egyptians, to be here alluded to. As for the Red Sea, it was, perhaps, so called from Edom, and is not red. Yet some Travellers say otherwise, and I shall determine nothing about it. There may be more Reasons than one for the Allusion, and God's Anger seems included. They sing the Song of Moses, such probably as he sung after the drowning of Pharaoh. Christians were before compared to Jews flying from the Dragon Pharaoh. See Dr. Clark's Translation of this Verse. It resembles a little the Grammar in ix. 21. and Acts ii. 40.

The new Temple described in the former Prophecy is here opened. The Witnesses worship therein. The Critics may consider Hammond on the Word ναος.

V. 8. The Passages in the Old Testament here alluded to, are quoted by Lowman. I imagined at first, that a Reference to the Smoak upon setting up the Tabernacle, and Dedication of the Temple


Temple was alone intended, as here a new Temple is opened; but upon second Thoughts I think, God's Anger is also meant. Consider the Word, Fire, above, and the Word, δόξα, here.

Chap. xvi. 1. The old Jewish Geography was simply expressed by the Earth, and Isles of the Sea, or barely the Sea. This Division used by the old Prophets is followed by John; but in this Verse no particular Part is understood. Where it is otherwise, it appears plainly from the Context, as in next Verse.

V. 2. This answers to the first Trumpet, tho' the Effect is expressed in a different Manner. Here the Eastern Wind produces a malignant Botch. Observe that many Expressions here are borrowed from the Plagues of Egypt. It may, perhaps, be called a Botch, to let us know, that at this Time the Invasions of the barbarous Nations began to have Effect, by destroying the Body Politic of Rome. Former Wars were only simple Fevers, not destructive to the Roman State; but the Eastern Empire, here distinguished by the Word, Earth, was so weakened by Invasions in this Period, that it became an easy Prey to the Saracens and Turks; and
and even the Western Empire became a Sufferer in the End. The Eastern People also worshipped the Image of the Beast, as here represented; for all Nations and Tongues were before said to do so. The Beast’s Religion had been set up in this Period, and even the Time of this remarkable Apostacy may be pointed at. Some may think, that John, by the Phrase, means only wicked and irreligious Men in general, or that he only describes the First Favoures of Opinions, which gave Rise to the Beast’s idolatrous Religion. Upon perusing this Note, I find some Scruples arise, and shall endeavour to remove them in an Appendix to this Work.

V. 4. 5. If you think Sir Isaac’s Interpretation strained, then paraphrase the whole thus: The second Cup turned the Sea into Blood, but the third adds to the Calamity, by converting to Blood all the Rivers and Fountains of the third Part of the Scene of the Prophecy. Sir Isaac’s Interpretation will, notwithstanding, appear to be better founded than the former, when we reflect, that the third Trumpet affected also the Fountains and Rivers. When John is exact, he has some Reason for it. The Beasts repeat the Word, Holy; and John there says, Day
and Night, in order to express Jewish Customs. An Angel says, Wo, Wo, Wo, to denote the three succeeding Woes. Four Winds are mentioned, because of four succeeding Wars from the four Winds. John therefore would not be so particular, as to mention Rivers and Fountains, both here, and under the corresponding Trumpet, did he not intend the present Division of the Western Empire. Observe how particular the Prophecy is in pointing out the Time of the first Edict, which made the Meeting of Dissenters capital.

V. 8. The Effect of the fourth Cup, says Lowman, differs from that of the fourth Trumpet, but observes not to us, that the three succeeding ones agree. Both first Cup and Trumpet affect the Earth, and yet their Plagues are differently expressed. The present Cup and Trumpet both affect the Sun; and why may they not be the same, though John explains their Consequences by different Phrases? Not so, says Lowman, for Sir Isaac, in his Chapter of prophetic Language, makes a scorching Sun to denote Evils inflicted by a Prince. But surely the taking away the Prince may be the Cause of these Calamities; and if Lowman be so very nice as to dislike this Explication of a scorching Sun,
Sun, then let us consider, that he himself explains the fourth Trumpet of Justinian the Emperor carrying on those Wars. Justinian therefore may be the Sun. Some may be for applying the same Method of Interpretation to the Star called Worm-wood. Esdras's Star should not be forgotten. Consult History concerning this Vial. Observe also, that Sir Isaac's Chapter of prophetic Language is accommodated to other Prophecies, as well as to John's. It is not therefore certain, that he applied what he there said of a scorching Sun to John's Vial. Yet if he did so, you see it is well enough applied. Where Sir Isaac says, Mountains and Islands signify, Cities of Earth and Sea Politic, and Dens and Rocks, Temples, it is not certain, that he applies these Things, with Mede, to the Apocalypse. The same may be said of the Metaphors of Trees and Vegetables. But if this was Sir Isaac's Opinion, he held it doubtless, as only conjectural.

V. 10. Here the Darkness occasioned by the Locusts is repeated, and also their severe Pains, as caused by Scorpions. This Cup is poured on the Throne or Kingdom of the Beast, whereas the corresponding Trumpet doth not so restrain it. To solve this Difficulty, observe that the Western
Western Empire is chiefly pointed at, as being the Residence of Antichrist. Consider also, that the whole Prophecy is brief, and designedly obscure; that John's Account of this, and the succeeding Vials is particularly concise; and that here it is not denied, that the Eastern World was also afflicted. The very City of Rome was afflicted, and perhaps this Event is pointed at. Saraceni, faith Sigonius, ipsam Basilicæ Vaticane valvas argenteas asportarunt.

V. 12. The Phrase, drying up Rivers, is used by the Prophets for conquering the Nations of those Rivers. See Note on xvii. 15. This Metaphor, that of imbittering the Waters, (which, by the by, Hammond says, denotes poisoning them, as the Phrases, Root of Bitterness, and Water of Gall signify elsewhere) and many others in John are borrowed from old Prophets. It is therefore improbable, that bitter Waters, mentioned under one of the Trumpets, denote the false Doctrines and persecuting Notions then broached. They rather denote mortal Calamities, as in the other Prophets. I must own, that the Phrase, drying up of Rivers may sometimes, for any Thing I know, have no Reference to the Conquest of Nations about those Rivers; but in case no Conquest was here expressed,
expressed, but barely passing the Euphrates, it would make no material Difference. You see the very Word, prepared, is again used, in order to point out the Synchronism of the Vials and Trumpets.

Thus you must acknowledge, that the Vials were at length explained by our illustrious Interpreter. The Deists boasted, that they were nonsensical, because even Mede could not un-riddle them.

V. 13. Here by the Dragon, the Eastern Empire seems to be meant. The Evil Spirits, or false Prophets are called Frogs, because they croak their Matins, foul the Waters of the Gospel, and enter into the Kneading-troughs and Beds of the Egyptian Antichristians. This seems whimsical. Frogs were called unclean by the Jews, were not too large to come out of the Mouth, and resemble Men, as these Evil Spirits may be said to assume the Shape of Men. See my Note on John's little Roll. They, not he, gathered them, as in Verse 14. Neuters plural require Verbs singular. The Prophets often predict Things, by saying, a Person or Place shall have such a Name. See Mede, Hammond, Lowman, and others, on Armageddon. I observed before, that most of the Phrases in the

Epistles
Epistles allude to others in the Prophecy. What you find in the Epistle to the Laodiceans best explains the Word, Nakedness here. Prepare proper Garments, for Christ will soon appear. Some may imagine, the holy war to be here meant, because the Frogs were so busy in promoting it; but probably it points at another future Event.

V. 17. This agrees with the last Trumpet, and affects the Air. Some think the Prince of the Power of the Air to be here defeated. But perhaps John never heard of that Expression of Paul. This Vial may therefore be said to be poured into the Air, merely because a great Commotion in the Air is often attended with the Effects here mentioned.

For the Phrase, Wine of the Fierceness of Wrath, Vide Mede and Hammond.

The Hail some may choose to explain of Bombs and Cannon-balls; but this looks a little whimsical, especially as John mentions both Hail and Lightning, in Wars prior to such Inventions. The Hail in one of Joshua's Battles may be alluded to. See also Isaiah xxx. The Gentile or Antichristian Cities, called here Cities of the Nations, now fall by Earthquakes, or Wars.

I shewed long ago the following Solution of this Prophecy to a learned Clergyman. When the Wise shall understand, or when the Witnesses shall have explained these Prophecies, and given a perfect Testimony, in the Person of Newton, England shall be engaged in an inactive War; so that the Protestant Nations shall lie dead for three Years and a half, and the Popish Powers shall make merry by sending mutual Presents and intermarrying. But after three Years and a half by a Peace made between the Queen of Hungary and Prussia, the King of Prussia, a Protestant, will be a Gainer, and England shall revive and begin to act. The Pope shall lose the tenth Part of his Dominions by an Earthquake or War; and thus, as you have it in the present Text, must be contented with the primitive three Parts given to him by Pepin. After the three Years and a half, 7000 of the Adversaries of England fall in Italy. Many are converted from Popery, and even the Pope makes some Advances towards a Reformation. I communicated this to that Clergyman, as now to the Reader, rather to amuse him than to convince him of my Success in these Studies. When the Peace was made, I found I had lost
my Labour, as I before suspected would be the case, and accordingly never inquired into the Extent of the Pope’s Territories so as to know whether I rightly explained the Phrase, the 10th Part fell. This Affair leads me to explain some Causes of the Mistakes of others in these Matters, for surely I must have erred, seeing the tenth Part of the City fell not at that Time. Why, δικατος, signifies not Tythes, I refer you to Mede. Mede’s own Interpretation is unnatural. The Defection of a popish King cannot, I think, be meant, because by an Earthquake, John elsewhere understands War, and the tenth Part falls by an Earthquake. A King’s deserting Antichrist has often happened; and the Fall of the tenth Part seems to express something particular, which shall, in the End, serve for a Clue to the Prophecy. John would rather have expressed this by the Fall or Metamorphosis of a Horn. Beverley’s Notion of the ten Kings deserting the Pope will not easily agree with the Greek. It might seem more natural to call the Pope’s Revenue, the tenth Part of the City, because the Word Earthquake might give Rise to the Expression; yet this Interpretation will, I believe, hardly please. The City, probably, becomes not three Parts by Faction. Nor is Hayter right, who makes three Punishments to be
be denoted. The Affair of the three Years and a half seems to be future, and coincides with the War procured by the Frogs; or that proclaimed by the Angel in the Sun; which also is attended with a Resurrection of Martyrs; or is a Forerunner of the final Ruin of Rome. I said before, that if any Thing new occurred for explaining the three Years and a half, I would give it in the Appendix. As yet I have nothing new to offer, but that three Years and a half seem precisely to be meant, for that John otherwise would have said three Years, or some other small Number in Use among the Jews. See Garret and others on the Numbers used by Daniel and John.

Chap. xvii. 1. I again caution you, not to think the Prophecy confused or disorderly. How naturally doth one of the Angels of the Vials designed against Babylon conduct John to behold her Judgment? The Angel means to give a larger Explication of her Crimes and Punishment.

The Emperors wore Purple in Times of Peace, and in War they wore Scarlet. They also wore Scarlet and Purple at once. The Dress of the Jewish High Priest was the same, with Gold and precious Stones. The High Priest
Prieſt here is not the Whore, for the Whore is his Church, and is here considered as a City. What you find in xviii. 16. ſhews the rich Drefs of the Romans to be pointed at, and here her Royalty.

The Whore's committing Fornication with the ten Horns is a beaſty Image; yet perhaps chosen by the Holy Ghost, to render Popery odious. Such dirty Images are used by the old Prophets, when describing that faithful City, which became a Harlot. See Hosea and Ezekiel. That the Whore ſat a ſtride is obvious. See Mede on the Position of the Heads. Perhaps the Names of Blasphemy were written on those Heads alone, and consequently Lowman's Fancy may be needless. The Devil is by some painted with Horns, and a cloven Foot, or Hoof, perhaps upon the Account of John’s Description of the Beſt. The Word, Abomination, is an Hebraism for Idolatry. Fornication signifies the fame. See Nahum iii. 4. Garret afferts that Heathen Nations were never called Whores. He means perhaps Adulteresses, for Niniveh is called a Whore. If Garret is right, then render ἄγομ, here, an Adulteress. For the Phrase, Golden Cup, see Jeremiah li. John ſaw her vomiting red. It is more probable, that ἄγομ, signifies
signifies a Whore, because the Antichristians are all along called Gentiles.

The Inscription on the Whore's Forehead may be explained by the Custom of Marking taken Notice of before; this City being a Votary of the Beast, and his Image. Or, may it denote the Whore sent, as the Scape-goat into the Wilderness? For the Lots were laid by the High Priest upon the Foreheads of the Goats with these Inscriptions, For God, and for Azazel. Some may think, that John rather intended to express the High Priesthood assumed by the Whore, because the Jewish High Priest had inscribed on his Forehead, Holiness to the Lord. But, properly speaking, the two-horned Beast, not Rome was High Priest. The Custom of Roman Harlots writing their Names on the Doors of their Apartments cannot be alluded to; for how could John know this, or why point at such an obscure Custom? John may only point at Inscriptions on Pictures, and Statues of Cities. Rome was worshipped as a Goddess, with this Inscription, Romaeternae; which perhaps is pointed at in xiii. 1. Upon the whole, more Causes than one may have given Rise to John's saying, The Whore had an Inscription on her Forehead.

By
By the Word, Mystery, he means, as elsewhere, that there was a hidden Meaning in the Words, and that it was darkly foretold by the Prophets. It seems very fanciful to understand it of the Mysteries obtruded by Rome upon the Church. Verse 7th seems to confute Hammond. I know not what the Learned think of the French Letter found in Joseph Scaliger's Notes. See a Sermon of Gill.

V. 8. See Dent, Lowman, the Family-Commentary, and other Books on, κοινωνες. Remember Sir Isaac's Scheme. The wondering of the Wicked here seems to include Worship of the Beast, and to interpret xiii. 3. and 8.

The seven Mountains seem, at first Sight, to be pointed at in Esdras; but it is more probable, that the seven Mountains of Esdras denote, many Mountains. Esdras only means, that God's People should possess many fruitful Hills like those in Judea, and also many Rivers flowing with Milk and Honey. Though Lisbon or Constantinople are now built on seven Hills, this avails nothing against Sir Isaac's Interpretation.

Lowman understands the seven Heads of seven Forms of Government. But it seems unnatural to call such Forms seven Kings, neither are
are those Forms sufficiently distinct. It is also highly improbable, that we should here be set upon a curious Search after the several Governments of Rome. It is much more natural, that the seven Seals should Point out seven distinct Heads, or Dynasties, with different Characteristics. Other Kingdoms were of old described by Dynasties. Do Historians agree as to the several Forms of Government in Rome, and would not God give stronger Conviction of the fulfilling his Prophecies, than what is built upon uncertain History? Beverley, Garret, and others use many Arguments to prove those several Sorts of Government to be pointed at, but those of Hayter against this Notion are much stronger. See Fleming. Jurieu says, James the First was the Person who first asserted the seven Heads to be seven successive Forms of Government. You may consult the Family-Commentary. After maturely considering Sir Isaac's Scheme, I can find no valid Objection against it.

In one Hour with the Beast. John thus uses μῦς, immediately afterwards; and this shews the Train of John's Ideas. For the Grammar, see πόρω καὶ παρεβαλέω, before.

The Waters denote Rome's Situation. See Isaiah li. 13. So also the Heads had two Significations; but John's Stile is elsewhere also concise
The Stile in 17 is very concise and obscure. See Lowman and others. The Phrase, making a Whore naked, you have in the Old Testament.
Testament. The Priest's Daughters, and probably their Wives, when guilty of Uncleanliness, were consumed by Fire, and why not the Whore Rome? The Phrase, eat her Flesh, seems to be taken from the Psalms. Vide also Daniel.

Chap. xviii. 1. There are also many other Prophecies besides John's concerning Rome's Destruction. See Balaam's Prophecy as explained in Mede, the Universal History, Xeres, Whiston, and others. The Prophecies concerning Edom sometimes point at all the Gentiles, particularly Rome. So Sodom, in Ezekiel, signifies all the Gentiles. Sometimes both literal and figurative Edom are prophesied of together. Mede indeed may sometimes err in explaining some Expressions used in the Prophecies concerning Edom. Besides the Scripture-Prophecies, there is a famous Irish Prophecy concerning the Popes; but that in the Life of Toland is said to be a Forgery. That Life of Toland refers you to a Piece written with Design to shew it to be forged. The Irish also have a Prophecy, that Rome will fall, when Ireland becomes Protestant; but this seems to be only a wise Conjecture. Usher's, an Extract of Nostradamus's, and other modern Prophecies, were lately published together. Whether Usher had the Gift of Prophecy, may
may be disputed by some; but why do the Writers of his Life assert, that he prophesied publickly in one of his Sermons? You will find the Opinions of the Learned concerning Nostradamus in many Authors. Varro's Story of the twelve Vultures may be referred hither. The Angel here described is Christ. Vide Ezekiel xliii. 2. and Luke xvii. 24.

V. 23. So Old Babylon was full of Enchantments and Sorceries.

Chap. xix. 7. So Esdras placeth the Appearance of the Bride who was withdrawn from the Earth, in the latter Days. Some take the Bride to be the Jews. See Note on xxii. 24.

V. 11. It may seem whimsical to think the white Horse of Hanover to be pointed at, or the Lion of England in Esdras.

V. 12. Yet it will not follow, that his Nature is incomprehensible, for the same Reasons as that of his Father. How he was created from Eternity, how God unites himself to him, and how he exercises his Power, Wisdom, and Goodness by him (whence he is here called the Word of God) no Person indeed can tell. If
his eternal Creation be contrary to Metaphysics, or if his Eternity would prove his Divinity (though our Eternity a parte post proves not our Divinity) then in John i. 2. apos+, must be rendered Antemundane, or ancient. But I believe Metaphysicians will not be able to prove this Point. Observe that some Things are affirmed of Christ as Man, some Things of his superangelical Nature, and others of him as possessed, if I may so speak, by God. Consider well the Stile in Mark, V. 6, 12; for it is of great Use here.

Vesture in Blood. This is twice found in the Prophets. It extends through the whole Reign of the Messiah. See xiv. 19, 20. The whole Reign of Christ is sometimes predicted in a single Expression, and yet some Particular is chiefly pointed at by the Prophet, or Writer quoting that Prophet. See Mede on Edom, where Christ is said to come from Bozrab. There Christ’s Conquest over the Kingdom of Satan, erected among the Gentiles, by his Death on the Cross, may be said to be commenced, and principally pointed at. Here John extends that Prophecy to the final Destruction of the Gentiles, and chiefly intends it by the Phrase, Red Vesture. Upon second Thoughts, I refer you to the Prophecy of Bozrab for its Meaning.
The Title, King of Kings, is borrowed from Daniel. See Hammond on the Word, Thigh.

εις, may perhaps denote a single Angel, in Opposition to a Multitude before mentioned. Is υς, in Mark, an only Son? Only, is often understood. You have υς, twice before. May rather, υς, signify, a certain Angel, or be an Expletive, or rendered as, un Ange in French? I had made a Collection of Places, where υς, is used in an uncommon Manner, but do want it at present. See the Word, certain, and the English Margin in Daniel. The Angel is here said to stand in the Sun, because the Sun of Righteousness is going to make War. Or you may understand it of the Universality of this War. But the best Account of this Matter is, that such a Standing would make the Herald's Person more conspicuous and glorious. See Ezekiel xxxix. 17.

The false Prophet, tho' born in the East, cometh to the West, as Balaam travelled to Balak, and wrought Inchantments before him. He shewed the ten-horned Beast, like Balaam, how to lay Stumbling-blocks before Israel.

Esdras saith, the Fire of Christ's Mouth, by which he shall destroy the Wicked, is his Law. The Killing by Christ's Sword here mentioned seems
seems to express what you find in John's Gospel, of Christ's Words judging Men.

Chap. xx. 1. The Beast and false Prophet are destroyed, as Balaam and Balak. The Dragon also is taken Prisoner. Yet the Dragon seems here not only to denote the Eastern Empire, but all Enemies of the Church, and the Devil their Head, who are chained for a thousand Years. There is no Fear of the Turks again slaying a third Part of Men, i.e. conquering the Western Empire, for where they are mentioned the second Time, they are conquered.

Many Prophets speak of these happy Times. The Peace foretold in Christ's Kingdom is not to be confined to a trifling Peace under Augustus, nor even to the Peace between God and Man, and Jews and Gentiles, which are often mentioned by Paul, but do reach to the millennial Peace. Nor is the Word Peace in such Prophecies put figuratively for any Sort of Happines.

Doth not Zechariah join both Advents of Christ, like other Prophets, and say God, i.e. Christ shall come with his Angels, on a Day neither Dark nor Light, but which in the Evening, i.e. in the Millennium, shall be Light? This Explication may please some as well as Whiston's. Another Prophet describes this Period, where
he says, the Day of the Lord shall have a sevenfold, i.e. a great Light. Joshuah's long Day may be alluded to; but why also may not the millennial Light be also pointed at?

That the 1000 Years should be understood as prophetic Numbers, as says Whiston on the Restoration of the Jews, cannot be admitted; for if John still proceeded by such Numbers, there would be something in the Context, directing us to such Interpretation. The prophetic Numbers are used, by way of Decorum, to denote the Life, Reign, or Actions of Kings, or Kingdoms represented by short-liv'd Animals; but here you have no such Reason to expect such Numbers. The Affairs also, said by the Prophets to be transacted in few Months or Days, sometimes evidently require a long Time, and consequently point out their Use of the Word Day for a Year; but why should it be so here? Add that the 1000 Years Peace, was, I believe, held by the Jews; so that John, when he uses the same Phrase, means the same Thing. No Obscurity is requisite here, as where a Day is put for a Year. It is also improbable, for the Reasons mentioned, that 1000 Years should be put for a long indefinite Time. John is more precise in his Numbers; and tho' 1000 Years and Hills in the Psalms, and 1000 Hills
Hills in Esdras may be so explained, we must not do so here, especially as the finishing of the 1000 Years is made by John the Epocha of an historical Fact. Some think Daniel speaks not of the Millennium, when he says, Christ coming in Clouds receives a Kingdom, because 1000 Years differ from everlafting Kingdom there mentioned; but this Objection is trifling.

I have omitted the Explication of no Number except one, which is the half-hour Silence. This Silence is indeed meant of the whole Reign of Theodosius, yet it furnishes but a poor Objection against what some call Sir Isaac's precise Way of considering John's Numbers. The Circumstances of the People's praying for the trifling Space of Time here mentioned, necessarily draws us off from looking for any thing exactly corresponding in the History, with respect to Length of Time. The 7000, in xi. 13. may happen to denote only a considerable Number, because the Jews spoke so.

They sate on them, contains an Hebrew Idiom, and means that Men, or Persons sate on them. Vide the Greek in xvi. 15. and elsewhere. The Word translated, Judgment, is, says Mede, an Hebraism for Government. Daniel says, the Judgment or Government shall fit. Christ says, I
ye shall sit on Thrones, and judge or govern. See also More.

They who hold the first Resurrection to be literal, may think τοὺς νεκροὺς to mean a glorified, or, as Paul calls it, a spiritual Body. Beheading was a Roman Punishment, and therefore mentioned by John. Compare Hall, Mede, Hammond, Sherwin, Worthington, Grotius, Markwick, Lowman, and others on the first Resurrection.

Jerusalem is called in the Apocrypha the beloved City. There are many Texts which seem to prove that Jerusalem will be rebuilt in the last Days. Read Genesis, where the original Grant is made to Abraham, and compare it with what the Prophet says, concerning the Return of the Jews from Babylon, in order to fulfil the Oath made to their Fathers. You have a curious Piece in Whiston's Memoirs, concerning the present Country of the ten Tribes, but whether it is liked by the Generality of the Learned I know not. See Burkit, the Universal History, Xeres, and others on Gog and Magog. Some make the Prophecy figurative, as those concerning Edom are sometimes. There is a very small anonymous English Pamphlet, which, on a cursory Reading, seemed to have something curious concerning this Affair. It censures Mede's
Maids' Notion of Gog and Magog, and treats of Ezekiel's Temple and City, and Whitby's Notion of the ten-horned Beast.

Chap. xxi. 1. New Heavens and Earth. The Prophet, from whom the Phrase is borrowed, expresses according to his wonted Custom, and also that of other Prophets, the whole Age of the Messiah, or both his Comings, when he speaks thus. There was no more Sea. Some may imagine it fled, and that a new Sea, as well as Earth and Heavens, was formed. The Scripture abounds with Trajectories; and I observed that there seems to be one in xiii. 8. John is sometimes tautological. Worship him, says he, who made Heaven, Earth, Sea, and Fountains. Hurt not, says he, Earth, Sea, and Tree. You may see Burnet's Opinion. Some may think the Vision to be given to John, according to vulgar Apprehension, the Sea being commonly esteemed not only useless but pernicious. Consult the Authors who have wrote against Burnet. Indeed the sacred Writers treat the natural Phænomena, according to the received Notions, as the learned Shuckford acknowledges. It seems more probable, that John only meant, that the whole Plan of the Earth being changed, the Sea would be useless. By the by, the Semi-deists,
deists, as one may call them, say, that the Scriptures treat the moral Phænomena according to vulgar Notions, but this is a pernicious Error. Some think it implies, that Trouble and Tumult should cease. You will find an uncommon Account of this Matter in the Fragments collected by Humphrys. What if the Want of Sea was represented in the Vision to John merely to shew, that the Inhabitants of the new Earth should be free from all Danger?

Shall Tabernacle with them. In vii. 15. render the Words, Tabernacle upon them, to preserve them from Heat, as the Shechinah in the Wilderness. See 2 Corinthians xi. 9.

V. 10. This was for the more convenient beholding the City, rather than to shew that Christ’s Church was established on a Mountain. You find the like in Ezekiel; and perhaps this was one Reason, why the City is shewn in a Field to Esdras. It is improbable that John is now brought to the Desert, whither the Woman fled; for he says not a Desert but a Mountain.

For the Criticisms on the Measures of the New Jerusalem compare Hammond, Mede, Lowman, Universal History, Family-Commentary and Whiston. The Measures of Ezekiel’s Temple are treated of by some of them. For the Word,
The Foundations were collateral. Lowman speaks of Houses, but John mentions them not. There is a trifling Piece, called Bunyan's Temple spiritualized, which speaks of Ornaments of precious Stones in the Temple. I do not remember that others mention such. The Stones of Fire in the Prophet are said to belong to Dress. See Markwick.

V. 24, 25. The Prophets frequently mention this Honour, which is to accrue to the Temple in the End. yeum, seems to mean Gentiles here. Such Splendor of the Jews may typically express this glorious State of the Church in the New Jerusalem, and even from its first Commencement. John, like the old Prophets, calls Christians Jews, and sometimes in Imitation of them, describes the Messiah's Reign, as if the Jews then triumphed over the Gentiles, instructed many of them, and were in every Sense their Head. When therefore John speaks of the sealed Jews, and of a Multitude of Gentiles afterwards added to them, he does not mean that many Gentiles were not of the Number of the sealed First-fruits. John only, as I observed, follows the Stile of other Prophets. Some think that by the Bride in xix. 7. the Jews are denoted, and yet in xxii. 17. the Bride includes all Christians.
But here it seems to follow from the Text, that the Bride or New Jerusalem denotes Jews principally. Read Verse 12, and my Appendix. In the mean Time, consult Garret, Sherwin and others.

V. 27. These you may take to be Hebraisms for making an Idol. See Romans i. 25. Yet some may doubt whether the Word, Lye, implies not something else. What Sort of Crime, or Apostacy may be meant here, in ii. 23, 24, and 9. in xiv. 5. in xxi. 8. and in xxii. 15. or whether different Sorts are pointed at in some of them is difficult to determine. What I have to say on these Verses, I must reserve for another Work. Woolston cites this Verse to prove his Definition of Virtue, but Hucbston has confuted him and all Opposers.

Chap. xxii. 1. I give you here some unconnected Hints without any Order, and as I wrote them for my own Use at different Times. Mede makes great Mistakes here. Hammond makes only one Tree to be found here, and his Arguments should be considered. Beverley makes the Branches spread to either Side of the River. Lowman makes twelve Trees. In the Mosaical Paradise there was but on Tree, and but
but one in the Epistle to the Church of Ephesius. The Doctrine of the twelve Apostles seems to be meant, as in the twelve Foundations mentioned before. As a River is here mentioned as in Ezekiel, and twelve Trees are mentioned in Ezekiel, so twelve Trees seem to be mentioned here. Ezekiel’s Trees bear Fruit monthly. The twelve Fruits answer to the twelve Months rather than to twelve Trees. καταραν, often signifies a Vintage and Harvest. Tourism, is very often understood in Scripture. Yet twelve Trees are meant as in Ezekiel, which bear Fruit monthly. Esdras makes a fragrant Balsam of the Leaves of the Trees. John seems to say, the River ran in the Forum, or principal Street, or rather in the Area, and had these Trees growing on either Side. Might not the Trees in the Vision standing on either Side appear as in the midst of the Area and in the midst of the River? So the Lamb seemed to be in the midst of the Throne. See Sir Isaac there. So Christ and the Witnesses seemed to stand on the Molten Sea. So the Angel, with the little Book, seemed to place one Foot on the Molten Sea, and the other on the Ground. So, if the common Version be just, Angels seemed to be bound in Euphrates. Consider also Daniel’s Man in the River. The Fire, &c. seemed to proceed out of the Horses'
Mouths, and the Cannon to be the Horse's Tails, which also seemed to have Heads, with Mouths spitting Fire and Smoak. Observe that the Article is wanting before, ήλθω, here in Verse 2.

Some say there was a River springing up under the Throne in the Temple, but probably the Learned believe it not. Ezekiel indeed mentions it, but perhaps his River is figurative. He may allude to the Mosaical Paradise. You have elsewhere a River and Fountain in the House of the Lord, and in the City of God. Ezekiel, in his Description of this River, prophesies of the Gospel and twelve Apostles, and like other Prophets, in many of their Predictions, extends the Prophecy to the End of the World. His River ran into the idolatrous Countries, as John here speaks of healing the Nations or Gentiles, and its Water of Life healed them; yet, says he, some Parts were given to salt, that is, remained barren, or unconverted. Whiston cites this Passage in Ezekiel, as coinciding with what Esdras says of Salt-waters found among the Sweet. If Whiston had lived to hear of the new Invention to change Salt-waters into Sweet, he would perhaps have made it a Sign of the approaching of the last Day, especially as his Version of Esdras from the Arabic exactly expresses it.

V. 8.
V. 8. I find the following unconnected Hints in my Papers. If John only intended to salute the Angel, seeing the Angel forbids him, it shews the Worship of an Angel would be attended with a severe Reproof. This Incident was probably mentioned as a Warning against that Doctrine, which John says the false Prophet taught. The Angel forbids such Worship, because he could not tell, but that John intended it, or because he might take occasion from John's performing an Act very like it, to caution all Men against Creature-Worship. Some imagine, that John took the Angel for Christ, and that at two different Times, because John would not worship Angels. The Angel here says, I come quickly, as representing Christ, and John might think it was Christ who spoke. By the by, is he Christ or an Angel, who says, Brother, in Esdras? John might think both Christ and an Angel to be in his Company, because of the Words, I come quickly, and think he worshipped Christ. In xix. 9. he may be rendered, one said; and in Verse io, it may be supposed, John thought he worshipped Christ. If there should happen to be an Hebraism there (though I think it very improbable) it is no more than what is common. There is one in xii. 6. which may puzzle the Illiterate.
In xviii. 1. Christ seems to be meant. Now, in xix. 10. might not John think Christ continued to speak? Who knows but that Christ spoke both there and here, as well as an Angel? A Voice from the Throne John often mentions in this Divine Drama. Garret has something extraordinary here, which, on a cursory Reading, I could not well understand. That this Affair only happened in Vision, seems improbable. I made a Remark on the Opinion, which makes John stand on the Shore of Patmos, and do think that John is there imitating Daniel, who was in Vision on the Sea-shore when he saw the Beasts. By the by, some there read, he stood on the Sea-shore; but in that case, I think John would have repeated, o deaov, in Verse 18.

Upon revising the above Hints, I think it most probable, that John intended not Worship. He did not take the Angel twice for Christ. It is as if the Angel had said, I think myself not sufficiently deserving of such Respect, and besides, would have you to know, that such Regard paid to Angels, though not criminal in you, is dangerous, and leads some People to Idolatry, or Polytheism. So Cornelius only paid high Respect to Peter in the Eastern Way; and yet Peter says, what the Angel says here. Cor-

nelius
nelius being instructed by Jews, and not willing to offend Peter, a Jew, would not religiously worship a Man. A popish Commentator says, that in Colossians, evil Angels alone are forbidden to be worshipped. But the whole Context shews the contrary. Paul there speaks of the Law, and its Ordinances said in the Scripture and Josephus to be given by Angels. Some for this Reason, and through Pretences to great Knowledge concerning the Dignity of Angels, worshipped them with an inferior Degree of Honour. This shews how Angel-Worship is joined there with the Doctrines of Judaizers. It was introduced by vain Philosophy, and fleshly Wisdom, which differs not from Folly. These ignorant Persons spoke much of the Administration of the Government of the World by Angels; and, as the Praises of Fools are Satyrs, they, says Jude, sometimes fell into ridiculous Stories concerning them. The Jews spoke of an Angel of Prayer, and probably some of them carried this Notion too far. If Worship of evil Angels was meant in Colossians, Paul would have bitterly inveighed against it. No Christian could be thus led astray. Some Papists tell you, those Angel-worshippers in Colossians, ascerted Angels to have been Creators; but Paul would also have spoken more severely of such a Notion, and
and Christians were in no Danger of such an Error. Another Papist says, that Angels were formerly worshipped. When present, they were honoured as by John. But in short, the whole Context in Colossians shews, that those Heretics were exactly the same with the Papists in this Particular. Paul there says, they were compleat in Christ, the only Head of the Church, and want not Angel Mediators, Law-givers, and Heads of the Church. See Xeres on the Words, Call no Man Father, or Master, as some called the Rabbies. By the by, Popes surely are excluded by Paul as Heads of the Church. They in Colossians are not said to derogate from the Father, by saying, that Angels were Joint-creators, but from Christ, the only Head of the Church. Angels are not to be honoured when present with such Honours as God alone is worshipped with, though we profess that we intend only an inferior Degree of Worship. When they are absent, this is still more forbidden, for that is making them omniscient, though the Worshippers profess the contrary in Words; and to make them omniscient, is as bad, as saying they are Creators; which latter Opinion some of them say is censured in Colossians. To worship Angels or Saints departed when present with the highest Ceremonies, pro-
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provided we declare we intend not Divine Honours, would not be criminal, if it was not forbidden; and it is forbidden, least the Ill-instructed should be led into Polytheism; an Opinion dangerous to Mankind; or imagine Christ merited not to be sole Mediator and Head of his Church; an Opinion which destroys the most important and salutary Articles of our Faith.

That Christ here forbids to worship himself cannot be imagined, for see Chap. i. 1, 2. It is not Idolatry to worship Christ, though a Creature, seeing he is one, in whom God dwelt so fully and effectually, as to make him the invisible Image of the invisible God, creating by him all Things, whether visible or invisible. Observe that it is said of Christ, that he was God's Image, before Paul proceeds to speak of his Incarnation and Exaltation. We worship him, as one in whom God dwells, as if he had assumed a Body. He is therefore much oftner called God, even in the Old Testament, than is generally imagined. The Jews worshipped the Shechinah, i. e. God in it. See Phil. ii. 11. The Reasons why we are forbidden to have more Gods than one, extend not to our worshipping God in this Manner. Even the Arian Creeds, though it has some very bad Effects, is not attended with those particular Ill Effects,
Effects, which made the first Commandment necessary. If it was certain that all Men would believe in many infinitely perfect Gods, it probably would not be forbidden to have more Gods than one. But, though some might hold such a Notion, yet others mistaking their Opinions, and seeing them worship a Plurality of Gods, might be led to believe, that those Gods might disagree. Or they might imagine, that some of those Gods were of an inferior Sort; and seeing them all equally worshipped, they might imagine the Polytheists to hold all the Gods to be imperfect. This was actually the Case with the Bulk of the Gentiles. But the Athanasian Creed leads not to such pernicious Doctrines. God therefore might suffer the Athanasian Creed, though false, to prevail even among his Witnesses, until the seven-fold Light, foretold by the Prophet, should arise. The Time is not yet compleatly come, when the Knowledge of God shall cover the Earth. See my Appendix.

sprouting from the old Root of David. The Bride speaking in or by the Spirit, you have in the following Verse. In Romans xv. 12. is Christ said to be before Jesse? He is there said to spring from the old decayed Root of Jesse.

V. 18. Such Adjurations have been formerly much used at the Conclusion of Books. This Prophecy of John is of the highest Importance, and hereafter its use will be evidently seen. It being designed to illustrate God's Providence towards his Church, and also to effect the Reformation thereof; a severe sentence is denounced against the Corrupters of this Book, by adding, diminishing, altering the Original, or Copies, forging new Revelations in the Name of God, putting designedly false Glosses on it, hiding it, forbidding the Use of it, or denying against Light of Conscience, that it is the Word of God. Observe, that all forged Revelations invalidate, among the illiterate, who are the most numerous Part of Mankind, the Authority of the true ones. So forged Miracles make many suspect true ones. Forged Revelations may also happen to contradict the true ones, in Predictions and Precepts. Observe also, that I said, this Prophecy may effect a Reformation of the Church, and I find others so far of my Opinion,
as to say, the shortest and surest Way to destroy Popery, is by studying such Prophecies. It is not meant, that this closes the Canon of Scripture, nor that God's Spirit would then cease to give new prophetical Revelations.

The Conjecture found in Hammond, concerning this Verse, and another in John's Gospel, seems groundless. John himself speaks, in both Places. In his Gospel, he had before used the Phrase, he knoweth that his Testimony is true. He afterwards uses the plural Number, in the Place referred to by Hammond, because others, (who, if not Eye-Witnesses, yet had them from such, as Luke also had) now joined in testifying many of those Things. So Paul joins others with himself, for wise Reasons, in writing many of his Epistles. This seems to be one Reason, why John speaks of himself, in the third Person. Indeed, all the Gospels seem to be compiled from Memoirs of different Persons, by the Authors whose Names they bear. Those Authors seem to have read many of the same Memoirs, because of their using frequently the very same Words. Others may have furnished John with some authentic Memoirs, and joined in the Publication. Observe, how John there resumes the singular Number, and says, a man, or, their common Ammonensis may say, a man, with John's Appro-
Approbation. I find a late Commentator giving another Account of μνα, in John, but it seems not probable.

V. 20. I come quickly. Upon revising these Notes for the Press, I find it necessary to say something more, on this Subject. I observed before, that the Prophets often join the two Advenstes of the Messiah. V. among many Places, Isaiah ix. and Malachi, Chap. last. Malachi speaks of Christ's Day burning as an Oven, which regards the Destruction of the Jews, and also the Day of Judgment, but principally the latter. Yet he adds, Elias shall come before it, there seeming to confine it to Christ's first Coming and Destruction of Jerusalem. This Way of speaking has led many astray, in other Things, besides this of Elias. Observe, by the by, that the Phrase in Mark, Elias suffered many Things, is there to be read in a Parenthesis; which is a common Scripture-Stile. Observe also, that such Figures are common in profane Authors, and Scripture. So, saith the Prophet, David shall rule in the latter Days. Explain thus all Prophecies, called by me figurative, unless where, besides such Type or Figure, more than one Thing is prophesied of. When Prophets saw at one Time, in Vision, many Things re-
resembling one another, and put together, because tending to one End, and proving one and the same Point, they wrote such Things as they saw them; whence Readers often imagine them to be only one Event. But an attentive Reader will see a Transition, that more than one Event is meant, and that sometimes the several Events are not contemporary, nor even sometimes immediately succeeding one another. But it may seem extraordinary, how I came to mention Isaiah, as joining both Comings of Christ. Read on, where I quoted him, and you will find, he speaks of Christ's destroying by Fire, which principally belongs to the last Day; yet, a little before, he calls him the Father of the future Age; which takes in the preceding Times. By the by, the Jews called a King, Father; and Isaiah, both before and after, speaks of Christ's Children and Seed.

Esdra also saith, Then shall my Son Christ die, and all Men, who have Life; which Words, by the by, seem to prove, that he wrote before Christ. Does he not conjoin the Death of Christ with the last Judgment, and at the same Time assert, that Christ was to come within 400 Years? Does he not elsewhere make a small Number of Years to be all that remained of the Time of the World, or Jewish Age?
Upon the whole, it seemeth probable, that this indistinct Way of foretelling Christ's two Comings, was one Cause of calling even his first Advent by the Names, future World, and last Times.

John knew very well, that the last Day was far off, seeing he knew Antichrist was to come, and that all Kindreds, Tongues, and Nations should apostatize, and worship the Beast. These Things must, he knew, require a considerable Time. Therefore revise my Notes on Daniel, for the Explication of, I come quickly; and let me add, that the Kingdom of God, and of Heaven is, sometimes, said to be come, and, sometimes, to come. The latter Sentiment is expressed in the Lord's Prayer, where we pray, that it may come; when his Will is to be done on Earth, as in Heaven. Christ said he was soon to come, and that some Standers-by were to see it, before they died; and yet you see his Apostle John knew that his last Coming was far off. So Paul having spoke in such Terms to the Thessalonians, as if the Day of the Lord was at hand, yet sheweth, in next Epistle, that he meant not, that his last Coming was near. In Thessalonians, he faith, we shall be caught up into the Air, who remain alive. In Corinthians, he says, we shall not all die, but we shall
shall all be changed. He elsewhere says, if we be not found naked. These Expressions may make some imagine, he thought, the last Day approached; but what I said on Daniel, and elsewhere, shew, that Paul was not of this Opinion. In Romans he faith, now is your Salvation nearer, than when you believed. Yet he meaneth not, that the last Day was at hand: but, (as Hammond faith, in many of his Notes) that Jerusalem should soon be destroyed; when not only Jews but Judaiizers should perish, Persecution from that Quarter cease, the faithful Christians escape, and Christ's Power be openly shewn and proved. Then Satan should be bruised under Foot. Now, by the by, then good, is not meant, but the Phrase before quoted is referred to.

We are scarce ever threatened with Death, in Scripture, but as it is in itself painful, or as it deprives us of the Comforts of Life, unless where the second Death is meant. What we are generally threatened with, is Christ's coming. It was so also, among the Jews. So Enoch said to the Wicked, the Lord cometh with Myriads of Angels. Consider also their Maranatha, and the Phrase, second Death, used by the Jews. Art thou come to torment us, before the Time, say the Devils. Divin's State,
in the Parable, after Death, will not, I think, prove the contrary. The Devils are said in Peter and Jude to be kept in Chains, to be punished at the last Day. So also the wicked Antediluvians are said to be kept in Prison, until God shall judge the Living and Dead; many of which last refused the Gospel, as prescribing Self-denial, and renouncing the Flesh, with its Lusts. This Place, by the by, was never before explained, so as to shew the Stile and Sentiment of Peter and Jude. Refuse not to suffer for Christ, as the Antediluvians, now dead, refused the Gospel, or you shall also be destroyed. Consider the Phrase, Wrath to come. The great Punishment of the Wicked is deferred until the last Day. So also is the great Happiness of the Saints. V. Revelations vi. 10. where they grieve for Christ's Delay, and the Restoration of Order and Peace, by Destruction of the Bad.

Discovering the Stile of the Prophets concerning the Reign or World of the Messiah, clears up many difficult Places in Scripture, where you will find the very best Commentators quite bewildered. In Epistle to Hebrews, God is said in these last Days to have spoken by his Son, to have begotten him on the Day of his Resurrection, after being condemned by the raging Heathens,
Heathens, (then commencing their Enmity against Christ) and People of Israel imagining a vain Thing; (by the Way, V. Hammond's Index on θεος, and its Meaning in Acts iv. 24, 27.) then to bring him again into the inhabited Earth; to put this World called future by the Prophets under his Power; then to command the Angels, who delivered the old Law, to worship him. Then Paul proceeds to speak of the Powers of this future World. His Tabernacle is not made with Hands, and is not perishable, but belongs to the new Creation, i.e. to the new Heavens and Earth, which are not to be shaken, as the present Jewish Tabernacle and World. The Christian Dispensation is not to be shaken, and is the Commencement of the Kingdom of Heaven. The Saints are come, not to Sinai to receive the old Law, but are already in Heaven, being dead to this World, and the old Law, and united now with Angels and Spirits perfected. The Lord promised to shake the Earth and Heavens, i.e. to make the old Earth and Heavens pass away; not only to destroy Kingdoms, in order to establish that of Christ, which is to remain for ever, and to be most powerful in the Millennium, but even to remove the Jewish Dispensation. The new Heavens
Heavens and new Earth are therefore partly commenced already, and are partly future.

Paul says in Romans, that Saints are as Spirits, led by the Spirit, dead to Sin, the World, and the Law, and are not in the Flesh, as Gentiles, or even Jews.

Haggai speaks of both Comings of Christ as one, and says, that the Power of Rome is to be shaken, or removed before the Millennium. I believe the best Commentators have erred, with respect to that Phrase in Haggai, I will shake the Heavens and the Earth; which means that new Heavens and new Earth shall commence. See the Phrase, shaking Things, in Esdras. At Christ's first coming, a new World shall commence, though it shall not be perfected until the Time mentioned by John in Revelations xxii. 1. on which Place see my Note.

Is not the Phrase, being in the Flesh, found in Romans vii. 4, 5. partly to be explained, as I said above, by the Death of Saints to the World and Flesh?

In Ephesians, Paul declares, that Saints are already in heavenly Places, in the spiritual Canaan, where they have obtained an Inheritance; that others are of the Age of this World, which will in some Degree subsist to the End under the Prince of the Air, whilst the Saints may be said
to be in Heaven, already in some Degree also present, though called a future or succeeding Age by the Prophets, and by Paul in ii. 7. The Kingdom of Heaven is partly commenced, but its best Period is yet to come. Seeing its best Period is not come, we may also say, that this World is as yet Satan's Kingdom. The Ephesians are Fellow-citizens of the Saints, and do belong to the great Family of Heaven and Earth. Those Saints, with whom they hold Fellowship, are as he faith in Colossians, in Light, and denote chiefly Jews departed. They were reconciled by the Cross to God, and the Ephesians and Colossians were then united to them in the heavenly State; though formerly Aliens. This Union of People in Earth and Heaven is called in Scripture the Kingdom of Heaven. So Christ faith, many Gentiles, as afterwards the Ephesians and Colossians should come, and partake of the heavenly Supper with Abraham, and other Jews gone to Heaven, and be gathered under the same Head of the Church.

In 2 Corinthians iv. the God of this World is distinguished from him who is there said to bring Light out of Darkness. The God of what Paul there calls the present Age blindeth Men; but the true God, as he at first brought Light out of Darkness, so he now removes the Darkness
Darkness of the blinding Devil, and enlightens
the Apostles of what is called the future World,
or Age of the Messiah. It is the God who spoke
Light out of Darkness, who hath shined. A
creating God is alone God, faith the Prophet.
This Interpretation of 2 Corinthians iv. 4, 5, 6.
is new, and perhaps may please.

I have now, I persuade myself, given a Key
for unlocking many of the most obscure Pro-
phecies. Having quoted Esdras in this Note
and often before, it now remains that I give you
my Reasons. I saw a Sketch in a News-Pa-
per of what was called Whiston's Interpretation
of Esdras's Eagle. I also saw a Piece written
by one Abraham a learned Jew who was con-
verted in Dublin, and cites Esdras as saying,
Christ will come within 400 Years. I then
found that one of the Fathers makes Augustus
to be pointed at in Esdras's Eagle. I lately got
Whiston's Memoirs, wherein I found some Places
in Esdras explained, and a Version from the Ara-
bic. Having wrote some lose Hints at different
Tims for detecting the Meaning of some Things
in Esdras, I here communicate them as I find
them in my Papers. Hakewell is very severe
against Esdras, but many of his Objections
have little Force. If Esdras's Prophecy of the
Eagle be agreeable to History, he must be a
true
true Prophet. Hakewell's Objection about the Weakness, and short Lives of Men in Esdras's Time may perhaps be invalid. He mocks Esdras as saying the Saints should eat the Leviathan. I find not this in Esdras, but I find in the Psalms that it had been done. Try Esdras vi. Xerxes gives an Account of the Mistake of the Jews in this Matter. Enoch and Leviathan seem to be put for all Fishes and Cattle. The Fishes are made to be devoured, as is, if I remember, said in Scripture. The best Account given by the Jews of this Point is, that in Job, and, I suppose, also in the Psalms, and Esdras, these Words signify all Animals. The chief ones may be put for all in Esdras, but this will not hold as to Job, nor probably in some Places in the Psalms. Where (as Whiston interprets Esdras) France is said to die in the Person of Lewis XIV, think of the Defeat of the French Project of universal Monarchy under Lewis. France died not in Battle as Spain did, but a natural Death on her Bed, or Lewis shall die for Grief. Whiston's Version is probably better than either of these. Christ shall die, and all who have Life, but they who remain shall rejoice with him within 400 Years, or about 400, as in the Arabic Copy. The World shall be turned into Silence or Rest, within seven Days,
or on the seventh Day, the Millennial Sabbath. Turned into Silence as at the first Creation. See the Word, Silence, in Chap. vi. Does Esdras point at the Duration of the World? How shall we explain that in Habakkuk, In the midst of the Years revive? I do not find that the Time of Christ's Birth is elsewhere pretended to be exactly foretold. When did Esdras write this Prophecy? Esdras joins Christ's first coming and the Resurrection, like other Prophets. Perhaps this was the Reason, why some said the Resurrection was past, explaining it of a Resurrection to Newness of Life, or a Revival of the old Dominion of the Saints. Humphrys, in his Collection of Fragments, will help to understand Esdras, where he speaks of the World to come, and the Resurrection. May Esdras mean, that the Church should rejoice 400 Years, i.e. until the Rise of Antichrift? It cannot, I think, be meant. Israel is sometimes put for all Believers in Esdras. Esdras is said to be the only remaining Prophet. When was that particular Saying written? Is it meant that he was the only Prophet left in that Place, Daniel being absent? He says he received a Charge on Mount Horeb. Did he receive it there in Vision? Or means he that he resembled Moses? He is afterwards said to see an Angel in a Bush,
Where Esdras saith, the Law was burned, the French Translator says, Part of it is only meant. Read controversial Writers on the Book found in Josiah's Time. The Books here mentioned were all the Helps I could get for understanding Esdras. I find Whiston has written more on the Subject, but I have not seen more than his Memoirs. After writing so far, I got Dr. Lee's Dissertation on Esdras. He has written another Piece on the Subject, but whether it is printed, I know not. I shall not transcribe any Thing out of his Book, but do recommend it much. You may compare my Hints with those of Lee and Whiston, and probably correct many Errors in mine. Perhaps you may find more Helps than I have mentioned.
APPENDIX.

Upon revising these Notes, I found it necessary to add some new Illustrations. I here present you with a new Interpretation of Daniel’s seventy Weeks.

I was for some Time fond of Tillinghast’s Scheme, which is as follows. Extend the seventy Weeks unto the Space of half a Week after Christ’s Passion. He confirmed the Covenant with many from the Time of his Baptism for four Years, and before the last Week was finished, or in the midst of it, he suffered, and thus made the daily Sacrifice to cease among the Jews.

But I afterwards got an Extract of Marshal’s Scheme, and found that the Learned reckoned sixty-nine Weeks, from the going forth of the Commandment to rebuild Jerusalem, unto the Death of Christ. I then proceeded to paraphrase the whole thus.

There are seventy Weeks until the Covenant is confirmed with many, and everlasting.
Righteousness is brought in among the People of the City, for whom thou prayest. There are sixty-nine Weeks until the Passion of the Holy Prophet, at which Time he shall be anointed. There are seven Weeks until the Walls are strengthened, and the Buildings are compleated. The City, for which thou prayest, shall not be his, for he shall be cut off; though many of its People shall become his by Covenant. The City, I say, shall not be his, for another People, belonging to another Prince, who is to come, shall in so small a Space as half a Week, destroy it, and make it until the End, or for a very long Time desolate.

The Learned will easily see this Interpretation to be right, when they read *Marshall*, and consider the following Observations.

Sir Isaac distinguishes between the Prophet and the Prince, and makes the anointing of the Prophet to be mentioned expressly. But the Phrase, Vision and Prophet, I find to signify, in a common Scripture-Stile, the Vision concerning the Prophet. See my Note on, Spirit and Bride, in *Revelations*. Gabriel therefore says, that the Vision concerning Christ as a Prophet should be finished, within the Period of seventy Weeks, and that this most holy Prophet should be
be then anointed Prince. Jesus is never said to be anointed Prince until his Resurrection.

In Sir Isaac's Way, it seemed strange, that Jesus should be said to be cut off, as if it was immediately after the sixty-two Weeks. The same Sort of Difficulty attends Marshal's Scheme; for why should not Daniel give some Reason, why he first said, seventy Weeks, and then cut off one Week. To say, he builds on the seventy Years Captivity, and therefore says, seventy Weeks, is not a sufficient Answer. Marshal's Interpretation is unnatural here.

It is scarce credible, that the whole Sum should make seventy Weeks, and yet that this should happen only by Chance. Now in Sir Isaac's Scheme, this is merely accidental.

Where it is said, there shall be seven Weeks until he is anointed Prince, and (below) sixty-two Weeks, there is a Trajectio, such as Grammarians find very frequent in Scripture.

The City shall not indeed be his, but, or yet, the People, for whom thou prayest, shall in great Numbers become his. See Sir Isaac for this Version.

The mention of the People for whom Daniel prayed, and who are here said to become Christ's, suggested the Phrase, The People of another Prince. So the mention of the Holy Prince
Prince suggested the calling the Roman Emperor, a Prince who shall come. Christ indeed is often called, ο Θεοῦ θεός, but Daniel would not without some Reason change his Epithet. Review my Notes on Daniel.

Limborch shews a parallel Stile in Ezekiel for severing the sixty two Weeks, seven Weeks, and one Week. Consult Grotius. See also Mede and More, who have many Things to the Purpose. Observe Revelations ix. 15.

By the Word here rendered, Street, the Area is meant. You have the Word twice used in Revelations for the Area of a City, and, if I remember, it is so found in Genesis.

If Daniel had meant by the Phrase, confirming the Covenant with many, the making Alliances with others, he probably would have said, with many, or other Nations. He surely rather means to shew here some Part of the Fate of the People, for whom Daniel prayed. He had already said, that they should have a Prophet who should be anointed Prince, and that he should procure to them, as well as to others, Forgiveness, Righteousness, and Reconciliation. Compare Marshal's and Pool's Annotations.

A little before Christ's Passion, we are told that some Jews said, the Kingdom of God should shortly appear. This they probably bor-
rowed not from Christ and his Disciples, nor could gather it, as to the exact Time, from any other Prophecy but this, which probably some of them, notwithstanding its Obscurity, at least partly, understood. They understood it of his Exaltation after Death, when he was to be anointed Prince, and not of his Birth. They seem to have known what Isaiah said of his Death, and consequent Exaltation; and this might help them to understand Daniel here. So also we find they understood the 2d Psalm, where Christ is said to be again born, or as Paul expresses it, revealed out of the travelling Earth, because at his Resurrection he was anointed Prince on Sion, even over the Heathens, and proclaimed Son and Heir of God on that Day.

Were the Jews freed from some remarkable Troubles or tyrannical Oppressors at the End of the seven Weeks, seeing troublous Times are here mentioned? Consult Mede and More. I want Books and Leisure to enquire into this Point. Or are the Troubles only, what are usually mentioned by Commentators. Perhaps if you inquire, you will find one Reason for severing the seven Weeks from the rest.

I have not seen Marshal's Scheme but in an Extract, so that I know not what Proofs he brings of the City and Wall being completed.
in seven Weeks. It is sufficient for our Pur-
pose that Gabriel plainly affirms it.

It was scarcely worth while to tell us, when
the Wall and City were to be perfected, so that
there seems to be another Reason for disjoining
the seven Weeks. See Sir Isaac on the Jubilees
and sabbatical Years found in his Scheme. Daniel
probably intended to express, besides what
Marshall says, that the finishing of the City was
a Matter of rejoicing, and therefore called it a
Jubilee. The confirming the Covenant with
many was a still higher Cause of Joy. He
therefore points out, that the whole was com-
posed of Jubilees or sabbatical Years. If you
be sceptical as to the Time of finishing the City,
the Reason by me given will be sufficient for
disjoining the seven Weeks. But it is more
probable, that the Time of perfecting the Wall
and City is also pointed at, because it is not said,
after the sixty-nine, but after sixty-two Weeks
the anointed Prince shall be cut off, the finishing
the City being made a remarkable Epocha.

In a Week after Christ's Death, Cornelius was
called. Many Disciples had fled, after the Mar-
tydom of Stephen, and thus the Jews lost many
Teachers, and the confirming the Covenant
was much obstructed. Until about this Time,
the Jews, for whom Daniel prayed, alone en-
joyed
joyed the Covenant of their Prince. But now the Gentiles begin to be Favourites of the Prince. He soon after sends Peter to Cornelius, and about this Time calls also Paul for the same Purpose of giving the Covenant to the Gentiles, as you are told in Acts xxvi. 17, 18. which, by the by, seems to be a Passage not often considered, nor compared with what is said of Peter in the Jerusalem Council.

You may perhaps not like my Account of the Phrase, Vision and Prophet. I answer, that, interpret the Phrase as you please, it is plain that this Prophet is there said to be anointed Prince, or that he should commence Prince within seventy Weeks. After his Death, he was exalted to be Prince. You find this often asserted in Scripture.

You may object, that the Words imply, that this Anointing is to happen precisely at the End of seventy Weeks. I answer, that the Words may as well, and do, only signify, that this happened in the last Week, at his Resurrection. This Way of speaking may be allowed, especially as the Angel proceeds to explain his Meaning; and the Holy Spirit chose it, in order to give a necessary Obscurity to this Prophecy.

You may object, that Christ’s Resurrection is not mentioned in Daniel, before he brings in Righte-
Righteousness, and confirms the Covenant. This
Objection is trifling. Isaiah speaks of Christ's
seeing his Seed, after speaking of his Death,
and yet mentions not expressly his previous Re-
surrection.

You may object, that your Notions of Chron-
ology are different. I answer, that you must
submit to Daniel; for was he so good a Prophet
as to guess near the Time, and yet not so very
good a one, as to hit it exactly.

Thus, I am persuaded, I have given a full
Explication of this Prophecy, which was hi-
therto called, Opprobrium Theologrum.
Many grant that the Days mentioned in this Chapter are those of Antiochus Epiphanes; yet something more is intended in this Chapter. It extends to the End, by which Daniel elsewhere means Christ's second Coming. The mention of Antiochus suggested similar Events. If Antiochus alone was described here, what Occasion for great Obscurity here, rather than in the preceding History of Antiochus, which is so plain, that Porphyry said it was written after the Facts? Though Daniel is a clear Prophet, yet where he speaks of the End, Christ, and Antichrist, he must become obscure, like other Prophets, for the very same Reasons.

In order to make a necessary Obscurity in Prophecy, Types or Figures are often used. Sometimes more Things than one are predicted together, making some Events typical of others. So Antiochus may, where Obscurity is requisite, be made a Type of Antichrist. The same may be said of the War which destroyed Jerusalem. Even both these Events may be joined together as...
as Types of Antichrist. In Esdras's Eagle, the French Monarchy is said to be meant by the middle Head, yet Lewis XIV. may be principally pointed at. Thus Antiochus may be pointed at, where the crafty King is mentioned. It may happen also, that this is one Reason, why that Kingdom is called a King. Thus Alexander the Great is principally meant, where the Kingdom erected by him is called a King.

Some may think, the Destruction of Jerusalem to be alone pointed at, in the beginning of the Chapter; and that about that Time, Christ should be set for the Resurrection and Fall of many in Israel (that is the Resurrection of some and Fall of others) as you find it expressed in Luke. Then also Apostles and Prophets were to run to and fro, and propagate the Knowledge of what was predicted by the old Prophets. But the literal Resurrection seems rather to be described, and the Word, Many, signifies the Multitude, as in Matthew xxiv. 12. and in Romans. He says not, all Men shall rise, because all shall not be found sleeping. The shining of the Good is also mentioned by Christ, where speaking of the literal Resurrection. This appears to be in the prophetic Angel's Mind, because he mentions here the End, and says below, that Daniel should rest until the End.
How the first Resurrection can be described, as Whitton supposes, where many are said to rise to Contempt, I cannot apprehend. The Destruction of Jerusalem seems to be expressed, but the Effects of it, and Power of the Romans, are also taken in, until the Restoration of God's People. This Sort of Stile and Method, is frequent in the other Prophets. Antiochus also is included, because the Days of his Oppression were still in the Prophet's Mind. The whole Age of the Messiah he speaks of together, leaping from the Affair of Antiochus, the Type of the other great Events here mentioned. One of these great Events is the Persecution of Antichrist, and the Dragon in the End, a Time of great Affliction.

What is principally called the Vision in Daniel (See Daniel viii. 13, 17, 26.) is the Age of the Messiah, wherein the Fate of the Church, for which Daniel was solicitous, is decided. This is obscurely revealed to Daniel, as well as to other Prophets. It was not to be understood until the End, which denotes the Age of the Messiah, but principally the last Periods of it. The Apostles indeed were to cast some Light on it. Yet still much Obscurity was to remain. Paul saw the Type Antiochus here, and calls Antichrist the Man of Sin, as Antiochus was.
was called in Maccabees, and says, as in Daniel, that he despised all Gods. Christ himself points at this Chapter, and says in the Stile of Daniel, that the Antichristian Gentiles should tread down Jerusalem, until their Times mentioned in Daniel should be at an End. Christ there speaks of the Roman Heathens destroying Jerusalem, and extends it to Antichristian Rome oppressing the Witnesses. John also in Revelations makes the same Allusion. Daniel required a clearer Account of these Matters, but the Commentary given him is obscure, as generally elsewhere. He had been told that much of it would be unintelligible until the End, and is now put of with a Type, by numbering the Days of Antiochus’s Persecution. It was demanded how long until the End of those Wonders; and he is told, that as a Time, Times, and a half should finish one Part of the Prediction, so a certain Number of Days here mentioned should finish another Part, which was a Type of it. The Days, as to Length of Time, are not a Type.

The Holy People, as Daniel elsewhere calls the Jews, are made a Type of Christian Saints. So the Saints are called Jews in the Revelations. Daniel’s calling them Jews is one principal Reason why John speaks so. Their Adversaries are of course called Gentiles. Christ also alludes to this
this in Daniel. Some say Christ means, that some Gentiles should inhabit Jerusalem, and should become Christians; that some Jews seeing this should become Christians, and inhabit it along with them. This trifling Affair seems not mentioned by Christ even in Type. Til-linghast makes the Gentiles in that Speech of Christ to signify the Saints converted from Gentilism, and says that when they were killed, and thus had their Times fulfilled, the Jews should return to Jerusalem. But my Explication of this Affair will I believe satisfy you. Christ says, both the literal and figurative Jerusalem shall be trodden down by the literal and figurative Gentiles, until the Times mentioned by Daniel, the Time, Times, and half of the Gentiles Oppression be fulfilled. Paul cannot well be supposed to hint at that Saying of Christ, where he speaks of the Fullness of the Gentiles. Other Prophets call Christians Jews. John Bap- tist, Christ, and his Apostles call all Believers Children of Abraham and Israel. We find that even Heathens called the Christians Jews. Re- view my Notes on Daniel.

Note on Note. Some Scruples may arise as to my Explication of this Chapter, and I shall endeavour to remove them in the second Part of
my Appendix; where I also consider the Prophecy of the Evening's Mornings.

Revelations ii. 1. You may, as I said, not hold the Epistles to be prophetic in Sir Isaac's Way. I told you before, that this affects not his general Interpretation. If you admit not his Scheme here (which yet seems a probable one to me) you must not think that John predicts the several Fates of the seven Churches, as distinct. He may, however, hint that all their Candlesticks should be removed, and that they should all be spewed out of Christ's Mouth. This indeed he seems to express only conditionally (in case Sir Isaac's Interpretation is wrong) and to defer this Affair, until he prophesies of the Turks; and yet it may, as I said, be hinted at. He more plainly hints, that these Churches should be severely persecuted, and often delivered, and points particularly at the ten Years Persecution. Lowman's Account of the ten Years cannot be admitted, for such Agreement seldom happens by Chance; as in his Way it must. If John had spoken of the Apoc- lacy and Destruction of the seven Churches so plainly, as to let them understand it, the Prophecy would have become Felo de se, or thrown these Churches into deep Despair, and made them
them careless in propagating Christianity to their Posterity. For the same Reason Paul speaks darkly to the Romans of their Defection and Excision.

Chap. iii. 14. Read over my former Notes concerning what is called the Trinity along with what follows.

Some Things are affirmed concerning Christ, as a Man, some, as a superangelical Being, and other Things, as inhabited by God. The Phrase, increased in Wisdom, seems principally to point at his Humanity. The Phrase, he knew not the Day nor Hour, may belong even to his superangelical Nature. What is said of his Exaltation seems to regard his Humanity; for when Paul says, he created us anew; he adds, expressing it in his usual short Stile, that this need not seem strange, seeing that God created even all Things by Jesus Christ. He therefore seems not only to have created all Things, nothing being made without him, but to be all along Head of Angels. This Opinion seems more probable, than that which makes his Headship to be then first proclaimed to Men. There is a Place in Mark, which I said was of great Use here.
Where it is said, his Name was known to himself alone, I now explain thus. His Name is known only to himself, and to such as he reveals it to. I observed before, that the Phrases in the seven Epistles generally refer to something in the future Work. Now there the Name of the Saints is said to be known to themselves alone. It is not meant, that their Name was incomprehensible, for then, even themselves, could not know it. Nor is it meant, that other Saints should not understand it. It is only meant, that none but such as Christ revealed it to, should comprehend it. The Knowledge therefore of Christ's Name is only said to be concealed from all but such as Christ discovered it to. At least, this Knowledge is not, probably, of that Sort alone, which I formerly supposed, but partly, if not entirely, such Knowledge as in that Phrase, The World knoweth thee not, but these have known thee, and that thou hast sent me. Observe the following Texts: Now call Jesus Lord, but by the Holy Spirit. None come to me, unless the Father draw them. No Man knoweth the Son, but the Father, and to whom the Son revealeth him. In this last Text it is asserted, that a Man might know the Son, if revealed to him. Christ, as to his Name,
is wonderful, yet this Name is partly revealed to his Saints. In case John takes in the Obscurity of his Name even to the Saints, it is also implied, that even what is known concerning Christ could not be known without Revelation. So Paul calls these Things the deep Things of God, and says, that without the Spirit they could not be known. By the by, he there cites Isaiah, who describes the whole Age of the Messiah, in one Sentence, and as of a Piece, like other Prophets. Yet Paul adds, that the spiritual Man knew such Things, or the Mind of God, because it was conveyed to him through Christ. This Knowledge is not indeed adequate, but is sufficient for our Purpose. The chief Thing I contend for is, that John affirms not that Christ's Nature is incomprehensible, as God's is, nor that there is a Trinity mentioned in Scripture in such Words as are not, or shall not be understood in this Life even with the Help of the Spirit. According to Xeres, where the Prophet calls Christ, wonderful, it is only meant that he was good; this Epithet being given to God alone. I know not whether this Criticism be just, but if it be right, then the Prophet speaks not of Christ's Nature, nor even of his Union with God as wonderful, but of the good God dwelling in him.
Some cite John iii. 13. to prove, that Christ's rational Soul was in Heaven. Paraphrase that Place thus: No Man hath descended with Instruction (having first ascended for that purpose, as all others besides me must do) but he who descended even the Son of Man who was in Heaven. This Assertion is common in John. Christ, though a Son of Man, was as as to his superangelical Nature in Heaven. He says not, that he had ever ascended. This is one of the most difficult Places in Scripture, but I think I have found by parallel Idioms that I have interpreted it right. A fuller Explication I reserve for another Work.

Consider Luke ii. 52. Things are often said to be done, when they only appear to be done; yet here it cannot be meant, that Jesus only seemed to increase in Wisdom, for did he also only seem to increase in Stature, and in Favour with God? If his rational Soul existed before the Foundation of the World, and administered all things, did it when confined to Flesh, and in our little Academy, make such Proficiency in Wisdom, as to be celebrated for Docility? Or did his rational Soul, when joined to Flesh, forget its Wisdom, as if it drank of Latin? Luke says not, Christ, or the increased in Wisdom,
dom, but says, Jesus the Man so called thus increased. It is also said, that Jesus increased in favour with God. There is a State of Innocence which may be attained without perfect Goodness. See Hucheson the Moralist. Jesus was always innocent, but never perfectly good, as his Father. A curious young Man, and tolerably good, accosts him by the Name of, Good. Christ having in his Mind the Degree of Goodness in this Person, or the fulsome Compliments paid to the Rabbies, tells him there is none perfectly good but God. See my Note on Revelations, which speaks of the Goodness of Creatures. Jesus grieved much and wondered; which helps to prove that his human Soul was distinct from his superangelical Nature. By the by, his Grief was not probably, due principally to his Fear of Death. Paul proves that Christ was a Man, or had a human Soul because he grieved and sometimes doubted. All Men are afraid of Death, though they sometimes confess it not, as he wisely did in order to prove that he was a Man. He was as Man struck with sudden Impressions on the Imagination which excited some Doubtings, soon indeed dissipated, as also his Apprehensions and Irresolution were. He often says, shall I submit to Death, but soon recovers himself, and persists in his Purpose. He says, Hast thou, my L God,
God, forsaken me? but immediately recovers his Reason and Trust in God, and expresses himself with Confidence.

If Christ had not a human Soul, how could he redeem us? It was necessary to prove all Men to be sinful or capable of Sin, by shewing, that their common Father would not obey even in a Trifle. This proved that it would not be safe for the Universe to make them happy, unless their Crimes were atoned for, and their Natures were meliorated. Jesus a Man obeyed even unto Death, thus atoning for them, and proved by his Actions, that Men might, by God's Help, become so good, that it would become safe to raise them from Death and make them happy. Death indeed they must be permitted to suffer, because whilst they are in the Flesh, they must be subject to many Failures. Jesus accomplished this voluntarily, tho' commanded; and here, by the by, the Law had only a Shadow, not a real Image of his Atonement. We do Things freely, though commanded, if we like to do them. Jesus approved the Scheme, though he sometimes was struck with Fear of Death. That is to be called a Man's Inclination which generally prevails in him. Christ's Fear of Death will not prove that he was unwilling to dye, though he should be
be always thus afraid. We submit voluntarily to a chirurgical Operation, tho' we dread it. But probably Jesus generally thought of his future Sufferings even with Satisfaction.

Observe in the Place above cited from Paul, that the Word Spirit has there a double Sense. It denotes the Mind or Spirit of God, and also the Holy Ghost, the Person by whom the Mind of God is made known to the Saints. So also the Mind of the Lord is afterwards, for the same Reason, called the Mind of Christ. Why in Romans the Phrase, Spirit of God is changed to Spirit of Christ, is thus also to be accounted for. You have alike Stile, where Paul says, he was not under Law, and yet was not without Law to God, but under Law to Christ, i.e. in the Christian Way. By the by, I find Lock mistakes much of the Design of the Chapter quoted, I mean i Corinthians ii. Paul speaks first in the singular Number, and says, he at first preached only the common Testimony, confining himself to Christ's Crucifixion, and considering them as Babes. Then he uses the plural Number, and says, we Apostles and Prophets are also able to speak Wisdom, or the Depths of God, among such as are perfect, for we have the Mind of the Lord thro' Christ.
In I Corinthians viii. 6. it might be objected to Paul, that Christ was called God. He answers, that tho' he might seem to be only an earthly Lord, he had created all Things; which the Prophet makes a Characteristic of God. Yea, he adds, he made us, and therefore is to be worshipped by us. He explains himself no farther, because they might easily know that he meant God was in him, and probably they, and all Christians in those Days, had been told so.

In Philippians it is only said, that Christ was in the Form of God. I believe all Commentators mistook there the Meaning of the Word, θεός. If they had thought of Slavery common of old, they might have fallen on the right Meaning. Locke observes, that in two Places it is ill translated. I find three or four more such Places. I saw an Athanasian Piece, which makes it of Use to prove Christ to be God; that Paul here says, he was made in the Likeness of Man. Paul, says the Author, makes him a real Man, and consequently meant to say before, that he was real God. His Argument is wide of the Purpose, and Paul says not here, even that he was real Man. If the Devil possessed a Man, we call that Man a Devil, and yet he is not really so. Neither does the Devil become a Man. If God dwelt in Christ, yet Christ is not,
not, properly speaking, God, nor does God become a real Man. But to come to the Text. This Text has been fiercely urged to prove the Divinity of Christ, and yet seems effectually and irrefragably to overturn that Notion. As Christ was only in the Form of a Slave, so he was only in the Form of God. He was indeed in some Sense God, and equal with God, because God was in him. The highest and lowest Things possible were, it is plain, intended to be said here of Christ. Some tell you, it is meant, that he is here said to be God's Servant. It is indeed said, he was obedient as a Servant to God, to that Degree, as to take on him the Form of a Slave. He was God's Servant by Compact, and took Wages, the Joy that was set before him. But something much lower is here said of him. Some say it is here meant, that he was a Servant to Magistrates. This seems not to confute an Athanasian, for Christ, as Man, was really such by tacit Compact, like other Subjects, and received for Wages the Benefit of the Laws. What Paul means is, that he assumed the Form of a Slave to Men, and only the Form, for he was their Master. Christ says this to his Disciples. He was no Bond-sla
death.
Death of a Slave, the Death of a Cross. By the by, &c. is here to be rendered even.

In John x. 30. Christ says, I speak so, because many Things may be equally affirmed of my Father and me, we being one and the same Substance.

In 1 Ep. John Chap. v. the Manner of what is called the Trinity, is plainly expressed. As three bear Record in Heaven, and they may be called a single Testifier, even God himself, so three witnesses on Earth, and resolve themselves into a single Witness, even the Holy Spirit. God is in Christ and the Holy Spirit, and they are one Substance. They therefore bear one Record. The Holy Spirit accompanies the Sacraments of Water and Blood, and is communicated in them. They therefore resolve themselves into a single Testimony, which is the highest one possible. In Verse 6th, the Spirit alone witnesses in the Sacraments. In Verse 9th, God alone is said to witness.


In John i. it is said, Christ must be God in some Sense, because he was in the Beginning with God, and made every Thing.
I know not whether my Explication of most of the mentioned Texts is found in other Authors. As for Christ's having a rational Soul I find it generally asserted, and even John i. 14. thus explained. The \( \alpha \nu \gamma \omega \) became Flesh, that is, a Man.

After proceeding thus far, I got a Book of Dr. Rudd's, and read a Page or two in a Piece of Whiston. I find they assert, that the \( \alpha \nu \gamma \omega \) supplied the Place of a rational Soul. Yet Rudd says, the \( \alpha \nu \gamma \omega \) was of the same Nature with the Father. I also now find, (so little had I read in this Controverfy) that this Question is thought of great Moment in deciding the grand Point. I know not how a Ruddist can answer the Arguments I have advanced, and perhaps more which have been urged by others; Nor do I see how this can much affect the grand Point debated. Some Texts seem at first Sight to favour Rudd, but at present I think he is mistaken, when he asserts the \( \alpha \nu \gamma \omega \) to supply the Place of a rational Soul. But this I shall be better able to judge of, when I have digested into Order, and maturely weighed a large Collection of Hints, which I have made for the Purpose. If Rudd's Notion was right, yet he must, I think, allow, that the \( \alpha \nu \gamma \omega \) which he makes of the same Nature with the Father, must also be of the same Nature.
Nature with the human Soul. Now his Argument for the \( \zeta \) being of the same Nature with the Father, is this, that every Son is of the same Nature with his Father; which I shall consider.

It is difficult to prove, that Christ is called a Son because of an antemundane Generation. In Luke i. he is called Son, because of his Birth from Mary. It cannot, I think, be there meant, that the Manner of Mary's Conception would prove him to be a Son by antemundane Generation. Angels are called Sons, because resembling God. Adam seems to be called Son of God, because not descended from human Parents. Saints are called Sons, because God's Spirit and his Likeness is in them. In Romans they are said at the Resurrection to have this Sonship compleated. My Arguments, and perhaps others found in Authors, seem, indeed, to prove, that Christ is called a Son by antemundane Generation; but if the Phrase, Son of God, be used in Scripture to denote the Sonship by a Birth from Mary, by Likeness, by immediate Creation, by having the Spirit, why should it anywhere signify more, when it speaks of Christ's being a Son? I mean, why should it import, that the \( \zeta \) was of the same Nature with the Father? If Jesus as Man was called a Son of God, and yet
yet had not in Soul or Body the same Nature with the Father, why should the have the same Nature? Christ is, probably, an only Son by antemundane Generation, but is so for the Reasons given in my Notes on Revelations. In Galatians, Paul seems to reason thus. Seeing Christ is called a Son because God’s Spirit dwells in him, ye are also Sons for the same Reason. He does not seem to mean that Christ being omnipresent dwelt in them, and that thus they were looked upon as Sons. I forgot to observe, that the Scripture speaks of Children of God, by Covenant-relation.

Dr. Rudd cannot, I think, mean, that all human Souls are of the same Nature with the Father. The Heathens said so, and called Man, Divinae particularis aureae. Marcus Antoninus speaks of a divine Nature in us, if I remember, in this Sense. But this Doctrine seems false, and though true, is not meant where our Sonship is spoken of in Scripture. Peter speaks of Saints alone partaking of a divine Nature. There may, for anything I know, be Spirits of different Species, and Christ’s may be the highest possible of created Beings (I speak not here of his human Soul) but it cannot be of the same Species with that of God. The great Difficulty in this Point now lies in John v. 18. The Jews say, Christ called himself the Son of God, and this
this implies his Equality with God. You may say they build on this Argument. All natural Sons have the same Nature with the Father. Now Christ arrogates to himself the same Nature, and consequently Equality with God. This Solution is against Rudd, but not against me. Will then a Ruddist say, the Jews reason'd wrong, for that Christ may be of the same Nature, and yet not equal? By the by, perhaps the Jews never said, my Father, but our Father, when speaking of God. It was prophesied of Christ, that he should say, my Father. Whatever the Jews allege in the Text, you may perhaps say, John grants it, by not contradicting it. This I deny, in case they speak of Christ as pretending to be a natural Son; for John supposed all Christians knew the contrary, even from his own Writings, and that such an Hypothesis would either lead to Nonsense, or Self-contradiction in such as asserted it. John only grants, that as all Sons were of the same Nature with the Father, so Christ was in some Sense a Son, and equal with the Father because of the super-added Nature and Likeness of the Father. Consider what happens in ordinary Generation. A Part of the same Substance is carried off, and a Substance like that of the Father is superadded. Human Generation is partly voluntary, and part-
ly involuntary. If you carry the Comparison too far, what consistent Scheme can you form? I find no Scheme resemble human Generation so much as mine. All the Difference lies in this, that instead of a Part of the same Substance, I make the whole to be communicated, by which I mean God himself. This sufficiently authorizes the sacred Writers to call Christ a Son of God. I have many other Arguments in my Papers, and if I find the present ones are approved by the Protestant Churches, I will publish them. This puts me in mind of another Expression in Scripture, this is my Body; which has given Rise to endless Disputes. The Protestants have indeed shewn that Transubstantiation involves a Contradiction, but have not perhaps seen all the Reasons which gave Rise to the Expression. Believers see so many occasional or Deputy-bodies of Christ in the Sacrament, as there are Pieces of Bread. If they have Faith in his Body and Blood, when they eat the Bread they receive God's Spirit accompanying it, as if they had eat his real Body, the Temple of God. If you carry the Comparison too far, you make it Nonsense. The Bread is not his Body acted by his Spirit, as his real Body was. The Bread is not always attended by God's Spirit, as his real Body was, but Believers alone then...
then receive the Spirit, and if they have not
sufficient Faith in Christ, they may be said to
receive the Flesh alone, which profiteth nothing;
that is, the Bread, which may, when the Faith-
ful receive it, be in some Sense called his Flesh.
Christ means, that if any one did eat his Body
born of Mary, the Spirit of God would dwell
in him, for it never left him, but means not
that the Spirit of God thus acquired would be of
any service to him. But of this also more ano-
ther Time, if what I say pleases such as a free
Reading of the Bible gives a Right to, and
enables to judge. Christ's Spirit may be said to
attend the Bread, because God's Spirit is by his
Spirit conveyed to the Faithful in eating the
Bread; and thus Christ's Spirit, though not
present, may be said to act in the Bread.

As God is inseparably united to Christ, Christ
may in a certain Sense be said to be Omnipre-
sent, Omniscient, and Almighty. Thus it may
be asserted, that God purchased the Church
with his own Blood, and was manifested in the
Flesh.

Chap. viii. 3. You may wonder, that in a
superadded Note, I admitted a Possibility of An-
gels praying for us. I know not where Whiston
got his Scheme of the seven Heavens. Per-
haps
haps he or some other picked Part of it out of the New Testament, and misinterpreted some Passages. I before observed, that the four Beasts could scarcely agree by Chance to the People of Israel. The Order of these heavenly Beings cannot well be supposed to be imitated by that of Israel. But their Order seems to be thus represented, to shew that God's Worship and People should resemble what is in Heaven, in Zeal and Purity, though in another Form. The Order also of the Beasts may be thus represented by way of Accommodation to the Capacity of the Jews. In the Heb. Paul says not that the Cherubims were made after the exact Pattern, or very Image of heavenly Things. By heavenly Things he chiefly means the Christian Dispensation called also the Kingdom of Heaven. I doubt therefore of Whiston's Distribution of the Cherubim, and Angels with their distinct Employments. The Jews indeed spoke of an Angel of Prayer, but perhaps they meant Christ himself. Perhaps therefore it is Christ himself who offers the Incense with our Prayers. Yet it seems not to be false Doctrine to say that an Angel may offer our Prayers. Public Prayers are there meant, and Angels are said in Scripture to join with us on such Occasions, and consequently to know our Liturgies, without Omni-
Omniscience. Paul describes the Angels as present in our Assemblies, and inspecting the Behaviour of Women there. He had before said they inspect the Affairs of the Church, and the Apostles were made a theatrical Spectacle to them. In Timothy, Christ is said to be observed by Angels. In Ephesians, it is said, the manifold Wisdom of God was made known to admiring Angels. It was so great, that it surprised even the Angels. By the by, even, is often understood as there. Taylor on Romans seems to err in 1 Corinthians xi. here quoted.

Chap. xi. 2. You may want to know my Opinion concerning the Witnesses lying dead three Years and a half. The War which destroyed Jerusalem may be a Type of the ten-horned Beast; but I do not believe, that the Time, Times and a half, though agreeing in Duration, can be a Type of the Times of Antichrist, in Daniel or John, in such Sort as to make the Times of Antichrist of uncertain Duration. These two Times may happen by Accident to agree; and I may say, it is next to a Demonstration, that Daniel and John would not so often, as they do, express the Duration of Antichrist, meerly by Allusion to the Duration of Titus's War, thus putting a definite for an inde-
finite Number. It may indeed seem incredible that the Time of the Witnesses lying dead should also in some Sort agree to those Times; and therefore perhaps the Time of their lying dead may not be precise, but borrowed by Allusion. Thus the half Hour's Silence signifies only a short Time. If this Opinion be right, then the three Years and a half will not be the Clue for unravelling this Part of the Prophecy, but the Fall of the tenth of the City, &c. will discover the Remainder. The Affair seems future, but the revealing Time is not yet come. It is worth while to consult Tillinghast concerning what he calls seasonable Truths, or Truths of the Times. By the by, Tillinghast seems to err much where he differs from those who say John here affirms, that Papists would deny Burial to Protestants.

Whiston makes an Earthquake in London to be predicted in Revelations. But did not John speak of the great City of Rome a little before, the City of the Beast? Is not the Article here found also before, τῶν; He might as well have said, that the City in Revelations xxi. 14, 15, 16, was London, because, μηδέν, and οὐδα, are not repeated. Christ was in some Sense crucified in Rome, and not our Lord Peter as Whiston explains it, except as other Commentators
tators say, as one of Christ's Members. Our Lord, means not Peter. Some make Christ not only to suffer there in his Members, but also say it it meant, that he and all his Prophets suffered by Roman Laws; or Authority. Vide xviii. 20, and 24.

Some make the City, which I call that of the Beast, to be Jerusalem; and say, that the Winepress was trod there, which is mentioned in xiv. and that it was Jerusalem which broke into three Parts. The Arguments are so weak for Jerusalem's being mentioned in the two last Places, that they need not be mentioned. As for the first Place, observe that John there calls Rome or rather Christendom, the Christian Jerusalem, because he was alluding to the trampling Jerusalem by the Gentiles. The Beast had the Witnesses on his own Ground; for his People saw them lye dead, and would not suffer them to be buried.

Chap. xiii. 2. I before gave you what occurred to me about the Meaning of this Text, but finding some Scruples arise, I promised, if I could do it, to remove them in the Appendix. I also found some Difficulties arise about the two-horned Beast.
I shall therefore now treat of the Pope or two-horned Beast, and of the ten-horned Beast, with the Objections against Sir Isaac.

It is called the Religion of the ten-horned Beast, least, as I said before, it should be confounded with Mahometism, that being the established Religion of the Dragon.

Daniel had called it the Religion of the eleventh Horn of the Beast, and it was proper to shew an Agreement with Daniel.

This Religion subsisted in the Beast and false Prophet, after Rome, the whoreish City, was destroyed. Therefore it was proper to call it the Religion of the Beast, rather than that of the Whore.

The Beast is spoken of more than the Dragon, because Daniel had described the Empire under that Name. The Part called by John the Beast, was in John's Time the Seat of the Empire, and therefore more is said about the Beast. His Religion was Heathen, and when Christian, it admitted of Idolatry, Persecution, and other Gentile Doctrines; and therefore such a Religion was to be denominated chiefly from the Beast, the Seat, as I said, of the famous Empire. As Judaism infected the primitive Church, so Gentilism ruined the Modern: But this by the by.

Though
Though the Emperor of Germany; and others of the Latin Church, opposed Image-worship for a while, it proveth nothing to the contrary; for in this brief Prophecy such Trifles are overlooked.

The Dragon became Mahometan, and therefore, for a Reason mentioned in my Notes, it was needless to say much about him. John also intended principally to comment on Daniel, and those who spoke of the great Line of Anti-christs. Add these Observations to what you find in my Notes, and consider also what followeth concerning the two-horned Beast.

I observed before, that many Phrases in the Epistles allude to others in the Prophecy. Balaam refers to the false Prophet in next Prophecy. John saith, he and many Kings were destroyed, besides the rest of the Men, who were slain: Compare this Stile with what you read in the Old Testament of Balaam's Defeat.

The Dragon, Beast and false Prophet sent out Frogs. Doth not this prove, that the false Prophet belonged to them both? Daniel hath described Antichrist as a single Horn. Therefore, to shew an Agreement, it was not proper for John to make two Lines of Antichrists corresponding to Greece and Rome.
John being more explicit than Daniel, calleth not Antichrist a Horn, but a Beast; in order, perhaps, to signify, that he acquired a Body Politic of his own with temporal Power, as well as the ten-horned Beast, and acknowledged no Superior.

It is said the two-horned Beast wrought Miracles before the ten-horned Beast, and the same is said concerning the false Prophet. They are therefore the same. Observe the Article before false Prophet. Now where was he mentioned before, except in the Character of the two-horned Beast? John also speaketh not of two Balaam's.

When the Dragon gave the Beast his Throne and Power (where, by the by, you have, ἀναστησαῖος, not ἀναστησας) he lent him his Counsellor. The Dragon afterwards took Mahomet for his Counsellor, and forgot his old one, who no more attended his Court, but that of the Beast.

The Popes having a principal Hand in promoting Image-worship, will not prove that the false Religion arose not in the East. Even the Scheme of an universal Bishoprick was projected there.

Daniel maketh his little Antichristian Horn belong to the Beast, and yet afterwards, when the Greeks became mighty under the Romans, he maketh
maketh Antichristianism to rise in Greece, and to be propagated to Rome. Now John is his Commentator. Consider also, that John maketh the Dragon, acted by an Evil Spirit, the Old Serpent, to remove to the East. The Woman also removes, as the Jews from the Dragon Pharaoh, to the West, to Rome, which became spiritually barren and apostate, or deserted for Constantinople. So the two-horned Beast, or his Frog, the Evil Spirit who acted in him, removed from Greece, where he had spoken like the Dragon, to the West. The Dragon, Woman, and false Prophet left a Portion of their Spirit behind them, but their chief Power and Influence thenceforward appertaineth to their new Habitations. The Devil working Miracles in the two-horned Beast found a better Game to play in the West, carried every damnable Doctrine to a higher Pitch, and there extended his Power much farther.

The two-horned Beast is the Greek Church with two Horns. This Church is represented as going for Safety to Rome. Then John calls its Head by the Name of the two-horned Beast, yet not excluding the Church, or Body belonging to that Head. So the Woman is, properly speaking, the Church, yet is afterwards converted.
verted into a City full of Whoredoms. See Esdras's Woman and City.

The Pope or Devil in him caused an Image to be erected to the other Beast, which acted by a diabolical Spirit, spoke only the Mind of the Pope, which is generally called by John, the Mind of the ten-horned Beast. John here seems to allude to the speaking Images of the Heathens, which were said to be inhabited by Spirits, who gave Oracles. Now it is sufficiently known, how the Devil, both in the East and West, acted in Councils, here called Images, and how the Pope, his Agent, played a worse Part in them, than is played in common Puppets.

Where the first Vial is said to be poured on those who worshipped the Beast and his Image, there seems to be a formidable Objection against Sir Isaac's Scheme. I there shewed you how this may be solved. See also my Note on xix. 20. Add what I have been saying in this Appendix on the Subject, as that Antichristianism, here called worshipping the Beast and his Image, subsisted also in the East; that, only by Way of Eminence it is called the Religion of the West; and that the Worship of the Beast and his Image subsisted in Embryo, during this Period, and even before the Beast separated from the
the Dragon. I also observe, that the Prophecy of the Vials is very brief, and confined chiefly to the Seat of the Beast, who is considered in Daniel's Way, as once trampling on the East. The Devastation there said to be committed by the Saracens is mentioned as if confined to the Throne of the Beast.

Upon revising these Papers for the Press, some new Scruples arose, and some Things in this Note I did not much approve, but will not blot it out, because many Things in it may be of Use. To pick out what is still liked, I have not Leisure. I add as follows. The Pope is said to rise in the East, because such Power was first claimed there. His Religion also was brought from Greece. Daniel speaks in the same Manner. He makes the Greeks destroy Jerusalem, because they resembled the Romans, were united with them in this Affair, were led by them against Judea, were then headed by one called a Prince from the East, as Antiochus, who seems to be the Type, was. Thus also Daniel calls the Romans, Greeks who introduced the Worship of Mahuzzim. Christ is called David. John Baptist Elias. The Romans are sometimes called Edomites. The Gentiles are called Sodom. John's saying that the Pope arose in the East, and procured Authority to the Western
stern Emperor, working Miracles in his Sight seems on first View to be a Riddle, or even false, but you see it is explicable. Such a Way of speaking was probably chosen in order to cast a necessary Cloud over this Prophecy. You may object, that the two-horned Beast is said to arise after the ten-horned Beast. John indeed speaks so, and, πρώτος, signifies not, that he had first mentioned the ten-horned one. It was after this rising of the Beast, that the Pope began to challenge Supremacy, and this is what John points at. You may object, that the Pope causes not the Authority of the ten-horned Beast to be worshipped, but often opposes him. Such Authors as make the Image of the Beast to be the German Empire, strive to account for this, and say that the Pope set up, and commands Obedience to the Emperor, though he has sometimes opposed him. But this is not John's Meaning, or at least is not the principal Thing intended. The Beast is here considered as a God, whom the Pope commands to worship in religious Matters. The Beast is now separated from the Dragon, and yet all Nations are said to worship him. Obeying him in Point of Religion is therefore meant. It is also said that they who worship the Beast or his Image should be tormented for ever. The German
Protestants are not commanded to disobey in temporal Matters. This leads me to consider more maturely xvi, 2. All Nations are said to worship the Beast, and therefore he was worshipped in this Period in the East, that is, his Religion was there followed. It is not necessary to say, that they followed it now, because the Beast commanded it; though the Councils held now in the West might help to corrupt their Principles, or confirm them in them; and the Beast included lately in the Dragon may in some Sense be said to have enjoined the Belief of it. I observed before, that Superstition began in the East, and consequently the Greeks may be said to be of the Beast's Religion at the Time mentioned. I find a Collection in Tillinghafl, though made for another Purpose, of all the Popish Doctrines established by Councils and Popes at this Time in the West, so that probably the West, as it first received Superstition from the East, now returned the Compliment, and became Instructer to the Greeks. At length, indeed, the grand Council, or Image, was erected on the Earth. i. e. in the East, and Image-worship there established, but the Pope in the West had that Council called, and this Heresy ever after prevailed chiefly in the West. Popery therefore as established by Councils may be
be called the Religion of the West rather than of the East. Let me add, that perhaps the first Vial fell also on some Part of the Dominions of the Beast. Sir Isaac mentions many Places where it fell, but for want of Books, I know not whether any of them were in the Territories of the Beast. I read Whiston on the *Revelations* cursorily on the four Winds, and he seemed to have something on the first Wind which may give Light into this Affair. Tillinghast's Design was to shew, that Antichrist arose in this Period, and also that the Roman Empire then fell, as Division is the Cause of Dissolution. I think I have now removed all Scruples; yet, lest any should remain, I add as follows. As an universal Bishoprick, and Popery began in the East, what more natural than to say, the Western Pope rose in the East? Even when the Dragon is said to be worshipped, it is said, all Nations worshipped the Beast also. The Beast may also here be considered in Daniel's Way, as extending his Power to the East; for when these Invasions began, the Beast included the Dragon, though the first Invasion did not take effect, being prevented by Theodosius, until the Beast was separated from the Dragon. The East followed in this Period the Religion which the Beast had established there.

M

Chap.
Chap. xvi. 16. Some explain Armageddon of the Holy War; but this is scarce included, much less principally meant. The Holy War was between Christians and Turks. The War in the Text was carried on by Turks and Papists against Protestants. Such Wars have been long carried on, to the Damage of the Protestants, by the French and Turks, and, probably, will be carried on for some Time. The Defeat of the Turks and of the ten-horned Beast are principally mentioned. Whiston makes the Return of the Jews to be here mentioned; but if it is here meant, yet other Things are included. The Turks, indeed, and the ten-horned Beast must be defeated before the Jews Return. If the Jews suffer much about this Time, yet their Victory, provided, as I said, here included, is principally expressed by the Word, Armageddon. That the Jews will be converted and return to Judea, seems very probable; and that they are called the Bride by the Prophets, and in Revelations, the Instructor, and Chief of the Christians, not only because the Christian Religion came from them, but because of their last signal Conversion.

Chap. xviii. 1. In order to find the Time of Antichrist's Downfall, I have consulted many Authors.
Authors. Most of their Schemes have failed. They who have given him only some Years more, will probably be found to err. Antichrist will probably fall by Degrees, and two remarkable Periods of Rome's falling, seem mentioned. The Phrase, Babylon is fallen, is fallen, seems to point at a double Fall, though Rhetoricians account for the Phrase otherwise. The tenth of the City seems to be said to fall before its final Destruction. Babylon is said to be divided into three Parts, or become three Parts by Means of an Earthquake or War before its utter Ruin. After it is said to become three Parts, is is said to be remembered by God; which seems to point at another Period, its final Overthrow. The Phrase, is fallen, is fallen, is used concerning the literal Babylon, where see Commentators. There is an Harvest, and then a Vintage, as in the natural World; for though the Place in Joel referred to, may express only one Event, yet John seems to make the Harvest precede the Vintage. Some of these Things being yet future, and perhaps at a long Distance of Time, the revealing Time may not yet be compleatly come. God opens Prophecies in his own Times. Tillinghast says, God's Method of old was not to discover thoroughly the Affairs of his Church, until ripe for Execution, and gives two In-
M 2 stances.
stances. The Deliverance from Egypt, though exactly foretold, was not ever dreamed of, until Moses was sent to the Hebrews. Daniel himself, says Tillinghast, knew not the seventy Years to be run out, until the last Year. These Prophecies have been unriddled by Degrees, according to the Necessities of the Church. See Jurieu; and consider the History of the Times wherein the best Commentators lived.

Sir Isaac makes the eleventh Horn’s Time of assuming temporal Power to be the Epocha of the Times of the ten-horned Beast. The Beast existed in the Dragon all along, and yet surely his Times cannot reach farther back than his Time of rising out of the Sea. The two-horned Beast existed before the other Beast rose out of the Sea, and yet his Times cannot reach farther back than the Time when he became Factor at Rome for the Beast. The Woman fled early to the Wilderness, yet her Times being the same with those of the two-horned Beast, they must begin no earlier than those of the two-horned Beast, when worldly Men began to feed her. Nay, the Times of the Beast are laid by John only to begin, when he began powerfully to make War against the Saints, which was not until the Whore got on his Back, and acted on him, and the two-horned Beast, or Pope, was, by Means of
of temporal Power, enabled effectually to factor for him in Religion. In xiii. 4. the Time of his warring victoriously, and with the Acclamations of his Worshipers is pointed at; and Verse 5 is explained by Verse 7. Add, that John is Daniel's Commentator, and Daniel uses the Word Horn for temporal Power, and makes the Saints to be given into the Hand of the eleventh Horn for 1260 Years. Observe well that Phrase, given into his Hand, for it signifies compleat Victory. The Time of Rome's Destruction is not exactly foretold, as that of the two Beasts is, but seems not to be long before it. For wise Reasons it is not foretold; for the Papists would then see the Accomplishment of the Prophecy, and would not then join with the Beast and his false Prophet; as it is foretold some of them would do even after Rome's Destruction. Thus also for wise Reasons, the Day of Judgment, the exact Times of Christ's Birth, of the Destruction of the Turks, and of the Return of the Jews are not predicted. I seemed to find, on a slight Reading of a certain Author, that he made the Epocha of the Woman's Days to be the Times of Constantine, and made them reach to the Reformation; but no such Thing is mentioned by John, nor a Commencement of the millennial Happiness built at
Chap. xx. 1. I shall say but little about the first Resurrection. That Christ shall personally then appear, seems to me to be confuted by Paul in Hebrews, where he speaks of only two Appearings of Christ. The Jews, as I have read somewhere, held a first Resurrection, a Reign of 1000 Years at Jerusalem, a persecuting Antichrist, and an Invasion of Gog in the latter Days, as Ezekiel expresses it. Had they these Things from the Christians, who sometimes pretended to be Jews, and might therefore influence their Belief in these Points? Or can it be undeniably proved, that the Jews wrote so, before Christ's Incarnation? If you can prove the latter Point, you may be apt to infer the Truth of these Doctrines, because you may allege, they had them from lost Prophecies, or understood preserved ones better than we do, as they conversed with the Prophets, and had other Advantages, which we want. You will perhaps also say, that John would not use their Expressions, if he meant not the same Things. I have not Leisure to enquire into the Antiquity of these Jewish Opinions, and yet much seemeth to depend on such Knowledge. They also had
a Tradition, that the World would last 6000 Years, and that a happy State would begin afterwards. Can it be certainly proved, that any Writing of theirs extant before the Birth of Christ mentioned this? Their cabalistic Arguments are sometimes good. Has Whiston on Esdras, or Lee any thing on this Subject? You may object, that the Jews, as well as some Christians, misunderstood the Nature of the first Resurrection, and therein misinterpreted the Prophets. This may be so; but in the other Traditions here mentioned, they seem to be right, provided you make the millenary Reign destitute of the personal Appearance of Christ. The Resurrection mentioned in xi. 12. seems to be figurative; and this may incline you to think John's first Resurrection to be literal: But others may tell you, that the Phrase is only borrowed, by Allusion, from the first literal Resurrection; or rather from Christ ascending in a Cloud. Some tell you, Corinthus was no Heretic, but faithfully taught John's Doctrine of the first Resurrection, and of other Things, though grossly handled by his Adversaries. But as to the first Resurrection, I determine nothing at present. Vide Is. i. 26. Jer. xxx. 21.
Chap. xxii. 16. Root of David, may be explained as in a former Note. Or Root and Offspring may be interpreted as, Spirit and Bride. Spirit in the Bride, says Lowman. Perhaps this latter Criticism extends to 1 Timothy iv. 12. The Idiom is very common. Some hold Christ not to be eternal, and cite John i. 1. In the Beginning, sometimes signifies Eternity. For the Phrase, before the Foundation of the World, compare John xvii. 5, 24. with Ephesians i. 4. and Revelation xiii. 8. A Ruddist therefore must find better Proofs against Christ's Eternity. I read only one of Rudd's Pieces curiously, and therefore may perhaps not know what he means when he says, Christ's rational Soul is of a like Nature with the Father. Perhaps he points at its Purity, and probably this is what Antoninus means (for I have not his Book at present) when he speaks of a Man's partaking of a Divine Nature. Angels may be, for this Reason, called Sons of God. Adam is said to be made after God's Image, and his Purity may there be partly denoted. Though Adam may have been created with weak Affections to God, yet in the Eye of Law he was innocent, until he eat the Fruit. This Innocence gave him a Like-
Likeness of God. He, in the Apocrypha, might have this Innocence only, and come into a Body only comparatively undefiled. By the by, Infants die not for Adam's Crime, but were proved by his Disobedience not to be worthy of a miraculous Exemption from Death. Or Rudd may mean that all Spirits resemble one another. Some may think this was another Reason, why Adam is said to be like God. Some may allege, that this Doctrine is implied in John iv. 24. Where God is called Father of Spirits, some may think that it is not alone meant, that God stands for ever in relation of a Superior to departed Spirits; but that he might be called their Father, as he begat them all in his own Likeness. I shall not stay to inquire whether those Notions are all just, but will only observe, that if these are Reasons for Christ's being called the Son of God, they are the smallest ones, and not hinted at in John v. 18. You have not there, υἱὸς εὐαγγελίου τοῦ. If Christ be called a Son, and an only Son, upon the Account of his ante-mundane Generation, it is because God dwells in him, giving him the compleat Likeness of a Son. The Worship of Christ terminates in the Father; for Paul's Stile elsewhere shews he means this in Phil. ii. 11. and it agrees with the Con-
Context. To make a Trajectory or long Parenthesis there, is unnatural. The Fullness of the Godhead dwells in him, but gives him not infinite Perfection. Vide the Preface.

CONCLUSION.
CONCLUSION.

I HAVE now finished my Observations, and cannot think of any material Objection which remains unanswered. One Thing indeed may occur, which may puzzle some Readers. If Antichrist is not to fall for a long Time, how can any one pretend to have given a clear Exposition of these Prophecies? Are the Antichristians, some may object, mad or drunk, so that they cannot perceive the Force of plain Arguments? But consider, that the Mahometans and Jews see not the Force of a Christian’s clear Reasoning. Methods are used for preventing a Papist’s reading the Bible and Protestant Books. Many of them will probably soon be converted, for Antichrist’s Fall seems to be not only gradual, but to be partly effected by a future Reformation. Obscurity was designed by the Author of these Prophecies, and therefore the utmost we pretend to, is a strong Probability for the Truth of our Interpretation. This Probability will not be seen by many Papists, though they should read our Works; for some of them will not believe, that God gave such obscure
obscure Prophecies, being unacquainted with his other obscure Predictions of Things which all Christians acknowledge to be fulfilled, nor considering that the same Figures, and Modes of Expression caused the Obscurity in other Prophecies. The Prophecies concerning Christ's first Coming, are few and obscure, says Sir Isaac; but those concerning his second Coming, many and plain. If we had not more Arguments for the Christian Religion than those taken from the Prophecies concerning Christ's first Coming, the most Part of Christians would become Jews or Infidels. But those concerning Christ's second Coming, which includes the Affair of Antichrist, are to me and others tolerably plain. Yet, as I said, these, or any other Arguments, will not convince many Papists, especially such as are prejudiced by Interest. I will not say, that the Bible, and its true Interpreters, cannot be understood, in prophetical Matters, without the Spirit. It seems to me to be otherwise; though to understand the Bible, so far as to extract from it such Principles, as necessarily form a Saint, cannot probably be done without supernatural Assistance. By the by, some may be thrown into melancholy, because they may imagine, they have not the Spirit. But as I observed before, God may give the Spirit, without
impressing on the spiritual Man's Mind a certain Knowledge of his having it. If a Man finds himself to live up to the Gospel, he is asserted in that Gospel to have the Spirit. It is not expressly asserted in John iii. 8. that a Man may have the Spirit without knowing intuitively that it is the Spirit of God (which is, however true, and may indeed be obscurely implied) but it is plainly said, that if a Man be righteous, he may be as sure of his having the Spirit, and as certain that there is a Spirit, from these blessed Effects, as that there is such a Thing as the Wind, from its Effects, though he see not the Wind in its Progress. But to return to the Affair in Hand. The Papists may call particular Councils, and reform some Countries hereafter. It is said that the ten Kings shall hate the Whore. They may possibly call general Councils, and reform their Church in some Trifles: But probably their chief Errors will remain in many Places, unto the Time appointed. Some of their Doctors may hereafter speak more like Protestants, as the Bishop of Meaux has already done, but the Beast will be the Beast to the End. It is possible indeed, that Transubstantiation and some gross Errors may be banished from Rome; yet, at least, their Tyranny, and Persecution, more damnable than any other of their
their Doctrines, will probably continue, until Christ destroys them for ever.

It remains, that I give you some Account of the Authors I have quoted. Sometimes, as I study Brevity, I tell not all my Reasons for my Quotations, and therefore those Authors should be read. Whether their Opinions concur or not with Sir Isaac's, they in one Shape or another corroborate his Arguments. Whiston on Revelations I had not seen until I finished my Notes, but have made some Remarks on that Book in my superadded Notes and Appendix. I have often quoted an anonymous Commentary, which will be of great Use to a Student in these Prophecies. After making some Extracts from it, I gave it away, and now find there are so many new Commentaries on the New Testament, that it is necessary to distinguish it thus: It is, if I remember, anonymous, in one Folio Volume, printed about the Year 1740, contains a great Variety of the newest Opinions about the Apocalypse, and may be certainly known by my Quotations. Some new Pieces I have not seen. Dr. Clark's Work I have not got, who is said to agree much with Sir Isaac. Most of Whiston's Works I read not, nor Lloyd, Bishop of Meaux, Greenhill, Waple, Daubuz, with many others. Yet I am confident, that no material Objec-
Objection will occur in reading those Books. It next to a Demonstration, that so many Sayings of Prophets, and the Order of John's long prophecy in particular could not be accommodated to a Series of historical Facts, was not such Agreement intended by the Holy Spirit. The Laws of Hazard will not allow such accidental Harmony. Consider also, that if one scheme be found consonant to History, no other will be found so to agree; for God's Oracles are never ambiguous, as probably most of the Heathen Ones were. By the by, I have lately seen an Account of Usher's Life; the Author of which relates the Affair of his prophesying in the Pulpit, in such a Manner, that we may conclude, he pretended not to prophecy, but that some of his Hearers only imagined it. The Prophecies concerning Antichrist are sufficiently numerous in the canonical Scriptures, and as plain as could be expected. But, as Daniel expresses it, the Wise alone shall understand them, or to use John's Words, all shall worship the Beast, who are not written in the Book of the slain Lamb. I forgot to observe, in its proper Place, that the Followers of the slain Lamb are here so called, in Opposition to the Admirers of the Beast with a slain Head.
WHILST I was transcribing these Papers for the Press, I got Whiston against Newton on the Apocalypse, and hastily copied some of his Objections, in order to answer them here.

Objection I. Sir Isaac's Account of the Prophecy of the seventy Weeks was, he says, first published by Dr. Clark in a Work, which also serves as a Key to Sir Isaac on the Revelations, and that he answered it. Josephus, continues he, dates the Year of Nebemiah's Commission from Xerxes. If I remember, there is also a Letter or Speech of the Jews in Josephus, which, if not the Invention of Josephus, seems to prove that the Jews dated it thus.

Answer. I have not seen Clark nor Whiston's Answer, and therefore cannot judge whose Arguments are stronger; but all Arguments seem to me too weak to overturn my Interpretation. Mine is built on the Scripture Stile. Remember that
that I undertook not to defend Sir Isaac here. By the by, perhaps Josephus thought Vespasian was prophesied of here. If so, Josephus erred not. Yet if I remember, Whiston or some other Writer thinks Josephus pointed at another Prophecy. Vespasian indeed seems to be described in another Prophecy of Daniel, but I scarcely believe Josephus understood it. Observe also, that Whiston quotes Josephus, saying, Jerusalem shall be taken, when the Temple becomes four-square. I suppose he took this, says Whiston, from Daniel ix. 26, 27. as then read and interpreted by the Jews. I believe I need not consider this as an Objection.

Objection II. He queries whether the Wings of the Lion denote two Kingdoms, and not rather the Swiftness of the Lion's Motion; as, says he, seems to be the Case of the Bull with two Horns, and the Wings of an Eagle on his Back, in the Testament of Nepthenim.

Answer. This is to be determined by History, of which I pretend not to be a Judge. I conjecture that Sir Isaac is right, because of the Use of the Word, Wing, elsewhere in Daniel, and his Commentators John and Edras. Is it certain, that the Wings in the Testament mentioned, denote no more? The four Winds in the

Revela-
Revelations allude to those in Daniel, whom John comments on.

Objection III. He wonders Sir Isaac makes the Stone cut without Hands to be a Person or Kingdom yet future.

Answer. Surely Christ's Kingdom is partly future. See only 2 Timothy iv. 1. Revelations xi. 17. xix. 6. Perhaps Whiston meant, that his first Coming is pointed at in the Prophecy of the Image. Read the Vision of the four Beasts carefully, which is a Commentary on that of the Image, and you will scarcely believe this. I often indeed suspect the contrary; and that, where it is said in the Days of these Kings, God will set up a Kingdom; the first Period of Christ's Reign is included. Yet this will not affect Sir Isaac's Interpretation. In the Days of the Roman Emperors, Christ will set up a Kingdom, which shall, in the Millennium, be most powerful, and fall on the ten Toes. This Interpretation I was led into by considering the like designedly obscure Stile in Haggai prophesying of the same Things. I said something on that Prophecy before. By shaking Nations, Haggai means, their Removal or Destruction. He changes it for the Word destroy. So also Paul explains Haggai. I will shake or destroy all
all Nations, and then the Desire of all Nations shall come. I will shake or destroy the Heavens and the Earth, and destroy the Kingdoms of the Heathen. Now all Kingdoms were not destroyed before nor since Christ’s Coming. The old Heavens and Earth are not yet destroyed. Haggai means, that some Kingdoms would be destroyed before Christ, and that Christ would immediately destroy more of them; some Part of the old Heavens and Earth, or of the old World, so called by Allusion to the Destruction of the last Day. Christ was soon to destroy the Jews, and their Dispensation, as Paul says in Heb. their Tabernacle being made with Hands, and perishable. See Lock on 2 Corinthians v. 1. Then he was to destroy the last Monarchy. Lastly, he was entirely to destroy all Kingdoms, and the very Heavens and Earth. Christ says, he will come in the Clouds, and John also says it, both pointing at the Words of Daniel. Christ may there speak of his Coming to destroy Jerusalem, or to destroy the World, or of both his Comings (though I think he means the latter) and John speaks of his latter Coming; yet Daniel’s Words may not happen to be restrained so. I saw Christ coming to receive his Kingdom at his Resurrection, when he ascended in a Cloud; and this Vision was
was repeated until his Kingdom was thoroughly established on the Ruins of Rome, and of the whole World. In case this Interpretation be just, yet as I said, it contradicts not Sir Isaac's general Explanation.

Objection IV: They had their Lives prolonged until a Season and Time, says Whiston, or rather until two Times, or 720 Years, when the Saracens arose.

Answer. Willet says, the Words are not the same in the Original. For this and other Reasons Whiston is mistaken. Their Lives were prolonged for a Season, I mean, an appointed Time. This is a better Interpretation. Daniel elsewhere speaks of the appointed Time or End. This End is the Coming of Christ to destroy all Kingdoms of the Gentiles; which Thing is here also expressly mentioned. Rome only took away their Dominion, for they still live, and will continue until the binding of the Dragon. Thus when the Stone falls on the ten Toes, it finds the Image intire, and all the Monarchies in some Sense alive, but then beats them all to Pieces. This helps to shew, why the Kingdom of the Greeks is said to be mighty, but not by its own Power. It was still alive, as.
as here, though it had its Dominion taken away. See the Phrase in xi. 24.

Objection V. He says the *Apocalypse* was written earlier than Sir *Isaac* thought.

*Answer.* I pretend not to much Learning of this Sort, and yet will venture to say, that *Whiston* seems very ingeniously to overturn all Sir *Isaac's* Arguments here. I am also told, that *Lardner* and *Twells* oppose Sir *Isaac* in this Point. Yet Sir *Isaac's* Interpretation of the *Apocalypse* remains unshaken.

Objection VI. The Law was not, says he, laid up in the Ark.

*Answer.* This is not material. If so, then the Word, Right-hand, was used for another Reason, which perhaps you may find in some Commentator.

Objection VII. He believes not, that the Dragon denotes the Heathen Religion, but all bad ones.

*Answer.* Sir *Isaac*, I believe, says the same. When the Dragon sent his Frog, he was *Mammon*, and perhaps such are not Heathens. When the Dragon gave the Beast his Throne, he was no Heathen, unless in *John's* Stile, who calls
calls all Antichristians Gentiles. Perhaps I misapprehend Whiston here. Sir Isaac indeed says, the Roman Empire was called the Dragon whilst Heathen. Can any one prove the contrary?

**Objection VIII.** He says, the Scripture of Truth was not a preceding Vision.

**Answer.** I thought Sir Isaac asserted the sealed Book in Revelations to be the Scriptures in general, where found to be prophetical or typical, and that they were epitomized in the Vision of the Evening-Morning (I only speak of those which regard Christ’s Reign) and afterwards a little more explained in Daniel’s two last Chapters. I want Sir Isaac’s and every other Book at present, so that I know not but I have misrepresented his Opinion here. In case Sir Isaac erred here, yet his Interpretation of these Places may be good. I know not what the Learned think of Whiston’s Opinion here, and what I found in his Margin in Josephus concerning the Times of receiving these Prophecies. I sometimes suspected, you should render the Phrase which is in our Version, noted in the Scripture of Truth, thus. What is to be noted, (by you) in a true Writing? But Willet, whom I generally consulted on these Points, has no such Version.

**Objection**
Objection IX. I find these Words in Whiston. 
Josephus said, that Daniel had foretold the Destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans; as did Jesus also interpret that Prophet. Josephus seems ever in his Wars of the Jews to apply Daniel's Prediction of Time, Times and a half, Daniel vii. 25. and xii. 7. to the Profanation by Antiochus, as if it had lasted three Years and a half, while he does as often leave off that Application in his Antiquities, and honestly owns, with the original Authors of the two Books of the Maccabees, that such Profanation continued but three Years only: which last is, also, I think, a remarkable Application of one of Daniel's Prophecies, I mean that of the 1100 Evenings and 1100 Mornings, 2200 in all, Daniel viii. 14. Which seems to have been the Number in Josephus's Copy; as Jerome says some would have it in his Time, instead of those 2300 in our Mazoreti-Hebrew, in Clem. Alex. in Africanus, in the MSS. Alex. and those 2400 in our Vatican Copy. So that it appears probable, that when Josephus wrote the Jewish Wars, he was an unbelieving Jew, but when he wrote the tenth Book of his Antiquities, a Christian. Sir Isaac's Explication of the Evening-Morning-Vision, is without Proof, and I myself have given a much easier and natural one
one in my Essay on the Revelations. The Translation indeed from the Grecian to the Roman Times, both in Daniel xi. 35, 36. and viii. 11, 12. though exact in point of Time, or just at the Profanation of the Temple by Antiochus Epiphanes, is yet somewhat obscure in our present Copies: but this being much the same in Sir Isaac's Transition from the Times of the Maccabees to the Times of Constantine, no considerable Argument can be thence drawn for his Hypothesis. Nor does Sir Isaac do well in setting down the Text, Daniel xi. 33. from the English Version only, without that Distinction which it affords, that they should fall by the Sword, &c. many Days; while the Word, Many, upon which alone an Argument can be grounded against the Persecution of Antiochus, as foretold here, is not in the Original. I agree nearly, continues he, with Sir Isaac, in expounding the first thirty Verses of Chap. xi.

It is a clear Case, that the next five Verses 31, 35. belong to the Times of Antiochus also, a King of the third or Grecian Empire. Sir Isaac strangely applies them to what I call the fourth Empire or Roman; by forcing the Text contrary to its natural Import and Coherence. I greatly prefer Mede's Distinction here, who does not begin the Roman Times till v. 36.

Answer.
Answer. These and many more Arguments may be alleged against Sir Isaac. As they all tend to one Purpose, I lump them together in this Article, and will set down such Things as may be said for or against Sir Isaac, or myself, as they occur to my Mind.

First read my Notes and Appendix on these Points. Antiochus Epiphanes is made a Type of the Romans, and even of the Antichristians, and all Daniel’s Prophecies reach unto what he calls the End, i.e. to the binding of the Dragon. I observed this to be the Case in Daniel xii. and have I think proved it. It is also the Case in viii. 9.

I at first imagined, that such an Interpretation would be incompatible with Sir Isaac’s general Scheme, but I find it is not. I believe with him, that the Greeks and Romans are prophesied of in all these Places which he mentions, but I take Antiochus to be the Type, and the Days in Chap. viii. and xii. to be those of Antiochus.

The Pope is called a little Horn, which had Eyes as a Bishop (προσωπος) and pretended to much Knowledge. He also is said to have Looks more stout than his Fellow-bishops. Antiochus Epiphanes is described in much the same Terms, in Chap. viii. and so are the Greeks and Romans, particularly in the Person of Vespasian, and the Pope.
Pope. *Antiochus* is not prophesied of in the eleventh Horn, but *Daniel* may by the Similitude of Phrases hint, that the eleventh Horn had his Rise in *Greece*, and went to *Rome*, seeing *Antiochus* belonged to the *Greek* Empire, and *Vespasian* was there when made Emperor, and led those of that Country, as *Antiochus* did, against *Judea*. Thus *John* calls the Pope a *Greek* by Birth and Likeness. This indeed is only Conjecture.

The *Greeks* and *Romans* resembled one another so much, and were so long united, that *Daniel* sometimes considers them as one People. *Antiochus* in the Vision is as in Painting, put for the future *Greeks*, and they are considered as united with the *Romans*, so that the *Greeks* are called *Romans*, and the *Romans*, *Greeks*. Consider Romans ii. 10.

Christ's Prophecy of *Jerusalem* resembles these in viii. and xii. It is not confined to a single Thing, but a sudden Transition is made to a resembling Thing, and the former proves that the latter shall happen. So if *Antiochus* was suffered to persecute, it was to punish Transgressors come to the full; and this proves God would do the same by *Vespasian* and the Pope.

When
When John calls the Pope a Greek in his obscure Way, he imitates the Phrase of Daniel in many Places.

Whiston (for I mentioned not all his Arguments above) says, Sir Izaac had no Reason for his Interpretation but one, that built on the Phrase, Mighty, but not by his own Power. This is a good one, as I said before, especially if you consider, that it was God's Design to let Daniel know this Union of Greeks and Romans, and that all these Prophecies explain one another in many other Things. See what I said on the prolonging of the Lives of the first Beasts.

Seeing Vespasian is mentioned in the Prophecy of the seventy Weeks, he is probably pointed at here, for the Reason mentioned in the last Paragraph.

Since this Horn is said to prosper, and Antiochus did not prosper, the Prophet has an Eye to Vespasian and the Antichristians, who prospered unto the End.

I will not insist much on the Title of Prince of Princes, because Michael is mentioned afterwards, and is said, according to some, to be a Chief, or the chief Prince. Yet as Michael is thought by some to be a Name of Christ, both here and in Revelations, you may imagine there is some Weight in the Argument. Many indeed
deed think that *Michael* is not Christ, though the Bishop of Clogher asserts it. See some new Pieces. My last Thoughts are, that the Argument has some Force, because *John*, Daniel's Commentator, calls Christ, Prince of Kings. *Michael*, Guardian Angel of the Jews, fights also in the *Revelations* for Christians, who are called Jews by Daniel and John.

The Romans were famous for gaining their Point by Leagues and Pretences to a Love of Peace.

Sir Isaac had many Arguments, many very strong ones, besides the single one mentioned by Whiston. Read Sir Isaac.

In the Book of Maccabees, says Whiston, the Words of Daniel are repeated, and therefore Antiochus alone is meant here. Antiochus is indeed meant here, but the Romans are also pointed at; for, as Sir Isaac says, he left the Sanctuary standing, which is here said to be cast down. The Author of that Book might not see that this Prophecy is double, or triple.

The Sanctuary is called that of the Prince of Princes, or of Christ. *Michael* is not meant. This extends probably even to the Christian Jerusalem, or Church.
The Word, Truth, may point at our Religion, which in the New Testament is often called the Truth.

The Tenour of this Prophecy agrees with that of last Chapter, where Christians are called Jews, and their Sufferings under the Roman Antichristians are considered.

The Order of the Prophecy is the same with that in last Chapter. After speaking of Antiochus, he proceeds to the Romans first as Gentiles, then as Antichristians, and then returns to Antiochus's Times of afflicting the Jews. When Christ speaks of Vespasian, he proceeds to the Day of Judgment, and then reverts to Vespasian the Type. Thus Daniel here speaks of Antiochus, then the Romans, and returns to the Duration of Antiochus's Affair with the Jews.

It is easy to conceive, that the Prophet saw in Vision three Princes heading three Sorts of People, and that both Princes and People resembled one another to a great Degree, but that there was some small Difference. The Prophets themselves often understood not their own Prophecies; and this seeming Indistinctness of the Visions was one Cause of it. They could scarcely tell whether it was not one Prince or People which they saw, the Difference being frequently minute. Daniel indeed seems to have
apprehended a Distinction, because he says he fainted, and was sick and astonished. The trifling Affair of Antiochus, from whom a speedy Deliverance, with God's Pardon, is promised, could not trouble Daniel much. Add, that according to the other Scheme, the Affair of Antiochus is said to be at a great Distance. So in vii. 15, and 28. he seems to apprehend something very pernicious, and of no short Duration to the Church. Here in viii. 15. he sought for the Meaning, for he suspected some tedious Misfortune to the Church was predicted. In xii. 8. he is inquisitive for the same Reason. And there in Verse 5. one Angel speaks to another about these Things, as Things of Importance and curious; and therefore Antiochus alone is not pointed at. Consider also viii. 13.

The Jews, if I remember, in the Days of Antiochus, were not a mighty People as here called. They might then be called a holy People, though they are here said to be at that Time great Transgressors, for this was an Epithet of the Jews; yet it may happen, that they were called Holy in this Place, in order to shew, that Christians, God's holy Witnesses, called also Jews, were here prophesied of.

I often suspect, because all these Prophecies explain one another, that the Prophecy of the seventy
seventy Weeks is called an Explanation of a Vision, because it interprets the present one. This indeed is but a Conjecture, and not yet well weighed.

The Phrase, latter Days, I do not remember to be elsewhere used for any Time but that of the Messiah. Even in the Prophecy of Gog, it seems to me to point at the future World, as the Prophets called it, or Reign of the Messiah. Consider how the Phrase is used in the New Testament.

In Verse 12. it is said, by reason of Transgression this was permitted. Consider also 23. Therefore in 13. Transgression of Desolation may not mean an Idol, as Abomination of Desolation signifies, but rather the Transgression of the Jews which brought on this Desolation. I have consulted no Commentator here.

The Author of the Book of Maccabees might quote the Prophecies of Daniel erroneously as to the Phrase mentioned, or might point at a Phrase in Daniel xii. He might also think as I do, that other Things besides Antiochus's Affair were here predicted by Daniel, and yet cite Daniel as here speaking of Antiochus.

In xi. 14. it is said as here, that the Vision shall be for many Days. Now that Vision must necessarily, by the Confession of all, extend at N 4 least
least to the Destruction of Jerusalem; why not therefore this Vision, where the same Phrase is used? Here also it is said, the Vision shall be at the Time appointed, and the End. Now what mean these Phrases elsewhere in Daniel?

Tillinghast endeavours to shew, that in viii. 26. it is only meant, that there should be many Days, before this Vision should be understood. But x. 14. would thus be nonsensical. By the by, you have there the Phrase, latter Days, which I mentioned before, as explaining, Days, there, or many Days; and here in viii. you have also many Days, which signifies as the End, and last End of the Indignation, here also mentioned. Tillinghast errs in the Phrase, as you will find, if you consult Ezekiel and Esdras. Observe also the Phrase, for a Time appointed, everywhere in Daniel. Tillinghast says, the Matter of the Vision began soon, and so could not be unaccomplished for many Days. I answer, that Part of it was clear and soon fulfilled, and consequently soon understood with the highest Evidence. He therefore had no Reason to look for such Meaning of the Phrase. It is indeed here asserted, that it should not be understood until the End, and the Reason given is, that it was not to be accomplished until the End: But the Vision here means the particular
Thing, Daniel was solicitous about, the Fate of the Church obscurely predicted. When Daniel is bid to shut it up, it is not meant, that he should not shew it, but that he was to be contented with its Obscurity, and to look upon it as a sealed Book not to be understood until the End. He is bid to understand some Part of it, and he did so. He knew the first Part, and seems to have seen that it was a double Prophecy. And he seems to be bid to understand that Part of the Vision was to be for many Days.

Such obscure double Prophecies were so common, that some, as a Prophet tells you, said, he prophesied for many Days, when it was otherwise. This I mention from Memory, but I believe you will find it in Ezekiel.

Antiochus Epiphanes was broken without Hands, and even in this Particular seems to be made a Type. He is not alone prophesied of there; for as these Prophecies illustrate one another, and even many of the same Phrases are found repeated in them, here the Stone cut out of the Mountain is pointed at. This Stone is the Christian Church. The Fate of Antiochus and Antichrist will perhaps be found similar. As the Church was built without human Hands, that is, Force of Arms, and even in Opposition to them; so perhaps the Destruction of Anti-
Christ, though not effected miraculously, will seem to point out the Hand of God. Think of Cyrus restoring the Jews. Observe, that the Phrase, Prince of Princes, lies near the Phrase without Hand. Therefore, as I before said, Christ is meant, against whom the Romans first stood up, when they crucified him.

The Jews, in the Time of Antiochus, could not well be called a mighty People. They might be called holy in a Sense often found in Scripture. Yet perhaps they are called Holy, because the Name of Jew here extends to the Christian Witnesses.

Porphyry said, Daniel's Prophecy concerning Antiochus was plain. Did he then find the Evenings-Mornings agreeable to History? What Reading must he have had in his Copy? If I remember, it was objected to him, that they agreed not to Antiochus. There being probably many Histories of Antiochus, and some of them erroneous in this Particular, it is easy to believe, that many would be for altering these Numbers in Daniel.

It is said, that God would predict much the same Thing, by mentioning three different Numbers of Days; but why not do so, as well as foretell much the same Event by three different Numbers of Years? But doubtless the Events
Events are different, interpret the Numbers as you please.

Prophecies are generally given more clearly, the nearer the Time of their fulfilling approaches. This was the Case here of Antiochus; and in order to shew plainly God's Fore-sight and Providence, three different Numbers of Days are chosen to point out the History of that Time.

Some few Things are not indeed clearly predicted of Antiochus for wise Reasons, being obscured by what I may call an associated Prophecy. So also it is not told exactly when he should do these Things. I mean that when he did attack the Jews, it could not then be certainly known, that the latter Time of the Kingdom mentioned by Daniel was come.

Consult the Hints I gave for explaining the Evenings-Mornings in my Notes. Is Whiston right where I quoted his Words? I suspect, that as I had two Pieces of his when writing out his Objections, I borrowed one of them from a Work different from his Piece against Sir Isaac. When I consulted his Essay on Revelations, I found he made the Evenings-Mornings to be Years. By the by, I have somewhere used the Phrase, prophetical Years not very properly, but the Reader will see my Meaning. Whiston prefers
fers his own Interpretation found in his Essay on the Revelations, but I cannot find either it or Sir Isaac's to be right. I like such an Interpretation as makes Days to be signified here and in last Chapter. The Remainder of his Interpretation found in his Essay I forget.

Cleansing the Sanctuary cannot mean the Destruction of Antichrist, for the Number of Years does not agree. It cannot signify the Return of the Jews; for Christ tells us, that will happen when the Times of the Romans are fulfilled, or soon after. Now if you choose Sir Isaac's Epocha of those Years, they extend far beyond the Ruin of Antichrist. If you choose Whiston's, the Return of the Jews might happen to be pointed at, if Christ had not said that the Time of restoring the Kingdom to Israel, neither was, or should be known. This Argument holds good both against Sir Isaac and Whiston.

Why should Daniel say, both the Sanctuary and Host should be trodden under Foot from the Days of Antiochus until the last Return of the Jews? It cannot well be said to be Truth. Why not as well date from Daniel's Time, seeing it was to be trodden under Foot until the Times of Antiochus, as much as from Antiochus until the Destruction of Jerusalem? If
If the Days in Daniel xii. are those of Antiochus, why not these in viii?

Does the Word, Desolation, found in viii. signify as in the Prophecy of the seventy Weeks? Did Antiochus make Jerusalem or Judea desolate?

Some render the Words, astonishing Desolation, in xi. and xii. If they are right, it shews Antiochus to be there pointed at. How long to the End of these Wonders, is said in xii? The answer is, the astonishing or wonder-causing Abomination, &c. But I find Willet is against this Interpretation.

Sir Isaac's Evening-Mornings would run too far into the Millennium. But you may say the Happiness of the Millennium may not commence in the very Beginning of it.

The Time of the Destruction of Jerusalem was not known for wise Reasons. Nay, some were in doubt whether its Ruin was foretold; for perhaps they interpreted the seventy Weeks Prophecy of Antiochus. It was not, probably, fit to predict plainly the Return of the Jews, nor its Time. Their Conversion indeed might safely be foretold by Paul, because Jews would not believe him. A Prophecy must not be so clear as to become Felo de se. By the by, Paul speaks not of a few converted Jews in his own Times, or soon after.

Christ
Christ cannot mean, that the Time of the Return of the Jews was predicted, but not to be understood by him, nor any body until it was effected. In case it was predicted by Daniel, perhaps Christ would not think proper even to hint so much. He seems plainly to say, that it was not fit for his Apostles to know such Things, and that he himself knew them not. The Apostles demanded, when Israel should be restored to its Power, for that was what they were solicitous about, and thought to be every where meant by the Prophets, where they speak of the future Happiness of the Jews. Now if it was not fit for his Apostles to know such Things, it was not fit for Daniel to know them.

Predicting plainly the Time of Jerusalem's Destruction would frustrate itself. If the Witnesses had known Rome's Ruin should be so long delayed, it might have had bad Effects on them. A Prophecy of the Time of the Jews Return might have had some bad Effects. It is not therefore foretold.

If by cleansing the Sanctuary, Rome's Destruction was meant, some Epocha would be given, which would make its Years terminate with the 1260. Apply this to the Days mentioned in last Chapter.
If by the Days in last Chapter, the Affairs of
the last Days were denoted, there would a plain
Epocha be given, or the Subject of the Prophe-
cy be mentioned, so that they at least who live
at the Time of the Event would know it to be
fulfilled.

Prophecies are made plainer as the Event ap-
proaches, says Tillinghast. Now if Daniel had
even the Number of Years told him in last
Chapter, would not John the great Christian
Prophet, and his Commentator, have some-
thing still more clear on the Subject?

What is there found in John to correspond to
the Days of Daniel’s last Chapter, except, per-
haps, the Ruin of Rome, and, binding of the
Dragon? What then in John answers to the
Number of Evenings-Mornings? Will John’s
Bride, getting herself ready, answer? It is
plain, that the Jews cannot be restored until the
Beast is destroyed. Now, what Epochas of
these Things will agree with the Order of John’s
Visions?

I saw some considerable modern Writer, who
seemed to accommodate satisfactorily the Days
in Daniel’s last Chapter, to the Times of Antio-
chus. I believe you will find this in the Univer-
sal History. If this be right, why may not also
the Evenings Mornings be so applied?

What
What Daniel means by the Vision, which troubled him in Chap. viii. and which he was anxious about in Chap. xii. relates to the last Parts of those Visions, and yet the Evenings Mornings are those of Antiochus, a Type of the last Indignation against the Jews.

Garret very well shews, that the Word King in Daniel and Revelations, generally signifies a Kingdom; but says he, the King of Fierce Countenance cannot signify a Kingdom. You may try whether there is any Force in his Arguments, for I forget them. By the by, it seems unnatural to call seven Forms of Roman Government seven Kings, seeing five of them are said to have been in the Time of the Republic. The Senate indeed and Dutchy of Rome may be called a King, if in Vision the Pope was seen to assume a Crown on the Conquest of it.

It is probable, that nothing was inserted in the sacred Oracles which was, or will not be understood by Somebody. If the Days of Antiochus were once understood, it is not necessary that we also should know them to be agreeable to History. The Jews probably knew it, when Antiochus was disappointed or died. Some foolish modern Jews took his Days for Years, but this will not prove, that their Forefathers were of the same Opinion. But if the Days of Antiochus...
ecbm are not pointed at in last Chapter, then it cannot be known with any tolerable Degree of Certainty to the End of the World, what it is that is predicted there. Tillinghast erred there, as the Event has proved. Mede and Whiston are very unsatisfactory, and give no Conviction. As for the Evenings-Mornings, the Event also has confuted Tillinghast. I forget how far Whiston on Revelations makes them to reach, but I believe they are, in his Way, either past, or very soon to be fulfilled. Any one who considers the present State of Europe will see, that without a Miracle, they shall not soon be accomplished.

If the Events of the Christian Times were pointed at in the Evenings-Mornings, how improbable is it, that their Epocha should be taken from Antiochus, and not from Daniel's own Time? Was it designed to let those after Antiochus know the Duration of those Times, and not others who lived before him? Apply this to the Days in last Chapter, and also consider that the Epocha in last Chapter, in case the Days are Years of Christians, must be metaphorical, and for other Reasons uncertain, because then they must reach to the Time of binding the Dragon, or some Event about that Time.

When
When I found, that in the Prophecy of the eleventh Horn, some render the Words, rose up behind them; I suspected it was implied, that the Pope was hinted at, as rising by Degrees in Greece, and thrusting himself among the Roman Horns; but I think this Conjecture is groundless. It is said, the other Horns were risen first, so that probably the eleventh Horn was not seen in Vision, as rising up gradually behind and along with them.

I have given my Reasons which led me to believe the Days in last Chapter were those of Antiochus, and that in Chap. viii. he is made a Type; the Prophecy being double. It is more difficult to shew the Connexion in the two last Chapters, and how it comes about, that the Days of Antiochus happen to be mentioned at so great a Distance from Verse 31. of Chap. xi.

Whiston says, Sir Isaac built on the Phrase, many Days, alone; which makes me apprehend he had never considered Sir Isaac's Arguments. Not only his written ones are to be weighed, but such as it is obvious, he must have thought of. I shall only mention some of them, referring you to his Book, which I have not at present, whilst I am finishing in a Hurry this last Part of my Work.

Sir
Sir Isaac did not believe that *Daniel* prophesied in what I call a double Way, and therefore rendered the Words in xi. 31. Arms shall stand up after him.

The Word, desolate, he probably thought pointed at the Affair of Titus.

He took this Part to be a Commentary on another Vision, where Titus's War was described.

The Phrase, many Days, he might think signified as elsewhere in *Daniel*. See particularly x. 14. where it means as, latter Days. Whiston objects, that he acts not fairly in adding the Word, Many; but this shews Whiston's Carelessness; for in x. 14. Many, is also wanting in the Original. Now Whiston acknowledges, that this Prophecy extends to the Times of Antichrist.

The Words, End, and End of the Indignation, seemed also to Sir Isaac to point out something which reached farther than Antiochus. Observe these Words every where in *Daniel*.

Verse 36. Sir Isaac imagined pointed at Antichrist.

He might think xii. 1. pointed at the Destruction of Jerusalem and Persecution of a Remiss Antichrist; or at what some think will happen,
a great Destruction of the Jews in their last Return, or at all these Things.

He might think great Obscurity was designed, gathering this from xii. 9, 10. and consequently that this Prophecy was not confined to Antiochus.

In case that either Greeks or Romans are described in xi. 36. it is more natural to think the Greeks are pointed at, tho' not indeed excluding the Romans, who, in this Period, are considered as one People with the Greeks.

So far I think Sir Isaac's Hypothesis is vastly preferable to Whitson; and yet I will venture to say, that Sir Isaac's may happen to be partly groundless.

May this Prophecy be double? May xi. 31. be translated thus? Arms shall stand on this Part or Side, that is, on the Greek Side now united to Romans; or will you rather paraphrase thus? Antiochus first, then Greeks (or Romans) shall make Judea desolate. Then may we proceed thus? The King Antiochus, and the Greeks (or Romans) his Successors, shall worship Mabuzzim. When Antiochus shall oppress, and much more when the Romans oppress, there shall be great Trouble.

I know not how to believe, that Daniel would plainly say, the Roman Arms should stand
Stand up after Antiochus. He probably would not speak so clearly.

The Phrase, many Days, may possibly be meant of Antiochus alone.

The Words, End, and last End of the Indignation some may think signify, the latter Time of Antiochus in this Chapter. Some may even think that the Word, End, signifies the fame in xii. 4. They may imagine, that seeing the Prophecy of Antiochus was to be partly left in Obscurity, by reason of the Jews in his Time not knowing when this Prophecy of Daniel, concerning such a Persecutor, was to be fulfilled; it is said to Daniel this was so ordered, that the Good should be tried and approved. It is also added, that such should apprehend Daniel's Prophecy pretty well. They may think that xii. 3. and 10. refer to xi. 33, and 35. where Antiochus alone may be pointed at. Though a Phrase in xii. 1. is applied to the Affair of Titus by Christ, yet Daniel may point only at Antiochus. His Persecution may be afterwards compared to the Day of Judgment, which tries all Men. The Men tried, may be denoted by the Word, Many. In xi. 36. they may think, Antiochus is described as introducing some new Species of Heathenism not so offensive to the Jews as that of the Greeks, and placing Images in
in the conquered Fortresses, the Jews having only one Temple. The King of the South and North in Verse 40. may be the same as in the former Part of the Chapter; and here also described as at War with each other. I find some Authors are of Opinion, that Antiochus alone is described in xi. 31, 45. You will, I believe, find this Interpretation in the Universal History, with the Reasons particularized, many of which I now forget.

Upon the whole, it seems plain to me, that the Prophecy is somewhere double; but where this Duplicity begins, or in how many Places found, I cannot determine at present with much Conviction.

If you make the King of the North to be both Antiochus and the Turks, then you make the Countries in Verse 42. to denote the Greek Empire, or the Turks Conquest of it must be omitted, which is scarcely credible.

I sometimes suspect, that if we had a compleat History of Antiochus, xi. 36. might in every Expression be applied to him. If Historians have described the Species of Idolatry, which he endeavoured to introduce into Judea, and it agrees not to Verse 36. then I would readily believe there was an obscure Transition there in Sir Isaac's Way, yet not excluding the Type.
The various Translations of these two Chapters should be consulted. I have not Leisure to peruse them.

Objection X. Whiston raises Objections against Sir Isaac's Account of the ten Kings.

Answer. His Objections seem to me, on a cursory Reading, to be, that some of Sir Isaac's Kings were inconsiderable, because of their small Power or Duration; or that they were near the Borders. Now these Objections have no Weight. Nay, if the capital Cities of some of them lay out of the Bounds of the Western Empire, yet they might be of the Number of John's Kings. If Whiston or any other brings any more Arguments from History against Sir Isaac's Account of the ten Kings, they may perhaps be invalidated as follows.

History is deficient in those dark Times, and we must take the Prophet's Word for it, that there arose ten Kings in that Period. Thus we believe Daniel asserting, that there were from the going forth of the Commandment seventy Weeks until the calling of the Gentiles. Thus we may believe John asserting, that there were an Hour, Day, Month, and Year, until the taking of Constantinople. God does not always oblige himself to preserve such Histories as will prove
prove the Times by him mentioned, to be fulfilled. It is sufficient, that no authentic History contradicts his Prophecies. If indeed good History contradicts Sir Isaac in this Point, or is silent about some of his Kings, and evidently so, because of their Non-existence, we must fly to another Hypothesis, which may be compatible with Sir Isaac's general Scheme.

Beverley's Solution cannot be admitted. He says there may not have been precisely ten Kings, but that because a Man has ten Toes, and these Kings were at first represented by Toes, Daniel afterwards, and John, represent them by ten Horns.

Dent, Mede, More, and others give Accounts of these Kings, which cannot be granted. They generally place one or more of them out of the Bounds of the Western Empire.

Neither can it be allowed, I think, that it is meant, that an indefinite Number of Kings planted themselves in the ten Roman Provinces. That there shall be ten Electors in the End is least of all meant.

May the Western Empire be in this Period considered as enlarged and subject to the Pope? This might introduce Dent's Account of the Kings. This Scheme seems false.

What
What if it is not meant that all the Kings then existed, but only a Majority of them, the rest rising up afterwards? Though Daniel calls them first Horns, or prior to the Pope, considered as a temporal Horn; yet they may not all have existed before him. If they became ten, when the Pope became a Horn, would this be a sufficient Reason for saying the ten arose in the same Hour wherein the Beast arose, or during his short Continuance? Does John only mean, that they were to be generally ten? Or does he only point at ten considerable and durable ones? Or are they to be precisely ten when they burn Rome? I was in hopes to reconcile Hammond's Account of the ten Kings to ours, thinking he meant, that ten Kings invaded the Empire, though possibly all of them erected not separate Kingdoms. I have not inquired whether this was in reality his Opinion, or agreeable to History. Garret gave me a Distaste to some Part of Hammond's Interpretation of this Place in the Revelations. Consult Garret and Whiston's Essays on the Revelations, for the Reason why the Kings are called ten. Whiston, in his Piece against Sir Isaac, and the Rev. Mr. Newton, give you other Catalogues of the ten Kings; but I have not as yet tried whether either of them is by any of the Methods above-
mentioned reconcileable to Sir Isaac's Hypothesis. This is a proper Place to speak of the three Kings which the Pope is said to subdue. Whiston, and the Rev. Mr. Newton, differ from Sir Isaac here. For my Part, I take Sir Isaac to be right. If the Pope subdued two of the Horns for his own Use, why not the third? His triple Crown seems to be here explained. Whiston also says, it is not probable, that the ten Kings of Sir Isaac shall burn Rome, but that those of his List seem likely to do it. I answer, that this destroys not Sir Isaac's Hypothesis, for from the very first Rise of the ten Kings, some of them may fall and others rise, and their Numbers perpetually vary. Add, that it will not necessarily follow from John's Words, that all these Kings shall burn Rome. A Majority is sufficient to verify John's Words. I have not consulted History concerning some Things here mentioned in this Affair of the ten Kings, but have only given Hints to Men who have Books and Leisure. Some may think Sir Isaac's Account of the ten Kings will not be found, in every respect, just, because it would make the Prophecy clear, when Obscurity was designed; and may like his Interpretation of the eleventh Horn's subduing three of the first Horns, because it supposes Daniel to have there spoken darkly.
Others may think, the Expression, shall subdue three of the first Horns, throws a sufficient Degree of Obscurity on the Prophecy concerning the Horns.

Objection XI. *Whiston* in some of his Pieces affirms, that *Rome* will soon fall. I know not how this can be proved from Scripture. Nor do we see any of those Revolutions which are to precede its Destruction. See my Account of the double Fall of *Babylon*. The ten Kings hate not *Rome* as yet. The Papists have lately acquired much Power in *Germany*, and their Missionaries are now well received abroad. The Immoralities of the Protestants are so deep-rooted, that probably a speedy Reformation is not to be expected; and it is not to be easily believed, that God will signally appear in their Favour for a long Time. It might answer the wise Purposes of Providence to conceal the Time of the Ruin of *Rome* from our Forefathers, but probably the revealing Time is now come. I mean that we now can guess better at it than our Forefathers, and will soon be comforted, notwithstanding the Delay of God's final Judgment on *Rome*, by seeing some Degree of its Downfall. Let us do our Part in extirpating Popery. *The Christian Religion, tho'*
corrupted, may often help to encourage Arts and Sciences. The Art of Printing has diffused the same in Popish Countries. A Desire to hurt or convert Protestants has contributed to this Encouragement. Add also an Emulation of industrious and studious Neighbours. You must thus Account for any Degree of Perfection found in Popish Countries; for the native and direct Tendency of Popery is to enslave, and destroy among Men every Thing that is fair, and flourishing and happy.

FINISH.
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