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PREFACE.

In the passage of scripture, of which the following Dissertation treats, the prophetical evidence of christianity is subjected to the test of chronological computation. If it stand that test, when fairly, though strictly applied, through a clear and consistent interpretation, the unbeliever, there is reason to hope, may be awakened, if not converted, and the objector, if not satisfied, silenced. On the other hand, a total failure under the application must be a stunning and almost deadly blow to the cause, which, having challenged the severity of so searching an ordeal, is found unable to endure in the hour of proof. Certainly no apprehension of such a fatal result was entertained by Sir Isaac Newton, who ventures to speak of this prophecy, as the foundation of the christian religion*: and in all ages of the

* "To reject his (i. e. Daniel's) prophecies, is to reject the christian religion. For this religion is founded upon his prophecy concerning the Messiah." By that particular prophecy he unquestionably means this of the seventy weeks: for this is emphatically the prophecy concerning the Messiah: who is not mentioned by the same name elsewhere in the book of Daniel. Observations upon the Prophecies of Daniel, p. 25.
church it has been esteemed by well-instructed christians, as fundamental to the "building up of themselves on their most holy faith," at least so far as its prophetic evidences are concerned, and consequently, as capable of sustaining the pressure of any weight that can be brought to bear upon it.

It must however be confessed, that the explanations of this prophecy, which have been given and maintained by the most learned and laborious expositors, are very various and discordant; insomuch that there are now few particulars of it, in which the student does not find himself obliged to decide between conflicting opinions supported by great ingenuity and erudition, as well as zeal. So long ago, as the time of Jerome those opinions were numerous, and that learned father thought it hazardous to decide between them. "I am well aware," saith he*, "that this subject has been repeatedly discussed by men of profound learning to the best of their abilities†, and yet they have formed different judgments upon it. Therefore, since it is dangerous to decide between the masters of the church and to prefer one before

† The edition I use, reads pro raptu ingenii sui; I conjecture the true reading to be captu, and have rendered accordingly.
another, I will content myself with setting down their several opinions, leaving it to the discretion of the reader to determine whose exposition he may think fit to follow.” This was doubtless a very safe determination; and by adopting it I might with no great trouble have made a larger volume than the present; but I think with any thing else than satisfaction to the reader. For Jerome himself afterwards states or recounts no less than seven opinions; those of Africanus, Eusebius, Hippolytus, Apollinarius Laodicensus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, and Tertullian. Pererius numbers up fifteen, and having refuted them all, left a sixteenth, as Frischmuth observes, to be refuted by others. Mr. Faber also notices the interpretations of fourteen expositors and adds his own, from which I find myself obliged to record my dissent, when I propose a new one.

If indeed the seventy weeks had been one of those prophetic visions, in which the subjects of prediction are shadowed out in types and symbols, such discrepancies would be less surprising. But here we have a precise and plain declaration concerning times and events to come, delivered in proper and unadorned language, and affording, as it should seem, no great scope for critical ingenuity to strike out diversities, much less oppositions of significations. The difficulties arising
from two or three various readings of small importance, from one or two singular and uncommon words, and from any questions founded on the connexion of the sentences and their several clauses, are wholly inadequate to account for that great variety and even contrariety of opinions entertained and expressed by christian critics and commentators of all ages: whence it may be argued, that, exclusively of the language and style of the prophecy, there must be some serious causes of doubt and error in the substance of it, out of which such manifold and wide disagreements have sprung. Those causes are discernible in the number of periods, or terms of weeks, which, taken together both principal and subordinate, amount to no less than seven, and in the difficulty of distinguishing and adjusting them in such a manner, as to bring them to a consistency with one another, with the facts appointed to each, and with true chronological dates. For mistakes herein not only affect the proper assignment of historical events to their corresponding predictions; but being, by the resolute attempts of commentators to fabricate a meaning conformable to their own opinions, reflected on the prophecy itself, they become the occasion of producing or adopting forced constructions and erroneous translations, and even
of proposing groundless conjectures, or bringing forward various readings of such slight authority as to be little less dangerous than mere conjectures, and fastening them on the sacred text.

Such treatment of this divine oracle is the more to be lamented, perhaps I ought to say, the less to be excused, since there is reason to think, that no inconsiderable portion of its obscurity may be the effect of design in its original construction. If this be true, it is certain, that a laborious and patient investigation of what we find actually written is the only means calculated to produce a true interpretation, as well as alone consistent with humility and sober piety; while the less gentle methods above mentioned can lead to nothing better than plausible error, and as they remove one difficulty, will probably leave or create others.

Although it was undoubtedly the intention of the Divine Spirit to make his prophetic communications, by their completion, testimonies to the truth of revelation, and in the mean time also to raise in the minds of men an awful expectation of "the things that are coming and shall come," yet nothing could be farther from his purpose than to enable the students of his sacred records to enact the parts of inspired prophets by foreseeing and foretelling with certainty
the exact periods and the particular circumstances of the events destined to take place. That would have afforded to mortals an opportunity of intermeddling in God's providential arrangement of human affairs, either by audaciously opposing their puny efforts to the purposes of his wisdom, or by awkward endeavours, less impious indeed, but hardly less rash, to facilitate or accelerate their accomplishment. This consideration applies especially to chronological prophecies, or the predictions of fixed terms; which, if exactly ascertained, would bear the appearance of a fatal necessity: and thereby, as the hour of accomplishment drew nigh, the course of things would be exposed to a twofold disorder. Weak and timid minds* would sink listless and passive in the contemplation of an inevitable event; while fierce and audacious spirits would rend heaven and earth in their interested strifes to avert the threatened danger or secure the pre-determined blessing. But

Prudens futuri temporis exitum
Caliginosa nocte premit Deus.

* It is of such minds that Lucan so powerfully expresses the feelings in the opening of the second book of his Pharsalia:

Sit subitum quodcunque paras: sit cæca futuri
Mens hominum fati: liceat sperare timenti.
Accordingly, although we do find in holy writ many chronological prophecies and predictions of fixed terms, yet it is observable, that they are constructed with such skilful management, as to give to mankind little or no opportunity, or even temptation, to act upon them in the way either of prevention or of promotion. This was peculiarly necessary in the case of a prophecy, that should fix a period for the coming of Messiah. For if the Jews had been able to calculate the times with precision, would not the worldly turn and the ardent spirit of their expectations, combining with their impatience of the Roman yoke, have interfered with the designs of heaven? If it could have been proved to full conviction, that the time of our Lord's appearance coincided exactly with the predictions in the seventy weeks, would not the whole nation have risen up, as one man, to do, what without such instigation some of them were well nigh doing,—"have taken Jesus by force to make him their king?" Doubtless in such case the humility of his character and the anti-secularity of his pretensions, in the minds even of the most worldly-minded, would not have availed to cast a shade over his mighty works; nor, in the absence of other and preferable competitors, have prevented the general acknowledgment of him, as the expected Messiah,
and the violent consequences, which, unless checked by such a manifest interposition, as might have seemed to look too favourably to the heathen domination, would have ensued on that acknowledgment. The Jewish history may suggest to the reader other arguments to the same purpose. But enough has been said to shew, that the state of opinions and of feeling prevalent among that nation at our Lord's appearance was such, as to render it highly advisable, and even necessary, to prevent a too close and decisive application of the prophecy to events, while they were either nearly pending or actually passing.

The mode, in which it has pleased the divine wisdom generally to prevent the certain computation of prophetical fixed terms previously to their expiration, is by throwing a degree of uncertainty about their commencement. I can recollect only one exception to this remark, which is to be found in the prediction of the one hundred and twenty years given to Noah, for that, provided we be correct in reckoning those years from the period of its delivery, seems to be as clear and decisive in its beginning as it doubtless was in its termination. But perhaps the knowledge of it was confined to Noah and his family, or if it were published, it was published to
a faithless and perverse generation, who would take no account of it: besides, the event was to be brought about, not by human instruments or through moral causes, but by such only as were placed above the reach of mortal interference. Another period prophetically fixed in scripture is that of the four hundred years, during which the patriarch Abraham and his seed were to be strangers, sojourners, and servants in a land of foreigners. Here, if the annunciation of the term be compared with the declaration of its conclusion, it will be found, that the commencement of it is involved in a great degree of doubt and difficulty; such as must have disabled any uninspired mortal from computing with exactness the date of its termination, until it actually arrived. In like manner the term of the seventy years captivity of Judah might have been uncertainly reckoned from more dates than one, until their return in the first year of Cyrus shewed, that it was to be computed from the first siege and capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar. A similar obscurity rests upon the long terms, which are predicted both by Daniel and by St. John, and which are yet in progress over us. We are unable, as to me at least it appears, notwithstanding all the efforts of commentators, to fix with satisfactory accuracy the beginnings of
those terms; and therefore we cannot argue with certainty to the time of their expiration.

Since then the attempt to fix the beginning of a prophetic term is by the direct act of the Divine Spirit himself made a matter of such serious difficulty, as almost to look like a prohibition, while the term itself is in transitu, it would be rash to affirm, that every degree of doubt ought at once and necessarily to vanish so soon as it has reached its conclusion. The event intended to mark its commencement cannot in itself do that office more perfectly than before, so that whatever degree of additional light and certainty may now be cast upon it, must be borrowed by a retrograde reckoning from its ascertained end. If indeed that point be clearly made out, and the reckoning lead back to a fact answerable to that, from which the term is dated, there can be no farther question upon the subject: the whole term stands fully disclosed before us; and nothing is left, but to examine, whether the events, by which it is filled up, correspond to those, which are predicted to take place in its passage. But if there happen to be more than one event, that can advance plausible pretensions to be the intended mark of the end, then it is evident, that the point of commencement also must remain undecided, until more accurate and more successful
inquiries shall have determined the right of the several claimants. This has been in some measure the case with Daniel's prophecy of the seventy weeks: not however because there is really any indistinctness in the intended mark of the end, but because interpreters have lost sight of it in pursuing it by indirect paths. Finding several edicts of the Persian monarchs in favour of the Jews, they hastily concluded, that the term must take its beginning from one of them; and they expected that the retrograde calculation would enable them to determine which. But the term when reckoned backward from its natural end was found to fall short of even the latest of those edicts. This should have been taken as decisive, that, unless the prophecy had failed of its accomplishment, the beginning of the term could not be fixed by any one of those edicts; and they ought to have sought the point of commencement in some other event. But instead of that, they generally deserted the natural and proper post, fixed by the plain expressions of the prophecy for the end of the term; and endeavoured to invent plausible arguments in behalf of another event, which the prophet himself has placed in the course of its progress. Hence, in order to support their opinions, they have been driven to those "numerous hermeneutic arts and that
great distortion," with which they are upbraided by Michaelis, or to the more pernicious contrivances of groundless conjecture and unwarrantable alterations.

In spite however of all the difficulty attending this prophecy, and all the variety of interpretations thereby occasioned, it has in all ages of the church maintained its credit. For however various and discordant the sentiments of christian interpreters may be among themselves, there is one triumph, which they have all achieved, and which they will ever continue to achieve; that I mean, which is gained over the incredulity and perverseness of the Jews. For no creditable or even plausible explication has ever been or ever can be given of the various terms of weeks and of the events appointed to take place during their course, which does not contradict or entirely preclude every hope of such a temporal and imperial Messiah, as they have been for ages expecting in vain. Their national commentators have indeed laboured by manifold hypotheses, each one more fanciful, inconsistent, and wild than the other, to make the prophet declare in their favour. But "seeing they see not;" and every expositor, who takes the trouble of examining their opinions, exposes to the world the fatality of their blindness. For as Frischmuth,
who has made it the chief object of his dissertation to recite and refute the principal Jewish interpretations, observes, "their incredulity has brought it to pass, that they cannot deliver any certain opinion of any prophecy. For while they strain the whole power of their understandings to pervert the true sense of words, they are carried to and fro by a sort of desultory temerity, uncertain in what point to find a footing*."

Besides, as Bishop Chandler has remarked, "although the explication of some parts of it have been very opposite, according to the different views and hypotheses of interpreters, yet the main general truths exhibited in the prophecy stand nevertheless unshaken; wherein all expositors must agree, if they will agree with the text†."

Unhappily however even this general agreement has disappeared, the condition, on which the learned prelate rests it, having been abandoned. Interpreters do not agree with the text; and their disagreements on that head are not less wide, and are likely, if persisted in, to be much more detrimental to the cause of truth, than on any other. Without referring to foreign critics, Dr. Blaney and Mr. Faber, especially the former,

* Dissertatio ad Dan. ix. 24, § 24.
† Defence of Christianity from Prophecy, vol. 1, p. 134.
in their several dissertations, have thought themselves warranted in introducing numerous and great alterations into the Hebrew text; alterations which seriously affect not only the meaning of single words, or even of the clauses, in which those words are found, but the whole structure of the prophecy. Of the former of those learned men, now no more, I have been accustomed from my youth to think and to speak with the highest respect: but I cannot help considering, that he has treated this prophecy, much as the daughters of Pelias, at the persuasion of the Colchian enchantress, served the body of their aged father. And although he has "kept the word of promise to the ear" better than Medea to the parricidal sisters, yet he has "broke it to the sense." For the resuscitated form, that issues from his critical laboratory, is a thing of quite another mould, of quite different parts and proportions from what we have seen in the sacred original; and coming in such a questionable shape, we can never recognize it, as the lively oracle, that proceeded from the pen and from the voice of Inspiration. I should also be seriously displeased with myself, if by any asperity of language I were to give just cause of offence to a gentleman of Mr. Faber's learning and piety; but I must say, that the principal alteration,
which he has introduced into the text, consisting of an addition of two whole words made on very slight authority, gives to the prophecy a new and foreign feature, and becomes in his hands the means of forcing an interpretation, which without resorting to such a violent expedient could not have been fixed upon it. When the formidable changes thus wrought on the original are considered in combination with the erroneous translations, by which they are accompanied, especially as to one of the most important clauses, with the new expositions which are consequent upon the new readings and renderings, and with the former varieties and oppositions of interpretation, it must be confessed, that they do altogether throw over the prophecy a degree of doubt and darkness sufficient to prevent the christian advocate from appealing to its testimony with that decision and confidence, which the wishes, not to say the wants, of his hearers and his own zeal for the honour of the common faith reasonably but vainly call for.

I trust therefore, that I shall not be considered, as making an useless addition to the volumes, that have been written on this signal prophecy, if I recall it once more to diligent examination; and if, by a new arrangement of its several periods of weeks and a new interpretation in some
respects of its predictions, I endeavour to fix the relation of the former to one another, and, bringing them at the same time to an agreement with chronological dates, to shew that the latter have been verified in some of the most eminent events, that are recorded in the annals of sacred and profane history.

The following Dissertation is divided into five chapters, of which the first is devoted entirely to a review of the new readings introduced into the Hebrew text by Dr. Blaney and Mr. Faber. Therein I have laboured, doubtless with no great skill, (for neither the course of my studies nor my opportunities have been favourable to the acquisition of such skill,) yet, I trust, not without success, to expose the weakness of the evidence, on which those readings are brought forward.

II. The new readings being set aside and the printed text reestablished, I have endeavoured in the second chapter to give a correct translation of the prophecy. In order thereto, I have taken every clause into separate consideration, and have proved, as I conceive, that the new renderings, which are necessary to support the interpretations of Dr. Blaney and Mr. Faber, are not founded upon such sure principles of grammar and criticism, nor so supported by examples and fortified by authorities, as to give them a merited prefer-
ence over those, which have been displaced. Of the renderings, which I have myself introduced, varying from our English translation, few, if any, can be said to be absolutely new; and in every instance of any importance, where I have departed from our authorized standard, I have assigned a reason for the deviation and supported it by good authority.

III. In the third chapter I have followed the example of Mr. Faber in laying down certain preliminary positions, intended to regulate and govern the interpretation. The majority of these may be justly styled abstract; but others, for reasons assigned in the opening of the chapter, are laid down without having any pretensions to that appellation, being collected not only from a comparison of the different parts of the prophecy with one another, but from other sources.

IV. The way being thus prepared, the fourth chapter enters into the interpretation of the prophecy, and states the events by which it appears to have been accomplished. And here I must acknowledge my obligations to Mr. Faber: for by discussing and refuting at length in his three preliminary chapters, the systems of preceding English interpreters, he has spared me the trouble of treading that thorny path. Neither have I thought myself obliged to enter into a
professed examination of his, any more than of Dr. Blaney's expositions, because their new readings and new versions are essential and fundamental thereto: and having in my first two chapters succeeded, as I trust, in subverting those foundations, it seemed superfluous to labour among the fallen fabrics; except in those particular instances, where the decisive agreement of the learned authors with my interpretation, or their opposition to it, rendered a specific notice necessary or advisable. This chapter, which occupies more than one half of the volume, is divided into six sections, each comprehending such a portion of the prophecy, as being connected in its parts, either naturally, by the near relation of their subject matter, or artificially, by the arrangement of pauses and copulatives, must therefore be necessarily, or at least could be conveniently, taken together. Throughout these divisions, I trust, it will be found, that, as by adhering to the plain literal sense of words, justified by parallel passages, by the authority of lexicographers, or by ancient versions, I have not created to myself any necessity for proposing or adopting new readings or forced renderings, so neither have I been obliged arbitrarily to shift the dates of events backward or forward, to contract or extend the bounds of the term fixed by
the prophecy itself, to change one Persian monarch into another, to adopt a double mode of computation, or to have recourse to any of those subtle contrivances, by which an author is compelled to speak the sense of his commentator. In ancient chronology, I have taken the canon of Ptolemy, to use the words of Prideaux*, "as the surest guide, the truth of which being demonstrable by astronomical calculations, and also verified by its agreement everywhere with the holy scriptures, it is not for the authority of any other human writing whatsoever to be departed from." At the same time I must apprize the reader, that as to a few facts and intervals of time, the dates of which the sacred volume does not furnish us with the means of fixing so accurately as could be wished, I have taken the liberty of following my own opinions and of supporting them by arguments which may appear somewhat new.

V. To the above I have added a fifth chapter, not for the sake of introducing any thing farther in the nature of interpretation or proof, but merely by way of recapitulation and conclusion.

I know not, that in such a work as the present it is necessary to offer any apology for the composition. But having been for thirty years and more accustomed to write little beside sermons,

* Connexion, part I, p. 411. Ed. 8vo.
I shall not be surprised, if the Dissertation be thought to savour, more than it should, of the pulpit. I also fear, that having been used to preach the word of truth to unlearned congregations, to whom explications of plain things are often necessary, I may have sometimes unwittingly run into a prolixity of exposition on subjects, where my readers are as well, or better informed than myself; while perhaps in other instances the consciousness of such a tendency may have led me into the opposite error.

Upon the whole, I am fully persuaded, that the footing, which I have taken, is sure; and then if the systems reared by other interpreters be moved out of their place by what I have advanced, I may survey the effect without fearing to be crushed by their fall. But, though I cannot profess to be actually "affrighted at my own temerity," yet "when I estimate the fame and strength of those that maintain the contrary opinions" on the subjects discussed in the following Dissertation, I cannot help calling to mind the apprehensions expressed by Dr. Johnson in his preface to Shakespeare; and that, as I suspect, with somewhat less of self confidence than the illustrious critic felt, when he was victoriously combating the futile arguments urged in support of the dramatic unities.
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A DISSERTATION
ON
THE SEVENTY WEEKS
OF
DANIEL.

CHAPTER I.

Of the true Reading of the Hebrew Text.

The extent of four verses should seem to afford but a very narrow space for the exercise of critical sagacity in the detection of textual errors and the substitution of new readings; yet no less than twelve emendations or alterations are proposed and introduced by the authors of the last two treatises, that have been published in this country, expressly on the subject of the seventy weeks, exclusively of those recommended by others, within this short portion of holy writ; which, to save the reader the trouble of reference, is here transcribed from the edition of Van der Hooght.
In these few sentences the following alterations are proposed or adopted and received in the dissertations of Dr. Blaney and Mr. Faber.  I. Dr. Blaney, in verse 24, for שבעים reads כללים. II. Mr. Faber for כללים reads ל철ות. III. For הלוח read both those learned writers read ששים. IV. In verse 25 the Doctor adds the letter ו before ששים; and V. the word שניא after ששים. VI. In verse 26 after והו ויר he adds the word ששים. VII. After he adds ושניים. VIII. He adds the letter ו before ושניים. IX. After Mr. Faber adds two words ושניים. X. Both Dr. Blaney and Mr. Faber for read שכורות. The alterations above stated, as proposed or adopted by Mr. Faber, he enumerates and defends in his dissertation, p. 230, 231; but in his translation of the 26th verse he makes two other additions, of which he gives no notice, adding, XI. דוע after הל, and, XII. כשונים.
Of the portentous list of alterations here exhibited a few rest on respectable authority, and, if received into the text, would produce little change in its appearance and little effect on its meaning. But of the rest the far greater part are not less important in their consequences than formidable for their number and magnitude. It is however to be observed, that as they are brought forward by the two learned critics severally, so they are at widest variance, yea absolutely inconsistent with each other. It is impossible to make Mr. Faber's insertion, No. 9, agree with Dr. Blaney's, Nos. 6, 7, 8. Since then the two sets of various readings do not act with combined force, there is none of that prejudice against the printed Hebrew text, which would arise from the concurrence of separate and unconcerted criticisms. A farther examination being admitted may be followed by various results: it may confirm the present text, or accredit one of the new sets of readings; or lastly, it may go to shake the authority of the text without overturning it or substituting either of the new sets of readings in its place. Should the last unhappily be the effect, it would cut up by the very roots all means of ascertaining what the prophet has written, and of course must destroy all hope of acquiring a satisfactory interpretation of the prophecy. If again those alterations depend on
mere conjecture or on such slight and insufficient grounds, that they have no claim to reception, except so far as they may be alleged in favour of a particular interpretation; and if, at the same time, the prophecy be in itself justly chargeable with such extreme difficulty, so hampered by uncommon and difficult constructions, so beset and entangled with incongruities, or so enveloped in obscurities, as to need such very uncertain and objectionable means to restore it to any degree of light and meaning, then indeed it would be the wiser plan to forego all further attempts upon it, and to consider it as overspread with a veil, that defies every effort at penetration or removal.

That no such inextricable perplexity and darkness is justly imputable to the prophecy, as it now stands in the printed Hebrew text, the succeeding chapters of the disquisition now before the reader are intended, and, it is hoped, will be effectual to prove. That the chief alterations proposed or admitted into that text by the learned authors above mentioned, rest only on conjecture, or on such very slight authority, as gives them no claim to reception, I shall here endeavour to shew.

I. The insertion of the ו in the wordlishw, has no other effect, than to change it from a word defectively, to a word fully, written, and as
the insertion is supported by many MSS. and is warranted by the punctuation, which supplies the 1 by Kibbutz, it may be received without doing any discredit to the printed text.

II. It must be confessed that many MSS. read לְכָלָה; Mr. Faber asserts as many as thirty or forty; and Dr. Kennicott enumerates twenty-eight. Mr. Faber also pleads the authority of the old versions and Hexaplars; of which the LXX and Theodotion read συνετελεσθησαν, and Aquila τελεσαί; the Syriac has לְכָלָה, the the Arabic absumentur, the Vulgate consummetur, Africanus consummata. The determination of this matter is not of serious importance to the interpretation of the prophecy; for, as Dr. Blaney observes, "the sense would not be very different either way." Hence it may also be argued, that the renderings of the ancient versions do not decisively prove לְכָלָה to have been the reading of the MSS. which their several authors had before them, since they have perhaps given what they understood to be the general sense, instead of the exactly literal meaning. This may be exemplified by the practice of the Jews. They doubtless read with the printed text; yet we are told*; "Judei vertunt, ut perficiatur, vel, ut consummetur, vel ad finem perducatur." Hence too it

* Poli Synopsis ad loc.
appears that there is not sufficient ground for concluding, that our English translators themselves followed the other reading, although they have rendered the word, "to finish." Since then the majority of the MSS. collated agree with the printed copies, and the evidence of the versions is questionable, I agree with Dr. Blaney in considering that the received reading is preferable. Besides, if לָכֵלָה were the original reading, it would be more difficult to account for the change, than the other way.

III. לָכֵלָה. More than forty MSS. read לְרָחַם, together with the Keri, which is followed by our English version. The Vulgate also has finem accipiat, and the Syriac לְרָחֲמָם. But on the other hand Theodotion reads σφραγισαί, the Arabic ob-signentur, and the LXX σφραγισαί; which last, if not a corruption of σφραγισαί, was probably intended for an interpretation of it: as also the Syriac translation of the LXX in the Ambrosian library at Milan, which reads, et imminuatur impietas. By these countervailing authorities the judgment is suspended, and since the renderings of the Syriac and Vulgate versions may not indubitably ascertain the readings of the MSS. whence they were made; since also לָכֵלָה is the more refined and difficult reading, and therefore, other things being supposed equal, or
nearly equal, to be preferred, I have translated and interpreted according to the printed text, though without any serious objection to the various readings.

The three various readings above noticed are matters of mere criticism, on which men may differ, while they agree in the interpretation of the prophecy; as is also another, which not being received into the text by Dr. Blaney or Mr. Faber, has not been enumerated with the foregoing, ראתה וגו'. Those which follow are of a very different cast, altering, as before mentioned, in very essential points the reading of the text and meaning of the prophet; but, standing, as I hope to shew, on very slight authority, they do not shake our faith in the general purity of the word of God, nor ought to affect our interpretation of this part of scripture.

IV. The addition of the letter י prefixed to יִשָּׁשׂ is made partly on the authority of an ancient MS. in the Bodleian library, and partly on that of the Chigian MS. of the LXX, an authority, which is little better than mere conjecture. The Greek version of the prophet Daniel by the LXX could not maintain its footing in the church, but was early laid aside, and that, in the judgment of Jerome, on good grounds. "It has been rejected," he observes*, "by the judgment of the

* Hieron. Comment. in Dan. c. iv. 8.
masters of the church, and that of Theodotion is commonly read, which agrees both with the Hebrew text and with the other translators. Whence also Origen, in the ninth volume of his Stromata, asserts, that he explained the part of Daniel's prophecy, which follows this place, (c. iv. v. 8,) not according to the LXX interpreters, who depart widely from the Hebrew verity, but according to Theodotion's edition." Upon this Bishop Chandler* remarks, "that the LXX's version of Daniel fell into discredit by Origen's means. The imperfections thereof appearing in his close comparing it with Theodotion from the original, the Septuagint, as amended by Origen, seems to have been first read in the churches, and afterwards the entire version of Theodotion to have been preferred to it." If it were needful to prove the propriety of so doing, it would be quite sufficient to turn to the prophecy of the seventy weeks, in which the Septuagint version affords an example of arbitrary departure from the original text, greater perhaps than any translation of any other author has ever exhibited. For no man will contend, or can believe, that the numerous mutilations, interpolations, and transpositions of the original text, which are found therein, are the result of mere mistake or carelessness in

the transcribers: they are evidently the meditated performance of the translator himself. The only way, in which I have been able to account for the phenomena, is by supposing the version to have been a bold attempt to support an interpretation, formed upon some previously conceived hypothesis, by a paraphrastic translation made from a text amended by conjecture; but that the author becoming at length less confident in, or less pleased with, his critical performances, or perhaps unable after all his efforts to bring his hypothesis and his translation to mutual accordance, left his work in an incomplete state. The reasonableness of such a supposition will appear to the attentive reader, who may detect in the Septuagint traces of at least two predicted desolations of Jerusalem. The first is foretold in the 26th verse, as an event appointed to take place after the seven, seventy, and sixty two; but as to those numbers, the writer seems not to have determined in his own mind what measure of time they should be applied to. Then in the beginning of the 27th verse he represents Jerusalem as rebuilt; and afterwards on the expiration of seventy seven times and sixty two years, (or perhaps of seventy seven times, and those of sixty two years*), making each time equal to sixty two

* και μετὰ επτα και εβδομηκοιτα καιρυς και εξηκοιτα δυο ετων,
years, and the whole equal to four thousand seven hundred and seventy four years,) as destroyed again. To cite such an authority for altering the text of scripture is then, I say, little or no better than citing a mere conjecture. Moreover the Septuagint itself must be made to undergo much emendation, before it can be brought forward to give the evidence required. In the words, which most nearly correspond to verse 25, no numerals at all are to be found, nor is any period of time at all mentioned or hinted at. The words of number do not occur till after the words \textit{xa\i\ με\tau\a}, which answer to the beginning of the 26th verse in the Hebrew; and accordingly they are numbered, as the first words of that verse, by Dr. Holmes in his edition of the LXX. But what is more; the words of number in verse 26 are not connected there with any words of time, which do not occur till the next verse. Consequently, the words both of number and time must be removed from verse 27 and transplanted into verse 25, when properly prepared for their reception; and the words of time must be inserted in the proper places in verse 26. What alterations may be necessary there and in the other verses, in consequence of these transpositions, or how they may affect the meaning of the LXX, I am not prepared to say, nor do I think it worth
while to inquire. Dr. Blaney himself, with all his attachment to the LXX and notwithstanding, that his dissertation is mainly built upon it, freely confesses, that it is chargeable with "much mangling, interpolation, and transposition." Such a version does indeed open to the emendatory critic a spacious field for the exercise and display of acuteness and ingenuity; and when duly prepared by a little farther mangling, interpolation, and transposition, it may perhaps be brought to give equally powerful evidence in support of other equally bold hypotheses, as that, which doubtless it was originally framed to uphold; but it can never be made an useful instrument in the hand of one, who is inclined to proceed with the cautious reverence due to the sacred volume. Deprived of this aid, the proposed addition of will stand on the ground of the Laudian MS. alone; but that, however ancient, being quite single in this instance, cannot afford any sufficient warranty for altering the text, or even for suspecting its integrity.

V. Dr. Blaney adds the word שביעי after ששתו. This is done on the authority of the Bodleian MS. before mentioned. But unfortunately the MS. has the word in a wrong place, occupying that, which should have been allotted to سابיע which is omitted. The MS. consequently, before
it can be brought to bear the desired testimony, must, like the LXX in the last instance, itself be subjected to critical operation; the absent word must be restored and הָנַשׁ removed into the required position. The testimony of the LXX also, which inserts the word εὐων, is vouched in support of this interpolation. But then it occurs not in the first mention of the numerals, but in the second; from which, therefore, it must be transferred to the 26th verse, as before mentioned. Nor is this all; for the genitive εὐων will need to be amended into the nominative εὖ. Such is the authority for the proposed addition; the weakness of which needs no farther exposure.

VI. I beg leave, for convenience sake, to postpone the consideration of the word belonging to this number till after the two following.

VII and VIII. These two alterations will be more conveniently taken into consideration together. After הרשעֵנִים Dr. Blaney adds the word שְׁבֵּנים, and before לֹא שָׁשֶׁן the letter ג. These additions are introduced by observing, that, "as the words are evidently designed to mark out precisely the same time as the foregoing, it may be thought sufficient perhaps to justify the substituting of the same numbers again, which have been already settled." Upon what authority those numbers have been so "settled," we have
seen above; but waving a second discussion of that subject, I must enter my protest against the unwarrantable extension of authority claimed to the emendatory critic. For the position here advanced implies the general principle, that if an author mention two numbers in connexion and afterwards proceed to speak of the second separately, without a specific declaration of his intention not to include the other, the critic has a right to come in, and, peremptorily deciding that he must be understood to speak of both, make forthwith the requisite addition to his text. This protest against Dr. Blaney's observation will not however affect so much of it, as is true, "that the angel's words are evidently designed to mark out the same time as the foregoing." Now the time next foregoing is sixty two weeks. It was mentioned indeed in succession to another period of seven weeks; but the two were not added together, and the angel might have very good reasons for keeping them separate. At all events the period of seven weeks is evidently and indisputably prior to that of the sixty two; and where could be the necessity or the propriety of mentioning the former in order to fix the date of a fact, which was not to take place till after the latter? Besides, supposing, as we may in all reason be allowed to do, without expressing or even hinting
any decision on the subject, that the seven weeks were not intended by the angel to be joined to the sixty two, so as to make the single sum of sixty nine, then the proposed addition would directly tend to mislead the reader, as it would force into conjunction what the angel had taken pains to separate. Nothing can be urged against the structure of the sentence, which, as well as its sense, is entire and perfect, neither requiring nor admitting the use of conjectural criticism. Its interference therefore only proves against itself, that the learned author had recourse to its aid, not for the sake of restoring or settling a corrupted or doubtful text, but because it was his object, for the sake of his interpretation, to melt the two periods into one, to which he perceived the separate mention of the latter formed a very considerable, if not an insurmountable obstacle.

Having thus, I trust, effectually opposed the remark, by which Dr. Blaney introduces these additions, we come at length to the authorities on which they are built. These are the Arabic version which reads "seven weeks and sixty two weeks," and the Greek one of Aquila, to which he might have added that of Symmachus, both of which read "the seven weeks and sixty two*,"

with no other difference, than a very slight one in the collocation of the words. He then observes, that these readings will agree with the numbers in the Septuagint, εὔδομην τοιαύτα καιρές καὶ εἴξηκοντα δυο ετῶν, if only we allow, "that by means of a different punctuation, what the former have translated weeks, the latter have more properly rendered seventy." But this allowance will be liable to the following objections: 1. With respect to the Arabic version; the word המשביעים appears according to the Latin translation in the London Polyglott to occur twice: Et post septem hebdomades et sexaginta duo hebdomades. In the latter it must be taken in the sense of weeks; in the former only for a noun of number. The words therefore will stand thus, after the seventy seven and the weeks sixty two; so that if the former of the two numbers do not, as I think it must, require weeks to be understood, and consequently make altogether one hundred and thirty nine weeks, at least the latter is expressly determined to that measure of time and no other. But both these reckonings are at variance with the numbers in the foregoing verse, as settled by Dr. Blaney, and neither of them can be brought to coincide with his hypothesis. The Arabic version therefore, or the Hebrew text, which it may be supposed to have followed, must be amended, before
it can be adduced as a witness in favour of the Septuagint or of Dr. Blaney's translation and interpretation. 2. With respect to the versions of Aquila and Symmachus; when the points, which they followed, are altered, and their εδο-μαδαζ consequently is turned into εδομηκοναα, their numbers will be left naked, like those of the LXX in the same verse, the subjects numbered being omitted. It may be said indeed, and perhaps allowed, that those subjects, having been specified in the former verse, may well be understood here; but then this supposes, that the readings of Aquila and Symmachus in the 25th verse agreed with Dr. Blaney's there; which is a mere supposition, destitute of all proof and of all means of proof. And even, if this supposition could be established, though the grammar might be safe, yet a great and unusual baldness would be seen and felt in the phraseology, such as is very unlikely to have fallen originally from the pen of Daniel, or such, as being supposed an error of omission, any transcriber or translator would, upon the revision of his work, have detected and corrected. So doubtful and unsatisfactory is the guess at a various reading thus formed on the remains of Aquila and Symmachus. And even all this proceeds upon the supposition, that Aquila and Symma-
chus found וַיַּעֲמֹר written in their respective MSS. and that they, of their own judgment, supplied the points, which decided it to signify weeks, rather than seventy. But their consent with each other and with all the ancient versions, except the LXX, encourages a suspicion, that they might have found the word written in full וַיַּעֲמֹר in their MSS. And this suspicion is strengthened by observing, that the word is found so written in fifteen of Dr. Kennicott’s Codices, of which a part are very ancient. From what has been said, it will be seen with how little justice Dr. Blaney could plead the “joint authority of three versions.”

But he endeavours to fortify the reading, which he would ascribe to the MSS. used by the LXX and Aquila, by a grammatical objection to the rendering of the word וַיַּעֲמֹר in the sense of וַיַּעֲמֹר, on account of the omission of the article וְ in before וַיַּעֲמֹר; contending, “that by a rule in the Hebrew language, where the substantive and adjective are brought close together in a proposition, if the substantive has the definitive article וְ, answering to the with us, prefixed to it, the same must be prefixed to the adjective likewise.” The rule is noticed by Buxtorf in his Thesaurus Grammaticus, lib. 2, cap. 5, but is far from being stated by him as of universal operation; for
he expressly admits the exception as of occasional occurrence. Speaking of He Hayediah, he lays down the rule concerning it in the following words; “cum substantivum et adjectivum con-
junguntur, nunc _alterutri_, nunc _utrique_ praefigi-
tur.” So too Cocceius in his Lexicon observes, “articulus aliquando duplicatur, additus _et_ substantivo _et_ adjectivo; aliquando non, sed _alterutri_ additur.” Accordingly, instances may be pro-
duced, in which the _ה_ is prefixed to the substan-
tive, while the adjective is left destitute of it; as הָעַלְוָה וּרְשָׁא, the new cart, 2 Samuel, vi. 3; הַפִּשְׁנַו שָׁם, Ezekiel xxxix. 27; and what is more to the purpose, we find two instances of the like practice in this very prophet, הָעַפְשֵׁנ שָׁם, and הָעַפְשֵׁנ מַפְשֵׁם, the transgression that maketh de-
solate, Daniel, viii. 13, and xi. 31. But is it true, as Dr. Blaney’s rule supposes, that the numerals here used are adjectives? In the opinions of the best Hebrew grammarians the ordinal num-
ers alone are adjectives, while all the cardinals are substantives. Accordingly, they are put ei-
ther in construction or in apposition with the subjects numbered, except that those, which have a plural termination, are never constructed, but are found only in apposition, as הָפִּשְׁנַו stands here. Hence it appears, that Dr. Blaney’s rule, even if it held good universally, does not apply to
the case in question; and so we find in fact, that when in such a case the article י is used, it is prefixed indifferently either to the substantive numbered or to the number, as והכ necessitàות שבעה, the seventy elders, Numbers, xi. 25; והכ necessities חמשים איש, the two hundred and fifty men, numbers, xvi. 35; והכ necessities עשרים איש, the fifty righteous, Genesis, xviii. 24; והכ necessities נבוכד, the thirty pieces of silver, Zechariah, vii. 18; והכ necessities השבעים איש, the seventy ears, Genesis, xli. 7; and the like several times in that chapter. Lastly, it may be found used exactly as here, והכ necessities, the one basket, Jeremiah, xxiv. 2. The objection therefore of Dr. Blaney to the rendering of the word יוסימ in the sense of weeks, as founded on a rule of Hebrew grammar, and the support thence derived to his alterations of Daniel's text, are entirely removed.

But Dr. Blaney has also a remedy for the baldness and bareness before complained of, as the consequence of leaving numbers without the things numbered: For,

VI. He adds the word יוסימ after יא. This is done on the alleged authority of the LXX, and on that of a single MS. of good repute in the Bodleian library. Now with respect to the LXX, the word χαράξ, answering to יוסימ, is not found in this verse, but only in that following,
whence it has been already removed into the preceding one, so that if it be inserted here, it must depend for its insertion upon conjecture alone. Thus the authority of that version, small as it appears to be from what has been before said, is reduced almost to nothing by the need, in which it stands of this conjectural addition. Then with respect to the MS. in whatever degree of repute it may be held, it is exceedingly probable*, since the reading is found in no other, that it is a mere mistake of the transcriber, whose eye may have been caught by the same word, which stands immediately before, and which begins and ends with the same letters as, the word which follows it, and who may in consequence have repeated it in his copy. But even upon the supposition, that the transcriber found in a second time in the copy which he used, it would be a very perverse mode of dealing with the sentence to join it with, as a noun of number. For thus, not only must the letter be supplied by conjecture before, but when supplied, the numbers will be found to disagree with those before mentioned in the same MS. which therein agrees with the printed text. Now we have no right to form conjectures, by which a writer is made inconsistent with himself, nor to insist on a

* Such also is the suspicion of Mr. Faber, p. 170, note.
particular mode of construction, which produces that effect, when another offers itself, by which it is avoided. Therefore the true way of rendering the word in question, supposing it entitled to a place in the text, would be, to take it in opposition with the following word, thus; and after those times, (namely the times of distress just mentioned,) those weeks three score and two. After this, is it too much to say, that Dr. Blaney's emendations may be remanded to the LXX and the other authorities from which they were taken, without being suffered to deform the text of the prophet?

It will sufficiently demonstrate the extreme improbability of those new readings in the 25th and 26th verses, on which Dr. Blaney would build his interpretation of the prophecy, to recapitulate briefly the various steps, which must be taken to arrive at them. It is necessary

1. To remove all the words of time and number, being no less than eight, from the 27th verse in the version of the LXX, and insert them in the 25th verse.
2. To change στων into στη.
3. To insert the word ἔκπες in the 26th verse after the first words of number.
4. To insert the word στη after the second words of number in the same verse.
5. To make divers other alterations in the text of the LXX, which are requisite to adapt it to the above.

6. To amend the Laudian MS. catalogued A 162, in the Bodleian library, by removing the word נַעַשׂ from its present position and placing it after עַשֶּׁנִי: and then

7. By supplying the place left vacant by the removal of נַעַשׂ with the word מַעַשׂ.

8. To alter the word εὖδομαδας in Aquila into εύδομηνωλα.

9. To add the word ἀχηρες before εὖδομηνωλα and to change τας into τας.

10 and 11. To do the like for Symmachus.

12. To alter the Arabic version so as to make it accord with Aquila and Symmachus thus amended.

Having thus prepared the materials, then the critic comes to make the five alterations in the Hebrew text, which have been above specified; forming altogether a body of seventeen alterations and more, (for I have in more places than one included several alterations under the same number,) by the various means of addition, subtraction, transposition, and transformation. Surely we may say, in the words, which the Dr. himself has quoted from Michaelis, with a slight variation, "multis artibus criticis, magna detersione opus fuit." And after all this marvellous
exhibition of critical skill, who will believe, that we have before us the text of Daniel the prophet? Will any Hebrew critic? Certainly no Hebrew; least of all Judæus Apella.

I must here protest once more, that I entertain the highest respect for the memory of Dr. Blaney, and a sincere admiration of his ingenuity and his learning; but I do think it my duty, when writing on such a subject, to resist to the uttermost this most pernicious example of forming a text by an arbitrary selection of various readings derived from different MSS. and versions, most of which themselves require to be reformed by the same, or still more, arbitrary means, before they can be produced as evidence. In this way a new text may be at any time formed, in which such and so many of the disjecti membra prophetae will appear, and those so arranged or disarranged at the will of the editor or translator, as may be made to accord with his own opinions and to warrant his own private interpretation. Mr. Faber* has objected with great force of reasoning to these "gigantic alterations;" but he himself also has fallen into the error of altering the text on slight authority, in order to make it agree with his exposition. For

* P. 168 et seq. But his statement of the various readings in the MSS. is not quite accurate.
IX. He inserts at once the two words שבתא שׁתא in the 26th verse after płינ. This is professed to be done on the authority of the Arabic version, supported, except as to the second word, by Aquila's, to which might have been added, as before mentioned, that of Symmachus. Now although the testimony of these versions might be urged with some force in corroboration of other authority, it cannot be admitted to overthrow the united evidence of the Syriac, the Vulgate, and Theodotion, much less that also of all the Hebrew MSS. combined with the printed text. Mr. Faber was without doubt perfectly sensible of the weakness of his witnesses, and therefore he has not ventured to give reception to their testimony without introducing it by an observation, similar to that of Dr. Blaney before noticed, which represents the reading as justifiable upon the ground of mere conjecture; "because," he says*, "it is plainly required by the context." But this requisition, with all its plainness, as I have done before†, so now, I utterly deny. Two portions of time having been distinctly mentioned, the angel here refers to the latter of them; and really it is beyond measure arbitrary to presume, that he must of necessity be understood to repeat both, and then proceed

* Page 230. † See page 13.
to alter the text of the prophet agreeably to that presumption. The truth is, that Mr. Faber, like Dr. Blaney, found it necessary, in his view of the prophecy, to make the numbers seven and sixty two one number. But the separate mention of the second by the angel forbade that union; and therefore the former has been interpolated to effect it by force. The exigentia loci, when fairly made out, is always pleaded with great effect; but the exigentia interpretationis has not yet obtained firm footing in the canons and court of criticism. When therefore the sacred interpreter assumes also the office of emendatory critic, he ought to exercise it with great circumspection and self-control, conscious of the temptation, which he may sometimes feel, to remove or cover difficulties, instead of solving them, by excision, insertion, or other means.

X. For read שֶׁהָוָה both Dr. Blaney and Mr. Faber, because in the singular form it may be put in regimine with the following word; a construction which is thought more agreeable to the citations by St. Matthew and St. Mark, than the absolute plural form, which requires it to be construed with the word preceding. This alteration is supported by the reading of a single MS. in the royal library of Paris, with which the learned Michaelis was so pleased, that he breaks
A DISSERTATION ON THE

out into an almost rapturous exclamation: "Vix insignius exemplum reperiri posse autumem, ostensuro in codicibus Hebraicis latere lectiones, dignissimas quae eruentur," &c*. Dr. Kennicott however assigns to this MS. no higher antiquity, than the latter part of the thirteenth century, and Dr. Blaney treats it with little ceremony, though he selects, as is usual with him, such part of it, as suits his purpose. Indeed, when its whole reading of the clause in question, נביהרל היוחי, ששיאור ומשמון†, is considered, it appears so plainly to be the work of an injudicious friend to the gospel, who did not scruple to commit a pious fraud in its cause, as to take away all weight from its evidence in this instance. The alteration then must depend upon other grounds than MS. evidence for its support, which in order to discuss sufficiently and with perspicuity, we must take the

* Kennicotti Dissertatio Generalis, p. 95, where the words are quoted. I have never seen Michaelis's letter to Sir John Pringle, which is, I believe, very scarce; and in my retired situation I have no access to public libraries.

† Dr. Blaney justly observes, "the difference is so very great between עלי, מ(Direction, and the one could not possibly be substituted for the other by accident; and supposing there was a design to change עלי, מ, I think it would puzzle any man to guess why the words should be fixed on to be placed in their stead; whereas the reason is sufficiently obvious for making the change in the contrary direction."
whole clause into consideration; שָׁכְרוּזֵים which words the LXX and Theodotion render εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν βδελυγμα τῶν ερημωσεων; with which the Vulgate nearly agrees, erit in templo abominatio desolationis; and the Arabic also, as given in the Latin translation, et super sanctuarium erit abominatio ruinar. Yet from these renderings I do not think it necessarily follows, that the authors of them found the reading in their MSS. different from what we have in the printed text. שָׁכְרוּזֵים signifies the wing or border of abominations. There may be some difficulty in hitting on the true application of these words; though I trust it will appear in the succeeding comment to be far from insuperable; and it is probable, that the translators having missed the mark, supposed that שָׁכְרוּזֵים was put by a metaphorical synecdoche (which the christian interpreters especially would be likely to do from recollecting, what they might think, the parallel instances of περγαμὸν το ἱερα in Matthew, iv. 5, and Luke, iv. 9,) for the temple or the sanctuary. But being once possessed with this idea, and having rendered accordingly, it was impossible for them to keep שָׁכְרוּזֵים in construction with שָׁכְרוּזֵים; for they could not suppose, that the angel would describe the temple of God, as the temple of abominations. Having therefore taken
the former word out of regimen, they were compelled to render the latter, notwithstanding its absolute form, as if it were constructed with the word following; and under this compulsion they preferred to put it in the singular number, judging an innovation in grammar less tolerable than a violation of the original text. To such an alteration too they were likely to be the less averse, as they might not perceive, that it produced any change in the meaning and might therefore think it likely to pass unnoticed in a translation, especially as the greater number of their readers would probably have little opportunity, and perhaps ability, to consult the original. I think this supposition may be fairly admitted, in order to account for the departure of those four translations from the Hebrew text in an instance, where all the MSS. that have been collated, save only a very suspicious one, are agreed against them. Besides, the Syriac version comes in aid, if aid be needful, of the Hebrew MSS. It gives the passage thus, "and upon the borders of abomination shall be destruction;" for though the author of it presents us with the word abomination in the singular number, yet he agrees with the printed text in the main point of putting כָּכָה in regimen with שָׁפַץ. Such a trifling deviation from the origi-
nal, as the mere interchange of the singular number for the plural, and the plural for the singular, argues neither variation in the Hebrew MSS. nor error in the translator; for where the number of a word is not a point of importance (and it might not appear to be so here) it is a matter of mere idiom, or of taste and convenience, with the translator, to render a singular noun in the plural, or vice versa.

I now come to discuss the effect, which the evangelical citations ought to have in determining the true reading of the Hebrew text. Our Saviour’s words, as given by St. Matthew, are these; το βδελυγμα της ερημωσεως ειως εν τοπω αγιω; by St. Mark, το βδελυγμα της ερημωσεως ειως οπες δει; by St. Luke, χυκλημενην υπο γρατοπιδων την Ιερουσαλημ. Dr. Blaney thinks, that our Saviour did not intend to cite from Daniel any more than the two words, which signify the abomination of desolation, because he has annexed the mark of citation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, to those words; whereas, if the rest had been a part of the citation, it ought rather to have been expressed thus, when ye shall see the abomination of desolation standing in the holy place, or where it ought not, as spoken of, or foretold by Daniel the prophet. But it does not seem, that our Saviour on this occasion intended merely to
quote the prophecy of Daniel, but to deliver a prophecy himself, and that he cited the words of Daniel only to shew that he spake of the same subjects standing in the same place as that prophet; thus at once confirming and explaining the former prediction by his own. It mattered therefore very little in what part of the passage he inserted the note of citation. Besides, the place, where the abomination was to stand, is a most important and conspicuous point in the divine oracle. It is described to be in τὸ πῶς αὐτῷ, or ὁ τετ pods δεῶ; and the scene of the armies is Jerusalem, or its circuit. In Daniel’s prediction also the place is equally important; the desolator is to appear ἣν ᾧ, upon or over the border. How then can we presume to say, that our Saviour did not intend to refer to the place pointed out by Daniel, as well as to the subjects, which, according to his prediction, were to be found there? It is highly probable, that our blessed Lord’s discourse was of greater length, than what is attributed to it by the Evangelists; so that he might have occasion in the course of it to refer three times to the passage in Daniel, in such a manner as to make the latter explain the former, and that each of the three has given us his words, as they were delivered in their different places. Or it may be, that each of the
Evangelists has given us a different rendering of the same words, as in the case of the inscription on the cross; and that St. Luke especially, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, has presented us with a paraphrase, rather than a literal rendering. However this may be, it is certain, that we must not, and it would be very unfair if we did, take the expressions of any one Evangelist, as alone giving us the genuine statement of our Lord's words, but explain the one by the other, as we should be bound to do, if they occurred in the different parts of a narrative by one author; so that St. Matthew's τὸ βδελυγμα της ἐφημωσεως εἰς εὖ τὸστὸ αἰῶν and St. Mark's εῦς ὁποιαδήποτε must be made to consist with each other and with St. Luke's κοιλημένην ὑπὸ στρατοσεβάσμον την Ἰερσαλημ. Now it must be confessed, that the first of these seems to accord almost to a nicety with the LXX, Theodotion, the Vulgate, and Arabic; but then it only seems so to do, because the phrase εὐ τὸστὸ αἰῶν, though it may, and at first sight perhaps by every one will, be supposed to mean the same thing, as εὐ τὸ ἱερον, yet in reality is not the same thing, and may admit of being extended far beyond the buildings of the temple. The whole land of Israel* was holy.

* In Zechariah, ii. 12, Judea is expressly termed the holy land; and in Isaiah, lxiv. 10, its cities are called the
unto the Lord, and Jerusalem especially might well be called τὸ πος αἱ ὐς, an holy place, as it is in this very prophecy termed the holy city; and whatever took its station on its boundary or border, its ἡν, might well be said to stand in the holy place, or on holy ground, as it is rendered by Dr. Campbell*. St. Mark's ὑσις Ἢ δει also holy cities of God. In like manner it is often represented as the land of God; Psalm, x. 16, lxix. 1, Ezekiel xxxvi. 6, xxxviii. 16, Joel, i. 6, ii. 18, iii. 2, Zechariah, ix. 16. That Jerusalem is called the holy city, the holy mountain, of God, in many passages both of the old and new testament every reader will recollect. Accordingly we are told in the Talmud and by Maimonides on the Mishna; "all the land of Israel is holy above all other lands. Ten holinesses are in the land of Israel one above another. The walled towns are holier than the rest of the land. Jerusalem is holier than the other walled cities. The mountain of God's house is holier than it." And so on till we come to the tenth holiness, the holy of holies. See the passage cited at length by Ainsworth on Numbers, v. 3.

* Translation of the Gospels, p. 96. The learned author observes, that, "with us the holy place invariably denotes the sanctuary, or the outer part of the ναός, or temple, strictly so called. This is not the meaning here; neither is τὸ πος αἱ ὀς the name by which the sanctuary is ever distinguished in the new testament. It is called simply, τὸ αἱ νοῦν, or ἡ σενη ἑντῆς, or αἱ νοῦν; the inner part of the house, or most holy place, being distinguished by the appellation ἡ σενη ἑντ αἱ νοῆς, or αἱ νοῦν αἱ νοῦν. Τὸ πος αἱ νοῦ.The whole temple, τὸ ἑντ, including all the courts, is twice so termed in the acts. Nay the whole city Jerusalem, with its suburbs and environs, was holy, compared with other cities; and such also was the whole land of Judea, compared with other countries. Besides, it deserves to be remarked, that the expression here is indefinite,
may well be intended to describe the same circuit, though it may equally be made to consist with a more extensive or a more contracted interpretation of the holy place. Both these Evangelists then leave the matter still sub judice. Let us try if the gospel of St. Luke will not enable us to decide it with greater certainty. Our blessed Saviour there expresses himself in proper terms, explaining, that what he meant by the abomination of desolation standing in the holy place, or where it ought not, was nothing but Jerusalem compassed by armies. Jerusalem then encompassed by armies, or rather the compass, the border, of Jerusalem in the occupation of armies, is the το το το η το of Matthew and the ως καὶ of Mark. But Jerusalem surrounded by hostile forces, or its border in the occupation of such forces, is certainly not the same thing as the temple in their possession, or as their standing in the temple, but something very different; as different as the exterior compass of a city, taken at some distance from its walls, is from a particular building within those walls. The three citations therefore of this passage of Daniel by our Lord as it wants the article, and is therefore more justly, as it is more literally, rendered by Scott, a holy place, than in the common version. The place, or ground, here called holy, is undoubtedly the environs of Jerusalem." Notes on St. Matthew, p. 442.
in the Evangelists do not agree with, but militate strongly against, the reading of the Parisian MS. with the LXX, Theodotion, the Vulgate, and the Arabic; insomuch indeed, that we may be said to have divine authority for pronouncing it erroneous. At the same time they are easily brought into agreement with the printed Hebrew text; for since hostile armies surrounding Jerusalem are the abominations standing in the border, it is an allowable figure of speech to call the border, rendered abominable by such possession, the border of abominations, which is nothing else, but the abominable border, or the border made abominable by the people or things that are in it. But it may still be objected, that according to the gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark, the word שקרון, instead of being the absolute noun following the word חן, as the noun in regimen, appears to be itself put in regimen before the next word זומן, and that it is rendered in the singular, instead of the plural number. It is to be observed in answer; 1. That the renderings in the two Evangelists are by no means inconsistent with the supposition, that our Lord read the original according to the printed Hebrew text, for he might intentionally deviate from the strict letter of the original, with a view to make the prediction clearer by his rendering. 2. That the
phrase, *the border of abominations*, is an obscure one and much needed such an illustration. 3. That in point of fact the deviation is calculated, as will hereafter appear, to lead us to a right understanding of the prediction. 4. That it is little, if any thing, greater, than what all the ancient versions and our Lord himself have made in respect to the very next word, which they have rendered as an abstract substantive, instead of a participle active. 5. That such departures from the mere letter of an original are allowable in translations, so that it would be absurd to set about altering original texts, to make them agree with similar deviations. The second objection is already answered in the foregoing observations, and by what has been said in page 28 on the like variation in the Syriac version.

XI and XII. Two more additions to the original text remain to be noticed. They are admitted, as I have before observed*, by Mr. Faber into his translation, though not stated by him in his list of approved readings. Both are found in the 26th verse. The one seems to be the word יִוּ, which he renders in conjunction with פָּה, *no more*; the other seems to be בָּ, or ב, rendered *for*, and printed in italics†, as if it were

---

* Page 2.

† The word *more* is not so distinguished by Mr. Faber; but in Ezekiel, xiii. 15, where our learned translators have
necessarily understood in order to construe the passage. I shall not dwell longer on these additions than barely to remark, that they are both mere conjectures, and that they ought, as it seems to me, to have been more distinctly proposed by the learned author; and that more especially, since the one lends its aid to support his interpretation and the other is little else than necessary to it.

It has now been proved, as I trust, that of all the various readings stated in the beginning of this chapter, not one is necessary; and only two or three are admissible on any competent authority, while they are in themselves very small departures from the printed text and introduce little or no change in the sense of the prophet; whereas among those numerous and important variations, which affect very essentially the text and the meaning of the prophecy, and upon which Dr. Blaney and Mr. Faber have respectively built their interpretations, there is not any that can make good a claim to be received as genuine, or is supported by such evidence, as to throw even a reasonable doubt on the integrity of the printed text.

thought, that it ought to be understood with the same negative word as here, though the necessity is not, to me at least, very apparent, they have printed it in italics.
I conclude this chapter with part of the 25th and 26th verses, as they are given by Father Houbigant. He would read the passage thus:

Notwithstanding the ingenuity and plausibility of the above conjectures, since they are nothing better, I do not think it necessary to offer any observations upon them.
CHAPTER II.

Of the Translation of the Prophecy.

The Hebrew text of the prophecy, as we find it in the edition of Van der Hooght, having been proved to be correct, at least so far as that neither its external appearance nor its meaning would undergo any serious change, even if all the various readings, which can make out a creditable title to reception, were established on the firmest ground, the next step is to obtain a correct translation. That, which is about to be offered to the reader, has been faithfully constructed according to the natural and regular order of things, previously to and independently of any decided interpretation; and is the result of a studious examination of every word of the original diligently compared with the ancient and several modern versions. It was originally intended to appear unaccompanied by any critical
or justificatory observations; but since it not only deviates in some places from our authorized English version, but in others agrees with it against Dr. Blaney and Mr. Faber, and since in the subsequent chapters it became necessary to animadvert, more or less, on the various points of difference, it was found on reflection to be a matter of convenience, that those points should be distinctly stated and argued in a separate chapter. At the same time, the high and grateful veneration, which the noblest work of our national church justly challenges from all her faithful sons, and the respect due to the memory and the name of the two learned men before mentioned, seemed to make it little else than an act of duty to assign the reasons, such as they may be, for departing in some instances, from them all, and, in many more, for preferring the one to the other. Moreover, in order that the reader may have the principal matters in debate fairly before him, the four translations are here given together, arranged in four parallel columns; the authorized version occupying, as is its due, the first place, the present new translation coming next, as approaching nearer to the former than the two others, Mr. Faber's following in the third place, and lastly Dr. Blaney's, as being that, which recedes the farthest from the first.
24. Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most holy.

25. Know therefore and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks,
24. Weeks seventy are the precise period upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to complete the apostasy, and to perfect the sin-offerings, and to make atonement for iniquity, and to cause him who is the righteousness of the eternal ages to come; and to seal the vision and the prophet, and to anoint the Most Holy One.

25. But know and understand, from the going forth of an edict to rebuild Jerusalem unto the Anointed One the Prince shall be weeks seven and weeks sixty and two; it shall

24. Weeks sufficient have been terminated (or completed) upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to check the revolt, and to put an end to sins, and to make atonement for iniquity, and to bring again the righteousness of ancient times, and to seal (that is, authenticate) the divine oracle and the prophet, and to anoint (that is, sanctify anew) the most holy things.

25. And thou shalt know and understand, that from the going forth of a decree to rebuild Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince shall be seventy and seven weeks, and three-
and threescore and two weeks, the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublesome times.

26. And after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself; and the people of the Prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined.

27. And he shall confirm the covenant weeks it shall be rebuilt, the street and the lane, but the times will be with straitness

26. And after the sixty and two weeks Messiah shall be cut off, and no one will be on his side; and he shall destroy the city and the sanctuary with the leader that cometh; and his end shall be with an inundation, for until the end shall be the war, the determined judgment of desolations.

27. Yet will he confirm the covenant un-
be rebuilt, with perpetual increase and firm decision, even in the short space of the times.

26. And, after the weeks seven and the weeks sixty and two, the Anointed One shall cut off by divorce, so that they shall be no more his, both the city and the sanctuary. For the people of the Prince that shall come shall act corruptly: but the end thereof shall be with a flood; and unto the end of a war firmly decided upon shall be desolations.

27. Yet he shall make firm a covenant

score and two years; it shall be rebuilt still enlarging itself, and becoming more and more considerable, even amidst times of distress.

26. And after the times seventy seven and threescore and two, Messiah shall cut off from belonging to him both the city and the sanctuary; the Prince that shall come shall destroy the people; and the cutting off thereof shall be with a flood; (that is, with a hostile invasion;) and unto the end of a war carried on with rapidity shall be desolations.

27. But he shall confirm a covenant
with many for one week; and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate.

**STONARD.**

to many one week; but in the midst of the week he will cause sacrifice and meat-offering to cease; afterwards upon the border of abominations shall be the desolator, and that until he shall be consumed, and the determined judgment shall have been poured upon the desolated.
with many for one week. And in half a week he shall cause the sacrifice and meat-offering to cease (for upon the border shall be the abomination that maketh desolate) even until an utter end, and that firmly decided upon, shall be poured upon the desolator.

(or make a firm covenant) with many for one week; and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and meat-offering to cease; and the abomination of desolation shall be upon the border; (that is, encompassing and pressing close upon the city and the temple;) and an utter end, even a speedy one (or, even until an utter end, and that a speedy one) shall be poured upon the desolated.
I now proceed to examine the foregoing translations and to defend that which I have given, by short clauses and almost by single words.

Hebrew שבעים שבועות. **Seventy weeks.** This is the rendering to which we are led by the points; it is also that of all the ancient versions, as well as of our English, and, I believe, of every other translation, until Dr. Blaney's dissertation appeared, in which he has given a new rendering, "weeks sufficient." Every one at all acquainted with the Hebrew language knows, that the distinction between the verb שבע, *to be full,* and the noun of number, שבע, *seven,* depends much upon the diacritical point being on the right or the left side of the letter ש; so that when the points are altogether omitted or disregarded, the distinction is effaced, and we can be directed only by the use of the word in like instances, by the context, and by authority. Now the last, it has been already noticed, is entirely contrary to Dr. Blaney; and granting, what ought to be denied, that the context will admit of his rendering, I maintain, that no instance can be produced, in which the word שבע, even though the point be on the left side of the first letter, signifies sufficient. Our learned translators have never so rendered it; and in all the texts of the old testament, where the word occurs, as an adjective, it signifies, not
sufficient, but satisfied, filled with, or full of, having enough, a difference from Dr. Bla-
ney's rendering, as wide, as that between the active and passive voice. It is easy to see, that the rendering was devised merely to support the patchwork readings, which the learned professor has with so much ingenuity put together, and which are incompatible with the correct rendering of all preceding translations.

וַעֲמַרְתָּם לְעֹלָם וּלְיָהֳרֵךְ קָדֵשׁ. Are the determined period upon thy people and upon thy holy city. Our English translation renders seventy weeks are determined. If נוֹחַר be a verb, it must be used in a distributive sense, by an ellip-
sis of יָשָׁה, seventy weeks, every one of them* is determined; but it is better, with Parkhurst and Michaelis, to take it for a participial noun, sign-
ifying something decided or determined; and

* Such is the rendering of Helvius, who thinks, that every week is destined to some particular event: but not being able to make out seventy events, he limits his remark "ad eas septimanas, quae ob singulares eventus ceteris sunt celebriores." Singular events by their very nature cannot confer celebrity on more than a small minority of the seventy weeks: and it will hardly be contended, at least admitted, that the occurrence of a few such events, emi-
nently marking a few of those weeks, is a satisfactory proof, that fifty or sixty other events of a more ordinary kind distinguished, though without adorning, an equal number of the weeks, and that they have ceased so to do, only, carent quia vate sacro.
here, a fixed term, or determined period. The word does not occur again in any part of the old testament under this or any other form. But Buxtorf observes, “apud Rabbinos frequens est;” and that, as he shews in his Talmudical lexicon, in the sense of cutting, lopping off, from which several derivative nouns take their significations. It is also used in the sense of decided, definitive, certain, as מַמֶּה וּתְרַךְ, demonstratio certa, evidens. Accordingly, Helvicus, in his diatribe on the seventy weeks, has made the following remarks on the Rabbinical use of the word. Rabbi Mardocheæus, in concordantiis, ait esse לְשׁוֹן הַחֲרָה. Cui et Kimchius adstipulatur in lexico, consentiente R. Salomone et Aben Ezra. Et Kimchius quidem profert usum Rabbinicum, apud quos frequens est והרכז של ברש segmentum seu frustum carnis, et locus incisionis. Est autem vox רָכָז וּרְכָז æquivoca, quippe que et secare significat et decernere. Utrumque igitur significat vox רָכָז, nempe secare, findere, in usu Rabbinico, et מַמֶּה וּתְרַךְ, seu decernere, determinare, in biblia*. In the same sense it is used in the Chaldee, as cited by Buxtorf from the Targum on Esther, iv. 5, where Daniel is said to be called רָכָז, or the decider, יִדּוּל מִימֵר, or the decider, because that ac-

* Critici sacri, vol 4, in Dan.
cording to the word of his mouth the affairs of the kingdom were decided. "The Hebrew or Chaldee word," says Bishop Chandler, "hath primarily the sense of cutting; and by custom of speech was translated to signify deciding and determining in the same manner as this very Latin word decido, which originally signifies cutting. Almost all the Hebrew and Chaldee words for defining with authority, decreeing or judging, do in their first sense signify to cut; and yet the latter and metaphorical sense is as generally received, and remains undisputed. From them the like way of speaking passed to the Greeks and Latins. They say τευνειν τας δικας, and secare lites*. And so it comes to signify a determination with certainty and preciseness†."

Theodotion however renders the word by συνεττηθησαν; but it is probable, that he was influenced therein by a regard to the primary signification of the two words, which is the same in each language; understanding thereby that the seventy weeks are cut short, or cut off, from the

* From the same verb comes the noun secta, a settled opinion, or determined course of conduct. So Lucan,

hæc duri immota Catonis
Secta fuit.

Pharsalia l. 2, v. 380.

great body of time both antecedent and subsequent, so as to be decidedly allotted and determined to the subjects specified. So Bishop Chandler remarks, that "the Greek word has the sense of deciding and determining," and that it is "put in the 26th verse to answer another Hebrew word, that is allowed to signify appointing, determining. And Eusebius, Theodoret, and before them Africanus, who used no other than the Greek bible, take the Greek word here used for decreed or appointed*. Accordingly one of the Hexaplar versions renders the Hebrew by ἐξοιμασθησαν, and another by εἰς κριθησαν, with which the LXX agree; these two being also the very words, by which Theodotion's rendering is explained by Theodoret. The Vulgate, following Theodotion, but taking the word συνετευκτο in its usual sense, has rendered, abbreviata sunt; but even that, as Bishop Chandler again remarks, "must be taken in the sense of defining and determining, if we may build upon Tertullian's explanation; for he is so far from understanding this abbreviation of shortening the numbers, that he stretches the weeks into seventy one and an half†." The Arabic, so far at least as the Latin translation is an authority, has praefinite

† Same, p. 288.
sunt; the Syriac has נָוחוֹת מָזַּה, the Ethpeel of מָזֵּה, quievit, which the Latin translator renders morabuntur.

Dr. Blaney, in conformity with his rendering of the foregoing words, weeks sufficient, has rendered this word, "have been terminated or completed;" and remarks, "that the sense of fated or determined seems to be entirely arbitrary and authorized only by a supposed exigentia loci." At the same time he admits the authority of the Rabbinical writers and the Targum in ascribing to Inn the primary sense of cutting off. But the other signification stands on the same authority, as may be seen in Buxtorf's Chaldee and Talmudical lexicon, and therefore has an equal claim to reception. To the citation from the Targum on Esther, iv. 5, he gives a most extraordinary turn. "The matters of the kingdom were decided or cut off," says Dr. Blaney, "that is, brought to a final issue or termination." Now that the measures of the Persian government were decided, fixed upon, determined by the word of Daniel, is easy to be understood; but how they could be brought to their final issue or termination by the same, exceeds my comprehension. That a verb, which primarily signifies to cut off, should also have the sense of determining, is not remarkable, as appears by the extracts given above from
Bp. Chandler, and is no farther departure from the original idea, than that of terminating. Of the learned professor's reference to the Arabic version I am not a judge; but in his appeal to the Syriac he seems to have fallen into a mistake, so far at least as Castell's lexicon is brought to prove, that דוכ, in the form Ethpeel in particular, signifies cessavit, destitit; for that signification is ascribed to it in Peal also. The words of the learned lexicographer are these; "Syr. דוכ, prim. ut H. דוכ. Luc. viii. 24, et cessavit, destitit. Ethpe, יד והב id. Gen. ii. 3."

Hence it appears that the two forms have the same sense. But the signification of cessavit, destitit, is not what Dr. Blaney's rendering requires; for in the cited text of Luke, where the verb is in Peal, it does not signify to be terminated, but to rest, to desist from motion, as the agitated waters of the lake Gennesareth did at our Saviour's bidding. So too in the other citation from Genesis ii. 3, where the verb is in Ethpeel, it denotes to rest by ceasing from action, as God did when he ceased from his work of creation. Here it is plainly used in one of the commonest senses of the word, rest, for abiding, continuing. Dr. Blaney's chief authorities then, I think, may be pronounced to fail him.
Farther; after citing Theodotion and the Vulgate, he asks; "In what other sense can we understand a week or other limited period of time to be cut off or cut short, but by its being brought to a final close or termination, after having gone through its full course?" By way of answer to this question, it is to be observed, that to cut off and to cut short are not synonymoues terms; the former being indeed applicable to a portion of time, that has run its full course; but the latter plainly intimating that the period, of which it is expressed, has not been permitted so to do, but has been abridged of its intended or expected duration. Now this latter is not the sense in which Dr. Blaney understands the word. Dismissing it therefore from consideration, we may observe of the other term, cutting off, that the sense of it will vary, according as it may be applied historically or prophetically, to a period now past, or a period yet to come. In the former case it would signify, that the period is brought to a final close or termination; but in the latter it could have no other meaning, than that the predicted period is rigidly cut off, exactly defined in the divine purpose or providence. Dr. Blaney's interpretation requires it to be understood of time past; but in this he is quite single; and other interpreters have an equal right to understand it of time future in the sense
A DISSERTATION ON THE

just mentioned. Now since it is plainly the inten-
tion of the angelic speaker, not to record a piece of history, but to deliver a prophecy, the prima facie probability is, that he is here speaking of time to come, and consequently that Dr. Bla-
ney gives to the word an erroneous application. For although, in the outset or in the course of a prediction, it may sometimes be to the purpose to rehearse something that is past; yet that must be either undeniably apparent or clearly proved. No interpreter can be permitted arbitrarily to assume such an intention in the prophet, and argue therefrom to the meaning of his words. Now Dr. Blaney assumes that the word is here used historically, of time past; but since that assumption rests upon nothing firmer than his erroneous rendering of the two former words, weeks sufficient, it is nothing better than if it were merely arbitrary.

Mr. Wintle has rendered the three words; "seventy precise weeks are upon thy people," &c. By this expression he conceives Daniel to indicate here a different sort of weeks from, and much shorter than, those afterwards mentioned, where the word ḫorer is omitted, and indeed the same sort as those, which in the next chapter are termed שבועות ירח or weeks of days. But how the rendering given by this learned writer in the
text of his translation, "seventy precise weeks are upon," meaning thereby short or shortened weeks, is extracted from the literal rendering*, seventy weeks are abbreviated, or are an abbreviated period, according as ידוע is taken for a verb or a noun, which latter Mr. Wintle prefers, he has not explained, nor can I discover. By the former, brevity is made to be the character of every one of the weeks individually taken, in reference doubtless to another and longer kind of week; by the latter, shortness is predicated of the period of the seventy weeks taken collectively, in reference doubtless to some other period of greater extent, understood though not expressed: There is then a real and essential difference between the two renderings, so that the one cannot be deduced from the other. Now if we abandon the notion of shortened weeks, as the less likely, and accept that of a shortened term, we must, as before noticed, consider it to be short in comparison with some longer term. But no longer term is mentioned in scripture, as impending

* Notes on Daniel, p. 140. Mr. Wintle does not indeed expressly give the words, an abbreviated period, as the literal rendering of ידוע, if taken for a noun. But that, or something very nearly the same, must be his meaning; for though he speaks of weeks of abbreviation, he cannot intend that for a literal rendering, because the word ידוע is not in the construct form, and because he mentions "the auxiliary verb as understood."
over the Jews and Jerusalem in their restored state; we must therefore refer the comparison to some conception, which Daniel had formed in his own mind, of the long period of prosperity allotted by the divine goodness to his people and city. But we have no warrant for supposing any such tacit comparison beyond what arises from the mere rendering of ἐν τῷ δόξῃ in the sense of abbreviation; and that rendering, even if it be justifiable, is by no means, as we have seen, a matter of necessity. Michaelis* could not at all assent to it; "magnopere displicet," he says. Discarding then that rendering, we may safely and satisfactorily adopt the signification of decided or determined, in which it is used by the Rabbinical writers and by the author of the Targum on Esther, which is justified by the authority of the LXX and the two Hexaplar versions above cited, not contradicted or opposed, but perhaps favoured, by Theodotion's rendering, and strongly supported by that of the Syriac, whose ἐν τῷ δόξῃ is easily reducible to the idea of permanent settlement or irrevocable determination.

The preposition ὑπὸ is rendered by Symmachus ἀνά τις, with the genitive case following, against thy people and against thy holy city, but contrariwise to all the other ancient versions and to the manifest intention of the prophecy.

SEVENTY WEEKS OF DANIEL.

7

לכה אל הייר. To put a stop to the transgression. The verb properly signifies to shut up or inclose; also to restrain, check, withhold, put a stop to; by the first of which words it is rendered in the margin of our English translation. It is so used in Genesis viii. 2, where the rain from heaven is said to be restrained, or put a stop to; in Numbers, xi. 28, my Lord Moses, forbid, restrain, or stop them; in 1 Samuel, xxv. 33, which has kept, or stopped me this day from coming to blood; Haggai, i, 10, the heaven is stayed from her dew and the earth is stayed from her fruit. In this sense the verb affords nearly the same meaning with the other reading, as has been noticed in the first chapter.

The noun is rendered by Dr. Blaney, the revolt, who remarks, that "לכה אל is not a generic term for every transgression, but marks that particular species, which consists in withdrawing the allegiance due to a lawful sovereign." The primary idea of the word seems to be, to pass on or advance; with י, to pass over or transgress, and with ל, to transgress or rebel against another. So Montaldi observes in Buxtorf; "saepius construitur cum ל quasi dicas rebellare in vel contra aliquem." Hence it may with great propriety be made to express apostasy, as both Mr. Wintle and Mr. Faber render it, meaning thereby, as Dr. Blaney also under-
stands by the revolt, idolatry, as being the most notable instance of revolt and rebellion against God. Yet Gusset observes; "non observavi nomen adhibitum de mere ethnicorum seorsim spectatorum peccatis in Deum, seu in idololatria consistenibus, sive alius generis." Indeed all sin is revolt and rebellion against God. It is "the transgression of the law;" and so the word is used in a general sense for transgression. Accordingly the Syriac renders the word by ἀφινθ, the LXX and Theodotion by ἀμαρτία, the Vulgate by prævaricatio, and the Arabic by peccata, in a general sense. It is sometimes used for offences of men against men, and that without implying any notion of rebellion against a superior. So Gusset remarks; "nolim affirmare, semper hoc nomine praesupponi subjactionem aliamve obligationem agnitam, a qua deficiatur." Besides if we restrain ἀφινθ to a particular sort of crime, may we not find it necessary to confine the two other words ἀφαινάντης and ἀφινα in like manner, each to some particular species of offence? This is precisely the fancy of Abarbanel*, who interprets the first, as the above mentioned critics have done, of idolatry, the second of adultery, and the third of murder; crimes, which, as

* This citation is taken from Frischmuth's Dissertation, printed in the Thesaurus Theologico-philologicus, p. 906, who gives Abarbanel's words.
he supposes, not having been expiated by the
Babylonian captivity, were reserved for punish-
ment after the expiration of the seventy weeks.
Upon the whole, I have thought it right to adhere
to the more general rendering of our authorized
English translation.

וֹלְדוֹת הַמַּסָּאָה. And to seal the sin-offerings. Our authorized version has in the
margin to seal up. The other reading which is
followed in the text, לְדוֹת הַמַּסָּאָה, seems to me hardly
to admit of a signification sufficiently distinct
from the two former words, especially if the read-
ing לְדוֹת הַמַּסָּאָה be adopted and מַסָּאָה be rendered
sins. The noun may equally well denote sins or
sin-offerings. But for the reason above given, I
consider the latter to be the true sense here, and
in preferring it I have the satisfaction of agreeing
with Mr. Faber.

וְאָשְׁרָה. And to make reconciliation
for iniquity. The verb properly signifies to
overspread to cover, and then in an especial
sense to cover sins, to forgive them in the person
offended, to expiate or make reconciliation or
atonement for them in the offender. So Bux-
torff; "si Deo tribuatur, sig. propitius est effec-
tus, condonavit, sin hominibus, expiavit, placas-
vit. It is remarkable, that in both Theodotion
and the Arabic, this clause has a double rendering,
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καὶ απολείψαι τὰς αδίκιας, καὶ εξιλασσόμαι αδίκιας;
et deleantur iniquitates et impetretur venia pro
impietate.

לְהַבְרֵיָא זָרִיָא לְכִלָּיָה. AND TO BRING IN THE
RIGHTEOUSNESS OF THE AGES. Our bible version renders the words, "and to bring in everlasting righteousness;" and I understand the rendering just given in the same sense; nor should I have departed from the form of expression, had it not seemed necessary to adhere to strict accuracy, in consequence of the versions given by Dr. Blaney and Mr. Faber. The former tells us, that the words literally and properly signify, and to bring again the righteousness of ancient times. But first it may be asked; is it true, that the verb נָלַח literally and properly signifies to come again, or back; and where is it used in that sense without some adjunct, or a context, that clearly determines it to that meaning? I believe no such instance can be produced. Now there certainly is not any thing in the context, that denotes repetition; and therefore the verb has no other than its common, literal and proper sense in the Hiphil form, to make to come, q. d. to bring in, to introduce. Had the prophet meant to express return or repetition, he would doubtless have used the word ילשכ. 2. As to the noun ילמי. If the verb נָלַח in the
Hiphil form properly and literally signified to bring back or again, then indeed this noun must be understood of ancient times or ages past, since it may have that meaning; but since the verb does not of itself bear that signification and there is nothing in the context to determine it thereto, so that it can be taken only in the sense of introducing or bringing in, we are not obliged to understand it in a past sense. Indeed it would be very arbitrary and unreasonable to impose that sense upon it; for it is most frequently and commonly used of ages to come; and being here found in a prophecy of things and times future, it may be fairly presumed that it is used here in its more usual acceptation.

Mr. Faber's rendering is, and to cause Him who is the righteousness of the eternal ages to come. The insertion of the word eternal, though unnecessary, does not seem objectionable; but I do strongly object to the introduction of the words in small capitals, Him who is. They are not necessary to supply any grammatical ellipsis, they are not warranted by any MS. or version, but are a mere interpolation, which the supposition of an intended metonymy or prosopopeia will not authorize, and which is inserted only to anticipate the interpretation.
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A AND TO SEAL VISION AND PROPHET. Our English translators have rendered the verb to seal up, in the sense of hiding, which does not seem to be the true one here. The Vulgate has ut impleatur, the Syriac לַמֵּלֶשׁלָם, to complete, accomplish, the LXX both διακοπείσθηναι and συντελεῖσθηναι, Theodotion literally σφραγίσαι. I have omitted the definite article before the noun, which our translators have inserted, because it seems to confine the words to the present vision and to the prophet Daniel, for which there is not sufficient authority. Our English version, following the Vulgate and Arabic versions, has rendered נִבְנֵי, the prophecy; but that is corrected in the margin. Dr. Blaney, in his dissertation, p. 21, has well accounted for the origin of the error. No MS. reads נבְנֵי, and prophecy.

A AND TO ANOINT AN HOLY OF HOLIES. The Vulgate renders et ungatur sanctus sanctorum; Theodotion's rendering is ambiguous, αγίου αγίου, without the article; but it is not likely that he intended the masculine article to be understood. The LXX, by the use of the verb σφραγάναι, seem to intend a person by αγίου, to which they also have not given the article; the Arabic, as far as the Latin translation goes, has the holy of holies; the Syriac connects
SEVENTY WEEKS OF DANIEL.

the words with the preceding clause; "to com-
plete the vision and the prophets, and for the
Messiah (that is to complete for him) an holy of
holies." The Vulgate then is the only evidence
decidedly in favour of the rendering adopted by
Mr. Faber, Dr. Hales, and others, the saint of
saints. That phrase however is not a scripture
one, as applicable to Christ, God, or any person
of the Godhead; and it cannot be attributed to
any created being. Dr. Blaney also has justly ob-
served, that "the two words are constantly appli-
ced in the old testament, not to persons, but to
things; to the temple or sanctuary itself, to the
altar, vessels, utensils, offerings," &c. But it is
to be farther remarked, that they are applied in
a peculiar form to the most holy place or holy of
holies; that is, with the emphatic י prefixed to
the second noun, whereas in all other cases that
article is omitted. It is indeed omitted here;
but then there is nothing expressly mentioned
here, as there is in all the other passages, where
the words occur in this form, to which they can
with any appearance of probability be applied.
Hence, I suppose, Dr. Blaney has rendered it,
"the most holy things," as if he had read יִשְׁרְקָה
ביִשְׁרָקָה. But the first word is in the singular
number, and there being no article to either,
they are properly rendered an holy of holies.
The omission of the article will be accounted for hereafter.

Know therefore and understand; or now know, &c. Daniel had been bidden in the 22d verse to understand the matter and consider the vision. This is therefore a second summons to the prophet to do his part towards that, for which Gabriel declares in the 22d verse, that he was sent to him; and for this reason I have adhered to our authorized translation in rendering the first therefore.

From the going forth of the word. It might possibly be rendered, from the finding of the word, that is, from finding it true by the event. I should not object to that rendering in consequence of the effect it might have on the following interpretation; but there are three reasons against it. 1. That the words נין וניב occur in the preceding verse, and though the word be not exactly the same, yet the form of expression is too similar not to require a similar rendering here. 2. Because about seventy MSS. read ננה in full. 3. Because all the ancient versions have rendered it by going forth.

To rebuild Jerusalem. Literally, to bring back or restore, and to build, that is to rebuild Jerusalem, or,
as our English translation has it in the margin, to build again, according to a common and well known rule of the Hebrew language, whereby ḥĕš, when immediately followed by another verb, has a sort of adverbial signification and denotes the iteration of the action expressed by the second verb. But the application of this rule to the present case is disputed by Frischmuth, who, while he admits it to have place when ḥĕš is in Kal, denies it when that verb is in Hiphil. It must be owned, that in that conjugation the phrase does not often occur. A strong instance however is adduced from 2 Samuel, xv. 25; but Frischmuth objects to it, as not in point. The real difference consists in this, that there the object is expressed after each verb in the suffix of the first person, whereas it is here expressed only once and is placed after the second verb. But this difference affords a strong argument in favour of the common rendering of the phrase in Daniel; for it appears, that David's mind was equally intent on returning from his flight, as on seeing the ark and the temple once more, and he marks that desire by adding the pronoun to the first verb; whence we may collect, that if he had not been so intent and had omitted the pronoun in that place, he would be understood merely to say, he will shew me, or let me see, again the ark
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and temple. Accordingly here, if the prophet had intended to fix the attention of the reader on the return of the Jews from captivity, he would have placed either Jerusalem or some equivalent word, as לְדָם, after ivri; but having omitted it, we are obliged to understand the two verbs together, as expressive merely of rebuilding. The mode of applying the rule seems very plain. If the second verb have a passive or neutral signification, must be in Kal; if transitive, it may be either in Kal or Hiphil, according as the repetition is predicated of the subject or the object. No stronger or clearer instance can be desired, than that of the passage before us; for here we perceive, that as the passive דָּבָר answers to the preceding active דָּבָר, so in Kal is connected with the one, and in Hiphil with the other. In all probability Frischmuth's objection would not have been brought forward, had not his interpretation of the prophecy made the seventy weeks begin at the return from the Babylonian captivity, and therefore required דָּבָר to be restrained to it.

UNTIL MESSIAH SHALL BE LEADER. It is to be remarked that neither of the nouns have the emphatic הַיְ. The word דָּבָר has it prefixed in very few instances, all in Leviticus, where it is applied to the priest, “that
is anointed." Besides, here it is evidently used as a proper name; and consequently could not regularly have the article prefixed. Neither is it prefixed to נבנ, as it probably would have been, if the prophet had intended to put that word in apposition with וֶרֶם. Now it is a general rule of Hebrew grammar, that the ה Hayediah is not prefixed to a noun, whether substantive or adjective, which is used as a predicate. Since then it is not here prefixed to נבנ, as that circumstance probably shews, that the word is not to be taken in apposition with the preceding one, so does it shew with equal probability, that it is to be taken as its predicate with the copula or verb substantive understood. Our English translators have rendered נבנ, "the prince." It properly signifies one, who is set or who goes before others; hence a prince or chieftain, or more closely to the original meaning, a leader, as it is sometimes rendered in our English version, and as Dr. Hales has rendered it in his chronology, vol 2, p. 561.

There shall be seven weeks, and sixty and two weeks it shall be rebuilt. I have here adopted the punctuation of our English version. If the stop be removed from after the words seven weeks and placed after sixty and two weeks, the two clauses of the sentence will
be disjoined from each other and made two separate sentences; and then it will not be so ready to bring up Jerusalem from the former, where it appears in the oblique case, and to understand it as the nominative to the verbs, which, being for want of a copulative deprived of their connexion with the foregoing words, will wear a very bald and naked appearance. The point and spirit also of the passage, which consists in opposing the completion of the work to the command for its commencement, the neutral and passive verbs in the latter part to the transitive and active ones in the former, will be exceedingly injured, if not entirely lost, when those verbs are rent from their connexion and forced into separate sentences. Besides, by removing the stop from וְשַׁמַּאי and placing it after שִׁשָּׁו, the two numbers, seven and sixty two, will be brought to coalesce into a phrase expressive of sixty nine, a phrase not to be justified by any parallel passage in the bible*. Aware of this and of the idiom of their native language, the Masorites have placed אָתְנַח under וְשַׁמַּאי.

* Grotius, who is an advocate for taking seven and sixty two to express sixty nine, cites Ezekiel, xlv. 12, as a case in point. But there the whole sum is expressed, of which the smaller numbers are the parts; for the word Maneh is equivalent to saying sixty. Moreover, the smaller numbers, fifteen, twenty, and twenty-five, are every one composed of aliquot parts of the Maneh; viz. of three, four, and five twelfths. Lastly, the sixty Gerahs, which com-
and thereby done all that in them lay to prevent an unskilful reader from joining the numbers; and Abarbanel also, who contends, that this junction is absolutely necessary to reconcile the prediction with the time of Christ's appearance on earth, re-

pose the Maneh are expressed in these parts; because, as Bishop Patrick, following Abarbanel and other Jewish writers, states, "there were coins of these several values, which taken altogether are to be of the same value as the Maneh." Now these three circumstances, and especially the first and last, which are very important, distinguish the passage in Ezekiel so decidedly from this of Daniel, as to put an end to all argument from it, as a case in point. After all, it is very doubtful, whether the numbers are really intended to make up sixty. For we have no ground for asserting, that the Maneh or Mina contained sixty shekels, except what can be gathered from the passage in question. From 1 Kings, x. 17, compared with 2 Chronicles, ix. 16, it appears to have contained one hundred. Mr. Parkhurst, in v. draws a distinction between weight and money; but he cites no authority; and in all probability the name of the money expressed the weight, as well as the value. Cocceius and Michaelis think, that Ezekiel intended to express three different sorts of the Maneh; the least of fifteen shekels, the middlemost of twenty, and the greatest of twenty-five; Supplem. ad lex. Heb. No. 1422. This is equally probable in itself with the other hypothesis, and I think it the more so by remarking, that there is no particle to denote the addition or connexion of the three small sums as parts of one great whole. They are stated quite separately, twenty, twenty-five, fifteen. Besides, the other hypothesis would afford a very strange and unexampled mode of expression; as if an English act of parliament passed a few years ago had settled the value of our coins in the following terms; "twelve pence shall be your shilling; ten shillings and sixpence, seven shillings, two shillings and sixpence shall be your pound;" because three coins of those values were then current and in their addition made a pound sterling.
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proaches those, who adopt it, as destitute of taste, κατάλληλον, critical discernment, or nice perception of the Hebrew idiom. The learned Jew, it will here-after be seen, was wrong in his opinion; but that he was right in his criticism, will appear from the following remarks of Houbigant on the subject; "Sacri scriptores, cum dicere volunt hebdomades sexaginta novem, nusquam scribunt hebdomades septem et sexaginta duae, dissociatis a sese numeris deno minoribus, ut hoc loco dissociati sunt numeri septem et duae. Nusquam reperies tales scribendi formas, ut per duos numeros separatos septem et duo significetur novem; ut per tria et quatuor septem; ut per tria et quinque octo, et sic de cæteris. Numeri omnes deno minores, si- ve unitates, cogi solent in unam summam," &c*. It is true that the ancient versions in general seem to give their countenance to the connexion of the seven weeks with the sixty two. But then the authors of them have dealt in such a manner with the original, as to shew the doubt and difficulty, which they found in so doing, and thereby

* Houbigantii notæ criticæ, Tom. 2, p. 543. But Sir Isaac Newton had preceded Houbigant, maintaining, that it is "doing violence to the language of Daniel to take seven weeks and sixty two weeks for one number. Had that," he observes, "been Daniel's meaning, he would have said sixty and nine weeks, and not seven weeks and sixty two weeks, a way of numbering used by no nation." Observations on Daniel, p. 137.
to detract in no small degree from the weight of their authority in this instance. Theodotion finds himself obliged to prefix a connective particle to the following words, and then to violate grammar by making two masculine nouns the nominative to singular and feminine verbs; and he is followed by the Vulgate and the Arabic both in the interpolation and in the irregularity. By the former, they shew that they felt the effect of their error in making the prefixed תְּנֵיָּה connect the two numbers of weeks, instead of the members of the sentence; and by the latter, their uncertainty as to the nominative to the verbs, when they lost sight of the true one by splitting the sentence into two. The following is the rendering of the Syriac, "from the going forth of the word unto the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the coming of Messiah the King shall be seven weeks and sixty two weeks." I have given these words according to the Latin translation of the London Polyglott; but I am convinced that it is in error here, and that a stop should be placed after the seven weeks, so as to connect the sixty two weeks with what follows, thus, "and sixty two weeks he (that is, Messiah the King) shall rebuild Jerusalem, her streets and her lanes unto the end of the time." That the passage ought to be thus distributed into two members of a single sentence,
instead of being made two sentences, is plain, not only from the fulness and roundness of the period in the one case, contrasted with its ruggedness and nakedness in the other, but from the confession, if I may so call it, of the Latin translator himself, who has found it necessary to interpolate tum before iterum aedificabit, thus doing with his original version what Theodotion, with the authors of the Vulgate and Arabic, had done with the original text. The Syriac version then may be produced, as remonstrating against the junction of the numbers and testifying in favour of retaining the stop after ידועו; though I must confess, that its authority is not a little impaired by its wide departure from the sense of the original, which is entirely perverted by connecting the rebuilding of Jerusalem with the coming of Messiah, in consequence, I doubt not, of the author's resolution to bend his version to some hypothesis, on which he had built an interpretation. Upon the whole the arguments in favour of the punctuation above adopted are favoured by the Syriac, and are little, if at all, affected by the other ancient versions; so that upon the strength of them we may resolve without doubt or hazard to follow the Masorites and our English translation.
The difficulty attending these two words lies with the latter. There can be no doubt, that signifies, what the ancient versions have rendered it, πλατεία, plate, a wide street or a square in a city; but the proper rendering of is very questionable; some, as Theodotion and the Vulgate and our English translation in the text, have rendered it the wall; others, as Castell, the ditch; our English translation in the margin, the breach or ditch; Mr. Parkhurst, a ruin or an heap of ruins. All these however agree in taking the two words for nouns; but Dr. Blaney, who is followed by Mr. Faber, has supposed the two words to be infinitives used gerundively; and since signifies to be enlarged, and as the Dr. and others maintain, to move or advance forward, he renders them, "still enlarging itself and becoming more and more considerable;" and Mr. Faber, "with perpetual increase and firm decision."

That in point of grammatical construction the two words, if the points are laid aside, may be used gerundively, by an ellipsis of the suitable preposition, to indicate the mode, in which the building of the city will be carried on, is certain; and to that construction I have not the least objection derived from any effect it may have on
my own interpretation of the passage. My opposition therefore, for I must oppose it, is disinterested. Doubtless the verb בורר signifies to enlarge or to be enlarged; and in the infinitive, when used as a gerund, it may be rendered, with Dr. Blaney, "still enlarging itself," or perhaps, according to Mr. Faber, "with perpetual increase." But, though the word, exactly in the form here used, is found in many texts of the old testament, it never appears as an infinitive verb, but always as a substantive, and never in any sense, but in that of a street. Is it then to be believed, that Daniel, aware, as he must have been, of the common usage, if he had intended to put it here for the infinitive of the verb, signifying adverbially, or after the manner of a Latin gerund, would not have manifested his intention by prefixing to it א or ב? Moreover, the subject of discourse is the building of a city, in which the street is so essential and eminent a part, and of course so intimately and obviously connected with the subject, that he would hardly have used the word בורר, which every where else in scripture signifies a street, in a different sense, without specially marking the difference in some manner, that would place his meaning beyond dispute or doubt.
Whether the verb "pri" primarily signify to advance or move forward, in the sense of continued progression, as Dr. Blaney contends, is very questionable. Only one text, 2 Samuel, v. 24, is to be found, in which it can bear that signification, and even there it admits with equal facility, as will presently be seen, of another rendering, derived from the more common and certain meaning of the term. With Mr. Faber I agree, that it is often used in the sense of deciding or determining; but I cannot agree with him in so rendering it here; and every reader, I think, must see and feel, that it is a singularly affected and enigmatical mode of describing the building of a city, to say, that it shall be built "with firm decision." I know very well, how Mr. Faber would explain his meaning; nor should I, if no other way remained of rendering the word, persist in objecting to that explanation; but only such necessity, I think, would compel me to have recourse to either. Mr. Wintle is of opinion, that "the proper sense is something decided or finished;" and then referring to Castell's lexicon, he renders the two words, "the enlargements and their completions." Hence the connective prefixed to the following word, "pri", is drawn away from it and made a pronominal suffix to "pri"; but after all the sense afforded is very vague and indistinct.
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is by all the ancient and, I believe, modern translators before Dr. Blaney, rendered as a noun; and though, as before noticed, in a variety of significations, yet in every one denoting some part of the city or of its fortifications. The circumstance of various paths tending to the same end marks the conspicuousness of the object to which they lead; and that, one would think, could hardly have been overlooked in this instance; for as is always used in the bible for a street or broad place in a city, and is by all translators before Dr. Blaney, except the LXX, taken for the same here in a collective sense, so is drawn over by it to an analogous signification. Amid the dissentients, I agree with those, who adhere to the Syriac version and take the word to mean the narrow lanes or alleys, which run through and intersect the wide streets and open places. This meaning may be derived with sufficient plainness from the primitive idea of the verb, which, according to Mr. Parkhurst, is to cut off or cut short. Hence it is used in the form of a participle passive, for an animal maimed, that is, cut off as to some of its limbs; also as a substantive for pure gold, as having all earthy particles and dross cut off and separated from it; likewise for a thrashing instrument, by which the grain is cut off from the straw, or perhaps the
straw cut in pieces. In 2 Samuel, v. 24, the verb, יָכַר, is opposed to בָּכַר, go round, fetch a compass, and consequently signifies, thou shalt cut off or cut short the way, that is, advance directly or in the shortest line. Hence too it signifies to direct and point by cutting off excrescences or sinuosities, so as to leave no doubt of the intention as to the object pointed at; accordingly it denotes to point the tongue at a person in reprehending or defaming, or as a dog in barking and snarling; also to point, fix, and limit the attention, by cutting off the consideration of all extraneous circumstances, all things superfluous and beside the purpose; and thus it signifies as an adjective, diligent, that is a person who cuts off all frivolous pursuits and irrelevant cares, and points his attention to the subject of business or of duty, to which it ought to be applied; whence it is opposed, not only to בַּכֵּר, but to יָכַר; in like manner it signifies to fix or limit the judgment, to decide, determine, and decree, by cutting off, as far as possible, every thing erroneous or having an erroneous tendency, every thing but what is just, true, or to the purpose. It having been shewn, that the idea of cutting off prevails in the various significations of the verb, יָכַר, and its derivatives, there is no difficulty in attributing to the word now before us the signification of a
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lane, alley, passage, in a collective sense, by which the main streets of a city are intersected and cut off at various angles, and which being for the most part comparatively narrow, the idea of cutting is more easily associated with them. Hence perhaps proceeded the rendering of the LXX; εἰς πλατώ καὶ μηχός. Michaelis*, who throws much unnecessary doubt on the word, is inclined to accept this signification; but then, instead of לוח, he would read לוח, which he supposes the Syriac translator to have read by conjecture and thence to have given his rendering; but from what has been said above, I hope it appears, that there is no ground or occasion for such supposition.

But the times will be with strictness; or as our English translation, even in troublous times; or as the margin has it, in strait of times; that is to say, in circumstances of difficulty and distress, producing anxiety of mind. Some, particularly Mr. Faber following Mr. Wintle†, render, in shortness, or in the short space, or narrow limit of the times. But the other renderings are preferable; or I should rather say, the latter is scarcely justifiable.

* Supplem. ad lex. Heb. p. 952.
† See Mr. Wintle's notes on Daniel, p. 143; and Mr. Faber's Dissertation, p. 237.
The noun pixin indeed occurs in no other text of the old testament; but no instance is produced, and I do not believe, that any can be produced, in which the radical verb or any of its derivatives are applied to time, so as to denote a limitation or shortening of it. The radix pixin signifies to press, to squeeze, to straiten; thence arises its metaphorical signification of straitness or distress of circumstances and anxiety of mind; and that is the sense, in which the term is most frequently employed, and in which it is employed here. At any rate it is most hazardous to introduce so doubtful a rendering, with a view to build upon it so important an interpretation, as that, which is given to it by those two gentlemen, who consider it as expressing the same space as the seven weeks, because that is the shorter portion of sixty nine compared with sixty two. The rendering which I have given is adopted from Cocceius; and I think it preferable to that in our authorized version, as being more agreeable to the simplicity of the original. The meaning is the same.

And after the sixty and two weeks. Mr. Marshall and Mr. Faber earnestly contend that must signify immediately after. Of this more will be found under the fifteenth position in the next
chapter. At present I shall only observe, that there is nothing in the origin or in the use of the word מָשִׁיחַ, that restrains it to the sense of immediately after. Every person acquainted with the Hebrew language knows that it is properly a noun substantive of the plural number in the construct form, and signifies places, times, persons, or events following. Accordingly it is sometimes used to denote posterity, descendants, those who follow a man. It is sometimes found with one of the prefixes ב or ב expressed, but far more frequently understood*. It may therefore with great propriety be taken in this place with such a latitude, as to comprehend all the events mentioned in the 26th verse, extending from the first appearance of Messiah as leader in the sixty second week to the end of the seventy weeks; so that it might be rendered, and must be understood to signify, in the weeks that come after the sixty two weeks.

נָכֹר מָשִׁיחַ. Messiah shall be cut off. Dr. Blaney and Mr. Faber have altered the vowel points of the verb, so as to change its form from Niphal into Kal. But I do not think that even so they have attained their object; for thereby Messiah, instead of being the nominative to יִקַּקֵּר, is made grammatically the accusative

* See the notes on Noldius de particulis, p. 8.
of yikroth, which ought to be taken, as Hebrew verbs frequently are, impersonally, or with ו, as an indefinite nominative understood, which, as every one at all acquainted with the language, knows, answers to the Latin quisque, or the French on: they shall cut off Messiah; a phrase which is of exactly the same meaning as the other, Messiah shall be cut off. Thus, notwithstanding the change in the punctuation, Messiah is not made, as Dr. Blaney and Mr. Faber wish to make it, the nominative to the verb, because that is of transitive signification, and therefore wants an accusative, the name of an object, on which to exert itself. It is in vain that they have recourse to so artificial and foreign an expedient, as that of making the city and sanctuary the accusative, and rendering the prefixed to the former of those two words, both, because the intervention of the clause plainly severs them from the verb, with which they would have been connected, if the author had intended them to be taken in connexion with it; in which case the intervening clause would have concluded the sentence. To the authority of Dr. Blaney I shall oppose that of all the ancient versions. The Syriac renders מישיא, Messiah shall be slain. So the Vulgate, occidetur Christus; to the same purpose, in regard to the verb, Theo-
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dotion renders ἐξολεθρευθησεται χρισμα; and the
LXX give it in the passive voice, ἀποκαθαρισται
χρισμα; with the former of which two the Arabic
agrees, "eradicabitur unctio." To these auth-
orities may be added that of the generality, and,
I believe, the universality of interpreters before
Dr. Blaney; and seeing that he is followed by
Mr. Faber, I shall oppose to the latter the equi-
valent authority of Mr. Wintle. "I think," says
that learned author, "with the Masorites and the
generality of interpreters, that the word ר inversión
must in this place be understood passively; shall
be cut off; that this form is most agreeable to the
pointed expression and laconic energy of the whole
prediction, and that the two following words, to
mention no other objection, will not admit of
its being rendered in an active or transitive form
by a fair or natural construction." Mr. Faber
however goes still farther; and not only renders
ר inversión in the transitive sense of cutting off, but
ascribes to it the idea of cutting off after a particular
manner*; "Messiah shall divorce, or cut off by
a bill of divorce." But as Mr. Parkhurst observes,

* The Jews also ascribe to the word the sense of cutting
off, after a particular manner, but a very different one from
that of divorcing, that of putting to death by a judicial sen-
tence. To this purpose Bishop Chandler cites Rabbi
Saadias Gaon in Rambas, c. 8. מִלָּה מְנָה דִּיקְיָרニְ o, qui interficitur sententia Judicis. So Levit. xvii. 14. De-
“the verb never occurs in this sense in the old testament, though the derivative ריחות is used for divorce or divorcement*;” and it is in vain, that Mr. Faber would produce this place, as the single exception, when the production of some other is the proof justly called for. Besides, if it could be proved, that the verb were sometimes used in the sense of divorcing, yet that would not be sufficient to justify such a rendering of it in this passage; because Messiah and the Jewish church are not here represented by the figure of husband and wife, not even by the remotest allusion; and it would be strangely abrupt to introduce the figure of divorcement in so indirect and obscure a manner, when the previous idea of marriage is not once alluded to. Upon the whole, I find myself not only disposed and warranted, but obliged and compelled, to adhere to the rendering of ריחות in a passive sense, as given in our English bibles.

ו_keep; AND NO ONE WILL BE ON HIS SIDE.

The rendering given by our English translators is, but not for himself, a solemn, awful, and pious rendering; calculated to excite in the reader the most devout, humble, and thankful sense of the spotless innocence of the person, whose cutting off is here predicted. But this rendering,

* See Heb. Lex. in v.
though supported by other very learned men, must be given up, as not reconcilable with the Hebrew idiom. For though the pronoun may be taken in a reciprocal sense, yet נ, though frequently and very allowably rendered not, is not the same thing as נ; but a noun signifying nobody or nothing, and has commonly the substantive verb understood with it, as it has here. In Exodus, xxii. 3, we find the words, ול נ נ, “if he have nothing,” or no property. So here it may be rendered, and he shall have nothing, or no one; of which rendering different explications may be given. To the same purpose, though not in the same words, both Dr. Blaney and Mr. Faber render it; the one, “Messiah shall cut off from belonging to him both the city and the sanctuary;” the other, “the Anointed One shall cut off by divorce, so that they shall be no more his, both the city and the sanctuary;” with little, if any, difference in the respective meanings. But I have preferred to adopt the rendering long since given by Vatablus; "et nullus erit pro eo, id est, nullus stabit a parte ejus. Ne-mo feret auxilium, sed destituetur omni ope.” This rendering is received by Mr. Wintle also; “and none shall be for him, or on his side.” Houbigant* acknowledges the goodness of the

* Notæ criticæ ad loc.
SEVENTY WEEKS OF DANIEL.

sense, but objects to the rendering; "cum nulla reperiatur scribendi forma talis." Perhaps his objection is made to the supposition, that הער is to be understood; for it must be confessed, that the words of Vatablus, as reported by Pole in his synopsis, seem to indicate an opinion, that הער is the word to be supplied, at least in the mind of the reader. But to this it is reasonably objected, that Daniel would hardly have left that word to be understood here, since he has expressed it in xi. 45, וּנְהָי. There is however no necessity for having recourse to such an expedient, since the prefix ה is often used in the sense, which the rendering of Vatablus requires us to ascribe to it. In Joshua, v. 13, we read, that when Joshua saw the captain of the Lord's host, with his drawn sword, he put in his ignorance this question to him; "Art thou for us or for our enemies?" הָיוֹ הָיָה השם, in which the prefix is twice used in that sense, and as here, with the verb substantive understood. Again, in Exodus, xxxii. 26, we find, וְהוּא הָיָה, "Who is on the Lord's side?" So in Psalm cxviii. 6, והוּא הָיָה, "the Lord is on my side;" and 2 Kings, x. 6, והוּא הָיָה, "if ye are for me, or on my side." It occurs in a like sense in Exodus, xviii. 19, where Jethro tells Moses, that "he should be for the people;" that is, on their behalf or on their
side, speaking and acting in favour of them to Godward, where the verb substantive is expressed. So too in 1 Samuel, xvii. 46, which our English version renders, "that there is a God in Israel;" but which would be more truly rendered, "that God is for Israel;" that is, on the side of Israel. Again in 2 Chronicles, xi. 12, "and Judah and Benjamin were on his side;" and in Psalm cxxiv. 1, "who was on our side." It is frequently so used with the verb דמות, as in Exodus, xiv. 14, 25; with מים, in Judges, vi. 31; with קים, in Psalm xciv. 16, and with other words. These examples are, I trust, sufficient to prove, that the rendering of Vatablus is not to be rejected, as being inconsistent with the Hebrew idiom; and since Houbigant allows, that it affords a good meaning, that eminent critic may be considered as a supporter of it. Indeed the rendering scarcely differs from that given to the two words in Exodus, xxii. 3, except in rendering the prefix for instead of to, which has been sufficiently justified. It would be unjust not to mention here the rendering given by Geyer, which is extremely ingenious and plausible. He supposes a verbal noun derived from רוח to be understood with רח; whence the rendering would be, "but it will be no cutting
off to him;" that is, he will not perish as his enemies may suppose, but rise again a glorious victor to immortal life.

Nirl Tax by ninv, v'prim myrn. AND HE SHALL DESTROY THE CITY AND THE SANCTUARY WITH THE LEADER THAT COMETH. If it were necessary to construe the first two words with the former part of the verse, it might be done (and there is no other way of doing it regularly) by distributing them under the word נלפ: "Messiah shall be cut off, or they shall cut off Messiah, and none shall belong to him, either city or sanctuary;" that is, neither city nor sanctuary shall be, or be accounted, his. But by that construction the following verb ישוע is not only made to begin a new sentence in a very abrupt and disjointed manner, but has to choose for itself in great uncertainty a nominative out of the two following words. On the other hand, when this clause of the sentence is not made a part of the former clause, but only connected with it in the same sentence by the prefixed to ישוע, all proceeds with the greatest regularity and facility. Then Messiah† is made the nominative to ישוע, the city and the sanctuary

* Polisynopsis in loc.

† Mr. Wintle mentions that Houbigant makes Messiah the nominative to ישוע, but I do not find it so in his
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are the accusatives governed by it, and these again are connected with the following words by the preposition with. And "he will destroy the city and sanctuary with the leader that cometh." For in the word בָּנָי I have substituted the vowel point Chirik for Pathach, and consequently, instead of the substantive people, I have made it the preposition with, or together with. Any construction, that shall make בָּנָי the nominative to the preceding verb, will produce difficulties, which cannot be surmounted without offering some violence to the passage, either as to the following pronoun, or the meaning of the preceding verb. Our English version adopts the former mode, making the singular suffix do the office of a plural one by representing two nouns; Mr. Faber has taken the other way, rendering ניבי in a neutral or reflective sense, "they shall act corruptly," and interpreting that corrupt course of action, of the hypocrisy, injustice, and extortion of the Scribes and Pharisees in our Saviour's time, and of the blindness and immorality of the people in general*. Now I am far from denying, that the verb ניב, in the Hiphil form, is often used in a

notae criticae, in 2 vols. 4to, printed at Frankfort; though it may so appear in his Hebrew bible, of which I do not possess a copy, and have no access to one. I am happy to find such a predecessor as Houbigant.

* Dissertation on the seventy weeks, p. 348, &c.
neutral or reflective sense; but I maintain, that wherever it is so used, in any of its forms, it is uniformly applied to idolatry. The reader will see the truth of this by referring to Exodus, xxxii. 7, Deuteronomy, iv. 16, 25, ix. 12, xxxi. 29, Judges, ii. 19, 2 Kings, xxiii. 13, 2 Chronicles, xxvii. 2, Ezekiel, xvi. 47, xxiii. 11, Hosea, ix. 9*. Other texts may be selected, as Deuteronomy, xxxii. 5, or Isaiah, i. 4, where no man will doubt of its having the same application, though that may not so certainly appear as in the texts before cited; and since no passage can be produced, in which it can be proved to have any other, it would be unreasonable to apply it in the few instances, where it may seem doubtful, as Genesis, vi. 11, 12, to any other offence. Now it is certain, that the Jews, as a nation, whatever their vices might be, could not be accused of idolatry in the days of our Saviour; and therefore I say, that Mr. Faber's application of the word offers violence to its scripture meaning, a violence moreover, which betrays itself by requiring the aid of another act of violence in the interpolation

* In this passage reference is made to the horrible instance of fornication at Gibeah related in Judges, xix. But the prophet does not mean to accuse the Israelites in his days of the same kind of crime literally, but of a degree of spiritual fornication, that is, of idolatry, equal in enormity to that frightful act.
of the particle for. Dr. Blaney has indeed avoided both these difficulties by making רָנִּים the nominative to רָעֲשָׁי; but then his rendering, "the prince that shall come shall destroy the nation," is purely arbitrary; for if the two nouns be not put in construction, רָנִּים may be the nominative and רָעֲשָׁי the accusative. In short, to make his rendering certain, he ought to read רָנִּים רָעֲשָׁי; for Kimchi's exception cannot have place here, that "when it is obvious, which is the agent and which the patient, there is then no need of the particle רָנִּים."

There is also another inconvenience, which has been briefly noticed before, attending the division of the verse made by Dr. Blaney and Mr. Faber; viz. that רָעֲשָׁי, beginning a new sentence or clause of a sentence closely connected in sense with the foregoing one, requires a connective particle, in the absence of which it appears bald and disjointed. Mr. Faber is so sensible of this, that he has connected it with the former, as before noticed, by the conjunction "for;" whereby he has also gained another advantage; for while he thus makes his translation run smooth and easy, he introduces the corrupt conduct of the Jews, as the reason, which induced Messiah, according to his rendering, "to cut off the people and sanctuary by divorce." But this important
addition is made not only without any authority, by mere conjecture, but without mentioning it among the other innovations, which he has introduced or adopted into the text, and without giving his reader any notice of it, except by printing the word in italics, which is not, I think, the way, in which a conjecture of so great importance to his translation and interpretation should have been offered to the reader. After all, the necessity of the addition, thus tacitly acknowledged, is as powerful an argument, as can be well urged, against the construction that produces it.

The punctuation of "by" with Chirik and the rendering, which is the consequence, are sanctioned by the ancient versions; by the Syriac, which reads, "NnNT N57n by barinnNump" Nn"p), and the city of holiness, or the holy city, shall be destroyed with the king that cometh; by the Vulgate, which renders "by" both as a noun and as a preposition, as if the word were repeated; et civitatem et sanctuarium dissipabit populus cum duce venturo; by Theodotion also, who making, as it should seem, "조사", which he renders "ξησκομα", the nominative to "ᾠδωρ", renders thus, καὶ τὴν πόλιν καὶ το ἁγίον διὰ τὸ εἰρήνην των εἴρημαν; by the LXX, who seem to agree with the Vulgate, rendering "by" both ways; βασιλεία
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θνον (such is their rendering of ὑ, the people, plainly understanding thereby the Gentile empire, the Romans) φθερεὶ τὴν πόλιν καὶ το αγὼν 

META τς Χριστς; and lastly, by the Arabic, which follows Theodotion. Thus does every one of these versions support me in rendering ὑ by the preposition with. Theodoret also does the same in his comment; Ταυτα δε πεισται τη πολις 

ΣΥΝ τω ερχομενο. Aquila alone coincides with the modern versions; καὶ την πολιν καὶ το αγιον 

dιαφθερει λαος γενεμεν ερχομενες. Thus with the grammar, the phraseology, and connexion of the passage, and the weight of authority all on the side of the rendering above given, there can be no doubt, but that it is the one which ought to stand.

καις μετα. AND HIS END (the end of the leader) SHALL BE WITH AN INUNDATION. Our English translation is inaccurate as to grammar, making the singular pronoun refer to the two preceding nouns, the city and sanctuary. Dr. Blaney and Mr. Faber agree in referring it to ὑ; but their renderings are in other respects liable to strong objections, as has before appeared.

For until the end shall be the war, the determined judgment of desolations. και is usually rendered here, agreeably to our English
version, as if it were in regimine with מַלְאָמָה הָיָה, until the end of the war desolations are determined. Thus the end of the war is made a fixed point of time, to which the desolations are referred as to their term. Now in order to become such a point in relation to some other thing, it is necessary, that the end of the war should itself be previously fixed; but of this nothing has been said: the beginning, duration, and end of the war are left altogether undetermined. Therefore it cannot become a fixed point to determine the desolations, and consequently the rendering, which makes it such, cannot be deemed correct. Taking the war to be, as it no doubt is, the same thing with the flood, in which the city and sanctuary are to perish, nothing is gained; it will be only making the prophet say, what perhaps he did not mean, and what perhaps too cannot be justified by the event; that the end of the city and sanctuary, of the war, and of the desolations all fall together. Dr. Blaney and Mr. Faber indeed join כֹּרֵאָדוּ as a participle passive with מַלְאָמָה הָיָה; and unto the end of a war, carried on with rapidity, [Blaney,] or firmly decided upon, [Faber,] shall be desolations. But still the objection remains; for the end of the war, however rapid that may be in its operations, or decided as to its certainty, its duration, and its consequences, is no settled
point, and therefore cannot be reckoned up to as a known epoch, either included within the seventy weeks or coincident with their end. It will therefore be the far preferable way of construing the sentence, to take נט, as an absolute noun denoting the end of some term, which has been before mentioned. But that can be no other than the seventy weeks, with which the end of the leader, and consequently of the city and sanctuary, is here plainly declared to be synchronous. Considering this, I have thought it right to render the prefix נ by our causal conjunction for, that it may introduce, according to what appears to me to be the prophet's intention, the argument, by which the common end of the government, city, and sanctuary of Jerusalem is proved not to fall short of, or to exceed the termination of the seventy weeks; viz. that the war, in which they perish, will endure until the end of that term, the war being the same thing as the flood, which is both repeated and explained by that word.

 rapes רープ is a participial noun in the construct form, preceding מַלְאָךְ שֶׁמֶשׁ and following שֶׁמֶשׁ, with which it stands in apposition. The Syriac version so renders it, and the Vulgate must have taken it in the same form to get the rendering, which it gives of it in conjunction with the following word, statuta desolation. The root רָעָב signifies, as
before mentioned*, to cut off, or cut short any thing, so as not to leave any superfluous part. “It is applied,” says Taylor, “to a thing, that is decreed, fully and irrevocably determined, stinted, limited, or brought to a settled point.” Hence it may be used for a determined sentence, or judgment, from which every thing superfluous or erroneous is carefully cut off, and which must therefore be fully executed in all its parts; or for a determined period, which can be neither abridged nor exceeded. In this meaning the word occurs in Isaiah, x. 23, xxviii. 22, and in Daniel, xi. 36, beside the two texts in this chapter. The verb itself is plainly used in this sense in 1 Kings, xx. 40; “so is thy judgment גאוש, thou thyself בחר hast decided it.” Vitringa† observes, that this passage, in the opinion of Aben Ezra, settles the meaning of the word, and adds, “est antem elegantior usus vocis in sententiis judicialibus, in foro promulgatis, quibus fas non est quicquam addi aut demi; et quidem in sententiis judicialibus, in quibus rigor juris, sive ius strictum, quod proxime ad severitatem accedit, observatur, et gratiae atque indulgentiae nullus relinquitur locus.” Hence there appears to be certainly no necessity, nor, as it seems to me, sufficient reason.

* Page 76.
† Comment. in Jesaiam, p. 284. c. 1.
for rendering with Dr. Blaney and others, as a participle agreeing with.

Yet will he confirm the covenant unto many one week. Dr. Blaney objects to this rendering, which is also that of our English version, that the definite article is not in the original Hebrew prefixed to. But that word is often used for a known covenant without the article, and particularly for the holy covenant of God with his people, no less than five times in the eleventh chapter of this prophet. There is consequently sufficient authority for rendering the covenant in this place. His own translation is liable to more serious objection. Taking the two words together, he renders them, he will make a firm covenant, in which he is followed by Mr. Wintle. According to this rendering no reference is here made to any former covenant or promise; but an entirely new one is described to be framed between Messiah and the many persons here mentioned. But the making of a covenant is expressed in Hebrew, not by the word in Hiphil, but by in Kal. I believe this to be the only passage, in which the former verb is to be found joined with; and consequently, instead of ascribing to it a sense appropriated to another verb, it ought to be rendered
in its proper signification of confirming or making firm; *he shall confirm the covenant*, the covenant previously subsisting, or at least before promised. Thus it answers nearly to the sense, in which בֹּקֶן in the Hiphil form is often used. If the prophet had intended to express the first making of a firm covenant, he would probably have said, מִלְחָה, מִלְחָה, בַּרְחַת אָסֹמוּת. The ancient versions are with one consent opposed to Dr. Blaney's rendering: the Syriac gives רְעִיתָךְ וּנְעָשֶׁנּ; the Vulgate, confirmabit pactum; the Arabic, according to the Latin version, confirmabit pactum; Theodotion, δυναμωσει διαθηκην. The LXX make two attempts; in their first, they give δυνασευσει διαθηκην, in their latter, κατασχεσαι διαθηκην.

This covenant it is declared Messiah will make firm to many one week. Mr. Wintle, following Theodotion and the Arabic, makes one week the nominative to the verb בָּרְחַת, for which there is not the least necessity, as we often find two accusatives follow a verb, especially where one of them is a noun of time*.

* Nomina temporis accusativo vel ablative casu cum verbis efferruntur. Buxtorfii Thes. Gram. I. 2, cap. 12, reg. 7. See also, among other places, Genesis, xv. 13, xlii. 17, and I Samuel, xxx. 12.
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CRIFICE AND MEAT-OFFERING TO CEASE; or he will cause them to cease half the week.
The former is with slight difference the rendering given in our English bibles. But some translators and interpreters prefer the latter, which is indeed the more literal one; yet not so much, I apprehend, on that account, as because it seems to express less forcibly an equal division of the week. For since they cannot bring the event, to which they apply the cessation, to coincide with the middle of the week, they flatter themselves, that the less decisive rendering will allow them to place it in any part of the latter half week. But the refuge is treacherous and cannot hold out. The expressions of the angel, however rendered, do beyond all controversy denote an equal division of the week; and when it is said, that half the week the sacrifice and meat-offerings shall cease, the meaning must be, that they are to cease from the middle of the week, or during all the half week, not for a portion, perhaps a small portion, of it only. Had the same motive existed for so doing, it might as well have been said, that the cessation would take place in the former half week; for if half may be spoken of less than half, it may with equal reason be spoken of more. It is, as Dr. Blaney has observed, "to adopt a style of language hardly justifiable on the
principles of common usage, and no better than solemn trifling." Certainly, if it were intended to predict the cessation, as taking place nearer the end of the week, neither the angel who uttered, nor the prophet who recorded, the prediction, would have been at a loss for suitable expressions. Whichever rendering then be adopted, the meaning is the same; present which side you will, the door is too narrow to admit such latitude of interpretation.

I have departed from the rendering of the latter of the two words, הרה והנשה, given in our English translation, for the sake of distinctness, the former signifying a sacrifice properly so called, consisting in the death of a victim, the latter an offering of inanimate substances, fine flour mixed with oil and frankincense, cakes of various kinds, and the first fruits of corn and wine. These were called in Hebrew by the general term בנה, which our translators have commonly rendered meat-offering, and to that, therefore, I have adhered.

AFTERWARDS* UPON THE BORDER OF ABOMINATIONS SHALL BE THE DESOLATOR. Our English version has,

* I have marked the transition from one subject to another by rendering the Vau, afterwards. That it may be properly so rendered, the reader will see by many satisfactory instances in Noldius, No. 41. 2.
“and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate,” or as it is in the margin, “and upon the battlements shall be the idols of the desolator;” the latter of which, since it construes a noun, that is in the absolute, as if it were in the construct, form, cannot be right, and the former, which gives to הֵן a signification, that it has nowhere else in the bible, and inserts a pronoun of very ambiguous reference, is in all probability wrong. The word הֵן properly signifies a wing, then figuratively the skirt, border, corner of a garment; and thence the border, the outermost part, the extremity or boundary of a place or a country. Mr. Faber thinks it may be rendered the wing of a building; but of that use of the word he gives no instance, and I believe none can be produced. Another rendering of it with the preceding word יָנ, upon the wing, meaning thereby the act of flying, hardly deserves notice. The phrase is English, not Hebrew. I have ventured to render the word יָכִים, the desolator, or destroyer, although in the ancient versions and in the gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark it is rendered desolation, as also by Dr. Blaney and Mr. Wintle, while Mr. Faber has rendered it as a participle, “that maketh desolate.” The latter is certainly the more correct version. No instance can be produced from the old testament, in which
the word is used for a substantive signifying desolation; and its form is that of a participle active. I have preserved that form in rendering it as a participial noun, which is necessary, because there is no subject expressed, with which it agrees, nor any object, on which it is to act. It is also to be observed, that by rendering the word מָשָׁמֶם by the abstract noun desolation, we make it merely a repetition of the word above used שָׁמָה, instead of rendering those two and the following word שָׁמָה, as what they really are, conjugates, expressing various modifications of the same idea; desolations, the desolator, the person or thing laid desolate. The difference of the words is plainly intended to express some difference in the thought; and not merely to vary the expression for the sake of elegance of style. Mr. Faber having adopted the reading of the single MS. that has שָׁמָה in the singular number, has made the participle agree with that noun. But the reading of the printed text has been defended in its proper place, and unless that can be invalidated, the translation founded on the altered one must fall.

And that until he shall be consumed, or brought to an end; that is to say, the desolator. Our English translators, with almost all others, have rendered the first
word, *even until*. But Dr. Blaney has objected to this rendering of ῥῦ, which he thinks ought not to be taken for a preposition, but a mere expletive, at least adverbially, for *omnino, penitus, even unto, nothing short of*; for which he cites three instances from Noldius and adds four of his own. Upon this it is obvious to remark, that there is a wide difference between a mere expletive and such intensive particles, as *omnino, &c.* and that it would have been more to Dr. Blaney's purpose, if he had produced an instance where ῥῦ necessarily signifies nothing but *and*. But it is of no use to dwell on this matter, since Dr. Blaney himself proceeds in the following terms; "or, without making much alteration in the sense, ῥῦ may be taken conjunctively for *even until*, as limiting a time for the continuance of the abomination of desolation in the situation before mentioned." This is the very sense, in which, with our learned translators and others, I take the word, except only, that I join it with ἑλλὲ, not as a noun substantive, but as the perfect tense of a verb, of which instances enough are to be seen in Noldius on ῥῦ, No. 2. But before I can conveniently proceed to justify my rendering of ἑλλὲ, it will be necessary to take the following words into consideration.
And the determined judgment shall have been poured upon the desolated. which I have rendered the determined judgment, is the same word, except that it is in the absolute form, as that above rendered in the same manner in the 26th verse, where, as a substantive, it is found in the construct form before. In Daniel, xvi. 36, the word appears decidedly as a participial substantive, נחרצת נותרה, for that which is determined shall be done, or the determined judgment shall be executed. Beside the three texts of Daniel, there are two of Isaiah, in which the word is found, x. 23, xxviii. 22; and these five exhibit the only examples, which the bible contains of its use. In each of the two latter it is connected with a preceding substantive by ו and follows the same verb, as an accusative case; consequently, there being no sufficient cause to be shewn to the contrary, it must be deemed a substantive also itself. If indeed it be used for a participle or adjective, it is very extraordinary and unaccountable, that out of five instances it is not in any one* found immediately connected with a substantive in the usual way, but always

* I do not consider Dr. Blaney's construction of the word in verse 26, even supposing that correct, to be an exception, because it is a different word from נחרצת, if it be not in the construct form.
(except in Daniel, xi. 36, where it is beyond all doubt a substantive, and above in the 26th verse, where also it appears as a substantive,) through the medium of the connective ıt. To allege, that here and in the two texts of Isaiah, the substantive דְֹלָכִי must be understood as being repeated and the ıt taken exegetically, is only to assume, that it is used as a participle or adjective contrarywise to usage. Dr. Blaney, who renders the word adjectively, a speedy one, cites in favour of his rendering that given by the LXX, the Syriac, and the Latin Vulgate, of the same word in Isaiah, x. 29. But of these three authorities the first is ambiguous; for the LXX have joined it with the preceding word to produce their version, λόγον συντετριμενον, and it will hardly be said, that דְֹלָכִי is properly rendered by λόγον. The second does not render it either as an adjective or as having the sense of shortness, but by the substantive οὐσίως, which, according to Castell, who cites the text of Daniel, signifies tempora statuta, sententia, judicia; nor does he give to the Syriac word in any of its forms the signification of shortness, but in several, that of decision and determination. The Latin Vulgate renders it, not, according to Dr. Blaney’s citation, as an adjective connected with the substantive דְֹלָכִי, consummatio abbreviata, but as equally a substantive
with the other, *consummationem et abbreviatio-
nem*. Thus, of the three authorities quoted by
him, the first lends him little or no assistance,
the second is against him, and the third only
half for him, and so far as the form of the word
is concerned, decidedly against him. Upon the
whole, it appears, that נְהָרְצָה is used in two out
of five places decidedly as a substantive, and that
in two more there is no good reason for taking it
otherwise, whence we may conclude with certain-
ty, that it is to be construed as a substantive here.
Since נְהָרְצָה is a substantive, if לכל ה is also be a sub-
stantive, then the verb ought, according to gram-
matical rule, to be in the plural number, whereas
it is in the singular. This must be allowed to
throw some difficulty in the way of construing
ברְצָה as forming in conjunction with לכל ה the no-
minative to תַּרְעֹת; a difficulty, which can be
avoided only by making the exegetical, or by
supposing an enallage numeri. But it is not ad-
visable to have recourse to such expedients, ex-
cept in cases of real difficulty, or where the sense
or grammar point out the necessity. Here cer-
tainly no such occasion appears, except it be sought
in resolutely persisting to regard לכל ה as a sub-
stantive. But לכל ה is a verb often used in this
tense and person, and when it is taken as such,
the difficulty and awkwardness vanish and the
sentence moves on with the utmost regularity and smoothness to its close. The nominative to the verb is a pronoun understood, representing מָשָׁם; "on the border of abominations shall be the desolator, and that until he shall be brought to an end," &c. I see no objection to this construction of the sentence, except what may be supposed to arise from the two passages in Isaiah, where the two words הנורהוּב, appear much as they do here, and where the former is certainly not a verb, but a substantive. I must confess, that this objection is not without some force; for the junction of the same two words in the several texts, where the subject of discourse is much alike, seems to afford some intimation, that Daniel had the two texts of Isaiah in his mind at the instant of writing, and intended to make his own expressions correspond with those of his predecessor. But the objection is greatly weakened, and, as it seems to me, removed, by remarking, that out of five places, or six, if the various reading in the 24th verse be admitted into the text, in which Daniel has used the word, this is the only one, where it can be taken for a substantive; and particularly, that in xi. 36, we not only find הנורהוּב as a verb, but preceded by ע and followed by הנורהוּב with the interval of only the conjunction י and one other word; ע זה הנורהוּב.
Now since an author is much more likely to fall into his own style of expression, than to copy that of another, it is much more reasonable to take this text, than those of Isaiah, to explain the passage before us. Moreover the parallelism of Daniel with himself extends to three words, whereas that with Isaiah goes no farther than to two. Wherefore, when we also take into consideration, the facility hereby afforded to the construction, we can hardly entertain a doubt, that Daniel intended to use חולם as a verb in this place. A difference may indeed be observed in חולם having a nominative expressed in the one text and understood in the other, and in the use of מ instead of מ; but these differences are too trifling to affect the high probability, that in two separate, but not distant passages of the same author, where the subject, if not absolutely the same, is altogether similar, the same three words, being found in a like connexion, are used by him in both to express the same sense in the same manner of signification. I therefore consider myself authorized at least, if not constrained, by the authority of Daniel himself, to render חולם as a verb, and חידתא as a substantive and as the nominative to חידתא. This rendering must, I conceive, approve itself especially to Mr. Faber, as it not only removes the
laborious construction of the sentence, but makes strongly in favour of his interpretation of the passage.

The verb יָסָר answers to יָשָׁר, in Daniel, xi. 36; “until the determined judgment shall have been executed,” or “shall have been poured forth,” in which sense יָשָר is used in many places of the old testament, correspondently to the pouring out of the seven vials in the Revelation of St. John. I have rendered this verb in the past future, compelled so to do by the sense of the passage. For as it cannot be said of the desolator, that he shall be on the border, until he shall have been brought to his end, that is, until his end be past, so neither can it be said of him, that he shall be there, until the judgment be poured out, for that is being poured out all the time that he is there, and will be emptied of its calamitous contents before his dissolution. Hence in translating the passage into English it is fit to use the past future, considering the language into which, as well as out of which, the translation is made. For although the Hebrew tongue has no distinct tense for the past future, but is confined to the use of the future or perfect for expressing that and every similar modification of time, yet since our language affords the means of accurately expressing what the prophet doubtless would have so expressed,
had his native language permitted him, a translator would but inadequately execute his undertaking, were he to neglect that advantage and to content himself with such a servile adherence to the letter, as, since it does not convey the meaning of the original, is little other than a mere counterfeit of the Hebrew diction.

The only word left to be examined is שׁוֹם, in the rendering of which, the desolated, I agree with Dr. Blaney and most others against Mr. Faber, who renders it actively, the desolator. Taken by itself the participle will admit of either rendering; but if the prophet had intended to express the very same idea, as he had done by the former participle, מְשַמֵּש, one should expect, that he would have done it by repeating the same word or by employing a synonyme from a different root; for by the use of a conjugate it seems reasonable to infer, that he meant to express the same radical idea indeed, but with some difference in the manner of signification. This has been remarked above; and therefore I need only repeat, that as we have before had the two conjugates, מְשַמֵּש and the desolation and the desolator, so now we have a third, שָמַם, the desolated, that is, the nation, the people desolated. In this sense the word may be found in the following places and probably in others also; Isaiah,
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xlix. 8, גהלת שמות, the desolate heritages;
liv. 1, בני שמות, the children of the desolate;
Lamentations, i. 4, שערים סוממים, her gates are
desolate; i. 13, הנני שומם, he hath made me
desolate; i. 16, בני שומם, my children are de-
solate; and iii. 11, שמי שומם, he hath made
me desolate.
CHAPTER III.

Containing certain preliminary positions intended
to fix and regulate the interpretation
in the succeeding chapter.

In his fifth chapter Mr. Faber endeavours to establish twelve positions, which he represents as abstract, that is, according to his reference to the learned Joseph Mede's synchronisms in his Clavis Apocalyptica, drawn from a comparison of the several parts of the prophecy between themselves, and intended to regulate in general the following interpretation of it and to be the test, to which every particular exposition may be referred. I think it will appear to the attentive reader, that some of those positions do not sufficiently answer to the character of abstract, and even that several of them are liable to strong and fatal objections. Yet duly appreciating the use of such preliminaries, I shall venture to follow Mr. Faber's example in laying down fifteen positions intended to ascertain the nature, purpose,
and mutual relation of the several periods of weeks proposed and determined in the prophecy, to fix in a general way the signification of some principal points, and to serve in a great measure for a basis, on which the succeeding interpretation is to be erected, and for a standard, to which it may be referred. I have also contemplated in the following positions the advantage of preventing or shortening several long digressions and discussions, of which still too many unavoidably remain, in the body of the interpretation. To this motive some of them entirely owe the place they hold, particularly the last two, which, as it should seem, would have been with greater propriety brought forward in the second chapter. But the great length of the fifteenth having induced me to set it by itself, the close connexion of the fourteenth therewith naturally carried that also to the same part of the work. The great majority of my positions are, as may be expected from what I have already said, different from those of Mr. Faber, and some even in opposition to his, while others agree or are at least reconcilable with them. Here too it must be confessed, that several of those which follow, have no pretence to be considered as strictly abstract, or drawn from a mere comparison of the different parts of the prophecy one with another. The whole prediction seems to
me not sufficiently extensive in itself or various in its parts, to enable an expositor to follow Mede at any length or with much success in his synchronisms. I have therefore referred without scruple, but still not largely, to other passages of holy writ. The main point, which I have kept in view, is to avoid the assuming of any interpretation, and as far as possible, (though it has not always been possible even in the two preceding chapters,) the anticipation of any thing that properly belongs to the following chapter.

But before I proceed, I must intreat the reader to reperuse the prophecy in the translation before given, which is repeated below, and to which is prefixed, as forming the introductory part of it, though not needing a new version or particular illustration, the preceding verses of the chapter, as they stand in our authorized English bibles.

**CHAP. IX.**

1. In the first year of Darius, the son of Ahasuerus, of the seed of the Medes, which was made king over the realm of the Chaldeans; In the first year of his reign, I Daniel understood by books (or, by computations) the number of the years, whereof the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah the prophet,
that he would accomplish seventy years in the desolations of Jerusalem.

3. And I set my face unto the Lord God, to seek by prayer and supplications, with fasting, and sackcloth, and ashes; And I prayed unto the Lord my God, and made my confession, and said,

"O Lord, the great and dreadful God, keeping the covenant and mercy to them that love him, and to them that keep his commandments; We have sinned, and have committed iniquity, and have done wickedly, and have rebelled, even by departing from thy precepts, and from thy judgments: Neither have we hearkened unto thy servants the prophets, which spake in thy name to our kings, our princes, and our fathers, and to all the people of the land. O Lord, righteousness belongeth unto thee; but unto us confusion of faces, as at this day; to the men of Judah, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and unto all Israel, that are near, and that are far off, through all the countries whither
thou hast driven them, because of their trespass that they have trespassed against thee.

8. O Lord, to us belongth confusion of face, to our kings, to our princes, and to our fathers, because we have sinned against thee. To the Lord our God belong mercies and forgivenesses, though we have rebelled against him;

10. Neither have we obeyed the voice of the Lord our God, to walk in his laws, which he set before us by his servants the prophets.

11. Yea, all Israel have transgressed thy law, even by departing, that they might not obey thy voice; therefore the curse is poured upon us, and the oath that is written in the law of Moses the servant of God, because we have sinned against him. And he hath confirmed his words, which he spake against us, and against our judges that judged us, by bringing upon us a great evil: for under the whole heaven hath not been done as hath been done

13. upon Jerusalem. As it is written in the law of Moses, all this evil is come upon us: yet made we not our prayer before the Lord our
God, that we might turn from our iniquities, and understand thy truth. Therefore hath the Lord watched upon the evil, and brought it upon us: for the Lord our God is righteous in all his works which he doeth: for we 15. obeyed not his voice. And now, O Lord our God, that hast brought thy people forth out of the land of Egypt with a mighty hand, and hast gotten thee renown, as at this day; we 16. have sinned, we have done wickedly. O Lord, according to all thy righteousness, I beseech thee, let thine anger and thy fury be turned away from thy city Jerusalem, thy holy mountain: because for our sins, and for the iniquities of our fathers, Jerusalem and thy people are become a reproach to all that are about us. Now therefore, O our God, hear the prayer of thy servant, and his supplications, and cause thy face to shine upon thy sanctuary that is desolate, for the Lord's 18. sake. O my God, incline thine ear, and hear; open thine eyes, and behold our desolations, and the city which is called by thy name: for
we do not present our supplications before thee for our righteousneses, but for thy
great mercies. O Lord, hear; O Lord, for-
give; O Lord, hearken and do; defer not,
for thine own sake, O my God; for thy city
and thy people are called by thy name."

20. And whiles I was speaking, and praying,
and confessing my sin and the sin of my peo-
ple Israel, and presenting my supplication
before the Lord my God for the holy moun-
tain of my God; Yea, whiles I was speaking
in prayer, even the man Gabriel, whom
I had seen in the vision at the begin-
ning, being caused to fly swiftly, touched
me about the time of the evening oblation.

22. And he informed me, and talked with me,
and said,

"O Daniel, I am now come forth to give
thee skill and understanding. At the begin-
ing of thy supplications the commandment
came forth, and I am come to shew thee;
for thou art greatly beloved: therefore un-
derstand the matter and consider the vision."

21.
24. SEVENTY WEEKS ARE THE DETERMINED PERIOD UPON THY PEOPLE AND UPON THY HOLY CITY, TO PUT A STOP TO THE TRANSGRESSION, AND TO SEAL THE SIN-OFFERINGS, AND TO MAKE RECONCILIATION FOR INIQUITY, AND TO BRING IN THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF THE AGES, AND TO SEAL VISIO-ON AND PROPHET, AND TO ANOINT

The PRELIMINARY POSITIONS.

I. The principal term of **SEVENTY WEEKS** has respect, not to time past, but to time to come.

II. The **SEVENTY WEEKS** are weeks of years, each consisting of seven years; and those, proper or solar years.

III. The term of **SEVENTY WEEKS** begins with the complete restoration of Jerusalem and the Jewish polity, and ends with the dissolution of the same.

IV. The six particulars, specified in the 24th verse, are all matters of good tidings.

V. The six particulars are comprehended within the term of the **SEVENTY WEEKS**, and must be brought to pass at, or before its conclusion.

VI. The six particulars are to be accomplished within the last nine weeks of the term.

VII. The term of seven weeks, mentioned in the 25th verse, is separate from, and prior to the term of **SEVENTY WEEKS**, and concludes at the point, where the other commences.

VIII. Either the seven and the sixty two weeks must be separated, according to the last position, and the former be considered
prior to the commencement of the latter and of the term of SEVENTY WEEKS, or the end of Jerusalem and the Jewish polity must follow within one week after the cutting off of Messiah.

IX. The leader that shall come, mentioned in the 26th verse, is a different person from Messiah the Prince, in the 25th verse.

X. The 27th verse is not progressive in the prophetic history of the SEVENTY WEEKS, but merely supplementary thereto.

XI. The week in the supplementary verse is not the last week of the term of SEVENTY WEEKS, nor yet a week superadded to them, but comprehended among them.

XII. The use of that particular week is to announce, that Messiah, after shewing himself as leader, will really act as such for a certain term, and reign to the benefit of his peculiar people the Jews.

XIII. Sufficient reasons may be assigned for separating the aforesaid week from the seventy, and for placing it, as it is found, in a supplement.

XIV. The word until, in the 25th verse, cannot be understood to refer to Messiah’s birth, but to the period, when he first acted, or shewed himself, as leader.
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XV. The word after, in the 26th verse, must be taken, not for immediately after, but with a latitude, so as to comprehend all the remainder of the term of seventy weeks from the sixty second week.

I. The principal term of seventy weeks has respect, not to time past, but to time to come.

This is also, with some difference in the form of expression only, Mr. Faber's first position; and truly it may seem to a reader unacquainted with what has been written on the subject very unnecessary to set off with a declaration, that a prophecy looks prospectively. But it is levelled against the new and forced interpretation, which Dr. Blaney has given of the seventy, or as he renders the word sufficient weeks, and by which he makes them look back to times past, even to the Babylonian captivity. As I consider Mr. Faber* to have fully succeeded in establishing this position, it is unnecessary to add any thing to his arguments, especially since it has been

* Dissertation, page 258.
proved in the second chapter*, that the substitution of the word sufficient for seventy in Dr. Blaney's translation, is not only unsanctioned by any authority, but contradicted by the uniform meaning of the original word in the old testament.

II. The seventy weeks are weeks of years, each consisting of seven years; and those, proper or solar years.

The first argument in favour of this position is of an abstract nature, drawn from a mere consideration of the prophecy itself without reference to any other passage of scripture. Therefrom we collect, that six most important, multifarious, and complicated particulars are appointed to receive their accomplishment; that a city and a nation are to wax strong, to flourish, to fall, and to perish; that a very distinguished leader of the same is to make his appearance, to reign, and to be cut off; that a covenant, doubtless of great consequence, is to be confirmed to the aforesaid people for a single week, with an important alteration during the latter half of that week;—all in the course of seventy weeks. Now upon reflection we find it utterly incredible, that such a multitude of events, many of them evidently requiring a considerable length of time

* Page 46.
for their production and development, should be brought to pass, or should be represented by any man in his senses, as destined, or likely to be brought to pass, in the narrow space of seventy weeks, or four hundred and ninety days, that is, little more than a year and a quarter. We must therefore of necessity have recourse to some other and longer measure of time, than seven proper days, to form the several weeks of the series. Now a day, which is marked by the revolution of the earth round its axis, is answered, according to a very close and striking analogy, by a year, which is marked by the revolution of the earth round the sun; so that we are promptly led by the natural relations of things and the connexion of our thoughts accordingly, to adopt that measure of time and to conclude, that the weeks of Daniel must be weeks, not of days, but of years. Before this solution the difficulties occasioned by the scantiness of the period vanish, and the mind immediately expatiates in the gratification that flows from the conviction of having easily and satisfactorily attained to the truth.

When we quit the abstract consideration of the subject, our satisfaction is increased at finding, that the conclusions of reason are warranted and confirmed by the language of holy writ, in which a week is many times put for the space of seven
years. Thus we find in Genesis, xxix. 27, 28, that the seven years' service of Jacob for his wives is twice called a week. So too in Leviticus, xxv. 8, the forty nine years' interval between the jubilees is twice called "seven sabbaths" or weeks "of years." Again, in Numbers, xiv. 34, years are expressly made to correspond to days, "after the number of the days, in which ye searched the land, even forty days, each day for a year, ye shall bear your iniquities, even forty years." In like manner we find days set for years in Ezekiel, iv. 5, 6. But above all it is to be noticed, that the use of the word week, to signify seven years, is so much a matter of course with Daniel himself, that when he employs it to express common weeks, he thinks it necessary to mark specifically his use of it in that sense, by describing such weeks as weeks of days, thus opposing them to weeks of years*. Other passages might be cited from the old testament to the same purpose; and it has been observed†, that "this mode of computation appears to have been sometimes used by other nations beside the Jews. Varro, at the time of writing his book inscribed "Hebdomades," saith

* Chapter x. 2, 3. This appears in the margin of our English bibles, though not in the text.
† By Grotius, Bishop Chandler, and others. The learned prelate cites in proof of the quotation in the text above, Auli Gellii Noct. Att. 3. 10.
he was entered into the twelfth week of his years, that is, his eighty fourth year." It is perhaps superfluous to dwell at greater length on a point, which, as Eusebius* informs us, was in his time generally, if not universally admitted. Yet it cannot be passed over without notice, that Mr. Wintle, after mentioning the opinion of an anonymous writer, who would confine the events of the whole prophecy to seventy common weeks, expresses his own to be so far in accordance with it, that he supposes the weeks in the twenty fourth verse to be only weeks of days; while on the other hand, those afterwards mentioned he conceives to be weeks of years. The former of these opinions, however contrary to all probability and even possibility, is at least consistent with itself; but what can offer greater violence both to consistency and probability, than the supposition, that the periods of the prophecy are to be computed by two different sorts of weeks? However, since neither of the above opinions has had, or is likely to have, many followers, they may both be safely left, as Mr. Faber has left them, to fall of themselves, together with the short-lived systems of Jewish invention.

But then a question is made, as to the nature of the years included in the seventy septains.

This is of considerable importance, for the years having been computed by different standards, different results have been given to the calculations. By twisting and pressing the rendering given by the Latin Vulgate to the Hebrew word יֶשֶׁר, above rendered the determined period, it has been maintained, that the seventy weeks are to be considered and explained as being shortened weeks, or rather weeks of short years; either lunar ones of three hundred and fifty four days, or Chaldaic ones of three hundred and sixty; as if to say, that seventy weeks are abbreviated, or are the abbreviated period upon thy people, (for that is the rendering upon which the whole depends,) were equivalent to saying, that seventy short weeks, or rather weeks of short years, are upon thy people. The rendering has been examined and confuted, and another preferred, in the proper place*. But even granting it to be correct, it is impossible to extract from it the meaning required by the advocates for the lunar or the Chaldaic year. The utmost that it can be brought to signify will amount to no more, than that a greater, or perhaps indefinite, term having been allotted or expected for the duration of the subject mentioned, it is now, by divine appointment, reduced to a shorter period consisting of

* Page 53, &c.
no more than seventy weeks. Supposing it said, that ten years were abbreviated, or cut short, upon the reign of the late king of France, Lewis the eighteenth, would any man living imagine the meaning of the speaker to be, that the years are to be calculated upon some reduced scale? Would it not rather be understood, that his whole reign, de jure, of nineteen years, as reckoned from the death of his nephew, Lewis the seventeenth, is intended to be cut down, to the period of his reign, de facto, which did but little exceed ten years? The merit of inventing the above enigmatical subtlety is due to Africanus, who flourished in the beginning of the third century*, and who has been followed by Theodoret, Bede, and others, and especially by the divines of the Romish church, guided by the authority of the Vulgate version, which the council of Trent decreed to be authentic. Mr. Marshall, following his patron Bishop Lloyd, is a learned and a strenuous advocate for the Chaldaic year, in which he is followed by Mr. Wintle and others; but Mr. Marshall† condemns unequivocally the notion of short, or shortened weeks, and even the rendering, on which it is founded, relying chiefly on some ingenious arguments, by which he

* Prideaux, Connexion, part 1, b. 5.
† Treatise on the seventy weeks, p. 181.
endeavours to prove, that the Chaldaic computation is the one followed in scripture, as well as that it was also in use among the Babylonians and Persians, in the time of Daniel, and among other ancient nations. But the whole argument for shorter years, whether lunar or Chaldaic, has been fully answered and completely exploded by Dean Prideaux*, Mr. Faber†, and Dr. Blaney. The argument of the learned writer last named being short, as well as convincing, I subjoin it here in his own words, previously observing, that it is brought forward against the opinion of Michaelis, who, in his letter to Sir John Pringle, had revived the computation of Africanus by lunar years, because, according to his interpretation of the prophecy, he could not make the computation by solar ones correspond with the settled dates of chronology.

"From the nature of the Jewish establishment it is abundantly evident, that though they might have reckoned a year or two together, as consisting of twelve lunar months, they never did nor could have carried on the same kind of reckoning for any long continued series of years in succession." To this he adds in his note; "a lunar year, consisting of twelve lunar months, or three hun-

* Connexion, part 1, p. 403, 8vo.  
† Dissertation, chap. 1.
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dred and fifty four days, falls short of the astronomical solar year, with which the seasons return, by about eleven days. Consequently with those, who compute their time by such lunar years, the beginning of their year must make a very quick circuit through all the different seasons successively. But among the Jews the beginning of their year was by the Mosaic constitutions necessarily determined to one particular season. The month Abib, or Nisan, in which they came out of Egypt, was ordained to be unto them the beginning of months, the first month of the year; Exodus, xii. 2. On the fourteenth day of this month the Paschal lamb was to be killed, verse, 6; the fifteenth was the first of the days of unleavened bread, and was kept as a sabbath, or a day of holy rest, in which no servile work was to be done, Lev. xxiii. 6, 7, and on the morrow after this sabbath, τη δευτερα των αυτων μηρα, εκ τη α’ εβ^ιν και διηκατη, says Josephus; Ant. Jud. lib. iii, c. 10, § 5, they were directed to bring a sheaf of the first fruits for a wave offering before the Lord, to be accepted for them. This was the beginning of their barley harvest, the day in which they first put the sickle to their corn; nor were they at liberty to taste of the fruits of their ground, neither bread, nor parched corn, nor green ears, until they had brought
this offering unto their God. Leviticus, xxiii. 10–14. From this time they were required to number seven complete weeks, and on the fiftieth day to offer a new meat offering unto the Lord of the first fruits of their wheat harvest. Leviticus, xxiii. 15, &c. Exodus, xxxiv. 22. Also on the fifteenth day of the seventh month they were commanded to observe the feast of tabernacles, otherwise called the feast of ingathering, after that they had gathered in their corn and their wine. Compare Leviticus, xxiii. 89, Exodus, xxiii. 16, Deuteronomy, xvi. 13. Now it is obvious, that these ordinances could not have been observed but seldom at their appointed times, had the beginning of the Jewish year been as variable with respect to the seasons, as a course of lunar years would make it. For in about sixteen such years each season would be changed for its opposite; autumn would be stept into the place of spring; and the month Abib, instead of being the month of green ears, as the name imports, would fall in after all the fruits were already housed in the barns. It is true, that, in order, to begin the year uniformly with the first day of the moon, the Jews gave the name of a year sometimes to twelve lunar months, and that for two years successively; in like manner as we for a similar reason reckon three years together
of three hundred and sixty five days each, reserving the exceeding hours, as they did the days, to be accounted for in an after-reckoning. Accordingly the third year was sure to be with them a kind of leap year by the intercalation of an additional month, which they called Ve-adar; and thus by repeated intercalations duly made, their reckoning in the long run was brought to correspond pretty nearly with solar computation, and the beginning of their year to fall in much about the same season, and at no great distance from the vernal equinox; εν χρόω τις πλιν χαθετωτος, as Josephus testifies, Ant. Jud. lib. iii, c. 10, § 5. Things being so, with what propriety can it be supposed, that a series of lunar years was here predicted, when it is manifest that the Jews had not, and probably no other nation then on earth had, any such reckoning in use? Or must it not appear a very fallacious mode of proceeding, to make use of a term in a sense different from the common acceptation of it, without giving previous and distinct notice of such a design?" Blaney's Dissertation on the seventy weeks, p. 33, 34. The argument above, though directed against lunar years, is, mutatis mutandis, equally efficacious against any shorter computation of time than the solar year.
The term of seventy weeks begins with the complete restoration of Jerusalem and the Jewish polity, and ends with the dissolution of the same.

"Seventy weeks are the determined period upon thy people and upon thy holy city." As the period is determined, precisely fixed and settled, it must needs have a certain beginning and end. These however are not stated by the angel in a formal way, but are left to be inferred or collected from the words, in which the term is announced, as being sufficient to that end. The people are without doubt the Jewish people and the city is Jerusalem. But it is to be carefully observed, that there is a wide difference in the expressions of Daniel on these subjects and those of the angel. Daniel had prayed for the Jews and Jerusalem, as being the people and city of God; the angel speaks of them as the people and city of Daniel. It is impossible to suppose, that in so short a prophecy as this, and in matters so closely connected as a petition and its answer, so great and striking a change in the terms should be purely accidental and undesigned; and being designed, that it should not be intended to answer some important purpose in respect to the prediction. The purpose is threefold. 1. It corrects the notions of Daniel
as to the people and city of God. 2. It confirms his expectations of the restoration of the Jews and of Jerusalem. 3. It intimates a future rejection of them from being the people and city of God.

1. The variation of the phrase plainly implies a difference in the subjects themselves, that may properly be termed the people and city of God, and those of the prophet. Daniel's people were Israel according to the flesh and the earthly Jerusalem; whereas the people of God are his faithful servants, not of Israel only, but of all kinds, nations, and tongues; even all the children of God, wheresoever scattered abroad, when collected into one body, having one Lord, one faith, one God and Father of all*; and His city is the new and spiritual Jerusalem. Now upon these certainly the seventy weeks were not determined. The period therefore is declared to be determined on the people and city, not of God, but of Daniel, thereby excluding the former from it, and confining its application to its proper subjects, the latter.

2. It confirms Daniel's expectations, as to the restoration of the Jews and Jerusalem, by expressing with emphasis, that the city and people were to be those of Daniel, not of any common individual, citizen, or Jew, but of the patriot

* John, xi. 52; Ephesians iv. 5.
and prophet Daniel, of him, whose thoughts and desires were continually bent upon them, and whose prayers and supplications had so lately ascended for them and, as the angel intimates in verse 23, had been accepted in their behalf. This emphasis is marked by the repetition of the possessive pronoun of the second person, "THY people, THY holy city." Now no man can suppose, that the people and city of Daniel, expressed with such emphasis, could be meant of the Jews and Jerusalem in their then woful plight, the one in exile, the other in ruins: in which while they continued, they could hardly be considered as a people or city at all, and from which he had most fervently implored their speedy deliverance. With equal reason we may argue, that the state of things, implied and indicated by such an emphatical and pregnant mode of expression, cannot be imagined to apply to the condition of the Jews immediately on their return from the Babylonian captivity, or to Jerusalem during their first weak and almost abortive efforts to rebuild it. Daniel's ideas concerning both may be best learned by adverting to his solemn prayer and supplication, to which the prophetic annunciation made by the angel is the answer. There we find him fervently intreating and solemnly obtesting God by the consideration
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of His own glory, in behalf of His own people and city, upon which His holy name was called, to rescue them from their present state of exile and ruin, and to restore them to a condition answerable to a people and city which were accounted and called His. Now, although the substitution by the angel of Daniel's people and city for those of God, may have been calculated to give some check to the aspiring views of the prophet, yet after this no man can suppose, that Daniel would have considered his prayer answered by putting together certain rows of cottages, or streets of houses, even though they should be "cieled houses*" among and out of the ruins of Jerusalem, or by the mere erection of a temple, unless the rites of religion were duly administered.

* Haggai, in i. 4, reproaches the Jews, that they were suffering the temple to lie waste while "they dwelt in their cieled houses." Hence Dean Prideaux and Mr. Faber after him argue, that Jerusalem was rebuilt in virtue of the decree of Cyrus. But the reproach is evidently addressed to the few wealthy Jews resident there, who, while they despaired of being able to undertake with any prospect of success, amidst such powerful opposition, so great a work as the rebuilding of the temple, yet had the means, and used the means they had, of providing for their own comfort. But the houses, though cieled, are not likely to have been spacious or splendid, being built in an unwalled city and exposed to many perils. It was probably the sense of insecurity thence arising, as well as the want of a due faith in the promises of God, that made them so backward to recommence their grand labour, and brought upon them the rebuke of the prophet.
in it according to the sacred ordinances, or by the inhabitation of a Jewish people, unless governed and regulated by their proper laws and statutes of divine appointment. He certainly looked for a complete restoration of the city to its former size and pristine state, at least so far, as to be a *defence* or fortified city, which was essential to its character, as well as necessary to the security and well-being of its inhabitants, and for a temple, if not so magnificent as Solomon's, yet as holy in the perfect celebration of the divine worship, by a priesthood consecrated according to the order of the sons of Aaron, and for the redintegration of a polity both civil and ecclesiastical, altogether consistent with and agreeable to the institutions of Moses. Thus it also appears that the people and holy city of Daniel are not to be restrained either to the literal city, with Mr. Marshall and some other expositors, or to the figurative city, with Dean Prideaux and some others, but comprehend Jerusalem with its walls and fortifications, as well as its habitations, and the people under their proper national laws and government, with a priesthood duly celebrating all the sacred rites of worship. In conformity with this, it is to be observed, that the seventy weeks are suspended over the people of Daniel and over his holy city, alike
over both; so that they are closely connected and inseparably united, the figurative and the literal Jerusalem, under that term. A common point of commencement, consequently, must be assigned for their restoration, a common event must be fixed for the dissolution of both.

Again, it cannot be justly suspected, that Daniel was less of a patriot than Nehemiah, or that his feelings were less warm and lively in behalf of his people and his holy city, than that illustrious governor's; but he, it appears*, "wept and mourned" over the account of their calamitous condition so late as the twentieth year of Artaxerxes, after Ezra had been at the head of affairs for twelve years, and with fasting and prayer, almost as earnest as the intercession of Daniel, he intreated the almighty for their restoration. The prophet therefore, it is to be presumed, would not have been satisfied with such a condition of his holy city, as moved the lamentations of Nehemiah. Mr. Faber† indeed seems to attribute the strong expressions of Nehemiah only to his sense of disappointment at finding, that "the city had not been rebuilt with so much rapidity as his patriotism induced him to hope;" and supposes, that they who perceive in them heavier motives for sorrow, must imagine, that the site

* Nehemiah, i. 4. † Dissertation, p. 135.
of Jerusalem was yet wholly destitute of habitations, so that the "temple stood in solitary magnificence without a single dwelling house in its vicinity." But Mr. Faber overlooks the real ground of Nehemiah's grief, which was not, because Jerusalem was yet wholly destitute of habitations and inhabitants, but "because the wall of Jerusalem remained broken down and its gates burned with fire;" that is, because it had not been restored to its ancient and proper character of a defended city, but lay open to the incursions of hostile neighbours, affording no secure or comfortable dwelling place to its inhabitants, but exposing the whole "remnant, that were left of the captivity in the province to great affliction and reproach." I say then, that Daniel also would have mourned and wept over such a state of things.

Now, the angel was sent to Daniel as being a man "greatly beloved" of the Most High, to comfort and cheer him with the assurance, that his prayer was heard, and that his expectation and desire would certainly be fulfilled. Therefore, without beginning and proceeding regularly onward from the first return of his exiled countrymen, and their first inceptive efforts to restore their city, temple, and polity, he passes at once to the com-

* Mr. Faber's Dissertation, p. 121.  † Nehemiah, i. 3.
pletion of the work—in medias res rapit audito-
rem. He presents to view the people and holy
city of Daniel actually existing and flourishing
in a restored state, agreeably to the expectation
and prayer of the prophet, and is careful only to
inform him of the term, to which their duration
in that state was at once extended and limited.

Farther, a strong argument in proof, that by
the people and holy city of Daniel the angel
meant Jerusalem fully restored, at least as a for-
tified town, may be collected from the circum-
stance, that not one word is said of so eminent
and so sacred a part of it as the temple, when he
speaks of "the word going forth to rebuild the
city." In the edicts of Cyrus* and Darius no men-

* Prideaux insists (Connexion, pt. 1, b. 5, p. 384) that the
word to rebuild Jerusalem, if the literal city be meant, must
be referred to the decree of Cyrus, because in Isaiah, xliv.
28, it is predicted of him, that he should say to Jerusalem,
"be thou built;" and in xliv. 18, that "God would direct
him, that he should build his city." Dr. Blaney also, who
understands by Jerusalem the literal city, has so construct-
ed his interpretation, or rather the prophecy itself, as to
make it correspond with these predictions of Isaiah. But
the two prophets may be reconciled without any violence.
1. By considering, that while Isaiah speaks of the first in-
ceptive efforts of the Jews to rebuild their city, Daniel speaks
of its complete restoration, as the expressions used in his
own previous petition plainly mean. 2. By taking Cyrus,
not merely for that prince personally considered, but for
the whole line of Persian kings, under whose government
Jerusalem was rebuilt and restored. In this sense Daniel
declared to Nebuchadnezzar, "thou art this head of gold,"
tion is made of the city; not however because those monarchs expected the Jews to rear such a building as the temple, "without a dwelling house in its vicinity," which no person of common sense can imagine, but because they would not be misunderstood to grant more than they in their jealous policy intended, so as to permit the erection of a fortified city. On the other hand, now, that the attention is particularly directed to the restoration of the city, that alone is mentioned and not one word is said about the temple; doubtless, not because the latter was forgotten or neglected as comparatively insignificant, for it was most important, and therefore could not be neglected or forgotten, even if it had risen among the palaces of Solomon, but because the prophecy refers to a time, when it would be already rebuilt. Merely as the site of human habitations, Jerusalem was begun simultaneously with the temple, or rather, I should say, necessarily before the foundation of it was laid; but though it continued to proceed, even while the work of that edifice was at a stand, yet the temple ever remained the first, the dearest, and most

ii. 38; and in vii. 17, four kings are put, not for so many individuals, but for lines of kings. So David is put, not for that monarch personally, but his descendants and successors; 1 Kings, xii. 16, 2 Chronicles, x. 16, Jeremiah, xxx. 9, Hosea, iii. 5, Ezekiel, xxxiv. 23, 24, xxxvii. 24, 25.
honourable of all national objects; and when at length permission was obtained and means afforded, it far outstripped in its progress all other works, and appeared, though not absolutely "in solitary magnificence," yet a fabrick of no ordinary splendour, the more conspicuous by comparison with the heaps of ruins which surrounded it. In speaking of such times, it is to the last degree improbable, that the mention of the temple would have been omitted; and the omission can be accounted for on no other ground, than that the prophetic spirit is speaking of a period when he foreknew it would be already rebuilt, refurnished, and consecrated, and that, by the silence observed in respect to it, he intended to intimate that foreknowledge to Daniel, and not only to that prophet, but to us who read his inspired volume. But since the time here spoken of is thus evidently shown to be posterior to the building of the temple, it cannot be referred to any period earlier than that, when Jerusalem resumed her proper character of a defenced city; for we know not of any earlier period, when such a material improvement took place in its condition, and considering its want of walls and other defences, it is utterly improbable that any such did, as would justify us in fixing upon that period, as the epocha whence the prophecy might
be dated, much less as that, when Jerusalem could truly be considered as the city of Daniel, of Daniel's expectations, desires, and prayers.

In addition to the arguments which have been drawn in proof of this position from the emphatical mention of the Jews and Jerusalem, as the people and holy city of Daniel, we may collect another from the period of the past desolations of Jerusalem as opposed to that of her future restoration. As it appears from the 2d verse of the chapter, that Daniel's petition proceeded upon an indubitable calculation, which convinced him, that the seventy years of desolation, foretold by Jeremiah*, were then arrived at, or nearly approaching to their conclusion, so it is observable, that the angel at once begins his word of consolation with a prediction of seventy weeks determined upon Daniel's people and holy city. We find then an opposition of the two periods to each other, an opposition evident and striking; so that none can doubt of its having been designed. It subsists both in the nature of the two messages and in the periods announced by them. For not only is the message of comfort communicated by the angel opposed to that of menace sent by Jeremiah, but the weeks of the one to years of the latter. Now, it has been proved

* Jeremiah, xxv. 11, xxix. 10.
above, that those weeks are weeks of years and consequently are altogether equal to four hundred and ninety years, or seven times the period announced by Jeremiah. Besides, the number seven in scripture often denotes a great and even indefinite multitude, and when used as a multiplier it expresses a vast increase and superabundance of one thing beyond another, and that either definitely or indefinitely*. In this passage, therefore, the approaching goodness and indulgence of God towards the Jews and Jerusalem, is greatly magnified by opposing the duration thereof to that of his past vengeance, inasmuch as the period allotted to the one exceeds that assigned to the other by no less than seven times told. Moreover, the opposition of the seventy weeks of years to the seventy simple years, coinciding with the opposition of consolation to threatening, plainly bespeaks a correspondent opposition in the state of the subjects to which they are determined, the

* Thus in Genesis, vii. 2, Noah is commanded to take seven times as many clean as unclean animals into the ark. In Deuteronomy, xxviii. 7, 25, seven ways are opposed to one way, but in an indefinite acceptance. Our Saviour uses the same mode of speaking, but with a decuple multiplication. "I say not unto thee until seven times, but until seventy times seven," Matthew, xviii. 22. So in Genesis, iv. 24, Lamech observes, that "if Cain," the guilty murder, "be avenged seven fold," he, the comparatively innocent, ought to be avenged "seventy and seven fold."
SEVENTY WEEKS OF DANIEL.

subjects themselves being the same. Now, the seventy years, as Daniel declares above, were accomplished in the desolation of Jerusalem*;

* Daniel dates those seventy years from the capture of Jerusalem, in the fourth year of Jehoiakim, B.c. 606. Then the temple was plundered, a select number of Jews, including many young persons of the royal family and the nobility, were carried into captivity, and the whole land brought into subjection and vassalage under the king of Babylon. This in a political sense may not improperly be termed a desolation, as well as a captivity, and it terminated soon after Daniel received this prophecy. But the real desolation of Jerusalem, as a city, did not take place till sixteen years after the above mentioned, when the temple and all Jerusalem were burnt and otherwise destroyed. In this desolation also seventy years were accomplished; for not only the city, but the temple itself, lay in ruins for sixteen years longer, notwithstanding the effort of the Jews to rebuild it immediately on their return from their exile; and these sixteen years, being the excess of the second seventy years beyond the term predicted by Jeremiah, form the subject of complaint with the prince of the angelic host, who takes upon him the office of interceding for the city and people of God, in Zechariah, i. 13. (See my commentary on the vision of that prophet, p. 13.) Now, though the earlier term of seventy years is certainly that referred to by the prophet Daniel, yet I conceive the second to be that referred to in the mind of the prophet's spirit, in opposing the weeks of the years of restoration to the simple years of desolation. For thus the opposition is more strongly marked and more entire throughout both the terms, the proper desolation being answered by the proper restoration. I do not conceive it to be any objection, that the difference between the period of captivity and the period of desolation is not explained to Daniel, because the divine counsel concerning the latter period was not intended to be the subject of revelation, until it was communicated to Zechariah just at its close. If, however, any person seriously affected with a concern for the truth, should deem this answer insufficient, it is to be observed, that Daniel, in the 2d verse, speaks
consequently the seventy weeks of years must be accomplished in her state of restoration. But no part of the previous decline and decay of the Jewish commonwealth and city are included in the term of seventy years, which begins at once from the actual capture of Jerusalem and the captivity of its inhabitants; therefore neither can the commencement of their restoration, or any part of their gradual progress towards a restored state, be included in the seventy weeks. They must consequently be dated from their existence in a state of complete reestablishment, as a defenced city and a body politic and ecclesiastical. Otherwise it is evident, that the different states of desolation and restoration would not be completely opposed to each other, which would greatly weaken, if not destroy, the opposition of the seventy weeks to the seventy years.

of the desolations of Jerusalem in the plural number. I do not indeed mean to assert, that the word in this form must necessarily be construed of more than one period of desolation, but that such an interpretation is not excluded and may with great propriety be admitted. The passage being thus understood, the mind of the patriotic prophet, we may be sure, would fasten with eagerness on the period, which was first terminated; while on the other hand, the prescience of Him, with whom a thousand years are as one day, might in the secret contemplation of his all-wise purposes speak with reference to the latter only.
Lastly, Dr. Blaney* with great clearness and strength of argument objects to the common interpretation, "that though the commandment is said, verse 23, to have gone forth in consequence of Daniel's supplication, very little or no regard is paid, either to the occasion or subject matter of his prayer." But from this position and from what has been said in proof of it, it appears, that the very first words of Gabriel's message contained an answer to the supplications of the prophet. To an interpretation therefore grounded hereupon that objection does not apply; for though it is true, that in the six particulars, the angel does not dwell on the subjects of Daniel's petition, or make them the main subjects of the following part of his communications, yet he does pay them all the attention, that can be expected, when it is considered, that he is sent to open to him in their stead those evangelical tidings, in comparison of which the others are trifles.

Upon the united strength of the above arguments we may safely conclude, that the commencement of the seventy weeks must be placed at the point of time, when Jerusalem may be found rebuilt in its extent, and established in the security of a defenced city, inhabited by its proper people, professing the true religion, worship-

* Dissertation, p. 11.
ping the true God with those rites and ordinances which he had appointed, and ruled by native magistrates according to his laws. To this answers the declaration in the next verse, that Jerusalem shall be completely rebuilt, both the broad street and the narrow lane, which by an allowable extension of their literal into a figurative meaning, may be presumed to comprehend all the parts, both the most important and the most minute of the Jewish religion and polity.

Such is the state of things at the opening of the term of seventy weeks. Its end may reasonably be expected to be found conformable thereto. It is fixed to the period, when Judah and Jerusalem shall cease to be the city and people of Daniel, that is to say, until the one shall be destroyed and the other dispersed; for his they both must be till then. Dean Prideaux* contends, that Jerusalem and the Jews ceased to be the city and people of God at the crucifixion of our Lord. The opinion may be safely admitted, and indeed I think it established by that solemn and affecting leave, which Jesus took of the temple, the city, and the people, as it is recorded in St. Matthew's gospel, xxiii. 37—39, as well as by other passages of the new testament. But here we must recur to the difference above

* Connexion, pt. 1, b. 5, p. 378.
noticed between the expressions of Daniel and those of the angel. The prophet had besought God in behalf of His, that is, God's people and city; but the heavenly messenger taking the pronoun in the second person, applies his answer to the people and holy city of Daniel. It has been observed, that one purpose of the change and of the distinction implied thereby, is to intimate a separation of the former from the latter, so that there might be a time, when the Jews and Jerusalem would be rejected from being the people and city of God, though they would still be those of Daniel*. Now, upon rejecting Messiah, they ceased, as before mentioned, to be the city and people of God, they were no longer acknowledged as His, they were deserted of Him; but they did not therefore cease to be the people and holy city of Daniel. St. Paul† expressly acknowledges the unbelieving part of the Jews, after their rejection, as his kinsmen and brethren according to the flesh, and manifests the strongest attach-

* So Jerome observes, "nequaquam populus Dei est, sed populus tuus, nec urbs sancta Dei sed sancta ut dicis tibi. Simile quid et in Exodo (c. xxxii. v. 7) legimus, quando Deus loquitur ad Moysen; "descende peccavit enim populus tuus;" hoc est, non populus meus, quia me deseruit." Comment. in Dan. Theodoret, in his Commentary, and Eusebius, in his Dem. Evang. lib. 8, have the same remark.

† Romans, ix. 3, Acts, xxiv. 17, xxviii. 19.
ment to them. But if after their rejection, they continued to be the people and city of St. Paul, so they doubtless did of Daniel. The words therefore of the angel plainly extend the seventy weeks beyond the period, when Jerusalem and the Jews ceased to be the city and people of God, until they ceased to be the city and people of Daniel, that is to say, until they were utterly destroyed and dispersed abroad.

That the destruction of Jerusalem is the appointed termination of the seventy weeks, is manifest beyond question from the 26th verse, according to the translation given of it in the second chapter of this dissertation; for there we read, that Messiah himself will destroy the city and the sanctuary, together with the leader that cometh, that his end (the end of the leader) will take place with an inundation, and that until the end (that is to say, the end of the term of seventy weeks*) will be war, a determined sentence of desolations. No one who impartially considers the end affixed to the term by the first description of it, as being appointed to measure the existence of the people and city of Daniel, can suppose, that these latter predictions, which announce their destruction, do not ascertain, at the same time, the end of the seventy weeks.

* See page 94.
It is only by long bending the mind to the contemplation of an hypothesis inconsistent with the plain meaning of the oracle, that a man can bring himself to suppose the end of a term predicted therein, and especially limited to the joint duration of a particular people and city, to be any other point of time, than that, which is decisively appointed for the joint and total destruction of the same.

IV. The six particulars, specified in the 24th verse, are all matters of good tidings.

This ought to be admitted upon the mere consideration, that the angel was sent expressly to comfort Daniel. He tells him of the term limited to the existence of Jerusalem and the Jewish people; but seeing that limitation implied an end, he immediately cheered his spirit by the glad tidings, that the blessed purposes of God in the Mosaic dispensation would be wound up and completed, into the promised dispensation of far higher blessedness, of far greater efficacy and wider extent, before the close of the seventy weeks. Besides, the prophecy, even as to the whole of the term, contains a strong admixture of evil, forasmuch as it is announced, that the people and city, when restored, rebuilt, fortified, and inhabited, would not subsist in unalloyed peace and prosperity, but on the contrary, that "the times would be with
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straitness, and that they would finally fall under the destructive visitations of divine vengeance. Therefore the angel was desirous, before he entered upon the calamitous part of his message, to fortify and establish the heart of the prophet, by opening to him the happy prospect of good things previously to come; the chief particulars of which he rapidly piles up in one sentence of evangelical tidings. This view of the general purport of Gabriel's message and of the six particulars corresponding to it is so manifestly agreeable to the gracious intentions of the divine sender, to the expressed desires and expectations of the receiver, and to the introductory words of the celestial messenger, that it seems altogether unnecessary to dwell longer on the subject. But since the whole sentence is thus an aggregate of glad tidings of good things to come, all the parts of it must have the same tendency. Accordingly, there is not the least mark of contrast to be found among them; no one member or clause can with the least shew of reason be put in opposition to the rest, or made to signify any thing foreign to them or essentially different from them.

V. The six particulars are comprehended within the term of the seventy weeks, and must be brought to pass at, or before its conclusion.
Mr. Faber, in laying down his second position, considers the seventy weeks to be the appointed period to effect the six particulars, and thence argues, that the termination of the weeks must be marked by the effecting of some one or more of those particulars; "because," saith he*, "if the term extend beyond the last to no remarkable era, then a smaller portion of time, precisely reaching to the last, ought to have been marked out; and if it extend beyond the last to an era noted for some remarkable event, then that event ought to have been specified in the list of particulars, otherwise the list is defective and it is in reality the appointed period to effect something more than the prophet teaches they should effect." But this argument does not proceed upon the data of the prophecy. For the term is announced previously to the specification of the six particulars, and its two extremes are, on the one hand, the complete restoration of Judah and Jerusalem, and, on the other, the destruction and subversion of the same; events, which, however nearly connected they may be with the six particulars, are yet not dependant upon them. Moreover, Mr. Faber's position, if admitted, ought to be carried farther; for since, according to his argument, the term of seventy weeks is

* Dissertation on the seventy weeks, p. 269.
appointed simply for the effecting of the particulars, and since he makes its termination dependant upon their accomplishment, the particulars must be considered as intended to measure the whole term. But since they measure the whole term, then both its extremes, its beginning not less than its end, must be marked by one of the six particulars. Now, there is no one of these particulars, as interpreted by Mr. Faber, which Mr. Faber himself can fix upon to mark the commencement of the seventy weeks; and therefore I do not see with what propriety he can insist, as he does, that any one should be the very mark of its termination. In reality the angel does not introduce the particulars, as having any other relation to the term, than that of most important events destined to take place during its continuance. They are appended to it, merely as containing matter of comfortable information to Daniel, for whose consolation the prophecy was primarily intended. And they fully answer that purpose, inasmuch as they plainly declare, that the wise and good ends of the divine dispensation, in making the Jews God's peculiar people, will be at least so far accomplished, as to be brought into clear light, full activity, and permanent establishment, though not to a conclusion, at, or before the end of the
seventy weeks*. In this view the six particulars have all the connexion with the term, and with the people and holy city, whose existence marks its duration, which they can be expected to have; but they do not extend throughout it, so as to measure the term, or the term them.

VI. The six particulars are to be accomplished within the last nine weeks of the term.

The first sixty two weeks are marked only by the existence of the Jews, as a political body, and of Jerusalem, as a defenced city, sanctified and adorned by its temple dedicated to the worship of the true God, and inhabited by a people governed according to the laws of Moses. This truly is the sum total of the good tidings, so far as relates to the sixty two weeks; previously to the coming of Messiah; and excepting only the straitness of the times, it amounts to a full and favourable answer to the previous petition of Daniel. But not one word is said or hint given, in the 25th verse, that can be construed to relate to the six particulars or to any one of them; and thence we may conclude, that they were not apponted to take place before the commencement of the sixty second week. Again, we learn from the words, in which the term of seventy weeks

* Grotius more than once observes, that these particulars are to be fulfilled “intra id tempus.”
is first announced, that the same course of events, as proceeds during the sixty two weeks, is to extend to the end of it. But the division of the term during some part of the sixty second week, and that expressly for so important a purpose as the introduction of Messiah, plainly intimates, that a new and greater order of things is thence to have its beginning, in the transcendent importance of which it would be unnecessary and almost impertinent to draw the attention to the external welfare of Jerusalem. Now, since it is evident, that the six particulars are in their nature, not only different from and much above the events allotted to the sixty two weeks, but are exactly and eminently adapted to the order of things, that might be expected to ensue on the appearance of Messiah; since too they are such, as no other person can be supposed either able or worthy to effect; and since they are indeed the very events, of which, in other prophecies, he is predicted to be the author. There cannot be the least doubt, that they are to be referred to his times, as being the distinguished acts, the graces and ornaments of his beneficent and blessed reign. But according to the prophecy, he is not to come, at least not to make his appearance as Messiah, and consequently the first of the six particulars cannot begin to take effect until the
sixty second week; and the last, as hath been before shewn, must be completed before the close of the seventy weeks; therefore some period within the last nine weeks must be that destined for their accomplishment.

Mr. Faber, though he dwells many times and at much length on these particulars and contends, that they are to be considered as appointed to take place in succession, and, as before mentioned, that the last, or some of the last, are destined by their accomplishment to mark the very conclusion of the term, yet does not fix the point, at which the accomplishment of the first* is to commence, nor allot any week, or number of weeks, for the period of their successive occurrence.

VII. The term of seven weeks, mentioned in the 25th verse, is separate from, and prior to the term of SEVENTY WEEKS, and concludes at the point, where the other commences.

For either the two numbers, seven and sixty two, must be taken together and considered as a phrase to express sixty nine, or the seven weeks must be separated from the sixty two, as having relation, each to a different series of

* That is to say, the first in the order of time, for according to Mr. Faber the order in which the particulars are stated is widely different from the order in which they are appointed to take place.
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events. Now, it has been shewn in the second chapter*, that the junction of the two numbers and the removal of the stop which is necessary to effect it, would occasion obscurity in the meaning of the passage, as well as ruggedness and baldness in its phraseology, would destroy its point and spirit, and above all would introduce a grammatical anomaly unparalleled in the language of the old testament. That the two numbers ought not to be so put together may also be proved from the inconsistency, that will thence result. For thus the term of sixty nine weeks will be dated from "the going forth of the word to rebuild Jerusalem," that is to say, from a period prior to its being begun to be rebuilt; and yet, according to the original announcement of the seventy weeks and our third position, the city will be actually rebuilt in all its parts and in full perfection, "both the spacious street and the narrow lane," during the whole space of those sixty nine weeks.

Seeing, it may be supposed, this absurd consequence, and feeling the force of Houbigant's argument, Mr. Faber and other expositors, who consider seven and sixty two as a phrase to express sixty nine, have found it necessary to make a partition of the two terms and to attribute to

* Page 68.
the seven weeks the separate work of rebuilding the holy city. By virtue of this disposition the words "shall return, and be built, or shall be rebuilt," are applied, not to the state of the city rebuilt, but to the mere act of rebuilding it, as plainly appears also by Mr. Faber's translation and paraphrase*. But in consequence of that application there remains not any event, or series of events, that can be allotted to the sixty two weeks, which therefore constitute a mere naked interval of time. Now, since the sixty nine weeks form a large space of time made up of two unequal portions, and since the smaller has a particular and important office assigned to it, what can be more improbable, than that the larger portion, almost nine times as great as the other, should be destined to no one object whatever, but suffered to remain a mere vacancy, or occupied only by the phantoms, with which imagination may amuse itself in filling it? 

Such being the consequences of endeavouring to force the two terms of seven weeks and sixty two weeks into one term, they must be taken separately and considered as having relation, each to a different event or series of events; that is to say, the one, to the work of building the holy city, the other, to the existence and duration of the

* See Mr. Faber's Dissertation, p. 229, 397.
same, as a city actually built, both in a literal and figurative sense, as we have before seen. The former is assigned to its proper purpose even by Mr. Faber and by those who agree with him; the other is the plain and indubitable meaning of the words, when once they are pointed, as it has been proved, that they ought to be; "and sixty and two weeks it shall be rebuilt," &c. Now, the mention of this restored, or rebuilt, state of things, immediately following the mention of the act of rebuilding, plainly indicates, that the term; during which such state of things is appointed to continue, is to commence immediately on the completion of the act of rebuilding and the establishment of things in a restored state. But the seventy weeks, as we have seen in the third position, begin with the complete restoration of Jerusalem to its former extent and to its proper character, as a defenced city, and of the people of Judah to their civil and ecclesiastical polity, and to their expected and desired condition as the people of Daniel; and since we have just found the same thing to be true of the sixty two weeks, both the sixty two weeks and the seventy weeks therefore have the same point of commencement. Moreover, it has been proved, that the seven weeks constitute a separate term from that of the sixty two. They are consequently
a separate term from the seventy weeks likewise. And they are also prior thereto. For the seventy weeks, as we have just noticed, find Jerusalem and its people completely restored, secured, and reestablished in all points essential to a fortified city, and to a well ordered and religious people; whereas the seven weeks are expressly dated from a period, which is necessarily antecedent to such a state of the people and city, and to the very act of beginning to bring them into such a state, even "from the going forth of the word to rebuild Jerusalem." Therefore I say, that the term of seven weeks is not only separate from the term of seventy weeks, but is also prior thereto.

The latter part of this position follows as a corollary from what has been said; for as the seven weeks are dated from the going forth of the word to rebuild Jerusalem, so the seventy begin with that city actually rebuilt and restored; whence the two terms manifestly adjust and settle themselves into a position, in which they are parted only, as it were, by a mathematical line, the end of the one being made the beginning of the other.

This arrangement of the seven weeks is a matter of prime importance in the interpretation of the prophecy, and will be found to remove many of those difficulties and inconsistencies, which
have so greatly perplexed and obscured it. It is
the remark of the great Joseph Mede*, that "if
these seven weeks could be well bestowed, the
chiefest difficulty were taken from the prophecy."

VIII. Either the seven and the sixty two weeks
must be separated, according to the last
position, and the former be considered
prior to the commencement of the latter
and of the term of SEVENTY WEEKS, or
the end of Jerusalem and the Jewish poli-
ty must follow within one week after the
cutting off of Messiah.

For if the two shorter terms be joined, then
Messiah will be cut off in the beginning, or some
following part, of the seventieth week, which
concludes with the destruction of Jerusalem and
the dispersion of the Jews, contrariwise to the
most certain records of sacred and profane history.
It was nothing else, I believe, but the foresight
of this plain consequence and the desire to guard
against it, that induced Mr. Faber and others to
misconstrue the verb רוח, and to mangle at
once the meaning and the grammar of the pro-
phet. But if the foregoing position had been
laid down and attended to, there would have
been no occasion for offering violence to either.

* Works, p. 700.
IX. The leader that shall come, mentioned in the 26th verse, is a different person from Messiah the Prince, in the 25th verse.

This position is levelled directly against the eighth of Mr. Faber, who contends, that the prophecy would be “chargeable with obscurity, if another person were introduced under the very same title as the Messiah, without any regular specification, that another person is intended.” But the person meant in the 26th verse is not introduced under the very same title, as the person in the 25th verse. On the contrary, great and essential points of difference may be observed; the most important part of that person’s title, Messiah, is omitted; nothing but the word נְא, a word of no very specific import, is retained; and to that, instead of the word מֶשֶׁך preceding, the word אָנָב is superadded. The difference, it must be allowed, is at least quite considerable enough to specify different persons, if different persons were intended. Is it not also sufficiently considerable to defeat the purpose of the writer, supposing that he intended to speak of the same person in both places? If indeed the same word, which is used in both, had stood alone in both, or even in the latter only, provided that it had the emphatic article prefixed, or if the prophet were wont to describe the leader in question,
sometimes by his proper name *Messiah*, and at other times, as *He that cometh*, then indeed we could not help seeing and acknowledging his intention to speak of the same leader in each place. But when we find the omission of the proper name uncompensated by any form of expression that can distinctly mark the same person to be the subject of discourse, and the appellative accompanied only by a term of general signification, which, neither in the former verse nor elsewhere in the writings of Daniel, is ever applied to Messiah, we have good reason for hesitating to apply the latter description to the same person as the former, and may be allowed to ask; why, if such were the prophet's intention, he pursued a method so likely to defeat it? Writers indeed, who aim at elegance of style, often produce obscurity, by varying their descriptions of the same subject, in order to avoid the repetition of the same words in neighbouring passages. But Daniel does not affect so polished a style, and therefore he would hardly have sacrificed perspicuity, when he could have had no other end but elegance in view, by naming the same person with such a difference of description in two adjacent sentences. Besides, the name Messiah occurs in the very same verse, and in the clause of it immediately preceding this, as the nomina-
tive to the verb. Therefore, if it had been the
prophet's intention to convey the sense, in which
Mr. Faber has rendered his words, he would
have expressed his meaning more clearly, as well
as more briefly, (and brevity is plainly a great ob-
ject with Daniel,) by writing הבש and connecting
it with the preceding sentence, by placing י before
בש; or if that, which Dr. Blaney con-
tends for, then by letting Messiah pass on to be
the nominative to the verb ובש, and by connect-
ing that verb with the preceding one ובש, by 1.

A strong objection to identifying Messiah with
the leader to come arises from the consideration,
that the words, when so understood, are used for
the sake of describing, not the person himself,
but the Jewish people by him. Now, not only
is the people of the leader, or prince, to come, at
least a very affected and far fetched description of
the Jews, who are the immediate and principal
objects of the prophecy, as they are likewise of
Daniel's previous prayer, but it is also illogically
applied. For Messiah being yet unknown, ex-
cept as the subject of promise and prophecy, was
certainly far less familiar to the apprehension of
Daniel, than his own brethren, whom he daily
saw and conversed with; and surely to describe
that which is more known by that which is less,
is to run counter to the usual and rational mode
of conveying information. Unless, therefore, the angel, or Daniel, who reports his words, directly intended to darken the prophecy by a doubtful description of what otherwise is well ascertained, he would have avoided so enigmatical a form of expression. Dr. Blaney's rendering, "the Prince that shall come shall destroy the people," does indeed steer clear of this objection; but it is liable to others, as has been before shewn. Besides, although it may readily be admitted, that ἄγαν in the singular number, standing by itself, is rarely, if ever, applied to any people, except the Jews, yet it should seem here to require the emphatic ἄγαν.

Farther, it is remarkable, that in the 26th verse neither the LXX nor Theodotion render ἀγαν by its proper correspondent term, Χρῖστος, but by χρίσμα, while the former render ἀνήνωγη by μετὰ τοῦ χρίσματος, and the latter, in the same sense doubtless, by συν τῷ ἡσύχῳ τῷ ἐφόσον. This rejection of the word Messiah in a place, where the word is actually expressed, and the admission of it in another, where it is not expressed, demand our attention. The latter proves indeed, that they considered Him to be unquestionably the person meant by the leader to come; and were determined at all events to adhere to that application of the phrase; but the latter shews
with equal plainness, that they thought it impossible, at least very unlikely, that he should be described as leader with a difference in the description, which would betoken different persons, in passages so near together. Hence doubtless it came to pass, that, rather than translate according to a phraseology, which they deemed so highly objectionable, they preferred to depart from the sacred text, and to render מָשְׁלָם, as if they had read מַשָּׁלָם; conceiving perhaps, however confusedly, that it might have some reference to the anointing of the holy of holies*. On the other hand, the Vulgate version, rendering מַשָּׁלָם by CHRISTUS, has rendered the other three words by populus cum duce venturo, but in such connexion, that, I think, no one, using that version only, would ever apprehend Messiah and the future leader to be the same person. I therefore claim these three versions, together with the Arabic, which is formed from Theodotion's, our authorized English translation, and all others that consent to it, in considering Titus to be the leader to come, as witnesses against the identification of Messiah with that leader. The Syriac version is still stronger

* It is however to be observed, that both Theodotion and the LXX are careful to preserve the excision of Messiah, though they thrust it out of its proper place.
against it than any of the foregoing; for having faithfully rendered, "Messiah shall be slain," the author proceeds, "and the holy city shall be destroyed with the king that cometh." Certainly he could not mean that Messiah was to be slain twice; consequently he could not suppose Messiah to be the king that cometh. So decisive is the testimony of the ancient, and of most modern versions against the confounding of Messiah with the leader to come.

The principal argument, on which both Dr. Blaney and Mr. Faber depend, is drawn from the use of the word סֵאָב, which being joined with פרָים, is supposed to be a description applicable to the Messiah alone. I have in another place contended for the appropriation of similar forms of expression to the Messiah; but then it is in cases where they are used absolutely, or with a pronoun of the first person, or with other words expressive either of some divine person, or of some extraordinary and highly exalted mode of coming. But I am not aware, that such a form is elsewhere found connected with פרָים, nor do I think that the specific term סֵאָב is any where in the old testament applied to our Lord Christ. In itself the word may, without the least impro-

* Commentary on Zechariah, p. 110.
priety and irreverence, be applied to any person, whose coming is intended, or expected, as it is in Daniel, xi. 16, where, if Mr. Faber's numerous citations can prove the point, for which they are adduced, it ought to be attributed to Messiah, though that would be contrary to the plain sense of the passage and destructive of all interpretation. But in truth few of Mr. Faber's citations in his eighth position lend him any effectual aid; for in the greater part of them the word come in various forms is used, not as a name, or a title of office, but merely as expressive of an act. Nor is it surprising that they should fail, for so little care does Mr. Faber seem to have applied in the selection of them, that in three, out of six, from the old testament, the word in question does not appear in the original Hebrew. Those from Matthew, xi. 3, Luke, vii. 19, 20, Hebrews, x. 37, are indeed to the purpose, but neither these nor others equally, if not directly, in point,

*I cannot help suspecting, that the new testament phrase, ὁ ερχόμενος, absolutely used, though adopted from the old testament, may have been more usually employed by the Jews in speaking of the expected Messiah, in order that they might avoid the jealousy of the Romans, which would have been provoked by adding βασίλευς, or any equivalent word. When excited by the hope, that their king would immediately assume his sceptre, they brake out into plainer language. ὢσαννα εὐλογημένος ὁ ερχόμενος εἰς ονοματι Κυριου, ὁ βασιλεύς το Ισραηλ. John, xii. 13,
as Psalm xl. 7, Zechariah, ii. 10, Hebrews, x. 7, avail to prove, that the word, when not used in a more striking application, in a more absolute sense, or with more decisive adjuncts, than it is here, must necessarily be referred to Messiah.

Lastly, the application of the description of the leader that cometh, to Messiah, rests in a great measure on the mistranslation given by Dr. Blaney and Mr. Faber of the word נער in the 26th verse; for it is difficult to see with what propriety He could be so described, whose cutting off is the subject of the words immediately preceding. Would he not more suitably have been described, as נגיד נוער, the leader who is to be cut off?

X. The 27th verse is not progressive in the prophetic history of the SEVENTY WEEKS, but merely supplementary thereto.

The first announcement of the term to Daniel limits it to the duration of the Jews and Jerusalem as a collective people and a defenced city; and to be consistent with the prophecy, it must of course expire upon the destruction of the city and polity of that people. Now their destruction is fully predicted in the 26th verse, in which, moreover, the end of the seventy weeks is distinctly declared to be attained. The 27th con-
sequently cannot be progressive in the prophetic history of the weeks, but merely supplemental to it. Now a supplement in general is found to answer one of three purposes. 1. It is intended to supply something that has been omitted, unintentionally and from want of care, which in a case of inspiration cannot be supposed; or purposely, because it could not, conformably with the intention of the writer, be introduced in its proper place, or because the introduction of it would interrupt the course of his argument or narrative. 2. To explain something that has been left doubtful, and in the case of a narrative to add some circumstance, which, though not necessary to the main facts of the history, may be material to elucidate the bearing and application of some part. 3. To superadd something which is over and above the main purpose and avowed end of the matter treated of. Such is plainly the case with the 27th verse. It consists of three clauses; the first of these gives some account of a week, which, although comprehended within the seventy, was omitted in the regular course of the prophecy. The second relates an additional circumstance concerning the desolation of Jerusalem; viz. that the destroyer shall be on the border of abominations. The third superadds to the prophecy of the seventy weeks a
declared, that the desolator himself shall at length be consumed, and that then the determined sentence of the divine justice will have been poured out.

XI. The week in the supplementary verse is not the last week of the term of seventy weeks, nor yet a week superadded to them, but comprehended among them.

It has been shewn before*, that the covenant mentioned in the 27th verse ought to be understood, not of a new covenant never made or heard of before, but of one previously subsisting, at least promised and well known to those whom it might concern. This is sufficiently indicated by what is expressed concerning it, that Messiah will confirm it, or make it firm, to many. The people and the city of the Jews are certainly the main subjects of the prophecy; and since nothing is added to express nations, or any persons, with whom God or Messiah had not made any covenant before, it must be understood of the covenant made with the Jews generally, though it is said to be confirmed only to a part of them, to many individuals among them. Why so, will be seen hereafter. At present it is necessary only to observe, that the covenant is certainly a beneficial one, and that the act of Messiah in confirming

* Chapter 2, page, 96.
it is an act of the highest goodness and favour. The week then, which is the subject of this position, and during which, it is declared, that the covenant shall be confirmed, cannot be one, in which that covenant is evidently shewn to be already expired or dissolved. Now it is predicted, that at the close of the seventy weeks, and consequently in the last week, Jerusalem shall be destroyed, both "the city and the sanctuary, together with the leader that cometh," and that until the end of the term war and desolation shall overrun the land. But such calamitous events, the consequences and symptoms of divine wrath proceeding to the uttermost against a guilty people, plainly suppose the previous expiration or dissolution of the covenant of favour and blessing. Wherefore the week of the covenant confirmed cannot be the last week of the term. Neither is it superadded thereto, as an enlargement of the term. For the prophecy, as before mentioned, being given in answer to Daniel's prayer, and therefore relating wholly to Jerusalem and the Jews; and the end of both, and consequently of the seventy weeks, having been predicted in the foregoing verse, if this week were considered as appended to it or an extension of it, it would be to acknowledge the existence of that, whose existence is already deter-
minded. Therefore I say this insulated week cannot be exterior to the term, and consequently must be comprehended within it.

XII. The use of that particular week is to announce, that Messiah, after shewing himself as leader, will really act as such for a certain term, and reign to the benefit of his peculiar people the Jews.

It has been proved above, that the week of the covenant confirmed is comprehended within the term of seventy weeks. Therefore it must have a proper place therein; and not only ought that place to be found and assigned to it, but the cause of its being set in its present position ought to be discovered and produced. It is remarkable, that the angel having in the 25th verse introduced Messiah as leader to his people and holy city, passes on all at once in the 26th verse to speak of his excision, without the least notice of the duration of his leadership, or of any thing done in it or connected with it. This might lead the reader to expect, that Messiah would be cut off as soon as introduced, without having performed any signal act, and so without having manifested himself worthy of the high expectations raised by the prophetic declarations concerning him, during his life on earth. For it is evident, that if he were really destined to exercise
any powers of government, or to perform any illustrious act, the proper place for the prediction of such events is after his introduction as leader, and before the mention of his death. Now, this supplemental week is calculated to prevent the erroneous and unworthy suppositions, that might arise from a total silence in that respect, since it is here declared, that Messiah will confirm the covenant. For the confirmation of the covenant is a business intimately connected with Messiah's government, a business of highest consequence and dignity, importing, not merely a single act, but a course of illustrious actions, fraught with advantages and blessings to his peculiar people, and may therefore, with the greatest propriety, be considered as a summary of all the benefits, that his coming and his reign were intended to effect for them. These it was the less needful to enumerate in detail, as they are briefly stated in the six particulars of glad tidings contained in the 24th verse. Seeing then that this supplemental clause exactly fits and fills up the deficiency, otherwise so unaccountable, in the main body of the prophecy, we may safely conclude, that it was really intended so to do. One important piece of information however is added, that the period, for which Messiah would confirm the covenant and offer its blessings to his people, should be
limited to one week, or seven years, which week would be divided into two equal parts, distinguished by a very authoritative act of his in annulling the law of sacrifice and meat-offering.

XIII. Sufficient reasons may be assigned for separating the aforesaid week from the seventy, and for placing it, as it is found, in a supplement.

From what has been said in the last position it appears, that the week of the covenant confirmed must in the event occupy the interval, or some part of it, between Messiah’s coming and his excision, and consequently its proper place in the prophecy would be between the 25th and 26th verses. Why then is it not found in its proper place? Why does not this summary, brief as it is, of Messiah’s acts occupy in the prediction a position correspondent to that, which it must have occupied in the event, instead of being relegated to a supplement, as if it were only a collateral or subordinate branch of the prediction? The arrangement seems at first sight to be framed with such a studious contempt of method, that it can be attributed to nothing else, but a settled purpose in the author to involve the prophecy in the greatest possible obscurity. But although this really is, in no inconsiderable degree, the consequence of it, yet doubtless it was not resorted to
without some reason, that, if discoverable, would satisfy the enquiring mind, as to its propriety and fitness, perhaps even its necessity. For,

1. If the week had been found in its natural and proper place, we should have expected, unless restrained by particular directions to the contrary, directions which it might on various accounts be improper to give, that the confirmation of the covenant would immediately succeed the appearance of Messiah as leader; or rather, that the act of taking upon him that character would be in fact nothing else but the commencement of the work of confirmation. But the separation of these two things in the angel’s discourse has a direct tendency to check any such expectation; and consequently to prevent surprise, if they should be found not less separated in the event. We do not indeed attribute to such an intimation the force of a direct prediction; but if facts do actually come to pass in conformity with it, if we learn by the history of Messiah’s life, that he distinctly shewed himself as leader at an earlier period, than that, in which he took upon him the office of confirming the covenant; then we at least perceive, sound and satisfactory, and little less than compulsory reasons for taking the week of the covenant confirmed out of its regular place, and setting it
where previously one could little have expected to find a subject so directly in the course of the prophetic history. For by thus insulating, as it were, that week, the connexion between it and Messiah's first act of leadership is broken off; and therefore his great work of confirming the covenant may occur long posterior to his first appearance, as leader, not only without detracting in any degree from the credit of the prophecy, but rather exhibiting it in exacter accomplishment.

2. Another effect of shutting up the week of the covenant confirmed in a supplement, and at the same time another reason for so doing, is to lead us to a suspicion, that there may be some remarkable difference subsisting between that week and the rest of the seventy. If it be found hereafter, that the insulated week is not an integral one of the seventy*, but a compounded one, taken out of two integral and adjacent weeks, it will differ in a remarkable manner from the other weeks, and we shall then see good reason for a different treatment of it. For upon the supposition, that the supplemental week is thus compounded out of two others, it is evident, that the prediction of it could not have been introduced

* By an integral week of the seventy I mean one of those units, into which the whole term is divisible by the number seventy. The units consist of seven years each, but they are units in respect to the term and to each other.
in its proper place, but at the expense of many more words, in order to express the separation of the parts from the two weeks and the recomposition of those parts into a third one, than suited the brevity of the rest of the prophecy; nor, as it should seem, without entering into a farther disclosure of events to come and fixing the date of Messiah's excision with greater exactness, than was necessary for the information of Daniel and consistent with the due maintenance of that veil, by which the divine wisdom has seen fit to cover things future, while they so remain, from mortal view. Hence it was even necessary to resort to some mode of intimating a difference between the week of the covenant confirmed and the integral weeks, and of affording sufficient grounds to proceed upon in instituting an enquiry and conducting it to a satisfactory result. This has been sufficiently accomplished by insulating the week in the remarkable manner exhibited by the prophecy, which first presents a difficulty, that stimulates the student to attempt its solution, and at the same time affords him a clue to the discovery of the truth.

9. A third effect produced by the irregular collocation of the week of the covenant confirmed, and thence we may probably conclude, another reason for it, is to prevent the scriptural student
from supposing the seven weeks, the sixty two weeks, and the one week to be all component parts of the seventy weeks. It happens that the numbers seven, sixty two, and one, added together, make the sum of seventy; whence it might be supposed, as indeed it has commonly been*, and strenuously argued too, in spite of the difficulties thence ensuing, that all those numbers are only inferior and subject terms carved out of the principal one. It may be safely allowed, that the coincidence of the greater term with the amount of the three smaller ones affords at first sight ground for a probable presumption, that they are designed to answer to one another, as a whole and its parts. The coincidence however may be only accidental, and should have been proved to be intentional, before so much stress had been laid upon it. But the intention being assumed, it follows, that the prophecy must be interpreted, so as to place these terms in regular succession; and that it must be shewn to be accomplished in a series of events corresponding

* See Prideaux's Connexion, pt. 1, b. 5, p. 414. 8vo. Mr. Faber also, p. 163, insists, that the supplemental week must be the last of the seventy, because of the many marvellous exploits, that may be performed, if the seven, sixty two, and one weeks be not taken as component parts of the seventy and in strict continuity of succession. It has however been proved before that the seven weeks are not a component part of, but anterior to, the seventy.
It is in the vain endeavour to find such an order of events, that interpreters have been driven to alter or corrupt the sacred text, to falsify the translation, and to play sundry tricks with chronology both technical and historical; whereas a little attention to the irregular introduction of the single week would have effectually prevented such attempts. For why, it would then have been asked, if it be indeed the intention of the prophetic spirit to represent the three minor terms as component parts of the principal one, succeeding in regular order, seven, sixty two, and one; why is not the last of the three plainly determined to its proper events? No events included in the principal term, of which this is the last week, can be supposed posterior to those, which are predicted in the 26th verse; why then is this week, during which they must occur, instead of being introduced together with them, not only separated from them, but connected with the mention of other, and quite different facts? Surely, if it had been intended to represent the three shorter terms, as component and consequently successive portions of the greater, the celestial messenger would have carefully refrained from such a treatment of the last, as would have the effect of throwing doubt on that very circumstance of the prophecy, which,
by the supposition, is intended to afford the main clue to its interpretation.

If indeed it could be proved, that some important matter is contained in this clause, which nearly appertains to the occurrences described in the 26th verse, as taking place at the end of the seventy weeks and consequently in the last week of that term, but of which the mention could not be conveniently introduced there, we might accept it as a reasonable, and even satisfactory, solution of the difficulty. But the truth is, as it has been shewn before in the eleventh position, that the business of the insulated week and that of the last part of the term cannot take place at the same period, but are absolutely inconsistent with each other. Hence it is certain, that the week of the covenant confirmed cannot be taken for the last week of the seventy; and then the supposition, that the seventy weeks are intentionally divided into seven, sixty two, and one, must be abandoned. For since the supplementary week is not the last of the seventy, it must be one either of the seven or of the sixty two; but then we are not able to count more than sixty nine weeks; and so the number seventy will not be divided into its component parts. In conclusion, it may be observed, as a corollary, that the continuous succession of seven, sixty two, and
one, as component parts of seventy, forms the chief argument for making the term of seven weeks the first portion of the seventy; but that has now fallen to the ground, wherefore there is little, if any thing, left to be opposed to the arrangement of the seven weeks according to the sixth position.

XIV. The word *until*, in the 25th verse, cannot be understood to refer to Messiah's birth, but to the period, when he first acted, or shewed himself, as leader.

According to the usual translation, "until Messiah the Prince, or leader," the word *until* might be supposed to refer merely and generally to his coming; and that might be interpreted of various periods of his life, as it has actually been, with respect to Christ, of his birth, of the preaching of his precursor John the Baptist, of his personal entrance on the duties of his office, and even of his death. But according to the rendering settled above, "until Messiah shall be leader," the point, to which the word refers, is more precisely determined. As such a phrase could not be used to denote a man's death, so neither could it his birth. A leader is properly one who goes before others, by his precedence pointing out and marking the path in which they are to follow him. Hence it is used metaphorically of
princes and rulers, who by a common phrase in
the Hebrew scriptures are said "to come in and
go out before" their people. So in 2 Samuel,
v. 2, the Israelites seeking David at Hebron and
proposing to make him their king, assert his fit-
ness for the office to have been previously mani-
fested by his leading them out and bringing them
home in the days of Saul. The Hebrew word
occurs in numerous passages of the old testament,
but it never, so far as I am aware, denotes
merely a person having a rightful claim to author-
ity, but always one engaged in the exercise of it.
The word then of itself, by virtue of its etymo-
logy and by constant application, is incapable of
being applied to one, who does not actually dis-
charge, as well as of right possess, the office of
a leader. There may be a baby king, but a baby
leader can hardly be. Hence it is evident, that
the expression until Messiah shall be leader can-
not without violence be applied to his nativity or
state of infancy, or to any period short of that,
in which he first appeared as leader, or at least
in some marked way shewed himself qualified to
act in that capacity. Moreover, not only the
word leader, but the form of the phrase, until he
shall be, seem to denote the actual exercise of
leadership. That exercise, it is true, may in the
event turn out to be only initiatory, only by way
of specimen or prelude, but it must be actual, and calculated to shew the requisite qualifications to be really possessed by the person claiming, or intitled to act as leader; so that if the words had been, "until Messiah shall be King," they could not properly have been understood of his birth, although he might be "born King of the Jews," de jure, but only of some period when he appeared and acted, or shewed himself qualified to act as King, de facto. Hence it appears, that Messiah's assumption of the leadership might consistently with the prediction take place either at a comparatively early, or at a late period of his life; whether of the two could be ascertained by the event alone. The only thing certain beforehand is, that the point of time denoted by the word until, is so fixed and limited thereby, that it cannot be moved onward to any period posterior to the first occasion, on which Messiah might act, or shew himself, as leader of his people.

XV. The word after, in the 26th verse, must be taken, not for immediately after, but with a latitude, so as to comprehend all the remainder of the term of seventy weeks from the sixty second week.

That Messiah was appointed to come into the world to effect some great, sacred, and highly
interesting purpose in the course of his leadership, is too evident to be a subject of discussion. But the period of that leadership must be fixed to a time of life, when a man may be esteemed qualified to enter upon the discharge of its duties; and then a sufficient space must be allowed for the exercise and fulfilment of such an extraordinary and exalted office. Hence it is obvious, that if the expression, until Messiah shall be leader, had been intended to mark his birth, then his excision could not take place, till long after the expiration of the sixty second week, by which time, supposing him to have come at the very moment of its commencement, he could hardly have attained the age of seven years. But unless the position last laid down had been well understood and generally admitted, which probably was not the case, it could not have been known, before the event had fixed the meaning of the prediction, that the word "until" did not refer to the period of Messiah's birth, and therefore the word after was not probably for several hundred years taken in the sense of immediately after, but with a latitude extending a great way into the remaining weeks of the term. Consequently, in the opinions of those who so understood it, the Hebrew word was not restricted to the signification of immediately after. The same reason exists for
allowing a proportionate latitude to the same word, if the word *until* in the foregoing verse had been supposed to specify, not the period of Messiah's assuming his leadership in all the fulness and extent of the office, but some special occasion during his youth or early life, in which he might be prematurely exhibited to his people acting as their leader, long before the time appointed for fully entering upon the laborious and arduous exercise of his sacred function. Even in the third case, on the supposition, that "until" were meant to specify the time, when Messiah should begin to fulfil to the uttermost the duties of his leadership, unless it could be satisfactorily made out, that this would take place at or towards the beginning of the sixty second week, we may contend upon similar grounds, that a latitude must be given to the word "after." For if Messiah were not to come until towards the close of the week, such a strict interpretation of the word, as is contended for by some writers, would not allow a space by any means adequate to the manifestation of his many excellent qualities and high deserts, and especially not to the founding, raising, establishing, and extending such a dominion and government as his was predicted and always expected to be. But before the event, it could not be certainly known, whether Messiah were to
come at the commencement or at the close of the week, and therefore in this, as in either of the cases before mentioned, every man, who read the prophecy, before its meaning were decided by its accomplishment, must necessarily have taken the word “after” in a latitude wide enough to comprehend several years.

On the other hand, Mr. Faber* contends very earnestly for limiting the signification of *after* in the strictest sense to *immediately after*, arguing, that to admit the indefinite sense would "destroy that precision of phraseology necessary to render any language certainly intelligible. Were we to say," he continues, "that Charles the second succeeded to the throne after his father's death, we should not, it is true, speak an absolute falsehood; but who does not perceive, that we should express ourselves with such a strange degree of inaccuracy as no language can tolerate; who does not perceive, that in this sense of the word *after* we might say with equal truth, that the third George reigned *after* the first Charles?"

The instances seem to be unhappily selected in support of the argument. According to the law of England, Charles the second did succeed to the throne after, yea immediately upon, his father's death; and in the chronological tables of

* Dissertation, p. 149—152.
the kings and queens of England, he is often found to follow his father without any notice of the interregnum. In such instances the word has reference, not to the historical facts, that followed the death of Charles the first, but merely to the proximate succession of lawful sovereigns; and accordingly when used in this manner, it really does bear the sense of next, or immediately after, a sense which Mr. Faber ought to have contended for, instead of adjudicating from it in this instance. The other example, by which that learned writer would expose the absurdity of understanding the word after with latitude, is of a different kind. The reader can hardly have failed to observe, that Mr. Faber has made a very considerable change in the terms of his proposition. The question is not, whether, it may be said, that the third George succeeded to the throne after the first Charles, but whether it may be said, that the third George reigned after the first Charles. The former question of the two certainly cannot be answered in the affirmative, for the proposition, if it were ever made, would plainly relate to proximate succession, and consequently would be false. But the latter question has regard to mere priority; and therefore, supposing, that at this time such a question could, as hereafter it may, occur, there would be
nothing intolerable, nothing inaccurate in saying, that the former reigned after the latter. Other instances will shew this plainly. Is there any thing to be blamed in saying, that the era of Nabonassar began after the era of the olympiads; or that the foundation of Rome took place after that of Solomon's temple? The propositions are equally correct in expression, as true in fact. It appears then, that in cases where proximate succession is the subject of discourse, the meaning of the word *after* must be the same as *next following*, or *immediately after*, but in those where mere priority is concerned, the memory and mention of intermediate circumstances are often dropped, and the word is applied indefinitely, or with latitude. In furtherance of his own opinion Mr. Faber refers to Mr. Marshall's Treatise on the seventy weeks, as containing "unanswerable arguments" in favour of the limited meaning of *after*. To me they do not appear so very convincing. They are three. The first depends entirely upon the correctness of Mr. Marshall's opinion, that "until Messiah" truly signifies, until the sufferings of Messiah; an opinion, which I apprehend most readers will consider to be as untenable as any that could well be advanced, and which is sufficiently exposed and confuted by Mr. Faber himself. I therefore do
not feel myself called upon to dwell upon it. His third, in like manner, rests upon Mr. Marshall's own arrangement of the parts of the prophecy, which must fall to the ground, if the positions I have maintained be admitted, and with which Mr. Faber is almost as much at variance, as I am. His second argument then is the only one, to which I find it necessary to pay particular attention. In this he contends, "that the plain and natural sense of the word after in the ordinary or common acceptation of it doth in no wise admit of such extended sense." But it is to little purpose to argue from the plain sense and ordinary acceptation of a word in the Hebrew scriptures, unless it can be proved to have that sense in those scriptures. This Mr. Marshall felt, and accordingly he proceeds to adduce his instances. These however are only three, and of these not one is to the purpose. Of the first, from 2 Samuel, xiii. 23, it is remarkable, that although the word after be read in the English translation, the word in question, the proper Hebrew word for after, is not found in the original. It may therefore be dismissed without more words. The two others are taken from the new testament, and consequently are not properly brought to decide the exact meaning of an Hebrew word. I freely admit however, that many
instances from the Hebrew scriptures may be brought forward, in which the word after is applied to events that took place soon, or next, or immediately, after the facts mentioned as preceding. But this concession, however liberal, is plainly insufficient to the support of Mr. Marshall's argument; for if evidence of the opposite usage can be produced, if it can be proved from the old testament, that the original word is used in an extended and indefinite sense, then Mr. Marshall's instances and even all the better ones, that might have been brought forward, go for nothing. For such evidence Mr. Marshall calls, and denies the possibility of producing such instances. With what reason he expresses himself with so much confidence will appear from the following citations. In the fifth and in the eleventh chapters of Genesis the word יְרָם is used many times in an extended sense to express the whole time, which elapsed from the birth of the first son of the patriarchs there mentioned, till their deaths. To these instances however, and others of a like nature, it will be objected, and that with reason, that although the time denoted by after is extended, yet that it begins immediately from the specified period of the birth of the patriarch's first born; whereas it is necessary for the support of my arguments to produce
instances of the word being applied to an event, which does not take place immediately or soon after the preceding period of time, from which it is dated, but in a considerable space of time, or a good while after. It is so used in Genesis, xviii. 12, "after I am waxed old shall I have pleasure?" For the subject of discourse there, being a general question concerning the possibility of the fact announced, the future tense, \textit{shall I have pleasure?} is aoristical and may with the greatest propriety be rendered, \textit{can I}? Consequently the word \textit{after} is not determined to a period immediately succeeding the present moment, or the time when it first "ceased to be with Sarah after the manner of women," but is applicable to any time posterior to her becoming old. So again in Genesis, xxiv. 36, Sarah "bare to my master a son, \textit{when}" (literally, according to the Hebrew, \textit{after}) "she was old;" but certainly not immediately after she so became; for she had been old for some years, as plainly appears by her own question before mentioned, and by Abraham’s doubts expressed in xvii. 17: \textit{After} is also used indefinitely in Genesis, xxii. 20, where the phrase, "after these things," may possibly indeed apply to a time shortly or immediately after; but there is not the least necessity for so understanding them; and in all probability
they ought not to be so understood. Again in Deut. xxxi. 27, 29, "after my death" does not signify immediately, or the next day*, after, but generally, in the times succeeding that event, and is applicable to many instances of Israelish defection for hundreds of years after. In the same manner, in Joshua, xxiv. 20, "after he hath done you good," does not date the opposite act of God's hurting and consuming the Israelites instantly from the time of his doing them good, but indefinitely, at any time after; and accordingly the threat is applicable to many times and many events recorded in the history of Israel. In Judges, x. 1, "after Abimelech," is applied to an event, which, according to the chronology of our English bibles, did not take place till twenty three years after; and if that chronology be questionable, yet we may thence learn in what sense its learned compilers took the word after. In Jeremiah, iii. 7, "I said, after she had done all this," the word does not signify immediately after, for the instantaneousness of the succession is plainly not the thing intended; but the mere circumstance of posteriority, as much as to say,

* That would not be true, as we learn from Joshua, xxiv. 31, where Israel is related to have "served the Lord all the days of Joshua and all the days of the elders, that oversawed Joshua, and which had known all the works of the Lord, that he had done for Israel."
notwithstanding all these provocations had been given. In Joel, ii. 28, the word is used indefinitely, and with the following word is rendered by our translators, “afterwards.” The times, from which the prediction is dated, were perhaps at a short distance, but the event, predicted to take place after them, did not come to pass for eight hundred years, being interpreted by St. Peter, in Acts, ii. 17, of the effusion of the Holy Ghost at the day of Pentecost. There are many places also, in which the word after is used indefinitely, without regarding whether the interval be long or short, and with the following one is rendered by our English translators, “after this,” and “after these things.” Of this use of the word instances will be found in Genesis, xlviii. 1, Joshua, xxiv. 29, 2 Samuel, viii. 1, 1 Chron. xx. 4, 2 Chron. xxiv. 4, xxxv. 20, and other places. I have not by any means made an anxious or extensive search for the instances above adduced; and indeed had it not been for the respect justly due to such men as Mr. Faber and Mr. Marshall, the question might have been dismissed more briefly by observing, that when the Hebrew writers mean carefully to determine the exact point of time, so as to express the sense ascribed to this passage of the prophet Daniel, that of immediately or next after, they use
a different word from that, which is here employed, a word, which, though it may be in some passages rendered *after* by our English translators, they have generally rendered, *at the end of.* Thus in Genesis, viii. 6, we read, "and it came to pass *at the end of* forty days;" and again in xli. 1, "and it came to pass *at the end of* two full years;" so in Exodus, xii. 41, "and it came to pass *at the end of* the four hundred and thirty years, even the self same day it came to pass;" and in Deuteronomy, ix. 11, "and it came to pass *at the end of* forty days and forty nights;" and again in xiv. 28, "*at the end of* three years thou shalt bring." The same we find in Isaiah, xxiii. 15, 17, "*after* the end of seventy years;" also in Jeremiah, xxxiv. 14, "*at the end of* seven years ye shall let go;" and in Ezekiel, xxix. 13, "*at the end of* forty years I will gather." The same Hebrew word is rendered *after* in our English version of the following passages; Genesis, xvi. 3, "*after* Abraham had dwelt ten years," literally, *at the end of* ten years to Abraham's dwelling; Numbers, xiii. 25, "and they returned from the searching of the land *after* forty days," literally, *at the end of* forty days; 2 Samuel, xv.

* The word is יָכָה, as in the preceding instances, though our translators have in these two verses rendered it, "*after the end.*"
SEVENTY WEEKS OF DANIEL.

7, "and it came to pass after forty years," literally, at the end of; and Jeremiah, xlii. 7, "and it came to pass after ten days," literally, at the end of; and perhaps in some other places. These instances are sufficiently numerous and plain to shew the practice of the Hebrew writers, when they meant to date an event immediately after the occurrence of another; whence it is a fair and almost certain conclusion, that if Daniel had intended here to specify a time immediately succeeding the sixty second week, he would have written, not after, but at the end of the sixty two weeks.

Lastly, it is to be observed, that the whole ground of Mr. Marshall's argument is formed upon the supposition, that it is the design of the prophecy to assign the specific date of Messiah's death. But this I sincerely believe to be a mistake. The sixty second week is clearly fixed for the period of his coming, which was the great thing to be ascertained; even in respect to that, it was not specified, whether it had regard to his birth, or to some early manifestation, or to his entrance on the immediate exercise of his office; so that a doubt was permitted, and probably intended, to hang over that which was most decidedly fixed. His death was indeed the principal point of all; but since it was certainly not
the first in order, the date of any prior fact relating to him and mentioned in the prophecy might with propriety be settled before it; and since especially the date fixed for his coming, could not be determined till after the event, it was of the less importance to settle the exact period of any thing concerning him, which, being successive to it, must be in some measure dependant upon it. The excision of Messiah is therefore no otherwise dated, than by being mentioned in connexion with those other events, destined to take place between the end of the sixty second week and that of the whole term; and none of these is determined to any particular part of the seventy weeks, or distinguished by any more precise note of time, than the one common to them all, that they occurred within the last eight weeks of the seventy.

This general comprehension of the last eight weeks under the word after is also more agreeable to the proper meaning*, as well as the common use, of the word in the Hebrew tongue, than the more determinate sense ascribed to it by Mr. Marshall and Mr. Faber. Accordingly it is to be observed, that the four clauses, which in this verse follow the cutting off of Messiah, are connected therewith by the copulative Vau,
SEVENTY WEEKS OF DANIEL.

whereby they are all comprehended under one general description as predictive of the things, that are to take place in the remainder of the term, after the sixty two weeks; but, being in their nature successive, they cannot be supposed to come to pass, all at once, or immediately after the expiration of those weeks.
CHAPTER IV.

Of the Interpretation of the Prophecy, with proofs of its accomplishment.

I am now arrived at the last, and that, which will be found, I trust, the most useful, as well as the most important, part of my labours; to erect upon the text, which on examination has been found to be the true one, upon the translation, which by many proofs and high authorities has been shewn to be the correct one; and upon the preliminary positions, which have been collected and laid down, not without considerable search and pains, for the very purpose of regulating and controuling this portion of the work, to erect, I say, a reasonable, clear, and consistent interpretation of the prophecy, though without pretending to absolute certainty, or a freedom from the possibility of objection, and to authenticate the same, as I proceed, by historical proofs of the accomplishment of the predictions accordingly.
Since the ensuing chapter extends itself over the whole prophecy, comprehending several determined periods of time, and the prediction of many specific and highly important events to be arranged accordingly; since, moreover, it will be found necessary to enter into various digressions of a critical and discursive nature and of considerable length, whereby the reader, unless very attentive, may be in danger of losing sight of the main subject, or at least of entangling and confusing himself amid a variety of incidental disquisitions, it has been thought, not only conducive, but really necessary, to perspicuity and convenience, to divide it into portions conformable to the periods and to the events predicted. The reader will therefore find it distributed under six sections; of which the first relates to the main term of the seventy weeks; the second, to the six particulars; the third, to the term of seven weeks; the fourth, to the predictions of Messiah's excision and the destruction of Jerusalem; the fifth, to the supplemental week, or week of the covenant confirmed; and the sixth, to the remaining part of the prophecy.
CHAPTER IV.

SECTION I.

Of the beginning and end of the Seventy Weeks.

24. Seventy weeks are the determined period, or, as our English version, entirely to the same purpose, are determined, upon thy people and upon thy holy city.

That the weeks of this prophecy are weeks, not of days, but of years, seven years to each week, according to the analogy of proper weeks, has been sufficiently, though briefly, proved in the second preliminary position laid down in the third chapter, so that it would be wholly superfluous to enter upon the subject in this place. The product of seventy multiplied by seven is four hundred and ninety. Such is the term of years announced by the angel to Daniel, as impending over his beloved countrymen and his desired Jerusalem; and these have been proved
to be years properly so called, or solar years, such as were in use among the Jews of old, and have ever been among all nations in their longer computations of time.

The true measure of the seventy weeks being thus understood, the term itself must be deemed to take its beginning, according to the third preliminary position, from the period, when Jerusalem was fully rebuilt in its proper character as a defended city, and reinhabited by the Jewish people, serving God and living together according to the rites of worship and the civil laws ordained by Moses, then reestablished in their proper force and efficacy. For the prophecy does not regard merely the literal or material city of Jerusalem, its walls and bulwarks, its streets and houses, but includes the figurative city, the inhabitants, with their government, laws, and religious ordinances. These are all to be taken together according to the express declaration of the angel; seventy years are the determined period upon thy people as well as upon thy holy city. Again, the term of seventy weeks must be considered to have reached its end at whatever time the city and its inhabitants ceased to be in that state; that is to say, whenever the city should be destroyed, the temple demolished, and its religious services abolished; whenever
the civil government should be dissolved and the people scattered, so that things should have returned to the same state as they were in, when Daniel put up his petition for their restoration. Now such a reestablishment of Jerusalem and of the Jewish polity therein is not like a single fact, of which the date is capable of being precisely defined, but consists in the series, as well as assemblage, of a great number of events successively and gradually brought to pass; and among these it would be a matter of extreme hazard to fix upon that crowning one, by which the restoration of the city, with its ecclesiastical and civil polity, was consummated. Hence it must have been little else than impossible to say, in what precise year the term had its beginning, until its expiration enabled men to understand the mind of the prophetic spirit.

Farther still; Jerusalem, with its people, its government, and its holy things, might have come to an end by the slow process of a gradual decline, they might have perished of mere exhaustion; and if such had been the fact, then it would not have been easy to determine even the exact point of time, when the term could with certainty be said to have expired. But the work of destruction is for the most part more rapid and more strongly marked than that of formation.
accretion, and restoration; and for that general reason alone we might justly expect to find the end of the seventy weeks capable of being ascertained with far greater precision and facility than the beginning, as well as because, according to the prophecy, it ought to have occurred almost five hundred years nearer our own times, and at a period, when history throws a far brighter and steadier light upon the transactions of the nations, in which the Jews were concerned, than in the remoter ages of the Persian monarchy. Hence it is evidently the more reasonable way of proceeding to take an inverted course, and having fixed the date of the expiration of the predicted term of weeks, to reckon backward by an easy computation to its commencement.

In the present instance the point of termination is one of the most conspicuous events in the records of time, and it took place with the force and suddenness of a single blow. Jerusalem was all at once destroyed, the temple was burnt, the forms of its religious services were abolished, the frame of government dissolved, and the people scattered abroad; so that the literal and the figurative city sank together in a common ruin. These events took place in the month of September, in the year of our Lord 70, according to the
vulgar era. Here then we find the seventy weeks terminated, and hence consequently must their beginning be reckoned by a retrograde calculation to a point of four hundred and ninety years distant from it, that is to say, to the year B. C. 420. Then, if ever, we shall find the instant of time, when the holy city of Daniel in a restored state corresponded to his expectations and its own name*; when it was not only a city of habitations, but a defenced and fortified city; when the temple worship, the priesthood, and the whole polity of the Jews, both civil and ecclesiastical, were thoroughly reformed and resettled.

From a brief examination of the scripture history it will appear, that this state of things cannot with any sufficient or probable reason be dated before the year above mentioned, and that at that period it had actually taken place. Although Cyrus in the first year of his reign, or B. C. 536, gave the Jews permission and encouragement

* Jerusalem signifies the inheritance of peace, tranquillity, or security. The signification of the name seems to be alluded to in the Apocryphal book of Baruch, iv. 29, 30, "He that hath brought these plagues upon you, shall bring you everlasting joy again with your salvation. Take a good heart, O Jerusalem, for he that gave thee that name will comfort thee." So probably in the new testament, where the new Jerusalem, or Jerusalem which is above, is celebrated, the etymology of the word is alluded to.
to return to their country and to rebuild the temple, and therefore doubtless to erect for themselves habitations sufficient to accommodate the builders and such of the expatriated citizens, as might think proper to revisit the seats of their forefathers, yet the language of his decree is far from manifesting any intention to restore Jerusalem to its former condition for strength and splendour. Nor were the numbers, who returned, by any means adequate to so grand an undertaking. The foundations of the temple indeed were laid in a short time after, but the progress even of that edifice, though particularly provided for by the decree of Cyrus and recognized by him as a duty, was soon obstructed and at length totally stopped by the envy and malice of the neighbouring people, and by their perfidious artifices operating on the jealousy of the Persian court. On the accession of Darius Hystaspides that jealousy seems to have been laid asleep for a while, and the pious labour might have been immediately resumed without fear or danger. But the spirits of the builders flagged and drooped, when they compared their present weak and low condition with the magnitude of a work, which rather befitted the royal opulence of David or Solomon; especially when they beheld the open and defenceless state of their city,
where the erection of a splendid building would be little else than an invitation to hostile attacks, and when they could discern either about or within themselves so little hope of future improvement. By the exertions however of Zerubbabel and Joshua, roused and aided by the earnest exhortations, the rebukes, and lofty promises of the prophets Haggai and Zechariah, the Jews were excited to new endeavours. In the divine oracles delivered by those prophets, an especial regard was had to the present circumstances and feelings of their brethren. By the vision of the angel with the measuring line*, they were encouraged to hope, that Jerusalem would be restored in "its length and its breadth," and by the express declaration, that God himself would be "a wall of fire round about it" they were assured, that they might proceed in safety to build an house for the habitation of his glory. Reanimated by that high affiance, the people returned with such alacrity to the sacred work, that the temple was completed and dedicated in the seventh year of the reign of Darius, and the twenty second from the return of the exiles to their native country. But the courage and constancy of the Jews seem to have been exhausted by that effort. For not only did Jerusalem continue to lie in ruins, but

* Zechariah, ii. 1, 2, 5.
the people remained in a weak and pitiable condition, "in great affliction and reproach;" their civil polity was much disorganized, and the law of Moses was openly exposed to violation in some of its most important enactments. Ezra, during the thirteen years of his administration, did all that could be done by abilities, piety, and zeal, armed too with the powers of government, toward the reformation of religion, of religious worship and discipline, of morals and civil subordination. But he seems to have been deficient in revenues; probably also in other necessary means to achieve the resuscitation of a dejected and degraded people. Indeed the melancholy aspect and defenceless condition of Jerusalem were of themselves most powerful obstacles to its own revival; and these Ezra had not obtained permission nor possessed the power to remove*. So late as the thirteenth year of his government the walls and gates of the city were described to Nehemiah, as remaining nearly in

* Ezra, in ix. 9, speaks of the Kings of Persia as giving the Jews "a wall in Judah and Jerusalem." But the word is used in a general and metaphorical sense for a defence against the hostile designs and attempts of the neighbouring people. This is manifest from his making the wall include Judah as well as Jerusalem. For what could the "wall in Judah" be, but political safety and protection; such as was afforded by the ample powers given to Ezra in his commission, as recited vii. 25, 26? This Prideaux, who cites the passage, acknowledges, part I, page 413.
the state, in which they were left by the Babylonians at the time of its destruction; and lying thus exposed and open to the incursions of its hostile neighbours, as it could not afford security and comfort to its inhabitants, so neither did it offer encouragement to the dispersed of Judah to return to the home of their fathers. This picture of the desolate scene, that surrounded and enveloped his paternal city, and the place of his fathers' sepulchres, struck upon the soul of the patriotic Nehemiah with a force that impelled him to sacrifice ease, pleasure, and every flattering prospect in the court of Persia, and to encounter hardship, fatigue, and danger, for the sake of visiting his native country, and making a vigorous attempt towards its complete revival and renovation. Accordingly he took advantage of the credit, influence, and opportunity, which his high post of king's cup-bearer gave him with Artaxerxes; and prudently contriving to bring forward his petition in the most forcible, but least intrusive manner, and on a favourable occasion, he readily obtained from that monarch permission and authority, together with an allowance of sufficient means, to visit Jerusalem, to rebuild the city, to fortify it with walls and gates, to erect a palace for himself, and to act as governor with a fullness of power, that seems to have
been, so far as we can judge by its exercise and effects, for he has not given us any copy or even extract of his commission, little short of absolute, over every department of the state.

This took place in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes and in the year B.C. 445. It is however extremely improbable, that Nehemiah was indebted for the successful issue of his petition, solely or even principally, to his personal credit and interest with the king, though that might be supported and enforced by the favour, the wishes, and even the intreaties of Esther, who had then been queen about seventeen years. Indeed the personal favour of Nehemiah with Artaxerxes was itself a strong argument against a prayer, which must on that account have been contrary to the inclinations and almost offensive to the feelings of the king. But the whole difficulty did not rest there. The principal matter of Nehemiah's petition was opposite to the ruling maxims of the Persian government; it had been generally avoided or refused by the former sovereigns; it was contrary to the interested views of a strong party in the royal councils; and when actually taken in hand at a former period, it had been forcibly suppressed in consequence of an edict issued by Artaxerxes himself in the beginning of his reign. Yet under all these disadvan-
tages, it not only prevailed, but prevailed, as we collect from the narrative, without undergoing any opposition; probably without serious discussion or deliberation. There plainly appears to have been no room for such dilatory measures; for Nehemiah took occasion to bring the matter before the king in the month Nisan, and we find that he had performed his journey, fixed his measures, made his preparations, and actually finished the wall of Jerusalem, a work of fifty two days, by the twenty fifth of Elul, in the same year, the interval being a space of only five months. Now Ezra, as he himself informs us, was four months in performing the journey from Persia to Jerusalem; but allowing, that Nehemiah by greater expedition performed it in two, or even somewhat less, yet if we add that time to the fifty two days and to those which he necessarily spent at Jerusalem, before he could enter upon the work of rebuilding the wall, we find that no time will be left for the repeated and protracted consultations, that might be expected to take place on a measure, which was opposed by all the influence of settled habits and court intrigue.

It would be extremely difficult to account for this hurried mode of proceeding, as well as for the promptitude, and even suddenness, with
which Artaxerxes himself consented to a proposal so little agreeable to his own feelings, if happily we were not able to assign a strong political motive, sufficient, not only to overcome the personal repugnance of the king, the cautious hesitation of his ministers, and the crafty opposition of those counsellors, who had leagued themselves with the enemies of the Jews, but even to make them all heartily concurring in granting Nehemiah’s request. About four years before this time the forces of Artaxerxes, both by sea and land, had sustained a signal and almost ruinous overthrow by the Athenians under the command of Cimon, who afterwards proceeded to form the siege of Salamis in the island of Cyprus. Dispirited by so formidable a defeat, recollecting too the difficulty, which he had encountered several years before in suppressing the revolt of Inarus in Egypt, when assisted by that enterprising people, and alarmed for the fate of Salamis and Cyprus, the great king in the year following submitted to make an ignominious peace with the Greeks. By the terms of the treaty it was stipulated*; 1. That all the Grecian cities throughout Asia should be subject only to their own laws and institutes. 2. That the satraps or provincial governors of the Persians should not

come nearer than the distance of a three days' journey to the sea-coasts. 3. That no ship of war should sail between Phaselis, a town in Pamphylia on the southern coast of Asia Minor, and the Cyanean rocks on the northern coast at the mouth of the Euxine. "Thus," as Mr. Howes remarks*, "were the Persians cut off from the whole coast of Asia Minor at least, both sea and land, and the extensive phrase of ad mare seems to extend even to the coast of Palestine also with respect to the restraint of any Persian prefect's approach. In this state of things, since it does not appear, whether the Persians were even permitted to keep garrisons along the coast of Palestine, a friendly and fortified town in the heart of that country, at more than three days' journey from the coast, such as Jerusalem, would be necessary to preserve a communication with Egypt, and in any case useful." But this motive, however powerful in itself, did not immediately produce the effect attributed to it; and if ancient historians had informed us, that the question was instantly entertained and discussed, we should probably find, that much suspicion existed as to the fidelity of the Jews, and great difficulty as to the choice of the person to whose hands the government of Judea should be com-

mitted. But the undecided counsels of the Persian cabinet received a mighty impulse by the revolt of Megabyzus* in Syria, in the issue of which two Persian armies of the first magnitude were defeated with great slaughter, and which, instead of being suppressed by the royal forces, was brought to a close by an accommodation with the rebellious prefect. The facility, with which the Syrians were induced to join Megabyzus, was a proof, that principles of revolt were at work among them, which needed only incitement and opportunity to shew themselves in acts of rebellion; and the politic Greeks were at hand with crafty counsels, victorious fleets, and troops of superior discipline, to plan, encourage, and aid them. The fears and anxieties hence arising were in full force and operation, when Nehemiah presented his petition, and to these, when added to the motives before mentioned, we may, with a probability amounting almost to certainty, attribute the readiness, with which it was granted and the total silence of all opposition in respect to it. The opportunity, equally seasonable and unexpected, which then presented itself, could not require, would hardly admit of deliberation;

an opportunity which offered to the king such a city, as Jerusalem, directly between the two doubtful provinces of Syria and Egypt, strongly situated by nature, and easily capable of being fortified, attached by gratitude to the Persian interest, and placed under the government of so prudent, so active, and so faithful a servant as Artaxerxes had experienced in Nehemiah.

Moreover, it is evident, that as soon as permission was given, and the necessary edict made out and signed, Nehemiah was at once ready and fully prepared to take advantage of the favourable moment. This is meant; not so much in regard to his personal equipment, as to the important affairs of his fortune and household. But a considerable space of time must be allowed for Nehemiah to put himself in such a state of preparation. His fortune, as it subsequently appears, was truly of princely amount, and his household doubtless corresponded thereto and to the magnificent spirit of the owner. Now, on breaking up his splendid establishment, a man of Nehemiah's disposition and feelings would find it incumbent on him to provide for the consequences it would have on the many persons, who were supported by it; and this alone must have occupied both thought and time. More especially in the arrangement of his vast property much
precaution must have been necessary. The greater the degree of prudence, regularity, and dexterity, that he may have personally applied to his affairs, the greater difficulty would there be in supplying the vacancy occasioned by his long absence in a distant country. It is plain, that for making the necessary settlements, for appointing trusty accouptants, stewards, and superintendents, with sufficient but not dangerous powers, for devising and determining the safest and readiest modes of remitting the revenues of his estates, and perhaps the emoluments of his office, which he might still hold and execute by deputy, several months must have been required. Accordingly we find, that four months did actually elapse between the time, when Nehemiah received from his kinsman the affecting intelligence of the state of Jerusalem, and that of preferring his petition to the king; and we may, for the reasons above given, conclude with great probability, that this long delay was not made, merely that he might take advantage of the molitia tempora fandi, (for in the office which Nehemiah held and in the degree of favour in which he stood, such opportunities must often have presented themselves,) but that he might avail himself of the interval in making all those necessary dispositions, so that when he had once obtained
the desired permission and powers, he might have nothing left to detain him. But it can hardly be supposed, that Nehemiah would have given himself all these pains and trouble upon the prospect of a merely possible contingency, the success of a petition, which depended solely on his personal favour with the monarch, when that very favour, as he well knew, was likely to be the principal obstacle to his obtaining it. Doubtless then he had good reason for believing, that his suit would meet with a ready acquiescence; and what other reason can we so well imagine, or what better desire, than his knowledge of the affairs of the Persian empire, as they stood with respect to Greece, to Asia Minor, to Syria, to Palestine, and to Egypt, which he clearly perceived would induce the politic part at least of the royal council (some of whom too, as he doubtless well knew, would be glad enough of such a fair occasion to promote and accelerate the departure of a powerful favourite) to comply with and even studiously further his petition? The only apprehensions then of a refusal, which he is likely to have entertained, arose from the kind partiality and friendship, if I may speak of friendship in relation to a despotic monarch, of Artaxerxes; but these, it appears, were overcome, as Nehemiah foresaw, though not by his solici-
tations, yet by the king's own sense of royal duty and his view of the political interests of his empire. Thus under the superintendence of God's providence, the mutable affairs of the world and the political relations of distant nations were made to conspire in bringing about the accomplishment of his will concerning his people, as revealed by his servants the prophets.

Nehemiah being arrived at Jerusalem, kept his commission and his intention a profound secret for the first three days; during the successive nights of which, as it seems, he took the opportunity, without being liable to suspicion or observation, of making such a survey, as the moonlight perhaps might afford him, of the state of the city. He found, as it had been reported to him, that the gates had been burnt, and had never been renewed, and the walls broken down, not perhaps entirely throughout their whole circuit and to the foundations, but in so many places and to such an extent, that the city of his fathers lay before him an undefenced, unwalled town; and in some parts the heaps of rubbish yet unremoved were such, as effectually to obstruct the passage of the beast he rode*. The patriotic governor, having satisfied himself as to the condition of Jerusalem, assembled

* Nehemiah, ii. 13, 14.
the rulers and principal persons, opened to them his commission, briefly laid before them the state of the city, and exhorted them to join him, in setting about the rebuilding and repairing of its walls and gates without loss of time; that the work might at least be begun and in some degree carried on, before their hostile neighbours could be sufficiently prepared to offer them any serious molestation. His proposal was met with zeal and alacrity by the Jewish leaders and by the people in general; and with so much spirit and industry did they address themselves to the labour, that, notwithstanding the malicious ridicule, which their adversaries threw upon their efforts, and although they were obliged to stand on their defence, and even to work with their arms ready for use against the threatened and apprehended attacks of their foes, the whole wall was completed in the short space of fifty two days. As this was the first, so perhaps was it the most beneficial act of Nehemiah’s administration; at least it was the foundation, on which all the succeeding benefits of it were built. For thereby the reproach was turned away from the Jews. Jerusalem now resumed its pristine and proper character, as a defenced city; and being in a condition to afford a secure and peaceful abode to its inhabitants, it immediately rose to be in
reality, what before it was only in name and pretension, the metropolis of Judea, the seat of government. We are informed in the eleventh chapter, that "the rulers of the people dwelt there;" and we are told too, that "the rest of the people also cast lots, to bring one of ten to dwell in Jerusalem, the holy city, and nine parts to dwell in other cities." No doubt this measure was brought about, though he does not expressly so inform us, by the persuasion and exhortation of Nehemiah himself, and not perhaps without some gentle exertion of his authority. But besides this tenth, there plainly appears to have been a considerable influx of voluntary citizens; for we read in the next words, that "the people blessed all the men, that willingly offered themselves to dwell at Jerusalem." The disinterested and pious governor lived there himself upon his own private fortune in a state of almost royal hospitality and splendour; and there is every reason to believe, that many of the dispersed Jews, not only allured by the revered and sacred name of Jerusalem, but encouraged by the safety and plenty, which it was now capable of affording, and by the justice and liberality of its administration, gradually and successively returned to the city of their ancestors and continually augmented its population, power, and wealth;
so that in no long time after Herodotus* could compare it to Sardis, the rich and splendid capital of Asia Minor.

During the whole term of his government, Nehemiah laboured hard in conjunction with Ezra, so long as he lived†, to reform the many abuses and corruptions, both in ecclesiastical and civil affairs, that had insinuated themselves into the newly restored and unsettled state of things, and growing up with them had acquired the force of customs, through the weakness of preceding governors, the corruption of the priesthood and nobility, and the ignorance and wilfulness of the people. The effects produced by his great talents, and by the zeal, the vigour, and the laborious industry, with which he exerted them to the glory of God and the good of his country, are

* Thalia. c. 5. There can be no question, but that by Cadytis the historian means Jerusalem. See also Josephus contra Apionem, lib. 1, c. 22; and the remark of Prideaux, part 1, b. 6, p. 529.

† The bible contains no account of the decease of Ezra, and the Jewish writers stretch out his days to a very improbable extent. His name is not amongst those of the persons, who signed and sealed the solemn covenant in the 9th chapter of Nehemiah; and the omission, as it should seem, cannot be well accounted for, but on the supposition that he was then dead. He is mentioned indeed in the 12th chapter as assisting in the feast of the dedication of the wall; but that festival, though related after, must from its nature have been prior to the covenant.
manifested by the extraordinary solemnity, ritual punctuality, and magnificence, with which he kept the feast of tabernacles, and which, as he informs us, exceeded any thing of the kind that had been known since the ancient days of Joshua the son of Nun. The same appears from the description of the pompous and joyful festival, in which he celebrated the dedication of the city walls, from the awful and impressive act of general confession and penitence, which he relates at length in the ninth chapter, and from the solemn and sacred covenant ratified by oath, into which he prevailed with the people to enter, and which was sealed by Nehemiah himself, the priests, the Levites, and the chiefs of the people, in the name of the whole. The articles of the covenant were:

1. In general, to keep the whole law of Moses.
2. To refuse all intermarriages with the people of the land.
3. To keep holy the sabbath day.
4. To observe the sabbatical year, especially by forbearing the exaction of debts.
5. To pay the third part of a shekel each person for the service of the temple.
6. To offer the first fruits of their ground, of their fruit trees, of their sons, and of their cattle, yearly in the house of God.
7. To pay tithes to the Levites, which were to be put under the care of the priests and brought into the chambers of the temple allotted for their reception.
At this period of Nehemiah's administration, when the wall and its gates were erected and completed, when Jerusalem was in a considerable measure rebuilt and reinhabited, the people brought under submission to the law of Moses, and the worship of God renewed in its ancient purity and lustre according to the Levitical institutions, it may be thought, that the city and people of Daniel were already restored to a state, that would sufficiently answer to the prophet's desires and expectations, and that hence, therefore, the seventy weeks ought to date their commencement. But perhaps the "street and the lane," even the external and material parts of the city, were not yet so fully rebuilt, as to answer to the intention of the divine oracle; and it is quite certain, with respect to the figurative city, the people, the government, and the laws, that this state of things was fairer and firmer in appearance, than in reality, for we shall soon arrive at a period, when the Jews were relapsing with a careless and fearless precipitancy into the open and flagrant violation of that particular precept of the divine law, which their ancestors had never transgressed without introducing idolatry as its natural consequence, which they themselves under Ezra had expressly and solemnly engaged to observe, and which of late, at the
persuasion and by the authority of Nehemiah, they had bound themselves under the sanctions of a covenant upon oath, signed and sealed in the name of the whole people, particularly and inviolably to maintain and obey. In other matters also of greater or less importance intolerable abuses took place; and had they not been providentially put an end to, by the second coming and authoritative interposition of Nehemiah, it might have been a long while indeed before Jerusalem and its inhabitants had answered to the prayers and expectations of Daniel. The complete restoration therefore of the people and city, and of course the commencement of the seventy weeks, must be postponed and assigned to a better and surer state of things, than that which had hitherto taken place.

The twelve years, to which the term of Nehemiah's government was limited, being expired, he quitted Jerusalem and returned to the court of Shushan agreeably to his engagement with the king. From the terms however of the king's question in ii. 6, "how long shall thy journey be, and when wilt thou return?" and from Nehemiah's expression, "so I set him a time," it has been conjectured, that his first leave of absence was short; that when it was expired he returned to court; but that he quickly obtained another leave; and that so for the space of twelve
years, during which his administration lasted, he several times went and returned to and from Jerusalem. But this supposition seems hardly reconcilable with the matter of Nehemiah's petition; for he specifies the rebuilding of the city, as the principal object he had in view, an undertaking surely of no sudden effort, but requiring long continued, patient, persevering labour, as well as diligent attention and prompt decision. Besides, is it likely, that he should notice in his history his intention of building himself a palace*, or that he should even have entertained the thought of it at his first mention of the subject to the king, unless he had intended to request and had actually obtained leave of absence for some years at least? It is possible indeed, that the time originally settled with the king may not have been so long as twelve years; and that it may have been prolonged to that extent, in consequence of one or more repeated petitions. But of this we have no information or even hint. On the contrary, it is evident from the terms of Nehemiah's declaration in v. 14, that he continued without any intermission to act as governor for twelve years; whence the greater probability is, that no less than twelve years was the time that

* "And for the house that I shall enter into." Nehemiah, ii. 8.
he originally set the king. "Moreover," saith he, "from the time, that I was appointed to be their governor in the land of Judah, from the twentieth year even to the two and thirtieth year of Artaxerxes the king, that is twelve years, I and my brethren have not eaten the bread of the governor." These words plainly indicate one continued and uninterrupted course of administration, and afford not the least ground for the supposition of repeated journeys to and fro between Persia and Jerusalem. Again in xiii. 6, he observes, "but in all this time was not I at Jerusalem; for in the two and thirtieth year of Artaxerxes king of Babylon came I unto the king." Now since he came from Artaxerxes to Jerusalem in the twentieth year of that monarch's reign, and here speaks of returning to him in the thirty second; and farther, since he specifies his absence from Jerusalem to have been that interval, which elapsed between his return to Artaxerxes and his final return to Jerusalem, without the least notice or hint of any other, it is reasonable to believe, that he continued all the twelve years in his native country; and the supposition of any other absence occasioned by any prior return to the Persian court, seems almost to go the length of contradicting his own account. The conclusions drawn from both the above cited
passages are too probable and consistent to be set aside by alleging the appointment, mentioned in vii. 2, of Hanani and Hananiah to the charge over Jerusalem. Their appointment was not to the office of vice-governors or even of sub-governors. It plainly extended no farther, than to the care of the gates and watches of the city, and was as necessary during Nehemiah's presence there, as in his absence. The reason assigned for the charge at once points out its nature and limits its extent. It was given, because* "the city was large and great; but the people were few therein and the houses were not builded." Whence also it is plain, that those persons were appointed to their post, not during any supposable absence of Nehemiah, but immediately on the completion of the walls and gates of the city. There is therefore no sufficient reason for believing, that Nehemiah often encountered the toil and hazard of the long journey from Jerusalem to Shushan and back; or that during twelve years Judea was ever bereft of the benefit of his personal care and superintendence.

At the expiration then of the twelve years, to which his government was limited, and not

* The Vau at the beginning of the fourth verse, should have been rendered for, instead of now, since it evidently introduces the reason for setting the watches and keeping the gates closely barred from evening till morning.
before, Nehemiah returned to the Persian court. How long a time ought to be allowed for his residence there before his second visit to Jerusalem and second government, is a matter of some uncertainty and debate. His own expression, "after certain days," or "at the end of days," is altogether vague and indefinite; but it is perfectly allowable, or I should rather say, necessary, to take the word days in the sense of years, a sense in which it is often used, as every reader knows, in holy writ. Our English translation indeed, agreeing with archbishop Usher, places his return to Jerusalem in the same year as his journey to Persia; but this is much too soon, considering the length of time he had been absent, and the variety and importance of the business, that must have laid upon his hands in passing and settling the accounts of his government, probably also in overcoming or allaying the enmity, removing the jealousy, conciliating and confirming the favour and good offices of the courtiers who surrounded the royal throne, and even in revising and arranging his own private affairs, which during his long absence may well have fallen into some degree of disorder. The great extent of his property has been noticed before, and may be fairly estimated by the magnificence of his expenditure as governor of
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Judea*, all of which, as we are informed by himself, was supplied out of his private funds, without touching any part of the royal allowance, the whole of which he seems to have given up to public uses. The conclusive settlement, and perhaps sale, of so vast an estate, with all that was necessary to be done preparatory to his final departure from the court of Shushan, must necessarily have occupied a considerable space of time. Farther, if we consider the favour in which he was held by Artaxerxes, and the pleasure, which the king is likely to have expressed at seeing so faithful, so able, and so beloved a servant, after so long absence, and the difficulty and dread with which he was oppressed, before he could venture to open his wishes to him on the former occasion, it will appear very unlikely, that Nehemiah would think of giving a hint to his royal master of any wish or intention to quit his side again, and that in all probability, considering the king's age, for the last time, till after the lapse of a much longer period than a few months.

Accordingly we find, that it was not till after any treaty, as the word in the original Hebrew plainly expresses, and probably not till after earnest entreaty†, that he obtained permission to return.

* See v. 17, 18.
† Our English translators have rendered the word, "ear-
to Jerusalem and resume his government there. Lastly, so short an absence, as Usher and our bible chronology allow, would not have afforded opportunity and time for the introduction and growth of such grievous disorders and gross abuses as Nehemiah found, both in the civil and ecclesiastical affairs of Judea, on revisiting that country. Time must be allowed for the gradual abatement of that commanding and subduing influence, which such a character as Nehemiah's must have left on the minds of all, who were near him or subject to him; for the opinion and the hope to be formed and to prevail, that his return to Jerusalem was unlikely, at least far distant; for the dismissal or removal of those trusty persons, whom he doubtless left in charge; and for the rise, and increase, and confirmation of that profligate audacity, which overleaped the bounds, not only of decorum, but of fixed institutions, sacred laws, solemn, holy, sealed covenants, and even disregarded and despised the admonitions and rebukes, which the prophet Malachi addressed to those children of Belial in the name of their offended God. Influenced by this last consideration, Dean Prideaux has placed Nehemiah's return to Jerusalem about five years neatly requested " in the margin. The verb is in Niphal, in which form it has the sense of the Latin *impetra*. 
after his journey to Persia, in the year B.C. 428; but Dr. Hales thinking, that even five years would not allow sufficient time for corruption to take root and extend itself so far as it appears to have done, places it four years later, in the year B.C. 424. Perhaps the former may seem as little as can be, and the latter more than may need to be, required for the purpose assigned. But a very strong, and, as it seems to me, decisive argument in favour of the longer period is to be collected from xiii. 23, 24, where Nehemiah informs us, that "in those days," that is to say, on his return from Persia, "he saw Jews that had married wives of Ashdod, of Ammon, and of Moab; and their children spake half in the speech of Ashdod, and could not speak in the Jews' language, but according to the language of each people." Now before Nehemiah went from Jerusalem to the court of Artaxerxes no such violation of the divine precept was known to have taken place. His absence consequently must have been of sufficient duration, not only, as before mentioned, for the relaxation of authority and discipline, and for the development and increase of irreligion and audacity in a degree sufficient to encourage such open transgressors to shew their faces, but afterwards also for the birth and growth of those half-foreign chil-
dren*, until they were able to speak the language of their mothers, while they had not learned the Hebrew tongue†. It is evident from the mode of expression, that examples of this sort were not few in number; but many such could hardly have shewn themselves in less than seven or eight years. Therefore it is hardly possible, that Nehemiah's absence could have been of shorter duration; and we may consequently date his return in the year B. C. 424.

It was not without lively indignation and grief, that Nehemiah on his return perceived the scandals, abuses, and corruptions, which had taken root and grown up in his absence. These he states in his thirteenth chapter in a list of six particulars; 1. That Eliashib the priest, to whose

* If it should be alleged that the conclusion here drawn does not certainly follow from the premises, because the children may have been born to parents, who after their birth came to reside in Jerusalem and brought their foreign wives and families with them, the objection will be sufficiently answered by observing, that the words of the sacred historian will not admit of that evasion; for he does not say one word of those Jews coming to dwell at Jerusalem, but that they had married, or rather caused to dwell, wives of the foreign nations; that is to say, being resident in the city they brought home those wives thither.

† The meaning of Nehemiah seems to be, that half, that is, a considerable part of the children spake the language of their mothers only, and that none of them had learned to speak Hebrew in its purity, but expressed themselves in a corrupt jargon, formed by an intermixture of the dialects of their foreign parents respectively.
trust were committed the chambers of the temple, at least those, in which the sacred vessels, with various sorts of offerings and tithes, ought to have been deposited, had betrayed his trust, and being in alliance with Tobiah the Ammonite, the implacable enemy of Nehemiah and of the Jews, had converted them into an apartment, or set of apartments, for his friend Tobiah's use. 2. That in order to this he had removed from the consecrated place the things that ought to have been stored up there, or at least had prevented them from being brought in at all, so that either waste or spoliation was committed on the furniture and property of the house of God. The account of this profanation and sacrilege is given in verses 4—8. 3. That the lawful portion of the Levites and singers being shamefully abstracted or refused, they were obliged to betake themselves to agriculture for their own support. This enormous abuse is related in verse 10. 4. That the sanctity of the sabbath was shamefully violated by openly labouring, buying, and selling on that day. The statement of the crime is given in verses 15 and 16. 5. That the Jews had without fear or scruple allowed themselves, and were allowed by their rulers, to contract unlawful wedlock with heathen women. This offence is stated in verses 23 and 24. 6. That even one of
the sons of Joiada, the son of Eliashib the high-priest, had married the daughter of Sanballat the Horonite. This foul stain upon the pontifical family is mentioned by itself in verse 28.

From this lamentable catalogue of transgressions and corruptions it is evident, that the reformation, which Nehemiah had wrought before his return to the Persian court, was incomplete, and without the direct and powerful interposition of his authority, would have been ineffectual; so that the city, at least in its figurative sense, the people, their government, laws, and religious ordinances were not then restored and reestablished in purity, and on solid and permanent foundations; and therefore, as before observed, we cannot thence date the commencement of the seventy weeks.

Nehemiah immediately directed his whole attention and authority, not only to restrain and remove, but effectually and fundamentally to reform and rectify these gross abuses, profanations, and impieties. He restored the apartment of Tobiah in the temple to its proper uses, and rejected, with evident symptoms of indignation and abhorrence, the furniture and property of the sacrilegious possessor. He returned their allotted portions to the Levites and singers, caused the tithes to be duly collected, appointed
proper officers to the superintendence of the storehouses, and thereby brought back the ministers of the temple, who had been compelled by want to quit the sacred service, to their stations and duties; he strictly forbad the profanation of the sabbath and appointed rules to preserve it from violation, either by Jews or foreigners. Lastly, he put a total and final stop to the practice of contracting unlawful marriages, especially by animadverting with just and impartial severity on that most conspicuous and disgraceful example, exhibited in the conduct of the high-priest's grandson; whom, upon his insolent refusal, we may reasonably believe, to put away his foreign wife, Nehemiah drove at once from his presence and from Jerusalem. Nehemiah does not appear to have found the task of reformation attended with danger or formidable difficulty. His absolute power and extensive influence, directed by talents and prudence, and exerted with vigour and zeal, quickly suppressed the offence and reformed or exterminated the offenders. Not that he was disposed to take severe measures or to make public examples, except in cases of necessity. Before he proceeded to the length of chastisement he was desirous to try the effect of exhortation and remonstrance; and in many instances they alone appear to have been effectual; nor
does it seem, that he experienced resistance or serious opposition from any quarter, except perhaps from the grandson of Eliashib, whose high birth and rank, together with his powerful foreign alliance, probably encouraged him in disobedience.

But though these measures were taken and entered upon with speed, and prosecuted with all convenient despatch, and although they were unencountered by any opposition sufficiently powerful or resolute to move or deter the zealous governor from his steady course, yet they could not have been carried into full effect but in a considerable lapse of time. While he was exhorting, reproving, chastising, or expelling offenders, he was busied in providing against the recurrence of the offence, removing the very ground of abuses, and laying the foundation of an improved administration of affairs both ecclesiastical and civil. Instructed by experience he would easily detect the causes of his former failure, and would find the means, either of eradicating them entirely or of preventing their evil operation in future; he would perceive and strengthen the weak points of the Jewish polity, and would be careful to ascertain the principles, abilities, and whole character of every man, to whom he committed any important charge. It is likely, that the whole
work would occupy and might be accomplished in four years. Less cannot well be allowed, and more does not seem to be required. But this interval exactly brings us to the point, which has been already settled by a retrograde calculation for the commencement of the seventy weeks, or the year B.C. 420. Then was the whole polity of the Jews both civil and ecclesiastical fully reformed and firmly reestablished; then Jerusalem, both as to the literal and the figurative city, was completely rebuilt and refurnished.

The one grand point of the reformation, which Nehemiah undertook and accomplished on his return to Jerusalem, was the determined reestablishment on a permanent basis of that important part of the Mosaic law, which forbade the matrimonial alliances of Jews with foreign nations. The evil consequences of such affinities were then sufficiently conspicuous not to need any arguments from human nature or examples from history to point them out. The children of those marriages being brought up from childhood with their mothers, being seldom, if ever, taught the language of Judah, but learning only or chiefly their maternal heathenish dialects, became naturally inclined to the society of strangers, were rendered easily susceptible of their notions and habits, and drawn over by degrees to
their interests and their religion. It is to be attributed to the mere effect of foreign connexion, that an apartment or set of chambers in the temple itself was sacrilegiously alienated from its proper uses and given for a lodging to Tobiah the Ammonite; and even the profanation of the sabbath may in its origin with great probability be traced to the same cause; for we find, that the sale of provisions and wares on that day was principally carried on, and is likely to have been originally introduced by those strangers*, who took up their abode at Jerusalem, and who, not being bound in conscience to keep the day, enticed and encouraged the Jews to profane it against their consciences. Enfeebled and thwarted by rulers, by priests, and by people entangled in foreign alliances, a governor, who had not possessed the extensive powers, the wealth, and commanding influence, as well as the piety, decision and activity, of Nehemiah, would hardly have had the spirit, and still less the means, to suppress those grievances and prevent their repetition. On the other hand, under a pliant or a careless administration, with those enormous encroachments already made on religion and religious ordinances, it would not have been a work of time and difficulty to mingle a portion of the

* Nehemiah, xiii. 16–21, x. 31.
heathen forms and ceremonies among those of the Jewish ritual, and thence, by quick yet unfelt degrees, to connect, as the Jews of former times had done, the worship of idols with the service of Jehovah; so that if Nehemiah's return had been a little longer delayed, he might have been obliged to add the abomination of idolatry to his list of transgressions. Until this root of bitterness was completely eradicated and prevented from springing up to bear its poisonous fruit, the figurative city of Jerusalem could not be said to be fully restored and reformed, and therefore the seventy weeks could not commence. But by the zeal, courage, and firmness of Nehemiah, armed with his power and means, an end was put to the evil. Where religion and the law of God were concerned, he paid little respect to persons and stations. As he had severely reprehended the meaner Jews, and in the warmth of his just resentment had proceeded to such extremities, as even to smite them and pluck off their hair, so he would not spare the offending grandson of the high-priest himself. It has been observed before, that he allowed to all a reasonable time to bethink themselves of their disobedience and to make suitable arrangements before putting away their foreign wives, and probably it was not till their refusal was expressed in terms or manifested by
their obstinate conduct, that he expelled them from his government. Accordingly we are bound in all reason to believe, that it was only when the effects of such mild and merciful proceedings, attended by all the respect justly due to so important a member of the house of Aaron, and by the delay, which the dread of the scandal thence likely to fall upon the sacerdotal office, would authorize and require, had been tried without avail, and the son of Joiada had been found utterly impenitent and contumacious, that the just and resolute Tirshatha exerted his authority and forced him to fly from Jerusalem. "I chased him from me," is his indignant expression.

This is the last act, which Nehemiah has recorded, of his great work, in reforming the Jewish church and figurative city of Jerusalem; the few sentences that follow containing only a brief recapitulation of what he had achieved for the benefit of his country and the honour of God. If any thing highly important and conducive to those ends had taken place afterwards he would doubtless have recorded it in his narrative. We must therefore take this for the ultimate crowning event, by which the restoration of the people and city of Daniel was perfected, and from which consequently we must begin to reckon the seventy weeks. Why it was so deemed by Nehemiah
himself, and pointed to as such by the spirit of prophecy, may easily be collected from the historian of the Jewish antiquities*. For upon this young priest, whose name, as he informs us, was Manasseh, taking refuge with his father in law, that inveterate enemy of Nehemiah, in order to compensate him for his loss of the Jewish priesthood, and to attach him firmly to his daughter Nicaso, built a temple on mount Gerizim near the city of Samaria, where the apostate was invested with the office of high-priest. The temple, as to its size, plan, and furniture, and the services and ceremonies performed therein, as to their external manner and appearance, seem to have been constructed and ordained with a sufficient conformity to those at Jerusalem, to satisfy superficial observers, or persons willing to be deceived, that the worship was the same. Hereby priests, as well as other persons, who by their misdemeanors and irregularities had incurred ecclesiastical censures or chastisements at Jerusalem, but from pride or obstinacy refused submission to the just and legal penalties, were induced to fly to Samaria†, where they found, not only reception and protection, perhaps even favour and reward, from Sanballat and his son in law,

* Antiq. Jud. lib. 11, cap. 7 and 8.
† Josephus, Antiq. lib. 11, cap. 8.
but plausible means of reconciling their lax consciences to the guilt of apostacy. This must doubtless for a while have fomented a spirit of dissension, insubordination, and turbulence at Jerusalem; but at the same time it fostered and increased, among the sincere and zealous votaries of the law and the prophets, their former abhorrence of the hostile mongrel race, who now insulted their religion by a rival temple, a rival priesthood, and rival rites of worship. The rage of rivalry is for the most part fierce and obstinate, but this was embittered and inflamed, on the part of the Jews at least, by many peculiar aggravations and stinging recollections, which ripened it into a deadly quarrel, an implacable and unextinguishable feud. Thenceforth every sort of intercourse and connexion was utterly broken off, and if any intermarriage ever took place, the guilty Jew would be no longer permitted to contaminate his brethren by his presence, but be forced to seek shelter with the loathed and excommunicated Samaritans*. Thus does it appear, that the prevention of foreign marriages was the direct consequence, as it was also the grand object, of Nehemiah’s severe, but impartial dealing with Manasseh, whence the

* See Lightfoot on John, iv. 6, Works, vol. 1. pages 598—600.
principal opening to change and corruption being closed, the law of Moses was established in its full vigour and extent; and therefore that act is justly placed by the pious narrator in the last place, as the crowning event of his government, and is fixed by the spirit of prophecy for the date, from which we are to reckon the seventy weeks.

But it is a great question, whether the Sanballat mentioned by Nehemiah, be the same person as the governor of Samaria, bearing the same name, who is mentioned by Josephus. In maintaining the affirmative, we must necessarily believe the author of the Jewish antiquities to have committed an egregious error, either rashly or wilfully, in placing under Darius Codomannus what had taken place almost ninety years before under Darius Nothus. This, notwithstanding the high authorities to the contrary, is the only alternative, that can be rationally or easily maintained. To support the other, we must suppose, that two different persons, each named Sanballat, each governor of Samaria, each under a different king of Persia named Darius, had each a daughter, married to a son of the high-priest of the Jews; and that in each case the same consequences ensued. But such a train of coincidences is improbable to the extreme of incredibility, and cannot with any reason be admitted.
We shall moreover be the less disposed to shrink back from the imputation here thrown on the credit of the Jewish historian, if we consider, that he not only makes Sanballat build the temple of Gerizim in the short space of nine months, but at a time when in all probability he was absent from Samaria, and certainly, when his finances must have been drained to support the forces, with which he attended Alexander the great. Such inconsistencies in one instance may justly be brought to prove, that the charge of at least rashness in another is not unlikely to rest on substantial grounds. But other and equally remarkable inaccuracies occur in this part of the history of Josephus, which evince either a careless inattention to the authority of scripture, or a capricious, though not less audacious, departure from it, and justify the suspicion, that he may have admitted an error in the date of Manasseh's apostacy and the erection of Sanballat's temple, either from mere negligence, or from some motive, which, however void of guilt, still merits severe reprehension. For instance, he makes Nehemiah receive the melancholy account of Jerusalem, that so deeply affected him, not from his brother Hanani and his companions, but from certain

* See Prideaux's Connexion, part 1, page 435.
† Antiq. Jud. lib. 11, cap. 5.
unknown Jews, whom he accidentally overheard conversing in the Hebrew tongue. Then, instead of an interval of four months between the receipt of this intelligence and the preferring of his petition, he hurries Nehemiah instantly into the royal presence, according to his statement, unwashed as he was, to shew his sadness, to tell his story, and urge his prayer. Moreover, what is particularly applicable to the case before us, he gives a false date to the whole narrative, removing it from the twentieth year of Artaxerxes, which Nehemiah himself has fixed, to the twenty fifth of Xerxes, a prince whose whole reign consisted of no more than twenty one years. He also makes the building of the wall a work, not of fifty two days only, but of two years and four months, and then extends the reign of Xerxes three years farther than he had done before. We conclude therefore, that while the truth of the sacred history, the remarkable correspondence of particulars, and the probable consequences of the transactions related by Nehemiah, authorize and even constrain us to transfer the facts related by Josephus from the period, where he has placed them, to that, which the above mentioned considerations require, we may still give the Jewish historian full credit for the main facts themselves, rejecting only the circumstances,
which in the spirit of fiction he has interwoven with his erroneous date.

Dr. Hales* agrees with me in placing the expulsion of the grandson of Eliashib in the year B.C. 420, which, reckoning from the destruction of Jerusalem, he had fixed for the commencement of the seventy weeks, so that he also brings the computations backward and forward to perfect coincidence. It must however be confessed, that we cannot trace by the authority of scripture the last act of Nehemiah exactly to that year. But since it is evident from the expressions of his own narrative, that it must have taken place very near to that period; and since, from the zeal, the vigour, and courage of Nehemiah, we have reason to think, that the distance of four years from his return to Jerusalem cannot be too early, while from a consideration of the variety, the number, and importance of the affairs, that called for his attention, and of the allowances, that must be made for awaiting the effects of advice, argument, persuasion, remonstrance, and repeated menace upon the young man, the same period can hardly be too late; there is therefore an high probability, that it is the very point, at which the date of Manasseh's exile ought to be dated, and since the commencement of Daniel's

weeks, by a computation backward from their certain end, has been found to fall at the same point, who will deny, that in this instance history and prophecy not only interpret, but testify to one another?

Mr. Faber, however, and those who follow Dean Prideaux, place this last act of Nehemiah's reformation eleven years later, in the year B.C. 409. This computation allows no less than nineteen years for Nehemiah's labours preparatory to the completion of his work; a most improbable length of time, considering the political power with which he was armed, the influence which he derived from the generous expenditure of his princely fortune, his personal abilities, and the zeal, prudence, and diligence, with which he exerted them all in his good and great design. Besides, so long a period plainly bespeaks some serious opposition to his undertakings, which could be overcome only by slow and cautious measures, and therefore required the lapse of so great a number of years. But his narrative contains not the least trace of any such thing, as doubtless it would have done, had such things occurred; whence it ought to be concluded, that he proceeded for the most part without any formidable obstacle in the execution of his plans, and consequently that nineteen years could not be required for their completion.
The only argument of any efficacy, that is or can be alleged for this lower date of Nehemiah's second reformation, is drawn from the supposition, that he places the sin and punishment of the profane son of Joiada in the priesthood of his father, instead of his grandfather; and then, since Joiada did not succeed to the pontificate till the eleventh year of Darius Nothus, or B. C. 413, it is presumed, that the guilty act of his son may be conveniently fixed to about four years after. The words of the sacred historian are these; "and one of the sons of Joiada the son of Eliashib the high-priest, was son in law to Sanballat the Horonite." Now it is contended, that according to the idiom of the Hebrew language, the son of Eliashib is only part of Joiada's name, and that consequently the official addition of high-priest is placed in apposition therewith and not with the name of Eliashib, although that immediately precedes*. Admitting the occurrence of many passages; in which this idiom prevails, I must enter my protest against the establishment of an universal rule to be founded on it, and that upon the strength of the following exceptions. 1. In 1 Samuel, i. 1, we read as follows; "now there was a certain man of Ramathaim Zophim,

* Prideaux's Connexion, part 1, b. 6, p. 591; and Faber's Dissertation on the Seventy Weeks, p. 333.
of mount Ephraim, and his name was Elkanah, the son of Jeroham, the son of Elihu, the son of Tohu, the son of Zuph an Ephrathite.” Here, if the Hebrew idiom contended for universally prevailed, the description, “an Ephrathite,” must belong to Elkanah; but it is certain that he was not an Ephrathite, but a man of Ramathaim Zophim, a place in a different tribe; therefore the description must be intended not for him, but for his abavus Zuph, the person last mentioned; which destroys the supposed universality of the rule. 2. In Judges, i. 13, iii. 9, and Joshua, xv. 17, we read of “Othniel, the son of Kenaz the brother of Caleb;” yet certainly not Othniel, according to the proposed rule, but Kenaz, was the brother of Caleb: for that virtuous man would not have broken the Mosaic law by giving his daughter in marriage to his own brother. 3. In 2 Samuel, xiii. 3, we find it written, “and Amnon had a friend, whose name was Jonadab, the son of Shimeah David’s brother.” Now if the idiom be applied here, it will make Jonadab the brother of David, instead of Shimeah; yet it certainly appears from 1 Samuel, xvi. 9, and 1 Chronicles, ii. 13, though there be a slight variation in the orthography, that Shimeah, and not Jonadab, was the brother of David. 4. In 2 Samuel, xxi. 21, and again in
1 Chronicles, xx. 7, we read that when a giant defied Israel, "Jonathan, the son of Shimeah the brother of David, slew him." The remark made on the last example applies to this also. 5. In 2 Chronicles, xxiv. 26, we read, that the persons who conspired against Joash, were "Zabad, the son of Shimeath an Ammonitess, and Jehozabad, the son of Shimrith a Moabitess." Was Zabad an Ammonitess? Was Jehozabad a Moabitess? Yet these men must have been women, if the rule hold good here. 6. In 2 Chronicles, xxxv. 3, Josiah gives a command to the Levites; "put the holy ark in the house, which Solomon, the son of David king of Israel, did build." In the next verse he directs them to prepare themselves after their courses, "according to the writing of David king of Israel, and according to the writing of Solomon his son." In these latter words the title "king of Israel," being given to David in so marked and exclusive a manner, we may at least conclude reasonably, if we must not necessarily, that it is also intended to be applied to him in the former, where the alleged rule would give it to Solomon. 7. In Ezra, vii. 1—5, we find his genealogy given in detail as follows; "Ezra, the son of Seraiah, the son of Azariah;" and so forth, till we come to "the son of Eleazar, the son of Aaron the chief priest." Now accord-
ing to the Hebrew idiom alleged by Prideaux and his followers, Ezra must have been the chief priest; yet it is quite certain, that he never held that office; and therefore the official designation belongs to Aaron, the person last named, who stands there in the same circumstances as Elia-shib in the passage in question; so that the case is altogether a case in point. 8. In Jeremiah, xxxvi. 10, Baruch is said to have read the words of the prophet, "in the chamber of Gemariah, the son of Shaphan the scribe;" where the proposed rule would assign the office of "scribe" to Gemariah; yet Gemariah, though his name occurs in other places, is never called a scribe, whereas that description is often given to his father Shaphan, as may be seen in 2 Kings, xxii. 3, 8, 12, and 2 Chronicles, xxxiv. 18, 20. Whence we may fairly conclude, that the addition is intended for him, and not for Gemariah, in this place also. 9. In 1 Maccabees, i. 10, we read of "Antiochus Epiphanes, son of Antiochus the king," where the original Greek* evidently gives the royal title, not to the son, according to the alleged idiom, but to the father. In English it appears doubtful, and would have appeared so in Hebrew, had the book been written in that language. In like manner, there are many

* Αντίοχος Ἐπιφάνης, υἱὸς Αντίοχος βασιλέως.
passages in the Bible, where the application of the description is doubtful, as in Numbers, iii. 32*, "Eleazar the son of Aaron the priest;" and in Exodus, xxxviii. 21, with Numbers, iv. 28, "Ithamar the son of Aaron the priest;" so too in Zechariah, i. 1, 7, "Zechariah, the son of Berechiah, the son of Iddo the prophet;" where our translators, in opposition to the alleged rule, have pointed the passage so as to give the addition, "the prophet," not to Zechariah, but to Iddo his grandfather, and that with great probability, for Iddo also was a prophet. Now since these passages, as well as several more such, that may be found, are not decisive, and therefore cannot with fairness be adduced on either side, there will be almost, perhaps quite, as many texts to be cited in the number of exceptions, as may be brought to support the rule; for the occurrence of other additions after patronymics is not of such great frequency in scripture, as may previously to examination be supposed. The rule in question therefore has not any just pretension to be general, much less universal; and consequently the allegation of Mr. Faber is

* Here the LXX render contrary to the alleged rule, Ἐλεάζαρ ὁ γιος Ἀαρών τοῦ προφήτης; and so probably they would be found to do in the two next examples, if Ithamar being in the genitive case did not conceal their intention. In Zechariah they agree with the rule.
not correct, that "the idiom of the Hebrew language will not admit of such a construction as that, which would place the word high-priest in apposition with Eliashib."

Moreover, the strict application of the rule in this instance would prove too much for the purpose. For it is evident, that according to the rule, whatever the number of patronymics may be, the addition at the end must be put in apposition with the name of the person, to whom they all belong. Now in this instance the proper name of the person is indeed passed over, but he is said to be one, or a man, of the sons of Joiada, Ben Eliashib, and therefore, according to the rule alleged, if it hold good universally, the official addition, high-priest, must belong to him, and can no more be attributed to his father, than to his grandfather. Now Joiada succeeded his father and was himself succeeded by his son Jonathan after a pontificate of forty years duration. But I do not suppose it will be contended, that the unlawful marriage of his son took place so long as fifty four years after Nehemiah's return, that Manasseh was the same person as Jonathan, or that the zealous governor, if he lived so long, drove the high-priest himself into exile. Yet, unless these consequences be admitted, the rule cannot here hold good in its strictness.

* Faber's Dissertation, p. 333.
Besides, the language of the historian and the order and connexion of his narrative evidently import, that this was one of those heavy offences, which he found on his return from Persia. No verb is expressed nor any word indicating an alteration of time, consequently the substantive verb, which is here understood, must be taken in the same time, as that in the last preceding paragraph in the twenty third verse, which begins, "in those days," that is to say, when Nehemiah returned from Persia. The learned authors of our English version were of this opinion, for if they had been of the opposite one, they must have rendered the verb understood, not was, as they have done, but became. If it be asked in objection, why then is the crime of Joiada's son mentioned by itself and not included, as its nature seems to require, among the illegal marriages mentioned in general terms in the preceding paragraph? It may be answered, that the extreme impiety and profligate audacity of the act in a member of the pontifical family well merited, and indeed called for the exposure of a separate statement, that so it might be exhibited as a glaring and odious example of the iniquities which had gained footing in Nehemiah's absence, which are thereby proved to have prevailed where they ought least and last to have been found.
Neither could we, but for the especial notice of this flagrant act, have duly estimated the strict and impartial principles, on which Nehemiah conducted his administration, not sparing any culprit, however high his rank, when justice, the good of his country, and the honour of God's law required his condemnation. Above all, the specific mention of this daring impiety was absolutely necessary to distinguish in full eminence the principal point, to which Nehemiah's reform was directed, the act, by which it was completed and crowned, and from which the prophecy of Daniel's seventy weeks was to date its commencement. The particular notice then, which Nehemiah takes of the young priest's offence, forms no objection to the argument, by which it is contended, that this was one of the enormities, which he found on his return from Persia.

Lastly, Nehemiah in the fourth verse of his thirteenth chapter makes mention of one Eliashib, as "a priest, having the oversight of the chamber of the house of God," that is to say, of the chambers, or, if I may coin a word, the chambery; the Hebrew word being here used collectively, or as a noun of multitude. This oversight, though an important, was yet evidently a subordinate and inferior office, by which no one would think of describing the high-priest, who had the supreme
inspection and direction of the whole temple and of every thing therein. The word, by which Eliashib is described, as having the oversight, is a participle passive, and signifies being intrusted with, set, or appointed over. It consequently indicates, that Eliashib had been nominated to and held that office by the gift or appointment of a superior. But this could not have been said of the high-priest, who held his sacred office by right of inheritance, and who possessed the power of appointing to the charge, with which this Eliashib is described to have been invested. Let it be supposed, if the supposition be possible, that the books were cast out of the library of the archbishop of Canterbury, in order to convert that apartment into a lodging for Lord King or Lord Holland, not a very dissimilar case to the one before us, would an historian of these times relate, "that Dr. Charles Manners Sutton, a clergyman of the church of England, having the oversight of the chambers of Lambeth palace," applied one of them to so strange and unbecoming a purpose? Or would that be giving any thing like a correct or even an intelligible description of that most reverend prelate, whose pardon I implore for venturing to make such an improbable supposition at his expense? Therefore we conclude, that Eliashib the overseer of
the chambers was not high-priest. Again, in the twenty eighth verse we meet with another person bearing the same name, and of course, unless we find some distinctive addition, we are entitled, and indeed obliged, to suppose him the same person as the former. Now according to the rule laid down and maintained by Prideaux and his followers, there is no distinctive addition given him; consequently we may, and in all reason must, suppose him to be the same person as the overseer Eliashib. But if we do so, we shall certainly fall into a grievous mistake; for this second Eliashib is said to be the father of Joiada the high-priest*, and consequently is the very person who actually was high-priest† at the period of Nehemiah's return from Persia; a conclusion directly contradictory to that before drawn. It may perhaps be alleged, that the absurdity, which is the consequence of the mistake, is sufficient to prevent its occurrence, and therefore is sufficient for distinction also, without any addition to the name of the second Eliashib. But surely no historian, who did not wish to bring upon himself the reproach of intentional obscurity, would leave his readers to draw such a conclusion, when the necessity might be obviated by a mere official addition. Yet, if we are

* Nehemiah, xiii. 28. † Nehemiah, iii. 1.
bound to follow at all events the rule concerning patronymics, by which the official addition is taken away from the second Eliashib, Nehemiah must be deemed liable to that reproach; except it be considered less offensive to charge him with ignorance of his own language, as not knowing, that its "idiom would not admit of such a construction as that, which would place the word high-priest in apposition with Eliashib." If then we would clear Nehemiah of all reproach on account of either wilful obscurity, or ignorance of Hebrew, we must give up the universality of Prideaux's rule and admit, that Nehemiah intended to distinguish the second Eliashib by his official addition of high-priest, in opposition to the first Eliashib, who has no higher title allowed him than priest.

And now, it has appeared; 1. That the rule in question is in fact so far from being universal, that the exceptions are little, if at all less numerous than the examples; 2. That if it were, it would operate to make the grandson of Eliashib, whom Josephus names Manasseh, high-priest; 3. That the time, which Nehemiah speaks of in the twenty eighth verse, where he introduces the mention of the young man's crime, is the time of his return from Persia; And lastly, that the operation of the rule would in this
A DISSERTATION ON THE

instance produce an absurd consequence, and would convict Nehemiah either of wilful obscurity or of ignorance of Hebrew. These are reasons amply sufficient to justify us in rejecting the operation of the proposed rule, even if it stood on broader foundations than it has appeared to do, in the present instance; and that being abandoned, no reasonable argument is left for fixing the date of the completion of Nehemiah's second reform at a later period than B.c. 420. It has appeared also, that the crowning event of Nehemiah's labours can be dated little, if at all before; and farther, it has been proved, that the civil and ecclesiastical polity of the Jews, and consequently the figurative city of Jerusalem, cannot be considered as fully restored and finally settled previously thereto. Therefore we conclude, that the year B.c. 420 is the very best point that can be assumed, from which we may reckon the seventy weeks of Daniel in a forward direction. But it is also the point, at which we arrive by a retrograde calculation; whence it follows, with almost unerring certainty, that it is the real point fixed by the omniscient spirit of prophecy for the commencement of that important term. "It is observable," says Prideaux*, "that at the same juncture of time, when the restoration of

* Connexion, part 1, b. 5, p. 417.
the Jewish church and state ended, there the holy scriptures of the old testament do end also. For this last reformation of Nehemiah, is the last act that is recorded therein, and therefore this ending of the period is of sufficient remark for this reason, as well as the other, to be taken notice of in the prophecy."
CHAPTER IV.

SECTION II.

The six Particulars.

To put a stop to the transgression, and to seal the sin-offerings, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in the righteousness of the ages, and to seal vision and prophet, and to anoint an holy of holies.

The term of seventy weeks, or four hundred and ninety years, being predicted by the angel, as a period decisively fixed in the divine wisdom and goodness, for the continuance of the Jewish people and of Jerusalem in a state of restoration and reestablishment, a period exactly equal to seven times the duration of their preceding exile and desolation, but the statement evidently implying, that the people and city would at the close of it come to an end, a fact, of which the
foresight might have tended to damp the expectations and depress the spirits of the prophet, he is reassured and comforted by the announcement of the joyful tidings, that before the end of the appointed weeks the great and blessed purposes of the Most High, in taking the Jews for his peculiar people and Jerusalem for his holy city, will be put into a state of actual performance, and even of incipient perfection, and will be carried on continually with energy, decision, and success, toward their final completion, though it may be long before they attain it. These are expressed in six particulars, all of which, according to the third position in the last preceding chapter, are glad tidings of good things, and must, according to the fifth position, be brought to pass within the last nine weeks or sixty three years of the term. The first of these is,

I. To put a stop to the transgression.

It has been remarked in its proper place, that the other reading of the verb, which is followed in our English version and is there rendered to finish, affords a meaning almost the same, as that of the printed Hebrew text, which is followed above; yet certainly not that meaning, which Mr. Faber has drawn from it. For who does not perceive, that it would have been a strange mode of administering consolation to the prophet,
sorrowing for the sins of his people and their calamitous consequences, to have informed him, however true the information, in the very first particular, that the audacity and rebellion of his beloved countrymen would in the course of the seventy weeks greatly surpass the bounds of all their former iniquities and mount to an height, which could not possibly be exceeded? Yet the Hebrew word is capable of that sense; and that is a good reason, among other and stronger ones, for adhering to the present reading, which is not liable to such a preposterous misapplication of the words of comfort. Not however, that the word, which I have rendered to put a stop to, imports the immediate and absolute expulsion and eradication of transgression; but that such a stop or check would be given to it, as would seriously impede its progress, narrow its range, and in the end lead to its total suppression and extirpation. The transgression or revolt, as I have before endeavoured to prove, is not the single and paramount crime of idolatry, for with that the Jewish church after its reestablishment was not chargeable, except in a very partial extent, but a general term, importing disobedience to the divine law, which implies revolt from, rebellion against, the divine authority; "all sin is a transgression of the law." This, the angel declares, will in
the course of the seventy weeks, receive a great check, or be put a stop to. Accordingly it was so restrained, impeded, or stopped, by the teaching and preaching of our blessed saviour, as may be seen in his many discourses and sermons, especially in that on the mount, and in a great number of his parables, in which he censured and condemned both open profligacy and artful hypocrisy, detected and exposed the vanity of those external forms and specious pretences, by which men are righteous in their own eyes and deceive their own hearts, corrected the dangerous mistakes arising from a misinterpretation or misapplication of the scriptures, settled morality, or practical religion, on sure and permanent principles, defined it by comprehensive yet sufficient and intelligible rules, and sanctioned it by bringing immortality to light, and by connecting it with all that can move desire or fear in the hearts of rational beings.

II. And to seal the sin-offerings, or the sin-offering, as the word may be read in the plural or singular number with no difference as to the meaning.

If the noun be rendered *sins*, or *sin*, as in our English translation*, I am either unable to dis-

* So in Genesis, iv. 7, our translators have rendered the word *sin*, and have connected it with an Anglicism, which
cover any meaning in the clause, or must ascribe to it a meaning no wise different from the former particular. In this respect, I have the happiness of agreeing with Mr. Faber, but in regard to the verb, I again prefer the printed Hebrew text to the various reading, though adopted both by him and our English translators*. The sealing is evidently of a figurative nature. To seal a deed or charter is to ratify it, to give it validity and effect; and accordingly the sealing of the sin-offerings, those offered under the law, denotes their final ratification, their acceptance by God in full to the end, for which they were instituted. It denotes also their completion, by some act, which will give, as it were, the finishing stroke to them, so as to render the future repetition of them unnecessary and even improper. This sealing took place, when the great and only effectual sin-offering was offered once for all in the sacrifice of the lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world. "It is not possible," saith the apostle†, "that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins. Wherefore, when he cometh into the world, he saith, sacrifice and

* See page 6. † Hebrews, x. 4, 5.
offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me.” It is unnecessary on this subject to prolong and multiply citations, which every reader knows where to find and how to apply; I will therefore content myself with the following*; “every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins; but this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God.—For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.—Now where remission of these,” that is of sins, “is, there is no more offering for sin.” By the all-sufficient sacrifice of the son of God the sin-offerings of the law were sealed, ratified, accepted, and confirmed, but at the same time closed and concluded for ever.

III. AND TO MAKE RECONCILIATION, OR ATONEMENT†, FOR INIQUITY.

This is evidently connected with and consequent upon the last mentioned particular. The Hebrew word† rendered as above, to make reconciliation, in its primitive acceptation signifies, as

* Hebrews, x. 11—18.
† I use the word atonement as synonymous with reconciliation, both on account of its etymology (see Mr. Todd’s edition of Dr. Johnson’s dictionary) and because it is so used by our English translators But see Archbishop Magee on the doctrine of atonement, vol. 1, p. 243.
‡ See Parkhurst’s Hebrew Lexicon in n32.
before mentioned in the second chapter, to overspread, to cover by overspreading. Hence when applied to sins, though often rendered to expiate, to appease, to atone for, the original signification is retained and may be easily and clearly perceived. It is thus applied three ways. 1. To the person offended. 2. To the offender. 3. To the offence. Thus in Genesis, xxxii. 20, Jacob says, "I will appease him;" literally, I will cover his face, "with a present." 2. But its application to the person offending is far more frequent, in which case it denotes the covering him from the consequences of guilt, from condemnation and punishment. 3. It is applied to the offence itself; in which case it signifies, to cover it by overspreading, that is, to deface, to cancel it, that it be no more imputed to the offender, or had in remembrance against him. Accordingly it here expresses the following up of Messiah's expiatory sacrifice by the complete forgiveness of sins and all its blessed consequences. See Psalm xxxii.

Under the law of Moses the tenth day of the seventh month was appointed for the great day of atonement. Then the high-priest having offered the sin-offerings for himself, his household, and the people, entered, as the representative of the great high-priest over the whole house of God,
with their blood, typifying His blood, and with a censer smoking with incense, representing His merits, into the Holy of holies, the image of heaven, and there made atonement, covered iniquities, for himself, for his family, for the whole congregation of Israel, and for the holy place, the tabernacle of the congregation, and the altar itself. Thereby he obtained of God, that he would cover, overlook, forgive, put out of remembrance, the offences of his people, that he would wipe away their pollutions, regard their persons with favour, and condescend to accept the worship, which they offered him by means and instruments ordained by himself to that end. But the atonement here intended by the prophet is certainly not the figure, but the thing represented thereby; for the typical atonement had been in use for ages and could not be a subject of prophecy. We must therefore, as Mr. Faber* justly argues, look "to the true atonement made by the alone meritorious sacrifice of the Lamb of God." In allusion to the typical atonement St. Paul† observes, that as "the high-priest entered into the holy place every year," on the great day of expiation, "with blood of others," of beasts slain in sin-offerings, and made atonement; so "Christ,

† Hebrews, ix. 24, 25, 28.
being once offered to bear the sins of many," entered, "not into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true;" that is, of the true holy places, which are in heaven; "but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us;" making atonement, reconciling his offending people unto God. Thus we find, that the third particular is distinguished from that immediately preceding, as the act of the Jewish high-priest in entering into the most holy place on the day of atonement was different from his act in offering the sin-offerings. Entirely conformable with this representation of the prophet's meaning is the language of St. Paul in his epistle to the Romans*. "Being now justified by his" (Christ's) "blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him. For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled," or atoned for, "to God by the death of his son, much more, being reconciled," or atoned for, "we shall be saved by his life. And not only so," that is, not only are we reconciled, "but we also joy in God, through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement," or reconciliation.

IV. AND TO BRING IN THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF THE AGES.

* Romans, v. 9, 10, 11.
Mr. Faber* has interpreted the righteousness by a metonymy of the abstract for the concrete, to be our blessed Lord himself; and argues that this interpretation must be admitted, "because else his coming will be left unnoticed among the particulars." His interpretation the learned writer has endeavoured to justify by several citations from scripture; but not one of the whole number, except that from Isaiah, xli. 2, is to the purpose; and even that may receive, or, as I should rather say, requires, a different translation†. The harshness of the supposed figure there, as here, is perfectly intolerable; whereas in all the other passages cited, the word righteousness is immediately connected with the express mention of the righteous person or persons, so that the figurative application of the word is evident; whence

* Dissertation, p. 268.

† The position of the accent shews the opinion of the Masorites on the subject. The Zakeph Katon being placed over the word east separates it from the word righteousness, and affords at the same time a regular construction, and that orderly arrangement of the words, which the versification indispensably requires.

Who raised up the man of the east?
In justice called him to his foot,
Gave the nations before him, &c.

The word πῶς may be taken adverbially, (see Glassii Philolog. sac. p. 937,) or πῶς may be understood, "whom justice called to his foot," which is Vitringa's construction; only he takes πῶς in the sense of ἔρχομαι. See his commentary on the passage.
the difference between those instances and the case before us is such, that no argument can be brought from the former to the latter; unless we admit his interpolation of the words, "Him who is;" the necessity of which, to make good the explication, throws a strong suspicion upon it. As to the argument from the necessity of the case, it is observed in answer, that if the distinct mention of the coming of Christ ought necessarily to be found in the list of particulars, it is of course to be expected, that those particulars would appear drawn up in some lucid arrangement, according to priority of occurrence, or some other principle of order, so that nothing of great and general importance in regard to the events of Messiah's life, could be omitted without being missed. But by Mr. Faber's interpretation they are thrown into the "most admired disorder;" for according to that the first particular predicts the guilt of the Jews in putting Messiah to death; the second and third also relate to his death; then at length the fourth announces his coming into the world; the fifth declares the accomplishment of the grand scheme of prophecy in him; last of all the sixth predicts his baptism. Really it is difficult to believe, that such an arrangement would have entered into the mind of any writer whatever; one thing at least is certain, that no
man can point out what ought to have a place in the midst of such confusion.

Seeing then, that no good reason is alleged for taking the word *righteousness* as a metonymy, we are bound to understand it in its proper sense, as an abstract noun, which being constructed with the next word denotes the righteousness of future ages or times, in opposition to the righteousness of the ages past*. The ages past are those, during which the law of Moses continued in force and was observed, if not strictly, yet generally; the ages to come are those appointed for the founding, growth, and prevalence of the Christian religion and church. The righteousness of the Jews during the former stood chiefly in the observance of circumcision and the various sacrifices, external rites, and ordinances of the law of Moses; but the righteousness of Christians is of a different description, and is by St. Paul opposed to the righteousness which is by the law. It is "the righteousness of God;" that is, ordained and effected by God; and "is revealed from faith to faith†." It is "the righteousness of God,

* Dr. Blaney renders the words *the righteousness of ancient times*, the very thing to which they are opposed. See chap. 2, p. 60.

† Romans, i. 17. In the rendering of this passage I entirely agree with our learned translators and cannot consent to the method, however high the authorities that may be
which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe." It is in truth and effect the same righteousness, only more authoritatively ordained, more clearly ascertained, and more widely diffused, than that, which was of old, even before the promulgation of the law, imputed to the patriarch Abraham, whose "faith was counted to him for righteousness." The same righteousness was not unknown to David, who hath pronounced it blessed in prediction, and hath described it as consisting in "the for...

urged in its favour, of constraining it by a very harsh trajectory; "in it," that is, the gospel, "the righteousness of God by faith is revealed unto faith." The phrase in nutriciis is an Hebraism.—"in intermedium inter eandem vocem, si o antecesserit, notat diversitatem; vel simplicem, vel cum incremento aut continuatione.—Incrementum, τὸ ἐν τῷ, a robore uno ad aliud, seu asceritate majore et majore. Psalm xxxiv. 7. τὸ ἐν τῷ, ex alimento ad alimentum, i. e. plus et plus alimenti. Psalm cxliv. 13. τὸ τὸ, a malitia una ad aliam, i. e. malitia majore et majore. Sic in nutritur ex nutrit, Rom. i. 17. in deo, ex deo, 2 Corinthians, iii. 18. fide, vel gloria, majore et majore." Noldius de particulis Hebrais, p. 37. Glass cites the same passages and adds, hoc est, progressum et incrementum fidei, seu fide quae quotidie incrementum accepiat. Sic dicitur ex unius usque usque. (Glass has not like Noldius distinguished increment from continuance; and it is obvious that they are nearly allied.) Apud profanos hunc sensum ex habet eodem nomini repetito interposita, οὐ μόνον ἐκάκων τοισ ἐκακοὶ ἑαυτης. Hom. ii. T 290. βασιλεύσει βασιλείας παραρέμβω. Heliodorus. Glassii Philolog. sac. p. 1027. Other instances may be cited of the phrase as denoting continuance. έκ and έκ then are set in opposition, and with the same word repeated constitute a phrase, which must not be rent asunder.

* Romans, iii. 22. † Romans, iv. 3, 5, Genesis, xv. 6.
giveness of iniquities and the covering of sins*;” which believers have “through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness, for the remission of sins that are past through the forbearance of God†;” so that the righteousness of the Jews themselves in the ages past, as it consisted in the forgiveness of their sins, was attained, not by virtue of any thing that they did or could do, but of the redemption wrought by Christ, to which the gracious God looking forward, in his blessed forbearance forgave the offences, that had been committed before it took place. There is no need to enlarge at this time on justification by faith, as being one of the mainly distinguishing doctrines of the gospel and church of Christ; but let it be observed, that the righteousness of the ages to come is not to be confined thereto, but comprehends also that personal and practical righteousness, which is the proper fruit of a lively faith, is produced by the sanctifying operation of the Holy Ghost on the heart, and shews itself in the fruit of good works; a righteousness which being commenced and carried on here on earth by grace, will be consummated hereafter in that great change, to which Christians look forward with

* Romans, iv. 7, Psalm xxxii. 1. † Romans, iii. 24, 25.
earnest and anxious expectation, "waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body.""

V. AND TO SEAL VISION AND PROPHET.

The word seal here signifies, not to hide, a sense, in which our translators seem to have taken it by their rendering, *to seal up*; but as before, to *ratify, to confirm, to authenticate*; and being applied to such subjects as "vision and prophet," to fulfil, to accomplish the one, to give credit to, to confer authority upon the other, by bringing to pass the things predicted by both. The words have undoubtedly a special and immediate reference to Daniel and his visions, and among them particularly to this; but we must take them in a more extended sense, of all the visions and of all the prophets, which had been since the world began, and which were all accomplished in Him, of whom "Moses in the law and the prophets did write." For although many prophecies and prophetic visions of the Old, as well as of the New Testament, extend far beyond the period of our Lord's personal appearance upon earth, even unto the consummation of all things, yet they do not exceed the duration of his reign or the limits of his dominion. At the same time, let it be observed, that *to seal vision and prophet* may be taken, as it may perhaps have been un-
derstood by our English translators, for *to seal up*, or *close*, in the sense, that no vision or prophet will be ever given, or will ever arise, to predict any dispensation succeeding that, which is to be delivered in the course of the seventy weeks. In the interpretation of this particular I have the satisfaction of agreeing generally with Mr. Faber.

VI. AND TO ANOINT AN HOLY OF HOLIES.

It has been observed in the second chapter, that Mr. Faber with Dr. Hales and others render the two last words, *the most holy one*, or *the saint of saints*, a rendering which is supported by the Vulgate, and by that alone of the ancient versions. If however the authorities for either rendering could be allowed to be equal, or nearly equal; yet, since the two words in construction occur many times in the old testament, without being in any instance applied to a person of any kind*, a strong objection arises to the personal application of them in this place, which is far from being removed by contending, as Mr. Faber does†, that they are capable of bearing a personal sense. If indeed, as he farther alleges, "the context imperiously require us to understand a person," we must submit to such irresistible authority. But I cannot see any thing of this imperious requisition. That our Lord Christ is

* This is the observation of Dr. Blaney. Dissertation, p. 32.
† Page 274.
truly "THE HOLY ONE," and is so denominated in scripture, as well as "THE HOLY CHILD," and "HOLY ONE, OF GOD;" and that he is also "THE MESSIAH," and is twice so called in the following part of this prophecy, is freely admitted; and therefore, if the expression, holy of holies, and that connected with the word anointed, were found in no other passage of scripture, it would be irresistibly argued, in spite of any objections, that he is the subject here distinguished as the Holy of holies. But in fact there are many subjects, of which extraordinary holiness is predicated in the same words, and which also are said to be anointed; it therefore follows, that the phrase may possibly be here applied to one of them; and since in the whole scripture it is never once applied to Christ, nor even, as before mentioned, to any person whatever, the great probability is, that Christ is not here meant, but one of those subjects. Moreover, the words are not here applied as a predicate of any subject, but are used as an appellative, or rather in the way of a proper name, to express the subject itself; therefore, if there be any subject thus peculiarly distinguished in any other part of scripture, that must be the thing here meant. Every reader's mind, I am sure, will at once fix itself upon that most sacred part of the tabernacle and temple, named em-
phatically and by eminence the most holy place, or the holy of holies, to which, and to which alone the expression is applied, as its apppellative, or even its proper name, expressing the substance of the thing itself. Is it not then in the highest degree improbable, that Daniel, or the angel, who delivered to him the prophecy, using the very name particularly appropriated to the adytum of the tabernacle or temple, without specifically applying it to any other subject, should mean by it any thing else but that, for which it stands, as its apppellative, or proper name, in holy writ? Our English translators have rendered the two words the most holy, by which, though the expression seems somewhat indefinite, they in all probability meant to express the holy of holies, for which they have used the term in other parts of the bible.

It has been before remarked*, that the two words are here distinguished by the omission of the definite article before the second, which is always used in other places, where the holy of holies is mentioned. That omission, though it may seem slight, is yet significant; for the mind of the reader having been carried to the Holy of holies, is drawn back and thrown into doubt upon observing the omission of the usual article;

* See chapter 2, page 63.
yet finding nothing else here mentioned, no sort of sacrifice, offering, or utensil belonging to divine service, to which the words, when occurring in their present form, are applied in other passages, it is forced to revert and adhere to the original idea, and is only excited to a more attentive examination in the hope of accounting for the anomaly. This may be accounted for (and so far as I can see, it can be accounted for in no other way) by considering, that not the Holy of holies, that of the earthly tabernacle and temple, which would require the definite article, is intended; but another; a new one, of a different nature or a new construction, to be set up as part of a new tabernacle or temple, and which is therefore with great propriety described indefinitely as an Holy of holies. But that which is left indefinite in the prophecy is fully defined and fixed by the event. The prophetic spirit alludes beyond question to the Holy of holies of the Christian Church, that of the "greater and more perfect tabernacle and temple not made with hands," into which Christ our great high-priest hath entered, bearing his own blood, as having "through the eternal spirit offered himself without spot to God." By this application of the words, at once full justice is done to the proper force of the expression, and at the same time its peculiar form is intelligibly and satisfactorily accounted for.
But it is to be observed, that the angel speaks nothing of the anointing of a new temple; nor indeed does he make mention of any temple at all. Yet such an edifice, though not expressed, must be implied; for without a new tabernacle or temple there could not be a new holy of holies. The expression is doubtless figurative, a part being put for the whole; and by the figure it is intended to intimate, that in the new building the entire temple and all its courts will, together with the Holy of holies, be anointed with one most sacred and pervading unction, whereby it will all be equally consecrated and made one Most Holy place unto the Lord. Hence it follows, that he who may gain admission to any one part, is not to be excluded from any other. Now in the tabernacle and temple of Moses and Solomon, as likewise in the second temple, there was a court for the priests, another for the people of Israel, and a third for the Gentiles; but from the uniform and equal sanctity of the new temple it is to be concluded, that neither Jews nor Gentiles are any more to be confined to their particular and respective courts, but are to have access even to the most sacred part, to the Holy of holies itself. Accordingly this is the actual state of the christian church, the spiritual temple, in which the Holy of holies is Heaven, whereunto every
member of the same is equally admissible. So it is expressly declared by St. Paul; "we," that is, "we all, have boldness (or liberty) to enter into the Holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us through the veil, that is, his flesh." The church of Christ then fully answers to the idea here afforded of a new tabernacle, a spiritual one, in which the Most Holy place itself is accessible to every worshipper, without exception of nation, office, or condition.

It now remains only to examine, whether the christian church has received such a sacred unction, as would communicate to the whole the general character of superior holiness. Jesus Christ the founder of it was anointed with the Holy Ghost, and the formal act took place at his baptism. No unction can be imagined more holy than this, either considered in itself, or on account of him on whom it was poured. Conformably hereto the tabernacle of his pitching, the temple of his rearing, was anointed with the Holy Ghost. The act of unction took place, when the blessed spirit descended on the apostles and first christians at the day of Pentecost, as related in the second chapter of the acts of the apostles. For it is to be observed, that the gift was poured forth, not only upon the apostles,
but upon all the christians that were assembled with them; and from the words of St. Peter, in the thirty eighth verse, we may collect, that it was in like manner imparted to all those, who on that occasion were converted and baptized. That descent of the holy spirit, whose presence was certified and represented by visible and miraculous signs, was then the formal and effectual act of unction, by which christians were duly anointed, hallowed, and set apart to be the spiritual temple of the Most High. But the anointing poured forth on the church at the day of Pentecost sanctified only the Jewish portion of it. As yet there was not any Gentile court in the christian tabernacle. But when once erected and opened, it received the same sacred and spiritual unction; for the Holy Ghost, we are informed, descended on Cornelius and the other Gentile converts who were assembled with him, "as on the apostles themselves at the beginning." Then the whole temple of the Lord in both its courts, or parts, was anointed with one spirit; and having also "one Lord and one God and Father of all," no wall of partition was erected, no veil was drawn, but the whole edifice in all its comprehensiveness was consecrated to one holy service and one blessed purpose. Accordingly St. Paul, as in his epistle to the Ephesians he speaks
of Jew and Gentile, as made one in Christ, so in his second epistle to the Corinthians speaks of both together, as being anointed; "he that anointed us," saith he, "is God." So too St. John in his first general epistle describes christians, as having received at their baptism an unction; "ye," saith he, "have received an unction from the holy one;" and then tells them, that the power of it still remaineth undecayed in them; "but the anointing, which ye have received of him, abideth in you." Thus the christian church is really, though spiritually, the anointed tabernacle and temple of the living God, having, if we choose to run the parallel, its exterior court, as it were, and first sanctuary with us below, but its holy of holies with the blessed above. Still however all they, who dwell in the church militant here on earth, are actual members of, and "by hope enter into, that, which is within the veil," the Holy of holies, the highest heavens, "whither the forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus, made an high-priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek."

Some of the Jews, among whom is the famous Don Isaac Abarbanel, have explained the holy of holies in this place to signify the Messiah. But

* Ephesians, ii. 15, 16, &c.  
† 2 Corinthians, i. 21.  
‡ 1 John, ii. 20, 27.  
§ Hebrews, vi. 19, 20.
that learned Rabbi* had recourse to such an exposition, not because he considered, that the saint of saints was the proper rendering of the Hebrew words, but because by the evident failure of his favourite exposition he was driven to seek others. For having explained the unction, as belonging to a third material temple, which, as he supposed, yet remains to be built, and whose duration is to be everlasting, and then perceiving that the unction here predicted ought to take place during the seventy weeks, that is, during the existence of the second temple, he was forced upon various conjectures, the last of which is, that the Holy of holies related to the Messiah. The circumcised interpreter had then a glimpse of the truth, but labouring under "the blindness that hath happened unto Israel," he could not attain to a clear discernment of it. Denying "the Lord of the temple not made with hands," he dreamed of an earthly fabric and a material oil of unction, and could not rise to the contemplation of such an Holy of holies as the spirit of prophecy contemplated.

* My knowledge of Abarbanel's exposition is derived wholly from the Dissertation of Frischmuth on the weeks of Daniel, printed in the Thesaurus Theologico-philologicus, tom. 1. The work of Abarbanel there cited is, I presume, his יֵשָׁנָיו, or fountains of salvation, which is a commentary on the prophet Daniel. Wolfii Biblioth. Heb. vol. 1, No. 1142.
CHAPTER IV.

SECTION III.

The additional term of seven Weeks.
The subordinate term of sixty two Weeks.
The appearance of Messiah, as leader, in the sixty second Week.


The words, "know therefore and understand," are evidently emphatical; and are intended to make a powerful call both upon the prophet, who heard, and upon us, who read them, to pay more than ordinary attention to the important subject, which they introduce, as containing something that is not likely to be understood
without it. The exhortation is in all probability
designed to extend to the whole* of the following
prophecy. Consequently it cannot be applied to
any part thereof; exclusively of that which next
follows, and which must rather be considered as
primarily, if not principally * subject of it.
But according to the interpretations, which have
commonly been given of the words next follow-
ing, it is not easy to see any use in, or motive
for so pointed and energetical a summons. The
mental powers of Daniel, or of other men, would
not be brought into any extraordinary exertion
by the addition of seven to sixty two; nor would
it require an intense degree of observation and
thought to take for granted, that the going forth
of the word is intended to mark the same point
of time, as the commencement of the seventy
weeks, and thence to collect, that the first seven
weeks of the term would be occupied in the
building of Jerusalem. Do not then the facility
and readiness, with which these notions occur to
the mind, when contrasted with the previous
summons to attention, implying difficulty or in-
tricacy, afford good reason for suspecting, that
the failure of those interpreters, who have joined

* There can be no doubt of this, since our saviour him-
self has used a similar summons in citing the latter portion
of the prophecy. Matthew, xxiv. 15.
the two numbers, seven and sixty two, into one, who have made the going forth of the word the point of commencement to the seventy weeks, and have consequently placed the work of re-building Jerusalem in that term, has in a great measure arisen from neglecting the admonition of the angel and acquiescing too readily in the thoughts that first offered themselves to their notice? On the other hand, it has not only been shewn in the second chapter*, that the addition of seven to sixty two, to make a sum of sixty nine, is contrary to the idiom of the Hebrew language; but farther it has been proved in the seventh† of the fifteen positions laid down in the third chapter, that the term of seven weeks is not part of, but prior to, that of the seventy weeks, and concludes at the point, where that commences. Now it must be confessed, that it required at least considerable exercise of attention, perhaps also some power of discernment, to discover this; and then some diligence in the application of thought and pains to ascertain and prove the truth of the discovery; whence it may be concluded, that the interpreter, who proceeds with such circumspect steps, has at least attended to the exhortation of the angel; and that conclusion will be fortified by remarking, that thus he is

* Page 67.  † Page 157.
able to assign a solid and sufficient reason for the summons.

Since the seven weeks are prior to the seventy and conclude exactly at their commencement, they must necessarily begin forty nine years before them, and consequently must be dated from the year B. c. 469. At that period the word must have gone forth. But what was the word, which is said then to go forth? Does it denote a command of God, or the edict of some human governor? Prideaux* decides for the latter, and lays it down, that "there were four commandments or decrees issued out by the kings of Persia in favour of the Jews, from one of which, according to the express words of the prophecy, the computation of these weeks is to be begun." The Hebrew word however does not necessarily or properly signify a decree or commandment, but merely a word; and nothing at all is said concerning the kings of Persia, or any earthly potentate or agent whatever. We are therefore justified in denying the peremptory statement of the learned Dean, that according to the express words of the prophecy the computation of the weeks must begin from any decree of a Persian king. The question then is still open; does the word, that went forth, denote a command of God.

* Connexion, part 1, b. 5, p. 387.
or the edict of some human governor? This is very easily and safely answered by referring to the twenty third verse, where the word, or, as our English translation again has it, the commandment, is said to go forth; and where it certainly does signify a command; not however that of any human sovereign, but the command issuing from God and sending the angel Gabriel to instruct Daniel as to the future condition and fate of his people and holy city. Hence we may with a degree of probability near akin to certainty collect, that in this place also it ought to be explained of a divine word* issued to the holy angels, and, as we may collect from the subject of the prophecy, commanding them to look to the rebuilding of Jerusalem.

This mode of dating the commencement of the lesser period of seven weeks, as it certainly tended, according to what is noticed in the preface, so perhaps was designed, to prevent any exact calculation beforehand of the greater period of the seventy. Nevertheless, since the divine word must be executed, it is highly probable that it did ere long manifest itself in some correspondent edict or decree of human sovereigns, or perhaps

* This is the opinion of many commentators. Vide Frischmuth's Diss. p. 912, § 15. It also entirely coincides with the celestial images in the vision of Zechariah, ii.1—4.
yet more satisfactorily and efficaciously, (for royal edicts do not execute themselves,) in some measures taken in pursuance of it. Here I freely confess, that I have not any edict or licence of the Persian monarch to that effect to bring forward. But I have what will do as well. We read in the fourth chapter of Ezra, that in the beginning of the reign of Ahasuerus or Artaxerxes,* that is to say, about the year B.C. 464, a formal complaint and accusation was brought against the Jews by their hostile neighbours, as being then engaged in rebuilding, what they were pleased to call, "the rebellious and bad city, and as having begun to set up the walls and join the foundations." They had probably been employed for some time in the work; for the expressions of the Samaritans, though we must make great allowance for exaggeration in a case, where the object was to procure a speedy decree for its suppression, indicate, that they were making some progress in it. But that progress must have been very slow, as is evident from the account given by Hanani and his companions to Nehemiah.

* I agree with Bishop Patrick, Prideaux, and others, in thinking that Ahasuerus and Artaxerxes in the sixth and seventh verses are the same person. Of course the circumstances mentioned in the two verses are the same, the latter being merely explanatory of, or supplemental to the former, and the Vau, with which it begins, has the same force as the Latin, inquam.
It is likely, that the Jews confided too much in the favour of Xerxes; and as they entertained no apprehensions of his death, for he was not an old man, so they might be the less eager in beginning their work, and the less active in carrying it on, till they were suddenly astonished and overwhelmed by the disastrous tidings of his murder. It must also be recollected, that they were not then animated and supported by the power, wealth, and spirit of the intrepid and patriotic Nehemiah, nor encouraged by the exhortations of the pious and zealous Ezra; and were, as usual, exposed to all the vexations and interruptions which their malicious enemies could offer. It is not surprising then, that under these circumstances so little was effected, that Nehemiah, when he came to survey the state of Jerusalem, found it unworthy of notice and left it without mention in his history. However, since they were not, and therefore, we may be sure, could not, be forced to desist from their undertaking, without a royal edict, it is evident, that they were not carrying on their labours without sufficient authority from the Persian court. Nor indeed did the accusation brought against them express or imply any illegality in their proceedings. The objections of the Samaritans were all urged on the score of impolicy alone, not as if the work
were contrary to royal decree, or even carried on without proper permission. Their endeavours, it therefore appears, were directed, not to enforce the execution of a law or a decree then existing against the enterprise of the Jews, but to procure the abrogation of one, which had been granted in their favour.

Since the accusation was brought in the beginning of Artaxerxes's reign, the work must have commenced in that of his predecessor Xerxes, who must consequently have issued an edict, or in some way have granted a licence, empowering or permitting the Jews to rebuild their city walls. Accordingly Josephus* informs us in general terms, that Xerxes favoured the Jews; and that king must too have been considered by their enemies as well disposed towards them, or they would not have deferred their accusation till the reign of his successor. Now Xerxes was slain by Artabanus in the year B.C. 465, whence only four years backward are wanted to arrive at the date of the divine word. But that word probably began to operate in some preparatory circumstances, as a petition from the Jews to the king, or the motion of some friend of theirs in the royal councils; and when we consider the opposition, that would be made by the Samaritan party, and

* Antiq. Jud. l. 11, c. 5, § 1.
the debates and procrastination, that would thence ensue, a considerable lapse of time may well be allowed between the issuing of the word in heaven and the permission of Xerxes in conformity to it. Then some time would be spent in bringing the edict to Judea; and there the Jews, at once wanting the encouragement of spirited leaders and confident in the royal favour, would be little disposed to avail themselves of it immediately, so that by the death of Xerxes, they might have made little progress in their work; and that they had not made much is evident, as before noticed, from the subsequent account, which Nehemiah gives upon his survey of the state of Jerusalem.

It may perhaps be objected, that the fourth chapter of Ezra does not relate to matters of so late a date, as those to which it is here referred, but to the time, when the Jews were engaged in building the temple, under the government of Zerubbabel and the high-priesthood of Jeshua. But this is a mistake, though a general one, arising from the want of an attentive examination of Ezra's narrative. Having begun his history from the decree of Cyrus, he relates, that upon the arrival of the Jews in their own country their insidious neighbours, pretending to be Israelites, but being in reality of a mixed breed, and contaminated by idolatrous practices, proffered their
assistance in the work of erecting the temple; but the offer being properly and necessarily refused, they immediately set up a malicious and powerful opposition to the work, and by means of bribery and other nefarious arts at length succeeded in obtaining a decree against it. This seems to have taken place in the third year of Cyrus; for it was in that year, that Daniel, as we read in his tenth chapter, fasted and afflicted himself for three weeks together; and it is altogether probable, that his mourning was occasioned by the hostile proceedings of the Samaritans, and by witnessing the favourable reception they met with in the Persian court. Accordingly Ezra observes, that "they hired counsellors against them all the days of Cyrus king of Persia," that is to say, all the remaining years of his reign, "until the reign of Darius king of Persia." Mention being thus made of the obstructions so maliciously raised by the Samaritans, the sacred historian, in order, as it should seem, to prevent the necessity of interrupting the thread of his narrative in another place, proceeds at once to notice the subsequent hostilities of the same people, which took place only a few years previously to his own arrival in Judea. These hostilities however did not relate to the building of the temple, which had long since been finished, but to the late efforts of the
Jews to rebuild the city and the city wall. The truth of this is equally certain and plain from the substance and form of that letter, which they transmitted to the Persian court, and in which not one word is said of the temple. By that epistle and by the base and subtle means, to which they had recourse, they excited the suspicions of the new king Artaxerxes and shortly obtained an edict absolutely prohibitory of the work, which they lost no time to put in execution, as Ezra tells us, "by force and power." These transactions are all related by Ezra in the manner of a parenthesis from the beginning of the sixth to the end of the twenty third verse; and that he really intended to bring together this part of his history into such sort of inclosure, he shews with all necessary plainness by resuming the thread of his narrative in the twenty fourth verse, where he returns to the opposition raised by the enemy to the rebuilding of the temple, repeating in other words what he had said in the fifth verse, of which the following chapter is the proper and connected continuation*. I trust that the objection is now sufficiently answered.

* This has been fully and satisfactorily shewn by the learned Mr. Howes in his critical observations on books ancient and modern, vol. 2, p. 82—85.
But it will be asked perhaps; since Xerxes was generally disposed to act with kindness to the Jews, why did he defer this most needed and desired act of favour till the seventeenth year of his reign? Or at least, what particular reason can be assigned for his doing it then? To the former question it is a reasonable and ready answer, that favours admit of more and less; that they are in number, weight, and measure; that it was one thing to protect and countenance the Jews in the observance of their laws and religion, and another thing to raise them to political importance; that it was one thing to supply them with the means of maintaining the splendour of their temple and the expence of their public worship, and another thing to authorize and enable them to build and fortify their city.

To the latter question it is replied, that a particular reason can be given for conferring this mark of favour at this juncture of time. It has been before related, that when Artaxerxes more than twenty years afterwards renewed that permission, which his father had given, and which he on the suggestions of the Samaritans had revoked, he was principally moved to it by the political considerations consequent upon the severe defeats, which his forces had suffered from the Athenians under the command of Cimon, and
upon the disgraceful treaty of peace, which he had made with that people. It is in the highest degree probable, that similar considerations would have influenced and swayed the mind of Xerxes under similar circumstances. If then it can be proved, that the political circumstances of Xerxes in the seventeenth year of his reign, which coincides with the year B.c. 469, were in any considerable degree similar to those, which afterwards befell his son, then the probability, that he was moved thereby to permit the rebuilding and fortifying of Jerusalem, will be great indeed. Now we learn from Diodorus Siculus*,

* Diod. Sic. lib. 11, Olymp. 77, An. 3. Plutarch, with some other authors, makes the peace of Callias, which Diodorus places in the reign of Artaxerxes, in the eighty second Olympiad, the consequence of this earlier battle on the Eurymedon. He informs us also that Callisthenes denied any such treaty of peace as that mentioned by Diodorus, to have been made. But perhaps Callisthenes only denied, that it was made after the battle of Eurymedon; in which he would not dissent from Diodorus. It is to be observed, that Plutarch has given us but little account of the last victories gained by Cimon, and none at all of their consequences. His attention seems to have been occupied by the dream of Cimon and the threatening circumstances of his sacrifice to Bacchus. At the same time we learn from what he does say, that the events were so important and the blows inflicted on Persia so heavy, as to have encouraged the Athenian captain to meditate the overthrow of the empire. Of such the peace of Callias was no improbable consequence. The narrative of Diodorus is far more distinct and greatly merits the preference, although it is liable to some exceptions as to the battle on the Eurymedon. For it is plainly impossible, that Cimon could have gained his victory off Cyprus,
that in the third year of the seventy seventh Olympiad, which answers to the year B.C. 470, the Athenians under the command of the same heroic captain entirely overthrew the forces of the great king by sea and by land on the coast of Cyprus and on the banks of the Eurymedon, capturing or destroying the whole naval armament and putting the army to a total rout. By these and by other misfortunes the maritime power of

then manned the captured vessels of the enemy with his own forces, and afterwards have sailed to the coast of Lycia, landed his troops, and beaten the Persian army, all within the space of twenty four hours. Perhaps Cimon in the engagement off Cyprus having taken and destroyed a great number of vessels, and got possession of the remnant, which during the battle were run ashore, and deserted afterwards, then bethought himself of the stratagem related by Diodorus, and before any report of the disaster could reach the other division of the enemy’s fleet in its station off Lycia, crossed the channel, deceived the Persians, beat their army, and took and destroyed their fleet. The naval and military exploits on the Eurymedon may both have been achieved in one day; and then in order to enhance the wonder and the glory, the Grecians, so “audacious in history,” so “covetous of fame,” may have tacked to them the previous victory off the coast of Cyprus. But whatever solution we may find of this difficulty, Diodorus is upon the whole consistent and credible in his narrative of both these most famous achievements of Cimon. When he farther informs us, that the Persians in the time of Xerxes, so far from making peace, set about repairing their fleet and equipping a greater number of Triremes than ever, the account is verified by the fact, that although they might for four or five years be unable to meet the Athenians at sea, and have reason to be alarmed for the safety of their possessions on the shores of the Mediterranean, yet they were able in the sixth and ninth years of Artaxerxes to send out those two powerful fleets against their revolted subjects in Egypt.
Xerxes was so reduced and crippled, that although he does not appear, like his son, to have proposed terms of peace, yet his vessels of war could not shew themselves without great risk in the Mediterranean, on the coasts of Asia Minor, or even of Palestine.

Notwithstanding the speed proverbially attributed to the flight of bad news, some time must be allowed for the travelling of this disastrous intelligence to the distant court of Shushan; and then another and longer space for the effect produced by it there to be well observed, ascertained, and reported to the Jews, before they could begin to take any steps in consequence. Again, some additional time must be granted for them to prepare a petition to the king, or to invite, entreat, and persuade their friends in the Persian council to interfere in their behalf. Now the season of the year, in which Cimon gained his twofold victory, is not, so far as I am aware, determined by historians; but the necessary intervals above mentioned are fully sufficient to convince any one, that the petition of the Jews could not be got ready, sent to Persia, and presented to the monarch, or any motion of their friends at court brought forward for discussion till the year following, that is to say, the year B.C. 469. And then probably by the dilatory
forms of official proceedings, by the opposition of enemies, and other causes and means of delay, the issuing of the edict would be retarded till late in that year.

The affairs of Xerxes then in the year B.C. 469 were in a like unfortunate condition with those of his son about twenty years afterwards; and since he could not have forgotten the revolt of the Egyptians, which troubled the last years of his father Darius and the beginning of his own reign, nearly the same political considerations, as afterwards influenced Artaxerxes and his councillors, naturally arose out of them and prevailed with him to listen to an application, which, whether brought before him by petition from the leaders of the Jews, or by a motion of their friends in his own councils, promised him a friendly people and a strong city, not exposed to maritime attacks and in the way from Asia Minor to Egypt. Here then is a sufficient reason assigned for this particular mark of favour being conferred by Xerxes on the Jews in the year B.C. 469.

Upon the whole it appears, that so early as the year B.C. 464 the Jews were actually engaged in rebuilding their city and its walls; that they had been so engaged for some time; that they had not undertaken the work without the
permission of the Persian monarch; that such permission is likely to have been solicited some time before it was obtained, and to have been obtained some time before it could be acted upon, so that the fifth year previous to that when the Samaritans interrupted them, is as likely a period as any that the most favourable supposition can fix upon, for setting in motion the petition or application, of whatever kind it might be. It appears also, that the king was generally well disposed toward the Jews, and that, at this particular juncture, political considerations would powerfully incline him to grant them this particular favour, which is yet the more probable, since a similar state of affairs afterwards operated to a like end in the reign of his son and successor, and consequently that this was the most favourable period, that can be imagined for the Jews and their leaders, or friends, to have set on foot an application to the Persian monarch. But this is the very year, in which the divine word went forth; so that, whether the Jewish application or the royal edict be considered as answering thereto, it is evident, that the act of the human agents on earth was so closely consequent upon, as to seem almost simultaneous with, the command given to the angelic ministers in heaven,
Beginning then at the year B.C. 469, we find, that according to the prediction we are to reckon from that point until Messiah the leader, first a term of seven weeks, or forty nine years*, which brings us to the commencement of the seventy weeks, and then a term of sixty two weeks taken out of the seventy. The former term, as we have before seen, is assigned to the work of restoring the Jewish people and of rebuilding Jerusalem, that is to say, to the reestablishment of the city, both in a literal and a figurative sense, in that state, in which Daniel desired to see it. The latter, being parcel of the seventy, is of course appointed, like the whole term, for the continu-

* It is here necessary to notice an objection brought by Abarbanel, which was omitted in its proper place in the second chapter, and by which it is contended, that if Jesus were the Messiah, he ought to have appeared at the end of the seven weeks, that being the term expressly limited to that event by the words, “until Messiah shall be leader there shall be seven weeks.” The objection is merely captious, and destitute of all reasonable ground. For the word Ἄρτος, or until, is plainly intended to extend its influence over both the clauses of the sentence which follow, and is of course to be considered as repeated in the connective particle Vau, or and, which introduces the second. “Until Messiah shall be leader there shall be seven weeks, and until Messiah shall be leader, sixty and two weeks it shall be rebuilt, the street and the lane.” Thus it appears that two terms in succession are fixed for the coming of Messiah as leader; and consequently if Jesus had come after the expiration of one only, that is, either between the two, or during the former part of the latter, he could not have been the Messiah predicted by the angel Gabriel to the prophet Daniel.
ance of the city and people in their rebuilt, restored state, so that when Messiah was come he would find them in that condition. Accordingly the latter clause amounts to a direct assertion in reference to the former, that the end, for which the seven weeks were appointed, shall be accomplished; *it shall be rebuilt*; and then it is specifically added, *the street and the lane*; that is to say, throughout the course of the sixty two weeks it shall be truly said, not only of Jerusalem in general, that it is rebuilt, but in respect to every particular and minute portion of it, the narrow lane not less than the spacious street. That this was true of Jerusalem soon after the period of Nehemiah's reformation, has appeared from the testimony of Herodotus before cited; and the city proceeded to increase in population, till its thronged inhabitants could no longer be contained within its walls. Josephus* informs us, that "overflowing with numbers the city gradually crept out beyond its walls; and the citizens joining the parts, that lay northward of the temple to the hill, went forward to a considerable distance, till they had covered with their habitations a fourth hill which is called Bezetha." But the street and lane may, like the city in general, require a figurative interpretation. Every

* De bello Judaico, lib. 5, c. 4. Hudson.
point of its civil and ecclesiastical polity, not only the essential and important, but the circumstantial and minute are to be restored, observed, and maintained. In this sense also the prophecy was accomplished. For such, we have before seen, was the state, to which Jerusalem was brought by Nehemiah's second reformation; and such, with occasional exceptions of greater or less importance, it continued to be until Jesus "came to visit his own." This latter point, we may be sufficiently assured of, without any long train of proofs, by merely adverting to the extreme exactness and scrupulosity, which the priests, scribes, and pharisees in our Saviour's time shewed as to the law of Moses.

The angel however is careful to put a limit to the visions of peace and prosperity, which the imagination of the prophet warmed by his patriotic affection might have shaped out for his country. He tells him that "THE TIMES WILL BE WITH STRAITNESS;" will be passed in pressure, difficulty, and distress of circumstances, and in anxiety of mind. This part also of the prediction has been amply verified by the general state of Jewish affairs. From the return of the captivity to the coming of Christ, with hardly the exception of a short period during the Maccabean dynasty, the whole times were "with straitness."
There is no necessity to relate in detail what is so well known; it is enough to state, that after suffering for two centuries under the mutable and often stern policy of the Persian monarchs, the Jews became the subjects of Alexander the great; and that after his short reign, amid that long and stormy rivalry and those often repeated and sanguinary struggles, that ensued between his ambitious successors, they passed in frequent and calamitous alternation from the sovereignty of the Seleucidae to that of the Ptolemies, until they all were engulfed together in the universal vortex of the Roman empire. Although the Jews could thenceforth suffer little by a comparison of their condition with that of the neighbouring peoples, who, whether foes or masters, had sunk together with themselves, yet, even amid the splendor of Herod's reign the evils of a foreign yoke lay heavy upon them; and whenever the sense of these shewed itself in riot or any symptoms of revolt, the more wealthy, timid, and luxurious part could not but feel, and perhaps express, their alarms, lest the "Romans should come and take away both their place and nation." During all the period then of their subjection to the three successive empires, the Jews were often in peril and tribulation, always in doubt and anxiety.—"The times were with straitness."
Here however it should be observed, that as the duration of Jerusalem is not limited by the sixty two weeks, so neither are the times of straitness. By the force of the words, in which the great impending period of seventy weeks is first announced, the one certainly must, and the other probably may, extend beyond the subordinate period of sixty two weeks; the main object of which in relation to the external circumstances of Jerusalem, is to inform us, that at the appointed time of his leadership Messiah will find Jerusalem fully built in every sense, as before mentioned, though subsisting in circumstances of "straitness," of pressure and anxiety.

It now remains to prove, that the period appointed for Messiah's appearance as leader coincides with the facts related in the gospel concerning our Lord Jesus, whom we maintain to be the Messiah or Christ.

It has been sufficiently shewn in the fourteenth position, that the phrase, until Messiah shall be leader, is expressive of a period, when he shall act, or at least shew himself qualified to act, up to the importance of that office; and that it cannot be applied to any point of time posterior to the first occasion, on which he may have so appeared. The prediction therefore cannot be referred to the nativity or infant state of Christ;
for although he was born a King, a Saviour, Messiah, the Lord, was so announced by the angel to the Jewish shepherds, and was inquired after by the magi, as born King of the Jews, yet it cannot with any propriety be said, that he then acted, or shewed himself fit to act as leader, as in any sense, or in any way, able or qualified to go in and out before his people Israel. Neither can the words be applied, as they are by Prideaux*, to a vicarious leadership; to the office of John the baptist opening the evangelical covenant and preparing the way for the approaching leader; for this carries its own confutation with it, taking for its very ground the fact, that Jesus was not then acting as leader, or shewing himself qualified for the office. Does then the form of the expression necessarily oblige us to date the leadership of our Lord Jesus from the period, when after his baptism by John he shewed himself publicly, acting as Lord of the kingdom of grace, announcing its arrival, and admitting men into it, or rejecting them from it, at his sovereign pleasure? The ministry of our Lord Jesus certainly comes up to, perhaps surpasses, any idea that we could previously form of the leadership intended by the prophet; but it would be too much to affirm peremptorily,

* Connexion, part 1. p. 419.
that no antecedent part of his life can be brought to answer to that leadership of Messiah. From what has been before said in the fourteenth position, it appears to be quite sufficient for the accomplishment of the prediction, if it can be proved, that at some earlier period of his life our blessed Saviour took upon him to fulfil in a marked and emphatical manner, though it were only for a short time and on a particular occasion, the office of leader of his people, or even that he expressively and significantly shewed himself qualified, commissioned, or appointed, to sustain and discharge that office; provided only, that the period of such manifestation agree with the date here assigned to Messiah's leadership. But the proof of accomplishment will rise far higher, if some period previous to his actual permanent ministry can be pointed out, in which he undertook the discharge of any of those especial duties, the performance of which necessarily implies the fulfilment of any one of the six particulars mentioned in the twenty fourth verse; or which by his recorded conduct and expressions during all the space between his baptism and crucifixion, he himself appears to have considered, as being eminently and peculiarly attached to his character and office, the going out and coming in before his people as their instructor, counsellor, and
guide in the way of salvation. Then indeed that period, and that alone, if Jesus be the Messiah, must be the very point of time specified by the word *until*, as being the first occasion, on which he shewed himself and acted as the leader; and to that therefore any interpretation, that makes pretension even to plausibility, not to mention truth, must prove the sixty second week to correspond.

But first we have to consider what part of the sixty second week the word *until* refers to. It is not to be conceived, that the sixty two weeks are intended by the prophetic angel to expire before Messiah's manifestation as leader, for then that fact would take place after the sixty two weeks; but what is to come after them is expressly the subject of the following part of the prophecy. If then Jesus be the Messiah, he must be proved to have acted as leader before their expiration, and that doubtless in the course of the last week; yet not necessarily at the very end, or even in the last year of that week; for it is evident from what has just been said, that the sixty second week is not meant for a complete, but a current week; and therefore the leadership of Messiah may be supposed to take place in any part of it, in perfect conformity with the prophetic date. Indeed,
previously to any attempt at fixing the time of accomplishment, I should prefer the first year of that week, as being most agreeable to scriptural analogy. Accordingly Dr. Blaney* has observed, "that it is agreeable to common usage in general computations to consider a day, a week, or a year as complete with respect to an action, which took up any part of it. Thus Deuteronomy, xiv. 28, at the end of, or after three years, is expressed, xxvi. 12, in the third year. And when Rehoboam, 2 Chronicles, x. 5, ordered the people to come again to him after three days, it is said in verse 12, that they came on the third day as the king bade. And not to multiply instances, our Lord's predictions concerning himself, that after three days he should rise again, Mark, viii. 31, and that the son of man should be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth, Matthew, xii. 40, are in this manner understood to be fulfilled by his rising on the third morning, although it is manifest, that he lay in the grave but a very small part of the first and last days." Now, as in the last of these instances, Christ rose again, not strictly after three days, but in the third day, and not at the close, but toward the beginning of that day, so it may be fairly presumed as to this prophecy, that it would be fulfilled by the

appearance of Messiah as leader, not at the end of the sixty second week, but in the beginning of it; that is in the course of its first year. We conclude therefore, that the word until may, and in all probability does, refer to the first year of the last week in the sixty two. Consequently, if our Lord Jesus appeared as leader in that year; he has so far an undeniable claim to the character of Messiah.

Sixty two weeks of seven years each are equal to four hundred and thirty four years, and these, when reckoned from the year B. C. 420, bring us down to the year of Christ 14, according to the vulgar era; consequently the first year of the last week must fall in with the year of our Lord 8. But Jesus was then in the twelfth year of his age; for it is well known to every one, who has the most superficial acquaintance with chronology, and even to an attentive student of our English version of the new testament*, that the nativity of Christ took place four years antecedent to the vulgar era; and that probably not at Christmas, but in the preceding autumn; wherefore the first year of the sixty second week coincides with the twelfth year of the real age of Jesus.

* In the margin opposite to Luke, ii. 42, the twelfth year of Jesus is marked A. D. 8, as coinciding therewith. The like also may be seen in the chronological index.
To some readers it may be necessary, at least acceptable, to explain the grounds, upon which the date of our Lord's nativity is fixed. It is next to certain*, that Herod the great died in the year of Rome 750, which was the twenty sixth year of Augustus, a little before the passover. Christ was born before, as the evangelist Matthew assures us, and as the slaughter of the infants proves. But that was not long before, as is evident from St. Luke's date of the period, when Christ had attained the age of thirty years, which will but just allow us to bring his nativity within the reign of Herod. The mention of the massacre at Bethlehem, as having comprehended children of two years old, is no proof that Christ had reached, or nearly reached, that age; for the word rendered *two years* may as well, and in this place much more probably, signify such as

* I say it is next to certain, although Lardner, after exhibiting and weighing all the evidence, professes himself unable to determine, whether Herod died in the year of Rome 750 or 751. But the former date is supported by the indubitable testimony of astronomical computations. Josephus informs us, that the death of Herod took place between an eclipse of the moon and the shortly ensuing passover. Now such an eclipse is found by calculation to have happened on the thirteenth of March, u. c. 750, and the passover fell that year on the eleventh of April. The same computation also places Josephus and Dio Cassius in perfect harmony. What may be said in behalf of the other date may justly be considered as amounting to nothing more than objections to this, which, though it may be difficult to remove them, ought not to shake our persuasion of a fact so firmly settled.
had entered on their second year*; and a jealous tyrant, like Herod, who paid no regard to human life, would be sure to take his measures wide enough to comprise at all events his intended victim, as Grotius and Whitby have observed. The visit of the magi also must have taken place very soon after the nativity. For Nazareth was the abode of Joseph and Mary, and no reason can be assigned for their tarrying at Bethlehem after her purification. But the magi came to Jerusalem during Herod's reign and found the holy family still at Bethlehem. Consequently their arrival must have taken place either very little before, or immediately after the ceremony of Mary's purification, or forty days from the child's birth. The circumstance of the star may seem adverse to this conclusion, because Herod, in calculating the age of Jesus, went, as before noticed, a full year back, and that according to the account obtained from the magi concerning the star's appearance. Now they might, and probably did, look upon it as giving notice of a fact, that had then lately, or perhaps at the very instant of observation, come to pass. But their notions, unascertained as they are, and accessible only by conjecture, erroneous too, as

* See Parkhurst's Lexicon in surname, and Whitby on Matthew, ii. 16.
they well might be in many particulars, are no evidence of the fact. The evangelist is our only witness; and he does not testify, that the marvellous meteor was divinely appointed to mark the very instant of the Redeemer’s birth. He speaks of it only as a notice and a guide. As such it announced to those observers of the heavenly bodies, who were looking among them for the sign* of the universal monarch then generally expected by the people of the east to arise out of Judea†, that they would find the King of the Jews born on their arrival in his proper territory. Arrived at Jerusalem they made their enquiries to the great agitation of Herod and of his subjects; and being directed by the prompt decision of the priests and scribes grounded on the prediction of Micah, to Bethlehem, they again beheld the star beckoning them on their way, till it remained stationary over the place, where the infant Saviour abode. This was the miraculous and satisfactory proof afforded them, that Jesus was the child they sought. But it proved no more. Any information as to the age of the child, if such had been conveyed by it, would have been superfluous, when they saw him before them; and if they had

* The star foretold by Balaam in Numbers, xxiv. 17, the established sign of a ruler.

† Suetonius in Vespasiano, c. 4.
formed any preconceptions on that subject, whatever discrepancy might be found between them and the fact, would instantly disappear; for whether the child were ten years old or ten hours old, he was certainly the object of their visit, the King of the Jews. Hence it appears, that the age of our Lord cannot be truly estimated by the period of the star's appearance to the wise men of the east.

All these things being put together, the birth of Christ may with great reason be placed in the autumn*, perhaps some time in the month of October, before; that is to say, in the year of J. P. 4709, U. C. 749, and B. C. or the vulgar era A. D. 5, and at the close of the third year of the sixtieth week of Daniel. Consequently the real year of Christ compared with those of other eras will agree with them only partially: for instance the year 1 of Christ's real age will agree for only three months with J. P. 4709, U. C. 749, and B. C. 5; but for nine months with the years

*This is a much more likely season than that, where it is usually placed, in the depth of winter, which is hardly consistent with the circumstance of shepherds keeping their flocks by night in the open country. It is probable that the event coincided with some part of the feast of tabernacles in that year, since we find, that the two other great Jewish festivals were distinguished by corresponding events in the christian history; the passover by the sacrifice of the Redeemer; the pentecost by the descent of the Holy Ghost.
4710, 750, and 4. So too the true year of Christ, agrees with the year 1 B. C. for three months or till January first, and then coincides with the year after Christ or A. D. 1 for nine months more. Hence it is evident, that after our Lord's fifth year, in computing events, which happened between autumn and January, the number five must be added to the year of our Lord, and in those between January and autumn must be added four. This will clearly appear from the annexed table, which is carried to our Lord's twelfth year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B.C. True Year</th>
<th>B.C. True Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autumn to January 5 1</td>
<td>January to Autumn 4 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...........................4 2</td>
<td>...........................3 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...........................3 3</td>
<td>...........................2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...........................2 4</td>
<td>...........................1 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...........................1 5</td>
<td>...........................A.D. 1 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 6</td>
<td>2 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 7</td>
<td>3 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 8</td>
<td>4 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 9</td>
<td>5 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 10</td>
<td>6 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 11</td>
<td>7 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 12</td>
<td>8 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hence it plainly appears, that as Christ completed his eleventh year in autumn A. D. 7, and then entered on his twelfth, we must add five to the year until January. Thence the date of the
year is changed to 8, but Christ’s twelfth year is still continued, so that till the following autumn only four must be added to A. D. But the passover took place between January and autumn, therefore at that season the year of our Lord 8 agrees with the year of his age twelve.

In that year he first shewed himself as leader of his people according to St. Luke’s narrative. For having been brought by Joseph and Mary to keep the passover, he contrived on their return to tarry behind; and on the third day “they found him in the temple, sitting in the midst of the doctors, both hearing them and asking them questions.” And we are informed, that “all that heard him were astonished at his understanding and answers.” It has been supposed, that Jesus having been made at this feast “a disciple of the law,” or examined as to his proficiency therein, a ceremonial nearly corresponding to confirmation in the Christian church, took this opportunity of putting some questions, as he lawfully might, to the president of the Sanhedrim or to the doctors. But since children were brought to this ceremony by their parents, and Jesus of course was brought by his, there could be no reason for his staying behind for that purpose. The circumstances also do not agree with such a supposition; for he was found “sitting in the midst of
the doctors," not at their feet, but in the midst of them, as one of them, and evidently taking the lead among them. As after his resurrection he shewed himself alive, "not to all the people, but to witnesses chosen before of God," so upon this occasion he shewed himself as leader, not to all the people, but to proper chosen witnesses, to those who were best qualified by abilities and by knowledge to judge whether he were likely to become a sufficient leader. He shewed himself to the doctors, to the scribes and learned men, who understood the law, who studied the prophets, and were then anxiously expecting that Messiah would ere long appear. Their judgment is plainly declared by the place they allotted him or permitted him to take,—a child in his twelfth year!—they permitted him to sit among them, they condescended to the equal intercourse of questions and answers, and could not repress the astonishment, that both his questions and answers excited by the depth and comprehension of intellect, and the extent of knowledge, which they displayed. Moreover the tenor of the passage indicates that he had been thus engaged for three days. Questions of mere examination put to a child in his twelfth year, would not, I may almost say could not, be carried on for three days in succession; the examiners must have been
A DISSERTATION ON THE

abundantly convinced of the abilities and attainments of the most extraordinary child by a much shorter trial. Neither could it be to gratify a trifling curiosity by attending the exhibitions of a precocious boy, that the Jewish doctors for three days together seated Jesus among them. Such curiosity would be satiated, or rather weariest, in a much shorter space of time. They were drawn to him by higher and worthier motives; we are expressly told, that he heard their questions, that he answered them, and that "they were astonished at his answers." They proposed to him their serious doubts and long debated difficulties, and he answered and removed them; they laid before him the obscure and mysterious parts of scripture, and obtained from him solution, elucidation, or a satisfactory reason, why they could not yet be elucidated and solved. We read also, that he in return put questions to them; such perhaps, (like those in after times,) as they were not prepared to hear, or able to answer; and they were again astonished at the ready and easy expositions which he gave of subjects beyond the depth of the learned. Thus did Jesus at that early age, not only give promise and earnest of qualifications equal to fill and adorn the high office of leader of God's chosen people, but he really acted as leader, and that, not to a
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crowd of illiterate and unpolished vulgar, but to the most refined, learned, and studious of the nation. He then took upon him that part of his office as leader, which is predicted in the first of the six particulars, and in which he principally employed himself and especially shone during all the more authoritative and acknowledged period of his ministry on earth, the office of teaching his people; for his miracles, full as they were of power and mercy, were subservient to his words. In them lay his gospel; upon them his kingdom stood; "they were spirit and they were life."

But why labour with so much solicitude to prove, that Messiah upon this extraordinary occasion shewed himself fit to act, and really did act, as leader of his people, when we may learn the fact from his own mouth? "Wist ye not," said he to his wondering parents, when they expressed their sorrow at having missed, and their anxious pains in searching for him; "wist ye not, that I must be about my father's business?" By these words Jesus plainly demonstrated, that he not only knew who he was, his high destination, and the nature and duties of his office, but that he had been really and actively engaged in it. 

He had been about his father's business, deeply and extensively employed in those high concerns, which were ordained to be the objects
of his labours at a more advanced season of his life. He had been instructing, reminding, forewarning, encouraging his servants, discharging the functions of his mission, prosecuting the purposes of his advent. I have here followed the rendering of our English version in Luke, ii. 49, in which many learned critics acquiesce; but there are others equally learned, who prefer to render the words of the evangelist, "wist ye not, that I must be in my father's house?" This difference however does not affect my interpretation of the prophet. For why was he in his father's house? Surely not that he might hide himself from Joseph and Mary, like a playful or a froward boy. He expressly states, that it was his duty to be there: "wist ye not, that I must be, or ought to

* Wetsein, L. Bos, and others give numerous instances of the ellipsis of ouswara or demara; but they are deficient in shewing that e(n) in tooc tivoc signifies to be in a man's house. On the other hand Schleusner, without referring to this passage, cites from Romans, xii. 7, ev e(πα) diakova (sc. etw) munere diaconi recte fungatur. But I have doubts about the word etw being that here understood; I suspect it may rather be diakovo(w) by an Hebraism. Next he cites from 1 Timothy, iv. 15, ev tivoc (sc. πραγματι) υπει. This is quite in point. He cites also from Ælian, v. n. i. 32 ev γεωργια ενωα, in agro colendo occupari; and ibid. iv. 8, επε δε ev tivoc ἦν; which again is entirely to the purpose. Horace also has, totus in illis. Rosenmuller takes the same side. The reader may see the opposite opinions of prior critics arranged in Wolf's Curae Philologicae. Upon the whole I have no doubt, that our translation gives the true meaning of the evangelist.
be, in my father's house?" He was there to take possession of it, as his own, by right of inheritance. He was there as "son over his own house*," as Lord and master of it; to transact the business of it; to overlook and order the concerns of his household. If we do not admit thus much, the words of Jesus will have no force, no significance, and the reason pleaded for his withdrawing from his mother and reputed father will be no reason at all. He certainly meant to say, that Joseph was not properly his father; that although He for a season consented to look upon him as such, to make his house His own home, his business His own business, yet that God was truly His father, the temple of God His house, and the doctrines, precepts, oracles, instructions there delivered, the service and worship there performed and celebrated were truly His business, the affairs of His own household, over which, as son of the father, He was come to preside, and had just exhibited a specimen of his ability and fitness to preside. There seems to have been nothing to blame in the conduct of the Jewish Rabbis on this occasion. Would that they had shewn themselves equally liberal and docile afterwards, when Messiah, the leader, again came to "his own," his own proper domains,

* Hebrews, iii. 6.
A DISSERTATION ON THE

house, or concerns*! But alas, then "his own†," his own proper servants, domestics, or ministers, "received him not." It has now I trust appeared that the part of the prophecy contained in the twenty fifth verse, has received a rational and scriptural interpretation, and has been accomplished accordingly; that the year B. C. 469 is the proper point whence the going forth of the divine word for the rebuilding of Jerusalem is to be dated; that in seven weeks, or forty nine years, which brings us to the year 420, the whole city, as well the narrow lane as the spacious street, was completed in both a literal and figurative sense; that in its state of restoration and reestablishment it continued for sixty two weeks more; that towards the close of that term, that is to say, in the first year of the sixty second week, Messiah, in the person of our Lord Jesus Christ, came and shewed himself as leader of his people, while the city was still standing, inhabited by a numerous population, and regulated by a civil and ecclesiastical polity framed according to the law of Moses; and yet, that the times were in straitness, the domination of Rome producing distress of circumstances with much anxiety of mind.

* υς τα ἴδια, βς. χωρα, οικηματα, πραγματα. John, i. 11.
† οι ἴδιοι, βς. διλαι, ὑψηλαι.
Before dismissing this part of the prophecy it may be remarked as somewhat surprising and unaccountable, that so extraordinary a circumstance of our Lord's history, as his assuming the leadership in the temple, should not be the subject of other predictions. May it not however be a matter of allusion in the celebrated one of Isaiah, ix. 6, "unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulders?" But whatever may be thought of this, it seems to me plain enough that the early leadership of Messiah, forms the subject of Psalm lxxxvii. a Psalm which has suffered so greatly from the mistaken Masoretic punctuation*, that as it now stands in our English bibles and prayer books, it cannot without force be brought to apply to our blessed Lord at all, although it cannot be applied to any one else; for the person whose glory is the subject of the hymn is represented to be born on mount Sion, which cannot be truly said of Christ. The reader will therefore permit me to offer a new translation, in which I think, the allusion being understood, justice is done to the meaning of the prophet. The words included in brackets in the fourth verse only point out what was clearly perceived when the hymn was

*The noun יֵלֶד, Yeled, is pointed Yullad, as if it were a verb in the Masoretic form Pual. Hence arises the obscurity.
performed in the temple service, by a proper
distribution of the several clauses of the verse to
different parts of the choir. Bishop Horsley has
endeavoured to specify the very arrangement,
but as it seems to me not satisfactorily.

**PSALM LXXXVII.**

1. His foundation (the Lord's) is on the holy
   mountains.

2. Jehovah loveth the gates of Sion
   Above all the habitations of Jacob.

3. Things glorious beyond expression are in thee,
   O city of God. Selah.

4. I may make mention of Rahab and Babylon
   to them that know me;
   
   [I may say]
   Behold Philistia and Tyre, with Cush!
   
   [It is no purpose that I direct their
   attention to human and perishable glories.]
   Disdaining such, they will only reply,
   pointing to Sion,
   
   HE is a youth there.

5. Yea unto Sion man by man shall say,
   A youth is in her, and HE the Most High
   shall establish her.
6. Jehovah will recount when he inscribeth the nations, 

[in the register of his own people,]

That HE was a youth THERE. Selah.

God will still cause this peculiar glory to rest upon his ancient habitation, even when the Gentiles shall have been taken into the number of his people; as he has done by relating the fact in the gospel of St. Luke.

7. Yea the singers as well as pipers, 

celebrating the praises of God among all people and through all ages; the pipers being put by a synecdoche, for all sorts of instrumental performers, 

All my fountains, shall recount that HE was a youth IN THEE.

By his fountains the Psalmist means the vocal and instrumental performers glorifying the Lord in divine worship; they were to him perpetual sources, perennial FOUNTAINS of delight and joy. In so hot a country as Judea, fountains were likely to become a general image for high pleasures of any kind. Accordingly we find in scripture similar expressions often.
used in the same sense. The last verse is destitute of a verb. The readiest and surest way of supplying the defect is to bring down from the preceding verse the word "recount," with its adjuncts, "that he was a youth there;" only, instead of expressing Jerusalem in the third person, the Psalmist immediately addresses her in the second person, as he had done in the third verse of the Psalm.
SEVENTY WEEKS OF DANIEL.

CHAPTER IV.

SECTION IV.

The Interpretation and Accomplishment of the Predictions posterior to the term of sixty two Weeks, until the end of the term of seventy Weeks.

26. And after the sixty and two weeks Messiah shall be cut off, and no one will be on his side; and he shall destroy the city and the sanctuary with the leader that cometh; and his end shall be with an inundation, for until the end shall be the war, the determined judgment of desolations.

It has been proved*, that the word after in the beginning of this verse does not signify immediately after, but may, and does extend to all the events, which are to follow in the sixty second week, and which are noticed in this verse.

* See chapters 2 and 3, pages 79 and 185.
A DISSERTATION ON THE

It has also been proved*, that the Hebrew word, rendered in our English version, shall be cut off, is properly so rendered, and that even if the alteration in the vowel points proposed by Dr. Blaney† and Mr. Faber were adopted, the meaning would remain the same. The Hebrew word rendered cut off is said by Rabbinical writers to signify properly such a cutting off as is the consequence of a judicial sentence‡. This nicety of signification may be nothing better

* Chapter 2, page 80.

† Dr. Hales, in his analysis of Chronology, vol. 2, page 563, has accused Dr. Blaney of "conspiring with Dathe and Michaelis to set aside the prophet Daniel's testimony to the violent death of Messiah." I think the learned author would hardly have brought forward such a heavy charge, if he had recollected the solemn and decided confession of the late Regius Professor of Hebrew; Dissertation, page 58. "Far, very far am I from wishing to weaken any part of that evidence, which is afforded us for the confirmation of any of those sacred truths which are most surely believed among us. But if the doctrine of our Saviour's death for the sins of mankind be not here to be met with in reality, as I am persuaded it is not, who can be justly blamed for acknowledging the truth? Nor do I think the credibility of the doctrine in the least degree shaken by the want of such an attestation. For if the illustration of this prophecy tends to the confirmation of the gospel truth in general, it tends also to the confirmation of every particular article which that gospel teaches. And I know not what it doth teach, if it doth not teach with the greatest plainness and perspicuity, that "Christ Jesus died for our sins, and not for his own, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us unto God." The same I am sure would be said, and truly said, by Mr. Faber also.

‡ See chap. 2, page 82, in the note.
than a subtle, and fanciful refinement, and probably is no other, since it derives little support from the frequent use of the word in the old testament; but if it could be firmly maintained, the prediction would only agree in a greater number of particulars with that in the fifty third chapter of Isaiah, and with the real state of facts recorded in the new testament. There is no occasion in this instance for exposition, where every thing is plain, or for formal proof, where every thing is admitted. Our Lord Jesus was certainly cut off, and that by crucifixion, the consequence of a judicial sentence, unjustly pronounced and barbarously executed upon him in the thirty fifth year of his age, and in the thirty first year of the vulgar Christian era, coinciding with the third year of the sixty fifth week of Daniel. But although there can be no doubt, that the crucifixion of our Lord took place, as here predicted, after the expiration of the sixty two weeks, yet since the prophecy is substantially of a chronological cast, and some of the most important and difficult points in its interpretation consist in the settlement and verification of fixed terms; it is advisable here, and will prevent the necessity of doing the like hereafter, to determine with as much accuracy, as the case admits of, the period of Messiah's excision.
A DISSERTATION ON THE

It has been shewn before*, that Christ was born about autumn, probably at the time when the feast of tabernacles was celebrated†, in the year of Rome 749, or of the Julian period 4709, hardly six months before the death of Herod the great. St. Luke, after relating his baptism by John, informs us, that he "was beginning to be about thirty years old;" that is to say, he was just on the point either of beginning, or of completing his thirtieth year. Thus the phrase may possibly be extended over one whole year of our Lord’s life; but it is difficult to see, how it can be made to take in more, except by such violent methods as would extend it to a whole decade of years‡. The period then intended by St. Luke, cannot be later than the autumn of the year of Rome 779, when our Lord had completed his thirtieth year. Now John, as St. Luke

* Section 3, page 316.
† This is the more probable, since we find that the two other great Jewish festivals are distinguished by corresponding events in the Christian history; the Passover by the sacrifice of the Redeemer, the Pentecost by the descent of the Holy Ghost.
‡ It is thought by Kepler, (cited by Lardner in his Credibility, part I, b. 2, chap. 3,) that by the use of the indefinite term about, any part of the age of Christ may be signified between his twenty-fifth and thirty-fifth year. But, unless it can be proved, that Ἰτις ἡμῶν ἡμῶν is the same thing as Ἰτις by itself, the signification is limited to nearly one of two periods, when he was just entering upon his thirtieth year, or when he was just thirty years old, a little before or after.
relates, began to baptize in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius, which, reckoning from his accession to the empire on the death of Augustus, agrees with the year of Rome 781, and with A. D. 28; consequently, with the close of the true year of Christ's age thirty two, so that the two accounts are at variance; but we learn from the Roman historians*, that another, and that an earlier, date, was given to the reign of Tiberius, according to which it was reckoned, not from the death of Augustus, but from a period not less than two years before that event, when he was associated with Augustus, as his colleague in the empire, in the command of the armies, and the administration of the Imperial

* Velleius Paterculus, l. 2, c. 121. Suetonius in Tiberio, c. 21. Tacitus in Annal. i. 1, c. 3. Dio Cassius, l. 56 and 57. That this mode of computing the reign of Tiberius was known to the early christians, is plain from the saying common among them, that Christ suffered in the fifteenth year of that emperor; (see the citations given by Lardner, Works, vol. 1, p. 382;) for since they could not but be aware, that St. Luke had dated John's baptism from the same year, they must have contradicted him, which it is impossible to suppose they could mean to do, by making that the year of the crucifixion, unless it were a matter of notoriety, that there were two dates of Tiberius's reign, of which they adopted one and the evangelist the other. Still indeed there is a mistake in their chronology; but that is easily accounted for: it arose from the persuasion they entertained, that the first three evangelists allotted one year only to our Saviour's ministry; either forcing St. John's account into an agreement therewith, or entirely overlooking it.
provinces, among which Judea was one. The effect of this mode of reckoning, is to carry back the first year of Tiberius, to the year of Rome 765; and consequently his fifteenth year also to 779, or A.D. 26. In the autumn of that year Christ must have been thirty years old, or on the point of entering upon his thirty first year, the very instant of time, when according to St. Luke, the baptist commenced his ministry.

To this it will be objected, that St. Luke states the thirty years of Jesus to be his age, not at the beginning of John’s baptism, but when He himself was baptized by John. This objection, if fully established, unless it could be shewn at the same time, that the baptism of Christ was the first act, or one among the first acts, of John’s ministry, would either set the two evangelists at variance once more, or in order to reconcile them, would make it necessary to suppose that St. Luke has antedated by a year the period when Tiberius was taken as colleague with Augustus. Now that evangelist plainly declares, that the baptism of our Lord did not take place at the early part of John’s ministry, but when all the people had been baptized*, not meaning however in strictness, that none were baptized after, but that those who received John as a

*Chap. iii. 21.
prophet, had in general been baptized previously. It is plain therefore that the objection cannot be maintained without opposing the two evangelists to each other, or without making such a gratuitous and improbable supposition, as the mode of computation above proposed, would with good reason be chosen on purpose to avoid. Farther, if the fifteenth year of Tiberius and the thirty years complete of Jesus be really separate dates, they are calculated to ascertain the interval between the beginning of John's baptism, and Christ's reception of it. This consequence must have been plainly perceived, and being perceived must have been intended also by St. Luke. But if he had entertained such an intention, then he would doubtless have taken care to fix the date of Christ's nativity with a degree of exactness, which would have enabled us to connect his age of thirty years, with the corresponding year of Tiberius, and thence to compute the interval above mentioned. But this he has not done. Upon these grounds we may venture to dismiss the objection, and to adhere to the computation above proposed, which supposes no more than what is in the highest degree probable, consistent with the tenor of the passage, and unattended by any obscurity; that the evangelist intended in the twenty third verse to reascend
to the first and second, in which he had fixed the date of the commencement of John's ministry, and to place the close of the thirtieth year of Jesus in parallelism therewith.

But on the other hand it will be argued in support of the objection, that St. Luke does not mention the age of Christ till after having related his baptism. The argument is not very formidable. The passage itself contains a proof, that the evangelist did not strictly attend to the order of time in his narrative, since he records in the nineteenth and twentieth verses, the tyrannical injustice of Herod, in the imprisonment of John, before relating the baptism of Jesus, although that could not, from the known facts and circumstances of the case, have occurred till afterwards*. The supposition then, that in the twenty third verse he reverts to the date given at the beginning of the chapter, is well supported by an instance nearly parallel, in the same part of his narrative, but in fact the whole passage from the end of the sixth to that of the twenty second verse, has the nature of a parenthesis, in which St. Luke has put together the whole that he thought fit

* This we collect with the greatest certainty from John, iii. 22, where it appears that the baptist was at liberty, and engaged in discharging the duties of his mission, even after the first passover, in which Jesus shewed himself publicly to the Jewish people.
to say of John's baptism and ministry, and is very similarly circumstanced to that in Ezra, iv. 6—23, upon which much has been said before*. It is the manner of St. Luke, when he has made mention of a subordinate subject, to relate at once all that he intends to say upon it, that it may not afterwards interfere with the principal thread of his history. Thus we find him introducing and dismissing the circumstances of St. Peter's temptation and denial, previously to relating the principal facts of our Lord's trial before the high-priest, although it is certain from St. John's account of the transactions, that both were going on together, and that several parts of the one were intermingled with those of the other; in conformity with which St. Luke himself informs us that an hour elapsed between the second and third denials†. Another instance of the same mode of narration will be brought forward hereafter. The evangelist then, it appears, being desirous to dismiss the whole subject of John and his baptism before proceeding to the ministry of our Lord, in order that he might pass from the one to the other by a

* See page 296.
† Matthew and Mark also place the temptation of St. Peter by itself, but in a different order from St. Luke's, disposing it after the narrative of our Lord's trial.
readier transition, made the baptism of Jesus the last act of the baptist's ministry, which he saw fit to notice. By taking this step he at the same time attained a very important object; he connected the age of Jesus with the received era, and fixed the date of our Lord's birth, as having taken place thirty years before the fifteenth of Tiberius, that is to say, in the year of Rome 749, agreeably to what is collected from the account of St. Matthew. Unless we suppose the evangelist to have had this object in view, the time that elapsed between John's commencing his baptism and his administering it to our Saviour not being ascertained, the mention of Christ's age on that occasion, however interesting, becomes altogether an unconnected piece of information, and on that account comparatively of small importance. Upon the whole then it may be concluded, that the period when our Lord Christ had just attained, or was on the point of attaining, the age of thirty years, was also the period when John began his baptism. And although we still have not any means afforded us for determining the interval between the commencement of John's ministry and our Lord's baptism, yet that does not lessen the probability of our conclusion in favour of the common mode of understanding the passage,
since thereby we find ourselves labouring under the same want of information. From the omission of it, which must have been designed, since it is at once so conspicuous, and might have been so easily supplied, we may with great probability collect, that the evangelist intended his readers to supply it for themselves by such a conjecture, as common sense and the circumstances of the case might warrant them in forming or adopting; the mode of supply plainly intimating, that the space was not long, nor the conjecture complicated or difficult. Accordingly the chronologers of our English bibles have unexceptionably fixed the interval at one year, dating the beginning of John’s baptism in A. D. 26, and our Saviour’s reception of it in A. D. 27. For since John came preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins, as we have seen, about autumn; since also it is highly probable, that Christ was born at that season of the year, and was just on the point of thirty when the baptist entered on his mission, it is evident that the latter would have run through the annual cycle of the Jewish festivals by the autumn of 27, when Jesus presented himself to receive the sacred rite. This would afford the necessary time and opportunities for proclaiming and spreading to a sufficient extent the tidings, that
A person was on the point of coming, whose appearance was already expected. Moreover, John continued to preach and to baptize for certainly more than half a year longer, through another passover; so that nothing can well be supposed wanting to the promulgation of the message, with which he was intrusted.

It must he confessed however, that our bible chronology, following Archbishop Usher, allows three years to pass between our Lord’s baptism and the commencement of his public ministry, which are of course supposed to make part of John’s. But this is done without any warrant of scripture; for the passage cited in its support, Luke, iv. 14, plainly indicates, that upon the temptation being ended, Jesus returned to Galilee and forthwith entered upon the duties of his sacred office. Nor can it be shewn, that the passage referred to by Usher, in St. Paul’s discourse to the Jews at Antioch in Pisidia, Acts, xiii. 24, 25, supposes such an extended period; for it is plain from a comparison of the three evangelists, Matthew, Luke, and John, that the words of the baptist quoted by the apostle were spoken before the baptism of Jesus, and therefore are produced in vain to prove, that he continued baptizing for three years afterwards. Neither can it be truly alleged, that the mission of John
the baptist was of a nature to require an additional period of three years to the former one, which had elapsed between his first annunciation of the approaching kingdom of heaven and the baptism of Christ. For its principal object was to bear witness to the advent of the divine sovereign; as John the evangelist tells us, "he came for a witness, that all men," certainly meaning not all mankind, nor even the Israelites universally, but the Jews generally, "through him might believe." Accordingly he went before the face of the Lord to prepare his way, and endeavoured, all that in him lay, "to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children and the hearts of the children to the fathers," that is, to possess the Jews of his day with the same sincere and steadfast faith, the same simple and holy character, as had prevailed in the patriarchs of old*. He preached to the people repentance, that they should no longer rest on the supposed merit of circumcision and other carnal and external ordinances for justification before God, but that "believing on Him who should come

* It is not to be supposed from the expressions of the angel in Luke, i. 17, that there was, or was intended to be any interchange of principles, affections, or conduct; as if the fathers were to take in return those of the children. The antithetic parallels are employed merely to increase the force and heighten the beauty of the expression.
after him," they should seek and cultivate that change of heart and of the governing principles, in which sincere repentance and a lively faith, like that which was imputed to Abraham for righteousness, truly consist. In like manner he turned, or sought to turn, "the hearts of the disobedient to the wisdom of the just," by inculcating, as we find he did, Luke, iii. 10—14, the precepts of pure morality, with an especial regard to the condition and peculiar temptations of his hearers. But these truths he taught in only a general way to the multitudes, who received his baptism; not as a teacher commissioned to deliver a complete body of divine instruction, but merely as making preparations for the approaching Messiah and his apostles to settle the whole doctrine of God on sure foundations, and rear up the edifice of truth to full perfection. It should seem then, that the space of a year and an half was quite sufficient for the purposes which John came to fulfil; and to extend it farther, postponing our Lord's ministry for the same space, is to suppose, that Jesus passed in unaccountable obscurity and retirement a period, during which he was fully prepared and capable, and even appointed, yea and after he had most successfully and victoriously begun, to act up to the full dignity of his blessed office.
If lastily it should be urged on the other hand, that Isaiah has predicted him, as preparing the way of the Lord in the desert of the heathen world, as filling up vallies and levelling mountains, clearing away the obstacles, which falsehood, ignorance, and barbarism presented to the progress of the gospel, and forming a passage for the entrance of truth, holiness, and integrity into the understandings and dispositions of the Gentiles, and that therefore a longer period must be allowed, the reply is obvious, that the prophet did not mean, that the baptist himself would effect the predicted ends by his personal labours, which in point of fact he took no means to do, but that he would publish and proclaim the arrival of the period in which those effects were actually produced. Accordingly at the time of John's appearance the Roman empire by its arms had conquered, and by its arts and literature had in a great degree civilized, the world; it had broken down the barriers of national divisions and distinctions, and by common government, languages, and laws had bound the nations in union, while it forced them into subjection, whence mutual commerce and intercourse were promoted and facilitated. Under its sovereignty the roar of war subsided, and the world was hushed in a profound peace. Thus
was the way made ready, the path thrown up, for the divine word to go forth; and in this sense and this alone John proclaimed the fact. It appears then, that there is nothing in the prophecies concerning John's ministry, more than in the actual discharge of it, to disturb our former conclusion, that the space of a year and an half is quite sufficient for all the purposes which he came to fulfil.

Admitting then, that John the baptist began his baptism about autumn in the year of our Lord 26, and that the space of one year intervened between that period and the conferring of the holy rite upon our Lord, we date the public leadership of Jesus, his actual and permanent administration of the office of Messiah, from the autumn of the year 27, and in the true year of his age thirty one, just as he entered upon it. For, that the period of his baptism was the point of time, at which he took upon him to act as the "captain of our salvation," we are authorized and indeed obliged to acknowledge by the testimony of St. Peter expressed in his proposal* to the primitive assembly of persons confessing the name of Christ, to ordain a twelfth apostle in the room of Judas Iscariot. "All the time," saith he, "that the Lord Jesus went in and out

* Acts, i. 21, 22.
among us, beginning from the baptism of John, unto that same day that he was taken up from us." The words *going in and out among us*, as they plainly and properly express the office of a leader, so do they signify the actual and personal exercise of it, not as being performed by agent, minister, or deputy: and the assumption of it by Jesus began, we are told, *from the baptism of John*, meaning from the baptism of Jesus by John, or from that period in John's baptism, when Jesus received the ordinance; for before that time he was unknown personally to any of the apostles, except those of his kindred, was unacknowledged as leader by any of them, and therefore could not be said to *go in and out among them* in any sense or to any purpose whatever. Even as it was, the personal acquaintance of most, and the submission to his leadership of any, did not take place immediately after his baptism, that is to say, not till after the expiration of the forty days of his temptation. For then it was, that having returned to John, and having received his solemn and repeated attestations to his being the expected Messiah, he set about collecting a body of disciples, and afforded them sufficient demonstrations, that he did indeed possess the knowledge and the power befitting the only begotten of the Father. Then truly
he began to go in and out among them. But the real, though not visible, commencement of his leadership took place before; even from the time, that he was “anointed with the Holy Ghost and with power;” for thence-forward he began to act as “captain of our salvation” against our spiritual enemies. Accordingly St. Peter, speaking to persons well acquainted with the facts, reckons into the leadership those forty days, in which, as captain of our salvation, he may be said to have gone in and out before his people, sustaining under the greatest disadvantages and overcoming by a triumphant resistance the temptations of the prince of fallen angels, that “strong man armed,” who finding, that a stronger than himself had come upon him, never dared to interrupt him in the exercise of his office, by disputing his absolute and often stern commands to resign the palace and the goods, of which he had usurped the possession. From the autumn then of A. D. 27 our blessed Saviour, according to the authoritative reckoning of St. Peter, went in and out among his disciples; and this he continued to do for three complete years and more, even until the passover of the fourth, when he was crucified; and yet for forty days longer, after his resurrection, “until he was taken up from them.”
The term of our Saviour's leadership we learn from St. John, who in his gospel has arranged it under four successive passovers. Doubts however have been entertained on the subject; some authors confining our Lord's ministry to a single year in conformity, as they suppose, with the three former evangelists, who make no mention of any passover except that, in which he suffered; and others, by taking out one of the four passovers, abridging its duration to two years and an half. The opinions of many writers on the subject are ably and fairly stated by Bishop Marsh in his notes to the third volume of Michaelis's Introduction, page 56. Without entering at length into the question, I will take leave to make a few observations.*

I. The most important part of the dispute lies between those, who would restrain our Lord's personal ministry to a single year, and those who maintain several, no matter whether three or four successive passovers; in as much as this seriously affects the veracity of the evangelists, and of course the credibility of the gospels, at least, as to this particular. For since the chief argument for a single year rests upon the fact,

* My library is far from containing all the books, in which the question is discussed. Let this be my apology to the reader, if he find that I have been anticipated in what follows.
that no other passover, but that of the crucifixion, is noticed by the first three evangelists, if it could thence be certainly concluded, that their gospels cannot be made to consist with more than one passover, then either the credit of St. John's gospel, which clearly mentions at least three passovers, must sink before the evidence of the others, or our belief in all must be suspended. For it is impossible to bring St. John's computation to agree with a leadership of a single year, without such violent efforts of emendation, excision, and transposition, as plainly prove the author δελευσιν ὑποθεσει; to try his skill on the text, not because it requires his critical hand, but because he would make it speak his sentiments.

II. There is no argument in proof that the first three gospels are incompatible with the three or four passovers of the last: for although the mention of those passovers is confessedly omitted by Matthew, Mark, and Luke, and there may be difficulty in accounting for the omission, yet that negative argument will not amount to a proof of any thing more, than that those authors did not intend to arrange their narratives by passovers, and in general that they paid little attention to the circumstance of time.

III. It seems however, that the gospel of St. Mark at least, if not that of St. Matthew
also, does contain some indication of a passover having taken place during our Saviour's personal ministry, previously to that of his crucifixion, and exactly agreeing with one of those expressly noticed by St. John. From him we learn, that the great miracle of the loaves and fishes was wrought a little before a passover, the approaching celebration of which feast would cause vast numbers of persons to be travelling toward Jerusalem at the same time, and was probably the occasion of the great concourse that was then collected. Now Dr. Hales in his Ancient Chronology*, acutely observes, that "St. John inserts this valuable, natural as well as chronological character, incidentally, that "there was much grass in the place," a circumstance that could not have happened at an earlier or later season than the beginning of spring in that warm climate." But St. Mark† relating the same miracle, informs us, that the people sat ἐπὶ τῷ χλωρῳ χορτῳ, and St. Matthew‡ ἐπὶ τῷ χορτῳ: therefore they bear witness to St. John, that there was "grass" and "much grass" at that season, and consequently, that the miracle took place in the early spring, that is to say, a little before the passover. From the facts afterwards related, it

† Mark, vi. 39. 
‡ Matthew, xiv. 19.
cannot be pretended, that this was the spring immediately preceding the passover, in which Christ was crucified; wherefore it may be concluded, that St. Mark does certainly, and St. Matthew probably, afford us proof of a passover having occurred in our Lord's ministry anterior to that of his crucifixion, and exactly agreeing with one noticed by St. John. But since those two evangelists have suffered one passover to slip by without direct mention, they may have neglected to notice one or two others; and therefore we conclude again, that from their silence no valid objection can be drawn to the number of passovers mentioned by St. John.

IV. The other question, whether four passovers, or only three, are noticed in St. John's gospel, howsoever settled, is entirely innocent of the consequences resulting from a perverse determination of the former. As to the first, third, and fourth, no doubt can be entertained. They are all expressly named as such, in ii. 13, vi. 4, xi. 55, or xii. 1. But the second is noticed in v. 1, only as τραπέζιον, a feast, without the article. If that had been prefixed, the noun would have been either referred to some specific feast before mentioned, or understood to signify some feast distinguished by way of eminence, as one above all others. Since no feast is previously mentioned,
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to which it can be referred, and since the passover is confessedly the feast, that alone can lay claim to such a distinction, it should seem, that the application of the general term εορτή specifically thereto would in such case hardly have been questioned. The omission of the article, it must be acknowledged, if we were obliged to draw simply from the word itself our whole argument for its specific application, would leave that application doubtful. But that is all that can be granted or called for; and accordingly that learned and acute investigator of the use of the Greek Article, the late Bishop Middleton*, thought the omission of it no objection to the opinion, that the passover is the feast here meant by St. John. The way then is still open to arguments, tending to prove, that what may be must be. Besides, it should be observed, that in many MSS. some of them very ancient, and in citations by the fathers the article is inserted†; and although their authority is hardly sufficient to

* Middleton on the Greek Article, page 351.
† Under the pretence of reconciling St. John with the other evangelists, it has been proposed to omit πασχα in vi. 4, or even to expunge the whole verse, as interpolations, though they are found in all the MSS. and versions. Let any reader judge, whether it be more likely, that a single letter, which is found in many MSS. should be accidentally omitted in the majority, or that a whole word, or even a whole verse, should be wilfully interpolated in all.
justify us in admitting the reading into the sacred text, yet at least it shews the full persuasion of the transcribers and citers, that the feast meant was the great feast of the passover.

V. St. John, it is well known, wrote his gospel at a much later period than the other evangelists, and with a view, as plainly appears from its own construction, as well as from the testimonies of the ancients, to supply sundry omissions of facts, discourses, and doctrines, necessary to be made known before the volume of the new testament should be closed. Now the omission of dates respecting our Lord's personal leadership in the first three gospels is surely a very important one, well worthy to engage the notice and to be supplied by the pen of St. John. And we may conclude, that it appeared so in his eyes, since he has actually supplied the deficiency. But this being an object with the evangelist, it follows of course, that all his notes of time are to be strictly attended to, and regarded, if no other reason appear for their insertion, as subservient to that object. Now we find, that in carrying his intention into effect, he has digested the period of his master's ministry by passovers, of which he has particularized three; and to these christians may with great reason think themselves authorized, if not obliged, to
add the feast mentioned in v. 1, although it has not received a distinct appropriation. For

VI. The miracle performed by Jesus at the feast in question does not by its nature or by any of its circumstances refer us to any particular festival whatever. No reason therefore can be assigned for the mention of the feast, except as being a note of time and helping to mark the duration of our Lord’s ministry*. But as a note of time, it is of no use, and marks nothing, unless it denote the passover. Consequently we may consider ourselves as following the guidance of St. John, when we refer it to that feast.

VII. It is however not improbable, that the motion of the water in Bethesda, being known, as St. John informs us, to take place \(\alpha \alpha \alpha \alpha \iota \rho \omicron \omicron\), \textit{at a certain season}, might sufficiently mark what particular feast he had in view. But of this, whatever knowledge of it might be retained, when St. John wrote his gospel, no memory is handed down to us. Yet such a preternatural commotion

* If it could be successfully maintained, that the evangelist by the mention of a feast intended only to account for the presence of Jesus at Jerusalem, still the passover must be understood by that feast. For in all the other passages of his gospel, wherein St. John notices the presence of our Lord there, he fails not to specify the particular feast, which was the occasion of his coming. His omission in the present instance cannot be satisfactorily accounted for, but by understanding \(\epsilon \omega \rho \eta\), though without the article, to be put \(\epsilon \rho \iota \alpha \chi \nu \nu\) for the passover.
of the element, as he describes, is more likely to have taken place at the passover than at any other festival, as being the principal one, and that, to the celebration of which the greatest number of Jews were congregated at Jerusalem.

VIII. Of the three passovers distinctly named, one at least, that mentioned in vi. 4, is certainly introduced for no other purpose, but to mark the lapse of time; for the miracle then wrought has no particular relation to the ensuing passover, but might have been performed with equal significance and effect, on any occasion, or in any place, where a large multitude was assembled. Hence it is a fair argument by analogy, that the mention of the feast in v. 1, which, as before observed, cannot answer any other purpose, is intended to answer that. But to that it is not applicable, if taken in a general and indefinite sense. It must therefore be applied to some particular feast. But that feast can be no other than the passover; for to that alone the general term can be applied αὐτὴν εἰς ἑορτὴν, as it is in iv. 45.

IX. The argument, that the feast in question denotes the pentecost, because in vii. 2 mention is made of the feast of tabernacles, which next followed pentecost, and in x. 22 of that of the dedication, which came next in order, falls to the ground, when it is observed, that an inter-
vening passover is mentioned in vi. 4, which breaks up the cycle, on the integrity of which the argument depends.

X. On the other hand, the mention of this feast is placed between two passovers, in the interval of which the other Jewish festivals must have occurred in their course. If the feast in question were one of those, the mention of it here must be intended to fix the point of time in that year, at which the miracle and discourse related in the fifth chapter took place. But then the particular feast ought to have been named, according to what may be termed the practice of St. John; for he has so done in vii. 2, in respect to the feast of Tabernacles, and again in x. 22, in respect to the feast of Dedication. Hence we may probably conclude, that the evangelist does not intend to distinguish a feast in the interval between one passover and the next following; and if not, then he must mean to express a third passover.

XI. When we farther consider, that St. John twice makes mention of the passover, under the general term of the feast only, in the tenth verse alone, and then names it expressly in the fourth verse of the next chapter, it should seem, that his intention to designate the passover by the indefinite term feast, is sufficiently clear without being more significantly expressed.
XII. The shortness of the narrative allotted to one whole year of our Saviour's life, in case the second passover of St. John be admitted, seems to offer no solid ground of objection against its admission. For St. John's gospel, like those of the other evangelists, does not profess to be a complete life of Jesus, but to give a selection of his actions and discourses, and of some incidents that befell him. Now if one of his objects were, as from the composition of his gospel it plainly appears to have been, to supply the deficiencies of the other evangelists, and that, among other things, with regard to time, the argument is totally without effect. Besides, the miracle and discourse related in the sixth chapter took place previously to the passover, yet nothing else is related to have been done by our Lord between that and the next feast of tabernacles, an interval of six months, and comprehending the passover itself, as well as the pentecost.

Upon the whole, seeing that the absence of the article has no farther effect than to make the application of the word εορτή, or feast, doubtful; seeing that the opposition, which St. Matthew and St. Mark were supposed to offer to the extension of our Saviour's ministry to the term of three years, cannot be maintained; seeing too, that St. John has supplied the deficiencies of the preced-
ing gospels, in respect to the circumstance of time, as well as other things, and that therefore his notes of time are to be strictly attended to; seeing farther, that the words in question do certainly express a period of time placed between two passovers, and that it is introduced principally with a view to ascertain the interval between those passovers, whilst it is superfluous to any other, at least any important, purpose; and seeing lastly that no interval but that marked by the occurrence of a passover can be ascertained by it, there can be little if any doubt left, that the feast is to be understood of the passover; and therefore we conclude that the period of our Lord's ministry, as determined by St. John, extended to the space of at least three years.

But it is farther certain from the testimony of St. John, that our Lord had acted as leader of his people, personally going in and out among them, sometime before the first of the passovers mentioned by the same evangelist, who relates several important incidents between the baptism of Jesus and the first passover; as the baptist's testimony to him on sundry occasions, the collecting of a small body of disciples, his miracle at Cana, his journey to Capernaum, and his abode there, with his mother, his brethren, and his disciples, for an indefinite space of time, said
however to be "not many days." But before all these things, and immediately after his baptism, he is found, agreeably to his office, engaged in a trying conflict, for forty days together, with the enemy of his people, whom he discomfited in three decisive encounters. When all these facts are laid together, it cannot be supposed, that they took up much less than six months; and we have no reason for believing that they took up more. This computation brings us to the point before settled for the baptism of Jesus by John; and from the coincidence of the two we derive an additional proof, that the period during which our blessed Saviour acted as leader in the personal exercise, and up to the full extent, of that exalted office, was three years and an half, when his labours of love and mercy were terminated by his sufferings and death. But that period began, as we have before seen, in autumn A. D. 27; wherefore his excision took place in the spring, that is to say, at the passover of A. D. 31, in the third year of Daniel's sixty fifth week, as before mentioned.

It is added, that no one will be on his side. This must have appeared very unaccountable and astonishing, as well as afflicting, to Daniel himself and to all pious Jews before the event. That the righteous, holy, and divine king,
Messiah, should be cut off at all, was beyond all apprehension and supposition; but that he should come to his death without a struggle; without an army to fight, without a friend to act, or even to speak, in his behalf; that there should be no one on his side in that extremity;—this must have seemed in their eyes to surpass all that history had ever recorded, and all that imagination could ever frame, of disloyal, traitorous, and cowardly desertion. Yet such too was the correspondent prediction of Isaiah; not only in general, that “he is despised and rejected of men; that we hid, as it were, our faces from him; that he was despised and we esteemed him not;” but with a particular respect to the last mournful period of Messiah’s sufferings, when the prophet, with the eye of prescience, seeing him “taken from prison,” or rather from custody, “and from judgment,” after the close of his shamefully oppressive trials, indignantly asks, “and who shall declare his generation?” meaning his manner of life and behaviour*; as much as to say, who shall bear testimony to his spotless character, to

* See the observations of Dr. Kennicott, in Bishop Lowth’s note on the passage. Translation of Isaiah, page 240, 4to. edition. A very plain instance of the use of the word בּוֹ מָו in the sense of moral conduct or manner of life is to be seen in Genesis, vi. 9, where it is distinguished from the word בּוֹ מָו just before used in the proper sense of generations.
his righteous, marvellous, beneficent actions, to his holy and blameless course of conduct? implying, that no one will; that there will be no one on his side; that not a man of all his subjects will come forward to speak a word in favour of the falsely accused, unjustly condemned Prince and Saviour. The event, as we well know, corresponded to the prophecies. When the Lord Jesus was cut off by an oppressive judgment, there was literally no one on his side. "His disciples," we read, "forsook him and fled*." One of them had previously betrayed him, and another, who at first made a shew of resistance, afterwards denied him. Of the multitudes who had heard the authoritative instructions, the solemn exhortations, the pathetic exhortations, the heavenly consolations of Jesus, of those who had seen his mighty and merciful works, and who yet retained in their own persons the indubitable evidences of his saving power, not one was found on his side. On the contrary, the misled populace were "instant with loud voices" and furious cries for his excision:—"Crucify him, crucify him;" and actually compelled the Roman governor, who on this occasion manifested a decent sense of justice and some generous feelings of compassion, lest by refusal he should excite a tumult and compro-

* Matthew, xxvi. 56, Mark, xiv. 50.
mise his personal safety, to carry their bloody purpose into execution. Thus was Messiah cut off and no man was on his side.

But "the days of vengeance" were not far distant. Messiah raised from the dead and "seated at the right hand of power" came "with the clouds of heaven," imperceptible indeed to outward sight, but evidently discernible to the eye of faith, in the course of his providence and in the terror of his judgments, directing his human agents and instruments with the might of his omnipotence to sweep away from the earth the guilty city, and the violated, deserted sanctuary, which he no longer acknowledged to be His.

AND HE (Messiah) SHALL DESTROY THE CITY AND THE SANCTUARY. It has been sufficiently proved in the second chapter*, that Messiah is the nominative to the verb destroy; that the city and sanctuary are the accusatives following it, and that any other construction is attended with great perplexity and grammatical difficulty. This having been settled, the words, like those immediately preceding, require no explanation.

And, as for proof of their accomplishment, every reader knows, that Jerusalem and its temple, the city and sanctuary here intended and doomed to destruction, have been destroyed

* Pages 87—91.
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accordingly; and will without hesitation or doubt refer the act of Messiah's providence in destroying them, to that terrible and fatal overthrow, which they received from Titus and the Romans, those formidable instruments of vengeance and desolation in the hands of the supreme disposer and judge.

It is farther predicted, that the material city and sanctuary will not fall alone; but that Messiah will destroy them with the leader that cometh. It has been proved under the ninth position in the third chapter*, that the description of the leader, as one that cometh, does not necessarily determine him to be the Messiah; but, that the description cannot, without being liable to the charge of impropriety and obscurity of expression, and can hardly, without some degree or other of grammatical inaccuracy, be brought to apply to him. Moreover it is evident, according to the rendering above given of the passage, which has been shewn to be the only unobjectionable one and is also supported by the highest ancient authorities, that Messiah cannot possibly be the leader intended; so that we not only may be allowed to search for, but are necessarily obliged to find, some other leader, who by the prophecy is doomed to perish, and who ac-

* Pages 168—170.
cordingly did perish, together with the city and sanctuary of Jerusalem.

In most of the interpretations, which have been given of the prophecy, the leader has been supposed to be the prince of a foreign people, and indeed no other than Titus, the son of the Roman emperor, and commander of the Roman armies, by whom Jerusalem was besieged and destroyed. But that supposition requires for its support the rendering, which we find in our English version, and which leaves the following possessive pronoun, his, without any antecedent, to which it can be grammatically referred. It may also consist with Dr. Blaney's translation, though he considers Messiah to be the leader; but it is totally superseded and set aside by that above given; for the destroyer of Jerusalem certainly was not destroyed with it. Indeed it is too evident to need farther observation, that the leader here intended, though he be not Messiah, can be the leader of no other people but the Jews. To such an one the whole tenor of the prophecy, which entirely relates to the Jews, and the immediate subject of this portion of it directly and decisively point. The description of him, as one that cometh, only distinguishes him, as future, when the prophet wrote; as about to come before the final downfall of Jerusalem, and to be actually bearing rule
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in the last days of her existence*. No valid or serious objection can be raised to this exposition from the form of political government, which prevailed among the Jews, and bare rule in their city, during that or any other period posterior to the Babylonian captivity. For the word leader may be used in the same latitude with the word king: not only of a single leader, but of a line or race of kings; and not only of a strictly monarchical or regal government, but of any other form of government whatever; as in the Revelation of St. John all the successive forms of the Roman government are described as kings, though some of them were republican. Accordingly, there was always in Jerusalem from the period of her restoration to that of her ruin some person, or body of persons, who might properly be called the leader. "The sceptre had not yet departed from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet;" not the sceptre of tribun al jurisdiction†, not a civil or ecclesiastical

* Such is the exposition of Theodoret; ταυτα δε πιστευα τοις ερχομοις των ραιων των ερχομοις παρανομως αρχαν. The illegitimacy, to use the word in a modern sense, of those rulers is an addition of Theodoret's own; the prophecy speaks of them, only as a person to come.

† Without espousing all the arguments of Sherlock, (see the third Dissertation annexed to his discourses on prophecy,) I think that tribun al jurisdiction in Judah, not regal dominion over Israel, is intended by the word πανω. The
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governor*, ruling or professing to rule according
to the law of Moses. But when Shiloh was
not only come, but "the gathering, or rather
obedience, of the nations unto him" had taken
place, in the erection, extension, and establish-
ment of his kingdom, the christian church com-
prehensive of the Gentiles, then the sceptre and
the lawgiver departed from Judah for ever. On

latter is indeed prophetically conferred on Judah in
verse 8; but it is separated from the former by the
intervention of the ninth verse. Farther, I do not
see, that the Theocracy, which Warburton (Divine Lega-
tion, b. 5. s. 3,) contends for, is properly or intelligibly
expressed by בַּיָּתָו; and the word בְּרֵאשׁ is not to be limited,
as that learned prelate would understand it, strictly to the
notion of a legislator; but is equally applicable to a judge,
an interpreter, or administrator of the laws.

* I say a civil or ecclesiastical governor, because I con-
ceive that the chief administration of affairs in the tribe of
Judah by an Israelite of another tribe, for instance by an
high-priest, would have no tendency to invalidate the pro-
phesy, or to prove that the sceptre had departed from
Judah. This part of the prediction relates solely to the
prolonged existence of Judah, as a political body, a collect-
ive people. Benjamin and the remnants of other tribes,
that joined the Jews after the Assyrian deportation, were
so far merged therein, that they retained no tribal sceptres;
so that if any individual of them had borne rule in Judah,
the sceptre would still have remained there. Accordingly
Levi did so bear rule during the Asmonean dynasty. Yea,
at the very moment of time, when Moses put the prophecy
of Jacob on record, Levi bore rule over Judah and over all
Israel; for the prophet himself "was king in Jeshurun."
Duteronomy, xxxiii. 5.

† I think the explanation of Genesis, xlix. 10, by the al-
ternate quatrain, as given by Dr. Hales, (Analysis of Chron-
ology, vol. 2, page 168,) and adopted by Bishop Jebb,
the desolation of Jerusalem by the hand of Nebuchadnezzar a leader was still left to the Jewish people, one to whom they could lift up their eyes, in the hope at least, that they might yet see him coming in and going out before them. Jehoiachin himself lived a long way into the seventy years of the captivity, and was towards the end of his life treated with much kindness and even great distinction by the king of Babylon. His son* seems to have been acknowledged as a prince by the captive Jews; and a leader of the royal line led home the exiles to the land of their fathers. But it is here declared, that it shall not be so in the last ruin of Jerusalem. The overthrow shall be complete and final. Messiah will destroy the city and the sanctuary with the leader that cometh. The polity both civil and ecclesiastical, under which the Jews had lived and been ruled according to the Mosaic in-

(Sacred Literature, page 30,) somewhat too refined. I also agree with Robertson, Parkhurst, and others in rendering ḫaṟnṯ the obedience, rather than the congregation or gathering of the nations; the latter word meaning, as I believe it always does, when in the plural number, Gentile nations only. Accordingly St. Paul describes himself as having "received grace and apostleship unto the obedience of faith among all the nations or Gentiles," Rom. i. 5. Not however that congregation or gathering is to be thought an erroneous translation. The verbs ḫaṟnṯ and ṣ̄āṯ are very nearly allied.

* Salathiel, the son of Jechoniah or Jehoiachin is mentioned in 2 Esdras, v. 16, as "captain of the people."
stitutions, was destined not to survive the final
ruin of the city and sanctuary, but to perish by
the same irreversible sentence, in the same utter
and irretrievable destruction. All that is here
predicted has been brought to pass, and that, as
every reader knows, to the uttermost. When
Jerusalem and the temple were destroyed by the
Roman armies under Titus, the leader perished
with them. No tribal sceptre has ever since
waved over that scattered people; and while
their code of peculiar laws remains on everlasting
record, the sentence, which annuls it, is placed
by its side, and is visibly carried into full effect
in the utter deprivation of civil and ecclesiastical
leaders invested with power to enforce and fulfil
its municipal institutions and its sacred rites.

The mode of destruction is next announced.
And his end shall be with an inundation; that is to say, the end of the leader,
for that is the antecedent, to which the pronoun
refers. The final subversion of the Jewish go-
vernment, shall be effected, not in a gentle and
easy manner, by a gradual extinction, or as it
were, by a natural decay, but in a signal, vio-
lent, and terrible mode, by an inundation; a
flood of foreign invaders, rushing through the
land and pouring into the city, overwhelming
and sweeping all before it with the irresistible.
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force of an impetuous torrent. In this sense the figure is often found in scripture. Thus in the eighth chapter of Isaiah*, where the invasion of Israel and Syria by Shalmaneser is foretold, this image is both used and explained; "behold the Lord bringeth up upon them the waters of the river strong and many, even the king of Assyria and all his glory; and he shall come up over all his channels and go over all his banks. And he shall pass through Judah; he shall overflow and go over, he shall reach even to the neck." There is no need to cite more texts in proof of a point so well and so generally known. It is also hardly necessary to observe, that the flood of invaders is the Roman army, who took Jerusalem by storm and executed the divine decree to the full.

For until the end shall be the war, the determined judgment of desolations. In that part of the second chapter†, where I have endeavoured to justify the above rendering, I have in some degree forestalled the interpretation of this passage. It is however necessary to recollect what is there said, as well as to add some farther observations. The particle

* Verses 7 and 8, see also, xvii. 12, xxviii. 2, and lix. 19, Daniel, xi. 22 and 40, Revelation, xii. 15.
† Pages 92—95.
for, as it introduces a reason for what is said immediately before, shews the meaning of the prophet to be, that the destruction of the city and sanctuary with the leader to come, whose end is by a flood, is appointed to coincide with the point, which is here distinguished as the end. Now by reckoning up thereto the prophet plainly teaches us to regard it as a fixed point. Therefore it cannot be the end of the war, which has not been settled, nor even once mentioned before; neither can it be the end of the leader, for that is referred to this very point, the end. Nothing therefore remains, but to refer it to the end of the term of seventy weeks, to which the word of itself, when taken absolutely, points with a direction that it should seem difficult to mistake. For surely the mention simply of the END, occurring either in a prophetic or historical narrative of events, that come to pass in the course of a previously limited term of years, does naturally carry the mind of the reader to the conclusion of that term. Moreover it was requisite, that the coincidence of the period, when the city, sanctuary, and government of Jerusalem were to be destroyed, with the end of the seventy weeks should be distinctly stated, in order to shew, that the prophecy is consistent in its several parts; which it would not appear to be, if it could be
imagined, as else it might, that either of the subjects, whose duration is at once extended to and limited by the end of the seventy weeks, might fall short of or endure beyond the prescribed term. Hence the prophet having predicted the destruction of the city and sanctuary together with the leader, by Messiah, through the instrumentality of a flood of foreign invaders, is careful to inform us immediately, that this is the last event ordained to wind up the prophetic term and bring it to its destined close; for that the war, meaning thereby the flood of invasion just before mentioned, in which city, temple, and government will be alike swept away, shall continue unto the end of the weeks and fully bring in the commencement of the determined judgment of desolations decreed by divine justice against the murderers of Messiah.

Although the events, which gave accomplishment to the latter predictions of the twenty-sixth verse, are among the best known in history, so that such general references, as those above made to them, are all that can be absolutely necessary, it may notwithstanding, for the satisfaction of some readers, be expedient to relate "the last labour" of Jerusalem in a brief abridgement, accompanied by a few extracts, from Josephus. In the spring of the year A. D. 70 Titus having
stationed his army around the city, and cooped up within it both the usual inhabitants and the additional multitudes who were assembled to celebrate the passover, which began that year on the fourteenth of April, a severe scarcity was soon felt. For the turbulent factions, that at once divided and oppressed the people, had, in their spite and madness against each other, wasted the stores and destroyed the storehouses, which contained corn and other provisions, with every other article necessary for enabling them to support a siege of many years; thus wantonly cutting off, as the historian emphatically expresses it*, "the nerves of their own strength." Great numbers of the Jews, urged by want and despair, betook themselves beyond the walls to the vallies that lay between the city and the Roman stations, in the hope of picking up a little food†. Here they were observed and attacked by the enemy; many were slain, and many more taken prisoners. The latter were brought alive into the camp to the number of five hundred daily. These wretched persons were crucified in the sight of the city, with the view of striking terror into the besieged; and the Romans, in the wrath and hatred they bare to the Jews, nailed them to the crosses in dif-

* Josephus de B. J. l. 5, c. 1, § 4.
† De B. J. l. 5, c. 10, § 1.
ferent postures by way of mockery; till "so
great was the multitude," says Josephus, "that
room was wanting for the crosses, and crosses
were wanting for the bodies." How plainly do
these horrible executions bespeak the retributive
visitation of that Hand, which the sufferers, or
their fathers, had nailed to the accursed tree!
But when Titus had closely begirt the city with
a wall, even that perilous mode of procuring an
occasional and scanty supply was cut off. Then,
as Josephus* describes, "the famine devoured
the people by whole houses and families. The
upper rooms were full of women and children,
who were dying of hunger, and the lanes were
full of the dead bodies of the aged. The young
men wandered about the market places like ghosts,
and dropped down dead wherever their fatal
pangs came upon them. Nor were there any la-
mentations or mourning made under these calam-
ities: for the famine overcame the natural passions
and affections; and they, who were on the point of
perishing, gazed with dry eyes and gaping mouths
on those, who were gone to rest before them. A
deep silence also and darkness, as it were, of death
seized upon the city." But let us hasten from the
preparatory horrors to the consummation of ruin.

* De B. J. l. 5, c. 12, § 3; and see c. 10, § 2, 3, and
l. 6, c. 3, § 3.
Titus having made breaches in the walls and taken the tower of Antonia, adjoining to and overlooking the temple, now began to assault the sacred edifice itself, which being very solidly and skilfully built answered all the purposes of a fortress or citadel. The walls being found too solid to be shaken by his battering engines, he was obliged to set fire to the gates of the surrounding cloisters. The Romans then made their way into the inner court; but although Titus was very desirous to save the body of the temple itself, his orders and his care to prevent its destruction were in vain. "A Roman soldier," as Josephus* describes, "impelled by a divine transport snatchèd a flaming brand from the burning cloisters, and hoisted up by another soldier, cast the fire through a golden window into a passage which led to the rooms that were immediately round the Sanctuary or Holy House." Other soldiers seemed to be seized with a like fury, and in spite of all the entreaties, and commands, and cries, and even of the forcible endeavours of Titus, the Holy House itself soon became a prey to the flames. The description given us by Josephus, who beheld the scene, is exceedingly awful†." "The flames," says he, "being carried to a great distance roared in concert with the groans

* De B. J. l. 6, c. 4. § 5. † De B. J. l. 6, c. 5, § 1.
of the dying; and from the height of the moun-
tain and the great extent of the burning edifice
the whole city seemed to be in a blaze. Nothing
can be imagined to exceed in loudness or fearful-
ness the noise that then arose. For there was all
at once the shout of the Roman legions engaging
in battle, and the yells of the seditious Jews all
encircled with fire and sword; while the people,
who had been left above, recoiling in mad
amazement upon the enemy, uttered piercing
shrieks and groans under the pressure of the pre-
sent woe. The multitude, that remained in the
city below, mingled their outcries with those up-
on the mount; and even many, that were wast-
ed away by hunger, and whose mouths were
almost closed in death, when they beheld the
flames of the sanctuary, broke out again into
loud lamentations and wailings. Perea and
the surrounding mountains reechoed those con-
fused sounds, deepening the rout and roar of
the conflict. Yet did the calamity, as it appeared
to the eye in its real nature and extent, exceed
in horror even all that tumultuous uproar; for the
mountain, on which the temple stood, being on
every side wrapped in flames, one would have
thought, that itself had been burning upward
from its very base, in one tremendous blaze. It
seemed too, that the blood of men flowed faster
than the fire flamed, and that the slain were more in number than the slayers. For the ground was no where to be seen under the dead that covered it, and the soldiers mounting upon the heaps of bodies ran over them in pursuit of those that fled." Such is the account of that scene of vengeance afforded us by Josephus. The temple was burnt on Sunday the fifth of August, and the upper part of the city was taken and burnt on Sunday the second of September*. After the capture and burning the city Titus ordered the whole to be entirely demolished, except three towers which he left to serve as monuments of the strength of the fortifications, and a part of the wall, which was kept as barracks for the soldiers, who were left there in garrison. The number of Jews of every sex and age, who perished within the city in various ways during those days of vengeance, amounted to eleven hundred thousand, and no less than two hundred and fifty seven thousand more were slain in other quarters. The captives taken were ninety seven thousand, some of whom were reserved to grace the triumph of Titus; others were slain in combat with wild beasts, or with one another as gladiators; many more were destroyed in various ways; many were

sold for slaves, and the rest were distributed over the Roman provinces.

Before the time that Jerusalem was finally destroyed, great multitudes of Jews were dwelling in different quarters and kingdoms of the world. But all these had still a country in Judea, a city in Jerusalem, a national government there, and a temple, in which the God of their fathers was honoured with worship and services of his own appointment, and to which they all paid a settled contribution. Toward these every Jew turned his eyes with constant and fervent affection, in the hope that Messiah would yet appear in behalf of his people, deliver them from the thraldom of Rome, and set their victorious feet on the necks of their masters. But now temple, city, leader, country were alike destroyed. The emperor Vespasian even ordered all the lands belonging to the Jews in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem to be sold for his own use, and every Jew, wheresoever resident, to pay to the Capitol at Rome the same sum, which he had been used to contribute to the temple of the God of Israel. Thus were the wretched remnant of that people dispossessed of patrimony, of tribual sceptre, of religion, and of all that could be construed to form their national character.

* Josephus de B. J. 1. 6, c. 9, § 2.
It is true, that after the destruction of Jerusalem there were still some strong places; as Machærus and Masada, remaining in possession of Jews, and that several engagements and sieges took place in order to their reduction. But it cannot thence be argued, that the termination of the war predicted by the prophet, did not take place till the horrible capture of Masada, two or three years after the expiration of the seventy weeks, and consequently, that the end of the prescribed term does not coincide with the period above assigned to it. For the city and people of Daniel are so linked together in the prophecy, that they form, as it were, but one subject. They rise, flourish, and perish together. Therefore, when Jerusalem had fallen, the Jewish people must be considered as having fallen with it. One of the combatants was destroyed, and of course the combat was at an end. The feeble and unavailing resistance kept up by a few obstinate, but insulated partizans had nothing national in it. Bereft of Jerusalem, of their temple, and their leader, the surviving Jews were thenceforth nothing more than a multitude of scattered individuals. They retained neither the character nor the semblance of a people, much less of the holy people of Daniel. To maintain the contrary, it should be shewn, that the prophecy contemplates
the absolute and total destruction of the Jews individually; which would contradict, not only many other predictions and historical facts, but even the concluding clause of this prophecy; for, as will be hereafter seen, the end of the seventy weeks introduced the era of the determined judgment upon Jerusalem and the Jewish people, of which the expiration is not made known to us in this prediction.
CHAPTER IV.

SECTION V.

The Interpretation and Accomplishment of the Prediction concerning the supplemental Week, or that of the Covenant confirmed, and its two Divisions.

The twenty seventh verse consists of four clauses. In the first we have an account of a certain week of the seventy; in the second we find a remarkable division of that week into two equal parts; in the third we are made acquainted with a particular fact in the conduct of the desolator at the siege of Jerusalem; in the fourth we are informed, that the desolator himself will at length be brought to utter ruin, and that the judgments of desolations on Jerusalem and the Jewish people have an appointed period in the divine foreknowledge and decree. But the two latter clauses do not fall within this section.
27. Yet will he confirm the covenant unto many one week; but in the midst of the week he will cause sacrifice and meat-offering to cease.

The Jewish people are the only direct and proper subjects of the prophecy, and indeed the only people mentioned or noticed therein. The covenant then here described to be made firm is a covenant with them, though it is to be confirmed, or secured, not to all, but only a part of them, to many. Now in the last verse it is predicted, that Messiah shall be cut off; and that so entirely with the approbation, at least with the tacit acquiescence, and probably by the act, of his own people, that there would not be any one to stand on his side in the hour of his peril and excision. It therefore seems extremely unlikely, that he would confer any mark of favour on such a disloyal, ungrateful, and rebellious people; and consequently, when it is declared, that he will confirm, or make firm, the covenant unto them, it is properly introduced to the reader by rendering the Hebrew connective particle by our adversative conjunction, yet.

The Hebrew words have been shewn in the second chapter* to signify, not the making of a new and firm covenant, but the confirm-
tion*, that is to say, the ratification or carrying into full effect of one already existing, at least of one promised before. The covenant is that originally promised to the patriarchs, begun under the Law, repeated, expanded, and explained by the Prophets, and brought to perfection under the Gospel. The substance of it was, that "Israel should be the people of Jehovah, and that he would be their God." The express words indeed of the covenant with Abraham, as stated in the seventeenth chapter of Genesis, comprise only the latter, as being to the people the more important and blessed part of it; but the former part is plainly implied and indeed necessarily understood. In other passages of scripture† it is expressed; but there can be no need to cite those passages at length, in order to shew, that such was the main substance and real essence of the covenant between God and his people in all ages. The terms themselves are of such general and comprehensive import, that they are calculated to include the whole scheme of salvation, by which the people of God are delivered from

* So Clarius has well observed "adimplebit Christus in ultima hac hebdomada foedus quod iniit cum patribus. Idee non dixit faciet, sed confirmabit, quod jam antea patribus promiserat:" de quo Jer. 31. Clarius in loc.

† Leviticus, xxvi. 12, Deuteronomy, xxvi. 17, 18, 2 Samuel, vii. 24, Jeremiah, xxiv. 7, xxx. 22, xxxi. 33, Ezekiel, xi. 20, xxxvii. 23, 27, Zechariah, viii. 8.
the guilt, the bondage, and the punishment of sin, entirely restored to the divine favour, and qualified to receive; as well as encouraged to expect, those blessings of spiritual illumination, direction, and comfort, which gradually train them up and lead them on to the more perfect knowledge of God, and of their relation and duty to Him and one another, to a renewed and sanctified disposition of mind and heart, to a more willing obedience, a more hearty trust, a more cheerful resignation, and more exalted hope of that immortal joy and felicity which await his elect in the life to come. Such, and many more, if drawn out at full length, were the items of the covenant involved in those general terms, by which “Jehovah avouched himself to be the God of Israel and the Israelites avouched themselves to be his people*;” and consisting of such, the Lord Jesus Christ, in exercising the office of leader to God’s people, confirmed† it to the Jews, according to that prediction of Moses; “the Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken‡.” Wherefore he is called by Malachi, “the messen-

* Deuteronomy, xxvi. 17, 18.
† See the twelfth position in the third chapter, p. 174.
‡ Deuteronomy, xviii. 15, 18, Acts, vii. 37.
ger of the covenant*. " It would be easy, were it necessary, to transcribe many and long passages of the new testament in proof, that Jesus fulfilled this prediction, when after his baptism by John he fully entered upon the arduous functions of his leadership, and the administration of his spiritual kingdom; and it would be the duty of the author so to do, if he were writing for the use of readers, to whom the history of the life, the acts, and discourses of our Lord were a new or an unusual theme. But at this time and in this country no reader of his inspired volume can need such information.

It must not however be forgotten, that according to the twelfth and thirteenth preliminary positions Messiah would not take upon him the complete discharge of the high and holy duties of his office, immediately upon his first appearance as leader; that on the contrary a considerable interval might be expected; and that to point out this fact is one reason for placing the week of the covenant confirmed, out of its regular order, in a supplement. This was actually the case with our Lord's ministry, which did not take place in real force and efficacy until nineteen years after his first appearance in the temple as leader of his people.

* Malachi, iii. 1.
The point, that next demands our attention, is, that although the covenant of salvation was made with or promised to *all* the people of Israel, yet we collect from this prediction, that Messiah would confirm it, not to *all* the people, but only to a *part* of them. There can be no doubt, that in this place a term expressive of universality, if such an one could have consisted with truth, would have been employed, as well with a view to console and soothe the troubled spirit of Daniel, as to declare with full energy the blessings of Messiah's leadership and reign. But we find instead, that the confirmation of the covenant is to extend only to *many*; a word, which, notwithstanding its wider extension occasionally, and especially when having the definite article prefixed, is applicable rather to a number of individuals selected from among a people, than to the whole body; whence it is to be collected, that the benefits of the covenant would not be effectually brought home to all, who were, or at least might be, parties to it. This partial confirmation of the covenant is not incompatible with the character of universality attributed to it in other passages, and is entirely agreeable to the state of facts. For in every covenant there must be at least two parties; and if one of those be a nation or a body of people, and only a part of them do, when all
might, accept or keep its conditions, to that part only can it be truly said to be effectually confirmed, while to the rest, notwithstanding its universal nature and applicability, it is in reality avoided. Accordingly, when Christ came as leader and preached the glad tidings of salvation and eternal life, he offered that blessed covenant universally to all the Jews; but a great part of the nation rejected the sacred boon; so great a part indeed, that the rejection was truly national; while those who gladly accepted it, formed an exception to the main body, and though many in number, were yet only many individuals. The distinction then here made is as accurate, as it is emphatical, and is moreover fully verified and explained by a similar one drawn by St. John; "he came unto his own; but his own received him not; but as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name." To such our blessed Lord confirmed the covenant of salvation; and it has been before seen, that he did so by his personal labours for three years and an half. Hereafter it will be found, that he continued to carry on the work by the hands of his apostles for a farther and equal period, making in the whole seven years, or one week, beginning in the sixty fourth and ending

cc
in the sixty fifth week of the seventy weeks.

When however it is said, that to these Messiah will confirm the covenant for one week, or seven years, no man will suppose the meaning of the prophet to be, that the validity of the confirmation will hold good and be acknowledged, or the blessings of the covenant continued, for that term and no longer; neither can it be imagined, that Messiah, having spent seven years in confirming the covenant, will then cease to confirm it for the future; so that the many, who in those seven years may be brought into it, or found in it, will be all, to whom it ever will be confirmed. The whole tenor of the prophecy, especially the six particulars enumerated in the twenty fourth verse, and the express declarations of numberless passages of the prophets, in which they speak of the reign of Messiah, and the blessings of his covenant, conspire to prevent any such narrow and erroneous acceptation of the angel's words. Let it only be well remembered, that the main subject of the prophecy is the future fortunes of the Jews, the people and the city of Daniel, and that it is to many of them alone, that the covenant is said to be confirmed by Messiah; and then it will be readily perceived and admitted, that this week is nothing else, but the period, during which the confirmation of the
covenant, whether carried on by Messiah's own personal administration, or by the agency of his officers and ministers, is to be confirmed to the Jews, and confined to Jews alone.

The cessation of the week, it is reasonable to suppose, will be found marked by some signal event, which at the same time may be intended to declare or indicate the opening of the covenant to other nations. This is rendered the more probable by the mention of a very remarkable occurrence, as destined to take place in the midst of the week; one, which, by the very terms of the prediction, may be considered as removing the main impediments to the subsequent enlargement of the covenant. It is said, that Messiah will cause sacrifice and meat-offering, or mincha, that is to say, every sort of offering, which was not a proper sacrifice, to cease, during half the week, meaning evidently the latter half of it; and of course thenceforth for ever. Now sacrifice and offering were certainly a part of the covenant of the Israelites with God, as articles to be kept on their part; and they are plainly introduced here, as being connected with, or rather as formal items of, that covenant. But since they are predicted to cease at a given time, and since, notwithstanding their cessation, the covenant is mentioned, as still subsisting and even confirmed,
or carried into substantial effect, it is evident, that they were not essential points of it; but only such, as could and should be laid aside, without annulling its substance, or exposing it to any degree of violation. When however we remember the solemnity and strictness, with which sacrifices and offerings were ordained and practiced, it would be very difficult indeed to look upon them as non-essentials in the covenant, unless we were authorized, and even expressly directed by many texts of the old testament* and by the general tenor of the new, to consider them as signs and shadows only of those good things to come, which were truly the essentials of the covenant, and upon the arrival of which, the others ceased of course. This will be more clearly seen and more readily acknowledged to be the meaning of the prophetic spirit, when we call to mind the second and third particulars, in which it was promised, that before the close of the seventy weeks the sin-offerings should be sealed; that is, according to the interpretation above given, ratified and accepted, closed and concluded; and that an effectual atonement should be made for iniquity. That great sin-offering and atonement, as we

* Isaiah, i. 11, 1 Samuel, xv. 22, Psalm l. 8—13, li. 16, 17, Proverbs, xv. 8, xxi. 27, Isaiah, lxvi. 3, Jeremiah, vi. 20, vii. 21—23, Amos, v. 21, 22, Micah, vi. 6—8, Hosea, vi. 6, Psalm xl. 6.
have before seen, was completed by "the full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction," which Messiah made for sins, when he offered himself on the cross, as the lamb of God, in the body which had been prepared for that end, and introduced a pure spiritual worship, suited to the nature and mutual relations of God and man; so that all the sacrifices and offerings of the patriarchal worship and Mosaic law were thenceforth abrogated and closed for ever*. Thus does the correspondence subsisting between the distant parts of the prophecy speak strongly in favour of the interpretation given to the latter one. But perhaps we may venture to attribute a yet more comprehensive signification to this prediction.

As great part of the conditions to be observed by the Israelites under the Mosaic covenant consisted in sacrifices and offerings; and as their numerous lustrations, purifications, and the greater

* Prideaux, part I, page 421, thinks that Christ caused the sacrifice and offering to cease in two instances; first when he entered personally upon the ministry of the gospel in the half of the week, and again by the sacrifice of his own death at the end of it. The latter supposition is inconsistent with the very words of the prophecy, and the former with the gospel narratives; for Christ himself not only was obedient to the law in the instance of his circumcision, and the redemption of the first born, but he observed the passover and other festivals, especially the former, during the period of his leadership, even to the end of the institution.
number of their ritual observances, were either built upon or accompanied by them; so, when it is said, that Messiah will cause sacrifice and offering to cease, we may well conceive, that the angel speaks by a common figure, putting a part for the whole, and intimates, that the entire ritual law of Moses will be discontinued for the rest of the week, and will of course be revived in force no more. It is no objection to say, that this abrogation was merely virtual; for when the previous part of the prophecy is considered, it is manifest, that it cannot be meant by the speaker to be actual and formal. According to the first words Jerusalem and its inhabitants, observing the law of Moses and governed by it, were to continue until the end of the seventy weeks; consequently the formal abolition of its sacred ritual could not take effect in a week, which, as we have seen, must necessarily be previous thereto.

It now remains to shew, that the real periods, in which these things were brought to pass, agree with those appointed for them by the prophecy. This however, the student of scripture needs hardly to be reminded, may in some points be a work of difficulty. The evangelists have afforded us but few fixed dates. They were more attentive to the essentials, than to the circumstantials of their gospels. This may indeed
be deemed an objection to the scheme of the prophecy, inasmuch as it disables us from proving with perfect precision the correspondence between the prediction and the event; but that is answered by observing, that the defect is counterbalanced by an adequate advantage; for it prevents another objection, that might have struck many minds with better reason and greater force. If the evangelists had been very careful in noting the dates of facts, it would have been argued, that their minuteness in that respect betrayed an anxiety to make them correspond to the predicted periods; whereas the undesignedness, with which they give their notes of time, though they often furnish us with no surer guide than the mere sequence of events, by removing every ground of suspicion as to their intentions, gives us cause to rest with even greater satisfaction in a general correspondence and in strong probability, than we might have done in a clear statement of dates, accurately answering to the prophetic periods.

The points to be proved are five. I. That, conformably with what has been said under the thirteenth preliminary position, the week of the covenant confirmed did not immediately follow the sixty second week, and is a compound week. II. That our blessed Saviour was personally
engaged in confirming the covenant for three years and an half, or half of the week, and then suffered for sins, thereby, as we have seen, virtually abrogating the law of sacrifice and offering, and with it the whole body of the ritual institutions of Moses. III. That during the half week, in which our Lord confirmed the covenant by his own personal labours, it was confined to Jews only. IV. That for the space of three years and an half more, or during the second half week, the confirmation of the covenant went on by the ministry of the twelve apostles, under the superintendence and sometimes the direct interference of their supreme leader, but was still confined to Jews only. V. That at the close of the second half week or termination of the seven years, that restriction was removed, and the christian covenant was opened to the Gentiles, an alteration, which was distinguished by a remarkable event sufficiently indicative of the divine will.

I. The Lord Jesus Christ was born, as we have seen*, in the third year of the sixtieth week of Daniel, in the fifth year before the vulgar christian era, and in all probability about the autumn. He first appeared as leader of his people in the first year of the sixty second week, in

* Page 316.
the eighth year of the vulgar era, and in the twelfth of his age. We learn from St. Luke, that he had nearly completed his thirtieth year, when John began his baptism; and we agree with the best authorities in the highly probable conclusion, that in about one year afterwards he was baptized by John, and immediately after receiving that rite took upon him the full execution of his exalted functions as Messiah, when of course he was just on the verge of completing his thirty first year; coinciding with the close of the sixth year of the sixty fourth week, in the sixteenth year of Tiberius Caesar, reckoning from his first accession to the empire as the colleague of Augustus, and in the seven hundred and eighth year of Rome. His actual leadership then, or the week of the covenant confirmed, commenced long enough after the expiration of the sixty second week, nineteen years and an half after his first appearance as leader. Moreover, since our blessed Lord took upon him the actual ministration of his office in confirming the covenant toward the close of the sixth year of the fifty fourth week, it is evident, according to what has been suggested in the thirteenth position*, that this week was not an integral week of the seventy; for it began one full year before the expiration of the sixty fourth

* Page 178.
week and consequently was compounded of that and of the sixty fifth week.

II. The week of the covenant confirmed commenced with our Saviour's personal reign immediately after his baptism by John, whereby he was solemnly anointed to his regal office. This is expressly assigned by St. Peter as the commencement of his master's administration. The week is divided by the prophecy into two equal parts, and the point of division is fixed to the cessation of the Jewish sacrifices and offerings. That took place, as we have seen, at the moment, when our Lord Jesus Christ offered himself on the cross, a sacrifice for sins. His ascension into heaven took place six weeks afterwards; and that was the termination of his personal leadership, when he ceased to go in and out among his disciples. The interval between his baptism and his sufferings, or, if we prefer it, his ascension, for the two events took place so near together in point of time, and are so closely connected in their nature, since he was "made perfect by sufferings," and his ascension was the mark and seal of his perfection, that in the defect of accurate dates we may take them as concurring in one point, has been proved a little above to be three years and an half, and therefore corresponds to the prophecy.
III. But during that period the covenant was not opened to any but Jews. This is plain from the whole tenor of the gospel history and from some decisive texts; as when Jesus commanded his apostles "not to go into the way of the Gentiles," and especially from that exclusive declaration, "I am not sent, but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel." For although it is true, that presently after speaking these words he healed the daughter of the Canaanitish woman, at the same time commending her faith, as he also cured the dying servant of the Roman centurion, on whose faith too he bestowed the highest praise, yet it cannot be said, that he received those persons into his covenant, or regarded them as proper subjects of his kingdom. These were acts of superabundant overflowing grace and mercy, as the poor Canaanitish woman herself represented them, taking up and applying to her case the strong and repulsive figure offered by our Lord. They proved indeed, that the Gentiles were not outcasts from the divine benevolence and care, but they were far from instating them on an equal footing with Jews in the heirdom of the covenant of promise. During our Saviour's life on earth then he preached the gospel, he confirmed the great charter of salvation.

* Matthew, x. 5, 6.  
† Matthew, xv. 24.
to Jews alone; and the half week, in which he was so employed, extended, as we have before seen, from the autumn of the sixth year of the sixty fourth week, or of the year of our Lord 27 according to the vulgar era, to the spring of the third year of the sixty fifth week, or the year of our Lord 31.

IV. During the second half week our Lord went on to confirm the covenant to many, by the ministry of his apostles; subject however to his own absolute superintendence, and sometimes directed by his immediate interference. Their labours under such guidance form the subject of the acts of the apostles; and from the general tenor of the early part of that narrative it undeniable appears, that although the covenant of God in Christ was from the great day of Pentecost confirmed to many, yet at first those many were all Jews, as being alone considered capable of becoming parties to it. Without citing particular passages, the truth of this assertion is sufficiently proved by the difficulties and opposition, which were at first raised to the admission of any other than Jews, and which for a long time after, in spite of the most evident manifestations of the divine intention to dispense its blessings to the world in general, continued in some shape or other to impede the progress and
molest the persons of those who were appointed to the christian ministry among the Gentiles.

But that the covenant was at length opened to them is certain beyond doubt, and the only question that can arise is, whether the period, at which the Gospel covenant was by the divine appointment opened to the Gentile world, ought to be fixed at the end of three years and an half from our Saviour's passion; that is to say, one week, or seven years from his solemn inauguration to and entrance upon his office. The period, if ascertained to be correct, will fall in with the year of Christ 34 according to the vulgar era, which coincides with the sixth year of Daniel's sixty fifth week. The correctness of the period assigned is the remaining point, which we now advance to prove.

V. That so great an alteration in the divine procedure, amounting in its consequences to a transfer of the covenant; that an act, I say, of authority so deeply interesting and important both to Jew and Gentile, would be marked by some extraordinary and significant event, by which at the same time the close of the week of limited confirmation would be determined, may justly be expected, and the proof of it fairly demanded. That event is found in the conversion of St. Paul. The reception indeed of Cornelius
the centurion and his family into the christian covenant and church, preceded, as it was, by a divine communication to St. Peter, and attended by the descent of the Holy Ghost manifested in a miraculous manner, may be thought to have equal pretensions to the honour of being the fact, which betokened and signalized the admission of the Gentiles into the privileges of the people of God. And so it must be confessed, that it was experimentally; it was the fact by which the divine purpose was actually carried into effect; thereby the Lord kept his promise to Peter, that he should have "the keys of the kingdom of heaven," and should be the first to open the door for the repentant and believing peoples of the earth to enter in. In like manner it may be thought, that even the publication of the gospel by the Cypriot and Cyrenian disciples to the Grecians at Antioch, as it is mentioned prior to any thing recorded of St. Paul's preaching, anticipated the appointment of the apostle of the Gentiles to that office, which he was so pleased to magnify. But neither of these events, not even the former, though so highly distinguished in the christian history, can bear a comparison in point of splendour with the circumstances of St. Paul's conversion. After the baptism, the transfiguration, the resurrection, and the ascension of Christ himself the
conversion of St. Paul is certainly the most signal and glorious event, that marks the annals of the new testament. The personal appearance of the Lord in such an overpowering radiance, as bedimmed the noon-day sun of Palestine, has invested it with a supereminent importance and majesty. But the very grandeur of the scene prepares the mind to expect results from it far superior to that, which immediately appeared. The event justifies the expectation. In the conversion of St. Paul we discern, not merely the turning of a single human soul, sudden and total, interesting and marvellous, as it was, from error and perverseness to truth and uprightness, but the call and ordination of the great apostle of the Gentiles; we behold the preparation and mission of the chief instrument in the hand of God for bringing the nations into the covenant of Abraham, that they might be His people and He might be their God.

It has however been doubted, whether St. Paul was invested with his office at his conversion, or at a period rather more than three years afterwards, when desiring to remain, for a while at least, in Jerusalem and preach the gospel there, which perhaps from the great affection he bare to his countrymen and his zeal for their welfare he might yet think the more honourable and
desirable post, he was authoritatively bidden by
the Lord to "depart;" "for," said he, "I will
send thee far hence unto the Gentiles." Doubt-
less this might well be considered the act of his
appointment to the apostleship, if that office had
not been conferred on the former occasion. But
in his defence before king Agrippa the apostle
expressly asserts, that when on the road to Da-
mascus Jesus appeared to him in his divine glory,
he sent him from that time forth to the Gentiles;
"unto whom," said the glorified Saviour, "I
now send thee to open their eyes and to turn
them from darkness to light, and from the power

* Dr Hales in his Analysis of Chronology, vol. 2, part
2, p. 1211, represents St. Paul to have received his apostle-
ship by the election of the Holy Ghost and the laying on of
hands, as related in Acts, xiii. 2, 3, 4; and then adds, that
"it was equally valid with the election of Matthias." But
Matthias was consecrated by the laying on of the hands of
the apostles, whereas on the occasion referred to by the
learned chronologist, not a single apostle was present, but
only certain "prophets and teachers." In fact the trans-
action was not an ordination of Paul and Barnabas to the
apostleship, but, as Whitby observes, only "a benediction
on their enterprise." St. Paul himself would have spurned
at the idea of receiving his office by the laying on of any
human hands, had they been those even of his brother
apostles. For it was his decided declaration and boast, that
he was "an apostle, not of men, neither by man;" and
that "the gospel which was preached by him was not after
man; for he neither received it of man, neither was taught
it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." See Whitby on
Acts, xiii. 1, and Galatians, i. 1, 12.

† Acts, xxvi. 17, 18. ‡ μετ αγάλλω 1b
of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins and an inheritance among them, which are sanctified by faith that is in me.” It seems no satisfactory answer, to allege, that St. Paul in the above cited passage puts together what his blessed master had spoken to him on both the occasions; for, although in the rapid and energetic recital of his commission the apostle may have departed from the exact form of the words, yet it is scarcely credible, that he should have dated his investiture with the apostolic office three whole years and more before it was actually given. At the same time it would be rash to contend, that all the words rehearsed by St. Paul to king Agrippa were actually used by our Lord at the instant of his august manifestation to the apostle, or even that any more were spoken than those, which St. Luke has recorded in Acts, ix. 6; where in answer to his question, “Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?” it is replied, “arise, go into the city and there it shall be told thee what thou must do;” for those words were undoubtedly spoken, and they do not seem to admit of the others having place with them. In those however it is observable, that St. Paul is referred for his commission, or for “what the Lord would have him do,” to something, that would be told him in the city. Now in the city
Ananias, in consequence of a divine communication, came to him, and doubtless delivered the message, which he himself had received from the Lord; that Paul was "a chosen vessel to him, to bear his name before the Gentiles, kings and the children of Israel." These words clearly express the divine purpose to invest Paul with the apostolic office, and that especially to the Gentiles, who are named first; and when rehearsed and addressed to him, as doubtless they were, personally, by Ananias, and connected with what he had seen and heard in the way, they would be rightly understood to convey an apostolic commission in terms as plain, and to an extent as full, as that, which was conferred upon him in the vision at Jerusalem. Accordingly, in his speech to the Jewish populace from the castle-stairs, Paul rehearsed the commission conveyed to him by Ananias, as an appointment to be "a witness unto all men of what he had seen and heard." The probability therefore is, that St. Paul connecting, as he reasonably might, the words of our Lord with those of Ananias, considered them as one divine communication; and as such he referred to it in his speech before Agrippa, reciting it in his own fervid language, or perhaps in that of some other oracle, which he might have received upon the departure of Ananias.
in pursuance of that promise; "I will shew him how great things he must suffer for my name's sake;" for the prediction of those sufferings must necessarily have comprehended, at least they plainly suppose, the prior grant of the commission, in the discharge of which they were to be encountered.

The miraculous conversion of St. Paul then, with its glorious circumstances, was the event, that marked at once the fact and the instant of his investiture with the apostleship. The same circumstances, by their peculiar, and almost unrivalled, grandeur, are also calculated to mark and signalize, with a dignity suited to the greatness of the occasion, the gracious act of God in closing the period allotted to the limited confirmation of the covenant, and in opening the charter of salvation, already signed and sealed with the precious blood of his dear Son, for the inscription of the nations in its everlasting volume. Nothing now remains but to shew, that it took place at, or nearly about, the time specified by the prophecy.

The want of dates in the history of the new testament has been noticed before; and the remark is peculiarly applicable to that of the acts of the apostles, which leaves us with little other means of arranging under their proper periods the first
proceedings of the Christian church, than what are afforded by calculations founded on the probable sequence of the events related in the narrative. The first event, to which St. Luke* has affixed a date, is the famine, which, as he informs us, "came to pass in the reign of Claudius Caesar." This was predicted by Agabus, who, in company with other prophets, or inspired teachers, came from Jerusalem to Antioch, while Paul and Barnabas were there. The famine is commonly referred to the year of our Lord 44, and the prediction is by many supposed to have been delivered the year before. But this latter supposition seems to be made against the authority of the sacred author himself, whose expressions oblige us to carry back the period of the prediction to a somewhat earlier date. "And in these days came prophets from Jerusalem to Antioch. And there stood up one of them named Agabus and signified by the spirit, that there should be a great dearth throughout all the world, which came to pass in the days of," or rather under, or in the reign of, "Claudius Caesar†."  

* Acts, xi. 28.  
† εἰς Κλαυδίου Καισαρί. Our translators considering the conjunction καί to be superfluous have not given it any rendering. Yet it seems to me not superabundant, but emphatic, adding force to the verb εγένετο:—which even, or which accordingly, came to pass.
No man, who reads this passage without prejudice, supposes that the prophecy was given, as well as fulfilled, in the reign of Claudius Caesar. Common sense, without the trouble of investigation, at once rejects, if it do not rather prevent, the supposition, as inconsistent with the words of the author. The reason is obvious. In every prophecy there are two principal periods concerned; that of its delivery and that of its accomplishment. These are naturally and essentially different, and when brought into contact or proximity, necessarily stand opposed to each other. Possibly a passage may be put together with so much awkwardness of construction, that the two periods may seem to be confounded; and there may be occasion for some degree of discernment and diligence, to disentangle them and bring them to light. But such is not the case here, where the days, when Paul and Barnabas were at Antioch and when the prophecy was delivered, are plainly opposed to the reign of Claudius Caesar, in which it was fulfilled; and being thus set in opposition, the two periods are exclusive, each of the other. If St. Luke had intended us to understand the days, during which Paul and Barnabas were at Antioch, to be part of the reign of Claudius, and the period of fulfilment another part of the same, he would doubtless have found
some means of intimating his intention. But we find no more hint of the former being part of the latter, than of the latter being part of the former. On the contrary, the one altogether is opposed to the other altogether; and each excludes every part of the other. Besides, the latter period has a certain distinction, or note of time, as being in the reign of Claudius; but the former would have no such distinction, except it were opposed to the latter; that is to say, it is distinguished only, as not being in the days of Claudius. I cannot call to mind any parallel passage; but let us suppose, that the thirteenth chapter of the first book of Kings were abridged in the following manner; “in those days a man of God came from Judah and delivered a prediction, that men’s bones should be burnt upon the altar in Samaria, which came to pass accordingly in the reign of Josiah king of Judah.” Now, would not every reader infer from such a passage, that the prophecy was delivered before Josiah’s reign? We know indeed by sufficient information, that such an inference would be right; but, if we had not that information, the same would be correctly drawn. And why? Plainly because the two periods, that of the delivery and that of the accomplishment of the prophecy, being brought together, are thereby set in mutual opposition, so that each
excludes the other. Or again; let us suppose it were related in a narrative of the birth of John the baptist, that “in those days the angel Gabriel came to Zechariah the priest and prophesied to him, that his wife Elisabeth should bear him a son, which even came to pass in the reign of Herod king of Judea.” If such a sentence could be written, what would be inferred from it; but that the writer was utterly ignorant of chronology, or that he knew not how to express his meaning intelligibly? I say therefore, that the prophecy of Agabus, recorded by St. Luke in the Acts, must have been delivered, not in the reign of Claudius, but in that of some preceding emperor; doubtless of his immediate predecessor Caligula, and probably toward the close of his reign, which expired at his death in January A.D. 41. For the manner, in which the narrative is put together, and the steps, which were immediately taken in consequence of the prediction, plainly indicate the event to have followed in no long time after the prophecy. This will be verified by carefully ascertaining the period of the famine.

It must however be confessed, that no small difficulty is found in determining with exactness to what year that period is to be referred, and even in what countries the famine prevailed. Lardner contends, that it did not extend through-
out the empire*, but was confined to Judea. Consequently he is obliged to shew, that by *all the world*, οἷν τὴν οἰκομενήν, the sacred historian meant no more than that province. But his arguments and instances go no farther than to prove, that Judea alone may possibly be intended by words, that in themselves are more properly applicable to the whole Roman empire. To fix them to that confined signification, it should be farther shewn, that while the famine prevailed in Judea at the time specified, there was plenty, at least no complaint of famine, in the other provinces of the empire. This the learned author has failed, at least omitted, to do. But even if his arguments were stronger, I conceive, they would be sufficiently answered by observing, that the historian has taken his date from the reign of a Roman emperor; and since he has connected it with words properly descriptive of the Roman empire, it is to be presumed, that by those words he intended to express that empire; especially as he himself, in speaking of the same subjects, uses the same words, in the second and fourth chapters of his gospel†. Had

* Credibility, part 1, book 1, chap. 11; or Works, vol. 1, p. 240.

† Luke, ii. 1, iv. 5. Some critics however apply the same limitation to these passages. I cannot forbear observing here, that Schleusner is inconsistent with himself as to
he meant to confine his expressions to Judea, he would doubtless have manifested his intention by taking his date from a Jewish governor, from Herod, or one of the succeeding procurators, as the case might be. The famine or scarcity noticed in Acts, xi. 28, must then have been felt at least in Rome itself, and probably in many provinces of the empire beside Judea, so that it might without undue exaggeration be described as afflicting the whole; that is to say, generally and successively, not universally, and all at once; much less equally and uniformly, which, in a territory of such vast extent, it is in the highest degree improbable, that it should have done.

There is no great weight in Lardner's arguments to the contrary; that we read of no collection being made for christians in other places beside Jerusalem; that the people of Antioch, in the foresight of so sore a calamity, must have had a regard to themselves; and that no such praise is given to them as to the Macedonians in 2 Corinthians, viii. 2, for their generous superioritv to all selfish considerations. For 1. Chris-

the former. In v. οὐκεκατερνη he renders the evangelists words censerit totam Judaeam, having already in v. αὐτογραφω rendered them ut omnes imperio romano subjecti nomen suum profite- rentur, &c. In like manner his exposition of ο αυνο μικᾶν given under the word οκεκατερνη is opposite to that which he delivers under the word αυν.
tianity originally proceeded from the Jews; for which reason all that received it were bound in, and acknowledged, a debt, not only of common charity, but of especial gratitude to them; as proselytes to Judaism also did, according to the parallel which Lardner himself has drawn. In this instance the very notice, whereby they were admonished to prepare themselves against the famine, came to the Antiochians immediately from Jerusalem; and what sense could the new converts have shewn of the important advantage derived from that information, if they had not to the utmost of their power administered relief to the poor saints there? There appears then sufficient reason for distinguishing no other collection than that made in behalf of the Jews at Antioch, supposing any to have been made for other christians both there and in other places. 2. Neither is there any reason to imagine, that the Antiochians had not a reasonable regard to themselves, or that they permitted their charity and zeal to outstrip their circumstances; for some among them seem to have been in affluence, and all might expect, that what they gave, in the prospect of the impending visitation, they would be able to save and replace by prudent management before its pressure should be actually felt. 3. Nor on the other hand is there any ground to
question their liberality on this occasion. Indeed the learned writer himself observes, that "it seems to have been a very great contribution;" and though there be "no hint of any straits they were in," yet it can hardly be believed, that all the contributors were in what is called good circumstances. The phrase here used is parallel to that of St. Paul* on a like occasion, where he plainly expected the contribution to be general, among rich and poor. The chief ground however of the praise due to the Antiochians is their faith. They had such confidence in the divine word sent by Agabus, that they decisively acted upon it, and gave their money in consequence of it, though the occasion on which it would be wanted, was yet at a distance and totally out of sight. The account then of the contribution at Antioch affords no reason to suspect, that the famine meant by St. Luke was not a general one.

But there are direct proofs, that a famine, which can be no other than the one in question, was felt at Rome and extended to a very great part of the empire. We learn from Dio Cassius†, that a great famine prevailed at Rome in the early part of Claudius's reign. Aurelius Victor‡

* o τι αυ ἐνοθετα, 1 Corinthians, xvi. 2. καθως ἄνανθετο τις, Acts, xi. 29.
† Lib. 60, cap. 11.
‡ Cited by Reimar in his note on Dio, vol. 2, p. 948.
carries it back to Caligula's time, and ascribes it to his insane extravagances. Dio himself places it in the second year of Claudius; but Lardner cites the authority of medals, which proves, that it was felt in the foregoing year also; and Reimar, in his note on Dio, cites the same sort of authority in proof, that the calamity was not at an end in the third. Nor are the words of Dio himself at all inconsistent with this three years duration of the dearth. For he mentions nothing of its beginning, continuance, or end, but introduces the notice of it incidentally, merely to account for the great work of Claudius at Ostia, to which this famine was the immediate motive. "A great famine," says Dio, "having taken place, he made provision for procuring copious supplies of food, not only for the present season, but for all time to come;" and then he proceeds to relate the formation of the port.

Hence Lardner, with a view to obviate the probable conclusion, that this scarcity owed its origin to unproductive harvests in the countries, which were the granaries of Rome, argues, that because Dio represents the formation of the port of Ostia by Claudius, as done with a view to secure, at least facilitate, the importation of grain, it is to be concluded, that this famine was occasioned merely by a failure of that mode of supply, in
consequence of the want of a secure station for vessels at the mouth of the Tiber. Now the want of a good haven must have been an equal and standing cause of famine in all years, till remedied by Claudius; yet since the effect did not always or generally follow, it cannot, unless we can cite the express authority of historians, with sufficient probability be attributed in any case, and consequently not in this, solely to that cause. Negligence and sluggishness, or the long prevalence of unfavourable winds, might in some years delay the customary supply, until the season became too far advanced for vessels to make the attempt at entering the Tiber, without great hazard; and hence famines or severe dearths may have arisen. But the two former causes would inevitably disappear in the following year under the bitter experience of their consequences, and the latter cannot, without great improbability, be supposed to have continued for three years together. Hence it appears, that we cannot sufficiently account for the famine at Rome in the beginning of Claudius's reign, but by ascribing at least one of its principal causes to a failure of the harvests in the corn countries cutting off the usual sources of supply. Now it is obvious, that even in such cases of failure, the formation of a good port at the mouth of the Tiber would have
a beneficialeffect; inasmuch as it would multiply those sources by extending the season, during which supplies could be received. The prudence therefore of the measure, as a provision against occasional and physical calamities, as well as against continual inconvenience, is unquestionable; but then, as a remedy, it does not point with a certain direction to the defective state of the Roman port, as being the sole cause of the evil, which it was intended to cure, or to alleviate: and therefore it cannot be maintained on the ground taken by Lardner, that the scarcity mentioned by Dio was confined to Rome, or that the historian himself attributes it solely to the want of a good port at the mouth of the Tiber.

Suetonius* also mentions a famine in the same reign, but without fixing the year. Lardner thinks it the same with that noticed by Tacitus† which took place in the eleventh year of Claudius. But the two dearths are palpably and irreconcilably distinguished; for Tacitus expressly attributes that, which he mentions, solely to defective importation; whereas Suetonius as plainly ascribes the other to frequent failures of crops, "ob assiduas sterilitates." Now we have found reason to think, that the famine in the first three years of Claudius proceeded, in no small measure

* In Claudio, cap. 18. † Annalium, lib. 12, cap. 43.
at least, from the same cause; and thence it is a probable conclusion, that the famine recorded by Suetonius is the same as that we read of in Dio. The expression too in Suetonius, "ob assiduas sterilitates," indicates a scarcity of some continuance; for those sterilities must have been successive, and this exactly tallies with the medals of three successive years, as cited by Reimar, corresponding to the years of our Lord 41, 42, and 43. Perhaps it may be thought however, that the rude assault made by the Roman populace on the person of Claudius, which is noticed by both Tacitus and Suetonius, proves, that they are both speaking of the same dearth. But Claudius, especially when in the act of administering justice in the forum, was no great object of reverence or respect to the Roman people; so that, as there were two severe scarcities at Rome in his reign, a similar consequence may, without any improbability, be believed to have occurred in each. This is the more probable, because the two authors differ, as to the manner, in which the emperor escaped from the hands of his famished and turbulent subjects; Suetonius describing it to have been by a back door; Tacitus, by means of a band of soldiers breaking way through the mob.
But Josephus in his antiquities, after mentioning a famine in Judea, which he tells us, was greatly relieved by the munificence of Izates, king of Adiabene, and his mother Helena, both converts to Judaism, places it after the death of Herod, under the procuratorships of Cuspius Fadus and Tiberius Alexander, that is to say, from the year 44 to 46. It is however to be plainly collected from St. Luke’s narrative, that, in the neighbouring countries at least, the scarcity was felt in the latter part of Herod’s reign; for he relates, that the Tyrians and Sidonians were obliged to make up their quarrel with that prince, "because their country was nourished by the king’s country." Now the sacred historian must mean, either that the Tyrians and Sidonians were generally accustomed to draw their supplies from Herod’s territory, or that they were confined to it on the present occasion only. If the former be his meaning, it does not appear to be a reason for their being necessitated to make peace with Herod; for they were a maritime people, carrying on an extensive commerce, and consequently were able to procure the necessaries of life from other countries bordering on the sea; and therefore if they generally took off the surplus produce of Herod’s dominions, they

* Liber 20, cap. 9 and 5.
certainly conferred an advantage and obligation on him; and then the statement of St. Luke is rather a reason for his feeling the necessity of coming to terms with them, than the other way. Consequently St. Luke must mean to say, that on this particular occasion only the Tyrians and Sidonians derived, and were compelled to derive, the means of subsistence out of Herod's territories. But whence could this compulsion arise, but from the prevalence of a famine or dearth in the countries, whence they ordinarily drew, or might then have drawn, their supplies? There was therefore before Herod's death a famine or severe scarcity existing in the countries bordering on the Mediterranean. But perhaps it will be replied, that the support, which those cities derived from Herod's country upon their coming to terms with him, is a proof, that there at least was plenty there. To a certain degree it undoubtedly is; but not absolutely or unexceptionably: for can it be alleged, that the coming of Jacob's sons into Egypt to buy corn, is a proof that there was at the time no scarcity in that land? In fact the want of provisions in Tyre and Sidon and the neighbouring countries must have made them very dear in Judea; so that, even if the harvest were abundant there, still the exportation must have produced the effect of scarcity. Now
since Herod died in the year 44, and, as appears from the account, which Josephus gives of his accession to the kingdom and of the length of his reign, in the early part of that year; and since his reconciliation with the Tyrians and Sidonians took place some time, perhaps some months, before his death, it is certain, that a dearth, or scarcity, must have been felt in Judea in the beginning of that year, in all probability in the latter part of the preceding one. Josephus then, we may with great reason believe, speaks of the scarcity, when at its greatest height; but it may have been for some years gradually advancing to that height, ob assiduas sterilitates, to use the expression of Suetonius.

Orosius* also notices the same famine, and places it in the fourth year of Claudius; he farther informs us that it prevailed throughout Syria; and metamorphoses the account of queen Helena's munificence from that given by Josephus; for making her a convert to christianity, instead of Judaism, he confers her bounty on the christians. Lastly Eusebius† in his chronicle notices a famine

* Hist. l. 7, c. 6. In the latter part of the same chapter the Historian has confounded the account of Claudius's danger and escape given by Suetonius with that by Tacitus.

in the third year of Claudius and the sixth of Herod, that is to say, the sixth from his being first made king by Caligula, which was the year before his death; and this he expressly states to be the famine of the Acts, and speaks of it as prevailing over the whole empire, as he does also in his ecclesiastical history.

When we put all these historical facts together we find the famines mentioned by Josephus, Oro-sius, and Eusebius, meeting in some point or other those recorded by Dio, Suetonius, Aurelius Victor, and the medals, so that they may all be taken together, as one extended dearth, which during so long a time, as the first five or six years of Claudius, afflicted the Roman world, though with greater or less severity in different provinces and at different parts of that period. Hence St. Luke's general expression, "a famine throughout the world, which came to pass in the reign of Claudius Caesar," as it is capable of comprehending the whole time of the dearth in its various localities and gradations of severity, so doubtless it was intended by him in a general sense to express its wide extent and long continuance. But the famine, as has been before observed, plainly appears to have followed the prophecy at no great distance, whence we may conclude, that as the former was felt in the year...
41, so the delivery of the other may with the greatest probability be placed in the year 40, shortly before the death of Caligula.

We must however attend again to the learned Lardner, who maintains, that Paul and Barnabas did not quit Jerusalem till after the death of Herod, which took place in the year 44. It is certain, that their previous residence at Antioch did not greatly exceed a twelve-month, and it must be allowed, that they returned thither on having fulfilled their ministry; wherefore it is impossible, unless they be supposed to have tarried a most improbable length of time at Jerusalem, that the prediction of Agabus, which was delivered while they were at Antioch, should have been given during the reign of Caligula.

But Lardner's argument rests wholly on the supposition, that, unless we date the return of Paul and Barnabas after Herod's death, it is impossible to account for the interruption in the course of the narration in the twelfth chapter of the Acts, and for postponing the mention of the fulfilment of their commission till after that of his decease. Now the motive, that induced St. Luke to break the thread of his narrative, was most assuredly to introduce, not the death of Herod, an event, which in itself was altogether beside the purpose of the history, but the persecution
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of the christians, the martyrdom of James, and more especially the imprisonment and miraculous deliverance of Peter. These things doubtless took place while Paul and Barnabas were on their way to, or abiding at, Jerusalem; for Luke says, that "about that time Herod stretched forth his hands;" but the time last mentioned is the sending of Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem. Sufficient reason then, it appears, may be assigned for interrupting the narrative, and for relating the circumstances concerning Herod without any regard to him, personally considered, or to his government, otherwise than as it affected the christians. But from that incidental mention it is by no means to be concluded, that his death followed immediately or even very closely upon the persecution. Indeed the history itself furnishes proof, that it did not; for Herod's quarrel and reconciliation with the Tyrians and Sidonians is described as taking place in the interim; and that was an affair, which in the settlement must have occupied some time, perhaps several months; for those people had to learn by experience the impracticability of obtaining supplies in the present exigency, except from the king's dominions, and so to feel the necessity of submitting to his terms. Since then Herod's death did not follow very closely upon the perse-
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cution, since too it cannot be supposed, that the
two apostles purposely awaited that event at Je-
rusalem, and since the business of their ministry
was not such, as to require a long abode there, it
is very possible, and even probable, that they
might have returned to Antioch before it occurred.
Besides there really is not any sufficient ground
for believing that Herod's persecution was set on
foot at so late a date, as within the last months
of his reign; but rather the contrary. For it was
evidently intended to acquire popularity, which
he greatly courted, among his new subjects, and
it was therefore in all probability one of his ear-
liest measures. We are informed by the sacred
historian, first, that "Herod stretched forth his
hands to vex certain of the church;" then, that
"he killed James the brother of John with the
sword;" to which he adds, that "because he saw
it pleased the Jews, he proceeded farther to take
Peter also." Here are three distinct steps; one
specifically ascribed to the motive above mention-
ed, and the others easy to be traced to the same.
Perceiving the general virulence of the Jews
against the christians, and desirous of ingratiating
himself with the former, Herod commenced a
vexatious, but it should seem not bloody, perse-
cution of the latter. Upon seeing that he there-
by attained his end, he was encouraged to more
violent and cruel proceedings, and without any regard to justice or humanity he put James to death; and finding that the good-will of the Jews still increased with the sanguinary progress of his ostentatious zeal, he laid his hands on Peter, with a like murderous intent, which he resolved to carry into effect at the ensuing passover. Popularity then, it is plain, was Herod's object, in his cruel treatment of the christians; but that being one more frequently courted by princes, and indeed more necessary to them, at the beginning of their reigns, than when quietly settled on their thrones, it is altogether probable, that he commenced his persecution in the early part of his reign. The duration of it certainly was short and its cessation sudden; and although the sacred writer has not formally stated the cause, yet every man, who reads the Acts of the apostles with an unprejudiced mind, will suppose, that he meant it to be ascribed, not to the death of Herod, but to the miraculous deliverance of Peter. That event staggered and overawed the merciless tyrant; so that when he had stopped to the best of his power the spreading of the tale by putting to death such witnesses of it, as were within his reach, he ventured no more to oppose himself to a religion, which he now found to be protected by a power, that it might be dangerous to provoke.
The historian having related the marvellous escape of Peter from the violence and persecuting cruelty of Herod, passes on to record the extraordinary death of the tyrant; not however, as the cause of the stoppage of the persecution, but as an exemplary instance of the divine justice overtaking a tyrannical persecutor in the midst of his pride. But justice we know often pursues such great offenders with an halting step—pæna pede claudio. The measure of iniquity remains to be filled up by an higher and fuller growth of impiety and folly, till all at once it calls down the blow of vengeance. So in the case of Herod: his displeasure and subsequent peace with Tyre and Sidon are introduced by St. Luke, for there is no other imaginable reason for their introduction, only in order to lead us to the immediate occasion of his fearful end. Herod, it should seem, was greatly delighted with the issue of that affair, as affording an eminent instance of his power and policy; insomuch, that on the occasion of some shows, which, as Josephus informs us, were shortly after given in honour of the emperor Claudius, he exhibited himself to the people in a style of very extraordinary splendour, and made a public oration, inflated, as we may reasonably suppose, with much self congratulation and vain boasting. His audience having answered his
speech with the profane shout; "the voice of a God and not of a man;" and Herod having accepted with complacency the incense of their impious flattery, the avenging angel smote him, and he received at once the merited retribution of his present arrogance and his preceding cruelty. Thus it is obvious, that Herod's death is connected with his persecution of Christians, only as a just punishment following acts of guilt without any regard to the interval between them, which, for any thing, that St. Luke has said, may have been either long or short. In that interval Paul and Barnabas returned to Antioch; but St. Luke could not introduce the mention of that fact in the exact order of time, without breaking the connexion, which it was his aim to preserve, of Herod's cruelty with his death and the immediate occasion of it. Therefore, according to his practice noticed before*, he postpones the relation of their return till after the mention of Herod's death; and that, with as plain marks, as any author commonly thinks necessary to give, that he is resuming the thread of his discourse after a long digression.

It appears then, that it is very possible and even easy to account for the order of St. Luke's narrative without supposing, that Paul and

* Page 337.
Barnabas did not return to Antioch till after the decease of Herod; and that the manner of accounting for it is so natural and satisfactory, as to afford sufficient reason for concluding against Lardner, that Paul and Barnabas set off on their return from Jerusalem sometime before the death of Herod. Consequently we are left in possession of our former conclusion, that the prophecy of Agabus was delivered prior to the death of Caligula, and in the last year of his reign.

To return at length from this discussion to the point, whence it set off. When Agabus delivered his prophecy Paul and Barnabas were at Antioch; but they had not been long there; for they are said to have taught in that city only for one whole year; which words, although they are exclusive of less only, and not of more, yet will not admit of an excess extending beyond two or three months. Some small excess, however, ought to be allowed, because it is certain, that they had been teaching and preaching at Antioch before the coming of the prophet, and it is necessary to leave as much time as possible, hardly less than a year, in order to afford scope for effecting the main purpose of his prophecy; namely, to provide a seasonable relief for the poor christian brethren resident in Judea. For
the work of collection was not that of a day; but gradually progressive; and proceeded with an effect continually increasing, in proportion as new converts were added to the Lord. While Paul and Barnabas were preaching the doctrines of the christian faith, they would of course teach their new disciples, that "faith must work by love;" and would make a particular application of their precepts to the case of the poor christians of their own nation. The gathering of the contribution must therefore have been a work of time; which indeed we might well infer from its amount being such, as to require, at least to justify, the sending of Paul and Barnabas themselves with it to Jerusalem. Besides we learn, that poor, as well as rich, contributed their share, "every man according to his ability." Now the poor could not well have advanced any thing considerable toward the collection at one time; and the probability therefore is, that they gave such small donations, as they could well afford, occasionally, or at stated intervals. By this consideration and by the parallel instances of the collections made on a similar occasion at Corinth and in Galatia, we are justified in supposing, that St. Paul directed the same method to be observed in this case as in those: "Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him
in store, as God hath prospered him*." Now the time occupied in a contribution, which proceeded in this mode, and was raised from contributors, who were not all at once, but gradually and successively became, liable to be called upon for it, must have been considerable. It can hardly be rated at less than a twelve-month: wherefore Agabus's prophecy, from which it originated, ought to be dated about a year before the departure of Paul and Barnabas from Antioch.

Farther, Josephus† informs us, that Herod was presented with the kingdom of Judea by Claudius among the first acts of his reign, which began on the twenty fourth of January, A.D. 41; and that he‡ lost no time in taking possession of the dominion conferred upon him: but it is not likely that he could have seated himself on his throne before the passover of that year; and indeed we may safely conclude from the silence of Josephus, that he did not; for he mentions the sacrifices, devotions, and religious rites performed by Herod on his arrival at Jerusalem; and if among them he had celebrated the high ordinance of the passover, the historian, with whom he

* 1 Corinthians, xvi. 2. It has been noticed before, that the two phrases, by which St. Paul and St. Luke describe the ability of the contributors, are very similar: οἱ οὖν ἐνορθοῖ, and καθὼς ἔνωσεν τοὺς. Acts, xi. 29.
† Antiq. lib. 19, cap. 5. ‡ Idem cap. 6.
was a great favourite, would not have neglected to notice it. It is however likely, that he might reach Jerusalem before the pentecost, and at any rate we cannot suppose his arrival to have been delayed long after that feast; so that by the beginning of the following year he would have had time, not only to take formal possession of his royal dignity, but to learn the state of his kingdom, to devise and digest the general measures of his government, to consider the best means of promoting his interests, and especially, of what he had much at heart, his popularity, and to resolve on the persecution of the christians, as one of the most promising. We have before seen, that the imprisonment of St. Peter, which seems to have been the last step of the persecution, took place at the season of the passover; but that passover, as appears from what has just been said, could not have been previous to the year 42. The feast however of that year might very well be the one in question; and since it was the first that occurred after Herod’s assumption of the royal title, it has for a reason before mentioned a stronger claim to be that, than any of those that succeeded it during his reign. Now Paul and Barnabas arrived at Jerusalem, as plainly appears, during the persecution, and, as we may reasonably believe, before Peter’s arrest;
consequently, no great while before the pass-
over; perhaps in some part of the month of
February. After making every allowance, that
can be required for resting with christian friends
in the way, consoling and confirming them in
the gospel, it cannot be supposed that they left
Antioch before the beginning of the preceding
December, and probably not long after. But
we have found, that the interval of a year or
thereabout ought to be allowed between the
prophecy of Agabus and their departure from
Antioch. Wherefore we conclude the prophecy
to have been given about the month of Decem-
ber, a. d. 40.

Again, Agabus prophesied in the reign of
Caligula; and Paul and Barnabas were at Anti-
och before the delivery of the prophecy. But they
abode there not much, probably not above two
months, more than a year, and they proceeded from
Antioch to Jerusalem, in travelling to which city
they might expend two months more. Conse-
quently they must have reached it within a year and
an half from their arrival at Antioch. Now they
came to Jerusalem no long time, perhaps two or
three months, before the passover; and they then
found Herod reigning and vexatiously persecu-
ting the christians, or proceeding to more fatal
lengths against them. But they could not, for
reasons before mentioned, have found him so reigning or so employed at the approach of any passover previous to that of the year 42. Neither can they be supposed to have come to Jerusalem with the Antiochian contribution any year after the year 42, without taking the prophecy of Agabus out of the reign of Caligula, which the expressions in Acts, xi. 28, will not permit us to do. Therefore the early spring, probably the February of the year 42, was the season of their arrival and of Herod's persecution. Moreover, since we allow about two months for the journey of Paul and Barnabas from Antioch to Jerusalem, they must have quitted the former city about December, 41. But their departure took place about a year after Agabus's prophecy; wherefore that must have been delivered, not only, as we have seen, in the last year of Caligula's reign, but within a few weeks of his death, probably in the month of December, 40. To have attained this date with so near an approach to certainty and exactness is a great point gained; for hence we may trace back by a few easy steps of justifiable conjecture the course of events until we arrive at the date of the conversion of St. Paul.

It may be remarked by the way, that although the apostles arrived at Jerusalem with the collection from Antioch in the early part of the year
yet, since in all probability the famine began to be felt, as we have seen, toward the end of the year 43, when we take into consideration the numerous inquiries, the preparations, the arrangements, that would be necessary for diffusing benevolence, in due proportion and to the best advantage, on so extensive a scale, as was here required, it must be confessed, that the provision did not very unseasonably anticipate the need.

But to proceed. Since the prophecy of Agabus was given about the month of December, A. D. 40, and, as we have before seen, not long after the arrival of Paul and Barnabas at Antioch, it is most likely, that they reached that city sometime in the autumn, probably about October. But this was not the first occasion, on which Barnabas had preached and laboured at Antioch; for indeed he had quitted it only to fetch Paul, the especial minister of the Gentiles, that he might have the benefit of that mighty apostle's learning, zeal, and divine illumination, in taking advantage of the happy opportunity, which offered itself for the promulgation of the gospel among the heathen in the Capital of the east. The voyage of Barnabas to Tarsus and back, his abode there, for Paul might not be prepared to quit his station and ministry in his own country at an instant's summons, with necessary or
accidental delays and impediments, may well be reckoned to have occupied a couple of months, so that the period when Barnabas quitted Antioch may be dated in the advanced summer, probably about August, of the year 40. His residence in that city before his expedition to Tarsus must have been of considerable length; for we find, that after his arrival he not only exhorted the christian converts, whom he found there*, "that with purpose of heart they should cleave unto the Lord;" but he applied himself diligently to the work of conversion, and that for such continuance and with such success, that, as we are informed, "a great multitude†," or, as our English version has it, *much people*, "was added unto the Lord." For the period of those labours, which appear to have been followed by so fruitful an harvest, and by the promise of one so much more abundant, as to have exceeded the measure of his personal abilities and assiduity to gather in with complete success, we cannot well allow less than one year; which carries up the time of Barnabas's first arrival at Antioch to the summer of the year 39. He had been dispatched thither by the church of Jerusalem on hearing the happy work of conversion, which had been successfully taken in hand and carried on by a small number

of zealous disciples, who some time before had arrived in that city. Allowing then a month for the preparation and journey of Barnabas to Antioch, the assembly of the church may be dated about July, A. D. 39.

The facility and promptitude, with which the christians at Jerusalem appear to have met and acted on this occasion, indicate the season to have been one of quiet and safety. What point then can we so reasonably fix for its occurrence, as that interval of rest, or peace, which the churches are in Acts, ix. 31, described to have enjoyed throughout all Judea, Galilee, and Samaria? The cause of that tranquillity is with the greatest probability attributed by Lardner* to the troubles, that beset the Jews themselves, in consequence of Caligula's attempt to be worshipped, as a God, by their nation; and the period of those troubles aptly coincides with the date above given. For although the march of Petronius with his army into Judea, bearing the command of the emperor to set up his statue by force, if force were necessary for effecting it, in the temple of Jerusalem, did not take place till later, nor, as it should seem from Josephus, till late in the autumn of the year 39†, yet the

* Credibility, part 1, b. 1, c. 2.
† Josephus relates that Petronius wintered at Ptolemais, intending to begin the war in the following spring. Ant. Jud. l. 18, c. 9, § 2.
tumult of Alexandria had taken place before; the ill-will also of the emperor towards the Jews had been shewn in his treatment of Philo and the Alexandrian embassy, and the cause of that ill-will, that is to say, the refusal of the Jews to adore his imperial divinity, was well ascertained. Hence the whole Jewish people, through all the provinces of the empire, must have been filled with extreme anxiety and alarm, at the expectation of the calamities, which a capricious tyrant, in the plenitude of unlimited power, might bring upon them, for many months before the publication of his insane decree concerning his statue; so that in the summer of the year thirty nine they would be ill at leisure to attend to the motions of the christians and to harrass them by persecutions, when they were in the actual dread of a far more formidable persecution, than any that they could raise against others, falling upon themselves. The season of the rest then to the church mentioned in Acts, ix. 31, does most aptly coincide with the period of the secure assemblage of the church at Jerusalem; and that coincidence, in its turn, reflects additional probability on the date assigned by Lardner to the season of the church's tranquillity.

The occasion of Barnabas's mission was, as before mentioned, that certain christian disciples,
men of Cyprus and Cyrene, had come to Antioch, and preached the gospel there with such success, that the mother church of Jerusalem deemed it expedient to send him thither, to confirm the new converts. The notice thus attracted, and especially the mission of so important a member of the church, as Barnabas, sufficiently prove, that the work of conversion had been attended with great success, and must have been going on for a length of time. Considering the novelty of the undertaking, in which, as will presently appear, they engaged, the difficulties thence attending it, and the extent to which they succeeded, we cannot allow less than two years for the period of their evangelical exertions; and consequently we cannot date the commencement of them with any probability later than the summer of the year 37. The expressions of St. Luke may indeed seem to justify a yet earlier date, since he speaks of these preachers as among the number of those disciples, who had been "scattered abroad upon the persecution that arose about Stephen." But it does not appear, that they came directly from Judea to Antioch, but rather otherwise. For on their arrival there they found that another body of the scattered disciples, who are described, as "preaching the

* Acts, xi. 19.
word to Jews only," had preceded them and were already settled in that city. They had consequently been elsewhere before; and therefore the date above assigned is no improbable one for their arrival at Antioch.

But what is chiefly remarkable in these Cypriot and Cyrenian teachers, is, that they are the first persons on record, who appear to have been engaged in the work of opening the covenant of grace to the Gentiles on a general and comprehensive scale. This appears from the account of St. Luke, that "when they were come to Antioch, they spake unto the Grecians, preaching the Lord Jesus." It would be drawing a very erroneous conclusion from these words, if we were to suppose that those active evangelists had not preached the Lord Jesus at all until they had arrived at Antioch. Such silence would ill accord with the character and degree of their zeal. The only credible account, indeed the only probable supposition, is, that there was some difference to be remarked either in the doctrine, which they now taught at Antioch, and that, which they had before preached at other places; or in the persons, to whom they preached it. The former supposition is not to be received without proof, of which it is wholly destitute; the latter also

* Acts, xi. 19.
requires proof; but we can produce it. There really was a difference between the persons, to whom those Cypriots and Cyrenians opened the gospel covenant after they came to Antioch, and those before. They, like their dispersed brethren, had hitherto addressed their glad tidings to Jews only; but henceforth they proclaimed them to the Grecians, to Gentiles; and of such were the converts, whom they made at Antioch. This may be argued with great force of conviction, from the fact, that Barnabas desired to have Paul for his companion and helpmate, the apostle of the Gentiles, rather than any other of the sacred college; and even went in person to seek him at Tarsus, rather than request the assistance of those at Jerusalem, by whom he had himself been dispatched on his evangelical mission. But there is no need to dwell even on such an argument, when it is expressly declared by the historian, as we plainly read in our English version, "that they spake unto the Grecians." It is true, that the reading of the Vulgate Greek testament is not Grecians but Hellenists, Ἑλληνοχριστα, not Ἑλληνος. But Griesbach has inserted the latter reading in his text on the authority of two ancient MSS. with the Syriac, Latin, Vulgate, Arabic, and some other versions and several fathers. His principal inducement however to that step
was doubtless the exigentia loci; and such truly is the force of the argument thence derived, that, even if we persist in retaining the reading of the Vulgate text, we must understand the word in the sense of the various reading. The conduct of the persons mentioned in the nineteenth verse is plainly opposed to that of those in the twentieth verse, οἱ μαθηταί τῆς συνόδου. Of the former it is said, that they "preached the word to none but Jews only;" of the latter, that they "spake unto the Hellenists, preaching the Lord Jesus." Now if the word be taken in its usual acceptation, those Hellenists were Jews; with no other difference from the Jews dwelling at Jerusalem, but speaking the Greek language and adopting Greek customs; and with no difference at all from those Jews, to whom the other party at Antioch addressed themselves. But then, while the form of the passage denotes opposition, there will be none in reality: there will be a distinction without a difference. The Hellenists therefore must be understood to be Gentile Greeks, as if the word had been Ἐλληνες, instead of Ἐλληνας, in the original; and then the conclusion to be drawn from the limitation of the preaching of these Cypriote and Cyrenian disciples to the time of their arrival at Antioch, is, that they did not till then address themselves to the Gentiles.
But it is not reasonable to suppose, that either then or at any other time those disciples would have ventured upon such a step, unless they had previously received what they considered to be sufficient authority for taking it; and since they were themselves Jews, doubtless with the common prejudices of their nation upon them, it is not at all likely, that they would have been satisfied with less than the most solid proofs. Now no such authority can be adduced from the Acts of the apostles, prior to the conversion of St. Paul and the baptism of Cornelius. But the former does not appear to have been generally known immediately on the event, nor even for some time after his abode at Antioch. Indeed the tidings of it were published chiefly by his own preaching. The latter then was the occurrence, that gave these Cyrenian and Cypriot evangelists boldness, and made them feel it a duty, to avail themselves of, and even to seek, every favourable opportunity for preaching the word of salvation to the Gentiles. Not however, that they can be supposed to have formed such a decided resolution and taken such an important step, upon a mere report, however credible, of the baptism of Cornelius, without having taken the advice of the apostles, and received from them authority and encouragement to so great an
undertaking. Now it is quite certain, that the apostles would not even have listened to the proposal of such an innovation, could any man have made it, before the baptism of Cornelius and his family. It is therefore to be concluded, that that signal event had taken place before the preaching of the gospel to the Gentiles at Antioch was begun; and the same thing is fully confirmed by the order and connexion of the narrative in the book of Acts, in which the account of what took place at Antioch follows close upon Peter's defence of himself for visiting and baptizing Cornelius and his family. It is not however to be concluded, that the Gentile ministry at Antioch followed immediately on the admission of Cornelius into the church, or on the recognition of it by the apostles*. There must have been an interval, not of a few days or weeks only, but of several months. For the Cypriot and Cyrenian evangelists were not at Jerusalem, when the assembled church heard and assented to Peter's defence, and came to the conclusion, "then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life." Time consequently must be allowed for them to have received the glad tidings, to have inquired into and ascertained their truth, and then to have so maturely considered their purport, as to have come to a decided opinion,

* Acts, xi. 18.
that they were both authorized and in duty bound to act upon them. Time must also be allowed for them to have consulted the apostles, to have stated to them the strong conviction they felt of their duty, and their hearty desire to fulfil it, and to have received in return their apostolic sanction and authority for the exercise of so new and so highly important a branch of the Christian ministry. For all these things we cannot allow less than six months. Now these evangelists began to preach at Antioch, as we have seen, in the summer of the year 37. The baptism therefore of Cornelius must be placed in the early part of the same year.

Farther, it is to be observed, that St. Paul, in his epistle to the Galatians*, expressly states, that after his return from Arabia, and his subsequent abode at Damascus he went to Jerusalem "to see Peter:" not however merely to visit him for civility or kindness sake, but, as the word† in the original Greek signifies, to visit him for the purpose of inquiry; with a view to learn his opinions on the subject of the Christian dispensation, and to satisfy himself with regard to his past conduct and his intentions for the future in the preaching of the gospel. But why does Paul so pointedly particularize St. Peter on this

* Galatians, i. 18.  
† inopmoat.
occasion? He tells us that he saw James also: but Peter was evidently the chief object of his visit. Why so? Doubtless not because he was chief and prince of the apostles, and because therefore the decision of all controversies lay in his breast;—a postulatum, which, as he was far from admitting afterwards, so neither is he likely to have thought of then; but because, during his residence at Damascus, after his return from Arabia, he had heard of the baptism of Cornelius by Peter and of the proceedings of the apostolic college thereupon, and probably too of the preaching of the Cypriot and Cyrenian evangelists to the Gentiles at Antioch. Aware then of his own peculiar commission, as apostle of the Gentiles, and feeling its high dignity and importance, he was desirous to learn from Peter's own mouth, how far the late events interfered in, or accorded with, his own especial grace and apostleship.

The baptism of Cornelius ought, as we have seen, to be dated about the beginning of the year 37. Now St. Paul's journey to Jerusalem, looking to the reason and motive, to which it has been ascribed, must have been undertaken some time after that date, probably about six or eight months; for not only did not news at that time fly with the same rapid wing as now, but St.
Paul was seriously and deeply engaged in the ministry of the word at Damascus*; and he might not think it necessary or advisable to leave his work immediately on receiving the intelligence concerning Cornelius, interesting and important as it was to all christians and especially to himself. Nor indeed does he appear to have quitted the city expressly for the purpose of visiting his brother apostle; but being obliged by the persecution of king Aretas, set on foot doubtless at the instigation of the Jews dwelling there, to make his escape, he bent his way to Jerusalem for the purpose before mentioned. St. Paul's visit to St. Peter may therefore with the greatest probability be dated in the autumn of the year 37.

In Galatians, i. 18, the apostle informs us, that his return to Jerusalem took place after an absence of three years; consequently he must have quitted it in the autumn of the year 34. But when he so quitted it, he was proceeding under the influence of his erroneous notions and in the heat of his unregulated zeal, with autho-

* Galatians, i. 17, 2 Corinthians, xi. 32, Acts, ix. 22—27. In the last cited passage it is evident, that the sacred author has either anticipated the period of Paul's preaching at Damascus, his escape thence, and his journey to Jerusalem, or he has included the time spent by the apostle in Arabia under the indefinite words "many days;" verse 23. The latter, as most agreeable to the manner of St. Luke, is the true way of solving the difficulty.
ritative letters and a commission from the priests and elders of his nation, to arrest the Christians at Damascus and send them bound to Jerusalem. Now it was in this expedition, and consequently within a few days of his setting off upon it, that he beheld the miraculous vision and received that indubitable manifestation of the power and glory of the Redeemer, which effected his conversion to Christianity; whence at last we conclude with as near an approximation to certainty, as the case will admit of, that the conversion of St. Paul took place about the autumn of the year 34. But that date is distant exactly three years and an half, or half a prophetic week, from the spring of the year 31, when our blessed Saviour by the offering of himself once for all caused the sacrifice and offering of the Mosaic law to cease. And thus we are at length arrived at the desired conclusion, that the conversion of St. Paul, which has been shewn to be the fact, that by its own intrinsic importance, by its avowed purpose, and by its direct consequences, as well as by the superior grandeur of its miraculous circumstances, has the best claim to be the grand signal appointed to mark the opening of the covenant of grace to the Gentiles, did also take place, as nearly as can be computed, at the very point of time, which agrees with the expiration of Daniel's supplemental week.
Since however we have arrived at this conclusion by a retrograde movement, it will be a strong argument in corroboration, if it can be shewn, that we may attain to the same end by inverting the process; that is to say, by tracing the course of the christian church downwards in the natural order of time, taking care to assign to the several steps, as recorded in the Acts of the apostles, a date consistent with the probable distance, at which they appear to have followed each other.

The effusion of the Holy Spirit on the apostles took place on the day of pentecost, or the fiftieth day, which we may be allowed to call two months, after the feast of the passover. That auspicious moment was distinguished by the conversion of three thousand persons to the faith at once*. After that signal exhibition of divine power in enforcing truth on the hearts of men, we find the progress of the church more gradual. We read, that "the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved†." This plainly denotes, not an instantaneous and miraculous conversion of many hundreds together, but a regular and steady, though still rapid, progress. Shortly after‡ we are informed, that the number of those who believed was increased to about five thousand.

* Acts, ii. 41.  † Acts, ii. 47.  ‡ Acts, iv. 4.
This augmentation could hardly have been effected in a shorter space than three months; but probably did not require more; for just at this time the notable miracle had been wrought on the "man of forty years old and lame from his birth" by Peter and John at the beautiful gate of the temple. This, with their subsequent discourse upon it, the violent, but important attempts of the rulers to prevent their preaching, and their perseverance, mightily aided by a second effusion of the Holy Ghost, must have tended to increase their numbers greatly without occupying any considerable time*.

But the passage, that next, after the interval of two verses, follows in the narrative†, as it does not relate a single fact or event, but a prevalent custom, must refer to a time far enough advanced to have allowed such a succession of individual acts to take place, as were sufficient to grow into an established practice. I speak of the community of goods; which being founded on no law of the christian dispensation could have no other authority, than that of an usage, which supposes for its formation the lapse of considerable time. The sacred historian has indeed noticed the subject in a former chapter‡. But he

* Acts, iii. 1—iv. 31. † Acts, iv. 34. ‡ Acts, ii. 44, 46.
could not there intend to speak of it as a custom; for it had not then become such; but desiring to bequeath to all future ages of the church a striking instance of the mutual brotherly affection of the first christians, and of the sense they entertained of the near and dear relation, which they bare to one another in the unity of their divine head and under the influence of the Holy Ghost, he stated the fact of the community of goods, as an unequivocal proof of the abounding of love to the exclusion of every selfish consideration. Carrying back then the origin of the custom to a time near the first effusion of the Holy Spirit, we cannot allow less for the growth of it than a year and an half, or thirteen months from the last stage; especially when we find, that some of the facts stated as examples, are contracts; such as the sale of houses* and lands and receipt of the produce, which could not be effected without thought, consultation, and manifold delay between the contracting parties. The sale of land by Joses†, surnamed Barnabas, is particularized; probably because the property was of more than ordinary value. But he was also an inhabitant of Cyprus, and his estate probably lay in that island, so that the process of bargaining and conveying was likely to occupy a considerable time.

* Acts, iv. 34. † Acts, iv. 36, 37.
Moreover it appears from the next chapter, that the custom had existed long enough to afford opportunity for corruption to creep in, and for persons of disingenuous minds and dishonest principles to make a profit of the Christian community, by putting into the common store a part only of their property; thus leaning upon the church for their whole support, while they secretly reserved the remaining and perhaps larger portion of their property, as a matter of gain to themselves. This abuse could not have advanced all at once to the height, which we find it had attained in the instance of Ananias and Sapphira*. Their awful story plainly shews, not only their covetous dispositions and infidel audacity, but their perfect knowledge of the Christian practice, with their fraudulent calculations upon it, and the impious steps they must have taken to avail themselves of the unjust advantages resulting from it; so that taking all the circumstances into consideration, we shall find that the additional space of two months may well be reckoned from the first. planings of avarice in that pair of dissembling Christians, until the consummation of their sin and its terrible punishment.

We afterwards read of many miracles† wrought by the apostles, which doubtless were successive, 

and in the course of their performance occupied some time. We find too, that they were accustomed to station themselves and teach the word of truth in a portico of the temple, called "Solomon's porch," a place, as it should seem, of much resort, and that in consequence of their miracles and discourses "many multitudes* were added to the Lord." As these things went on, the attention of the Jews in general, as well in the adjacent country†, as in the city, was engaged by the apostles; a strong feeling in their favour, amounting almost to enthusiasm, was excited; and indeed, when every one, that sought relief from their hands, found it, we cannot be surprised at the admiration, that every where attended them. By their marvellous success and by the increasing popularity of their doctrine a vehement alarm was raised among the Jewish rulers; and in consequence the twelve were arrested and imprisoned. But being miraculously released‡, and again beginning to teach in the temple, they were once more arrested§ and brought before the council. But being heard in their defence, and then, on the well known motion of Gamaliel, discharged, after receiving some corporal chastisement, "they ceased not to teach and preach

Jesus Christ." For all these circumstances we may reasonably allow a farther space of two months.

As the church widely extended itself, and as its members, notwithstanding their fidelity, righteousness, and moral purity, were still men; men of different dispositions and different degrees of understanding and spiritual attainments; the sense of the distinction, which parted Jews and Hellenists, began to shew itself in murmurs against those, who were intrusted with the administration of the common revenue; the latter suspecting that a partiality was exercised in favour of the widows of the Jewish brethren more strictly so called. It should seem, that this altered state of things could hardly have taken place in less than six or seven months after the last date, that is to say, eight or nine months after the death of Ananias and Sapphira. For that fearful event must have impressed the minds of the whole community of christians with an awe, which till worn off or abated of its force by the lapse of a little time, would be a safeguard against the entrance, at least the voluntary entertainment, of selfish notions and feelings. Besides, as the suspicions of partial and unfair dealing were doubtless awakened some time before they were expressed at all, so probably the
murmurs were faint and indistinct for a good while before they reached the apostles ears. We may well be justified then in carrying on the date, as above proposed, six months farther from our last stage until the ordination of the seven deacons, consequent on the utterance of the above mentioned complaints.

Of the deacons so appointed some were undoubtedly persons of rare and excellent endowments, both intellectual and moral; they were also eminently distinguished by the blessing of heaven, and were raised to the discharge of duties greatly superior to those of their original institution. Upon their appointment, we read*, that "the word of God increased, and the number of disciples multiplied in Jerusalem greatly; and a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith." Stephen became particularly remarkable for the abilities, the zeal, and the strength of argument, which he displayed in his controversies with unbelieving Jews and Hellenists until his bold and unanswerable pleading before the Sanhedrim obtained for him the glorious crown of martyrdom. To this point we must admit of an advance of not less than two months farther.

* Acts, vi. 7.
Upon the martyrdom of Stephen the disciples were scattered abroad*, betaking themselves to different towns and governments, in the hope of escaping the general persecution that followed. But Saul above their other enemies proceeded with a vindictive enthusiasm to "make havoc of the church†," which "he persecuted even to strange cities‡." A considerable time however must have elapsed from his inactive acquiescence in the death of Stephen to his attaining such a distinguished character for zeal and unsparing rigour, as to qualify him for a commission, as chief persecutor, in the ancient capital of Syria. We may then with great probability date his conversion at twelve months after the martyrdom of Stephen.

Such is the easy and probable account, which an accurate survey of the facts recorded in the Acts of the apostles enables us to give of that interesting period, which elapsed between the passion of our Lord and the conversion of St. Paul. Now $2+3+13+2+2+6+2+12=42$; that is to say, the sum of the intervals amounts to three years and an half, exactly equal to the half of the prophetic week. Other persons may be disposed to abridge or to extend the several portions of time allowed to elapse between the

* Acts, viii. 1. † Acts, viii. 3. ‡ Acts, xxvi. 11.
several events; but all who carefully examine the history will come near to an agreement in the general result. By pursuing the same process in an opposite direction we have before arrived at the same conclusion, which therefore stands doubly founded upon the basis of strong probability.

Upon the whole it has now been proved, that the covenant of grace promised to the patriarchs was confirmed to Jews alone, and to many of them for the space of three years and an half, or one half week, by the personal ministry of our blessed Saviour: that in the end of that half week, by the offering of himself once for all, he caused the sacrifice and offering, and therewith all the ceremonial and typical institutions of the law of Moses, virtually to cease: that the covenant went on to be confirmed to many Jews, and to Jews only, by the ministry of his apostles, for three years and an half, or half a week more: and that the end of that half week, and consequently of the whole supplementary week, is marked and signalized by the preeminent event of St. Paul's conversion, from being an enemy and persecutor of the christian church to be the apostle of the Gentiles; though not exclusively, yet peculiarly and emphatically, of the Gentiles. The covenant being thenceforth
virtually opened, the effects of that opening were
made actually manifest not long after, in the re-
ception of the converted Gentiles, Cornelius and
his family; into the number of the people of God,
by baptism. Then also, and not till then, the
sixth particular predicted in the twenty fourth
verse received its completion: for then the Gentile
portion of the christian holy of holies was joined
to the Jewish and made one therewith, by receiv-
ing the common unction of the Holy Ghost de-
scending upon it with sensible tokens of his
presence.

It must be confessed that the proof of the ac-
complishment of the prophecy, with respect to
the week of the covenant confirmed, rests chiefly
on a calculation of probabilities. But there are
many dates in chronology, in which an higher
sort of certainty is not attainable, and among
such there are few, in which we can rise to so high
a degree. For by settling the date of Agabus's
prophecy at the latter end of the year 40, we put
only nine years and three quarters between that
period and the time of our Lord's passion. Of
these, after reckoning, upon an accurate exami-
nation and deduction of historical facts, three
years and a quarter up to the time of Paul's visit
to Peter after his escape from Damascus, and tak-
ing three more on his own authority for the
interval between the period of his conversion and his return to Jerusalem, there remain no more than three years and an half to be accounted for; and these the history itself enables us to arrange in due order, by supplying such a continuous narrative of facts, as affords sufficient grounds for laying down a series of highly probable dates.
CHAPTER IV.

SECTION VI.

The last clauses of the Prophecy concerning the continuance of the Desolations, the end of the Desolator, and the exhaustion of the divine Judgments upon Jerusalem.

Afterwards upon the border of abominations shall be the Desolator, and that until he shall be consumed, and the determined judgment shall have been poured upon the desolated.

The first clause of the supplemental verse fills up, as we have seen, the vacancy between the twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth verses. The second, now before us, belongs to the latter part of the twenty-sixth verse and gives us one principal feature in the character of that desolating agent, by whose hands Messiah was to "destroy the city and the sanctuary with the prince that cometh."
In translating the passage into English, it is requisite to mark the transition from the former clause by rendering the connective particle *afterwards*, or *moreover*. To render it *and*, as in our English version, produces confusion, because it thus seems to connect what follows with the latter half week, as if it were something appointed to take place within that period; whence also arises a manifest inconsistency, because the desolator is made to do the work of destruction during the very week, in which the covenant is confirmed. The connective is not intended to denote any thing more than bare succession, as it very frequently does in other places.

The interpretation of this clause has been unavoidably forestalled in some measure by the discussion, into which it was necessary to enter in the first chapter*, of the effect which the evangelical citations† of it would have on the reading of the Hebrew text. It is there shewn, that those citations do not support the Greek, Latin, and Arabic versions, in rendering the *temple*, instead of the *border*; while they are easily and entirely reconcilable with the reading of the printed Hebrew text, which is truly and literally rendered, *afterwards upon the border of abominations shall be*
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When these words are diligently compared with those of St. Matthew and St. Mark, foretelling, that the desolator shall stand in "the holy place," or "where he ought not;" and with those of St. Luke, that "Jerusalem shall be encompassed by armies;" four things are evident: first, that the border is the border of the holy place, which again is the same as Jerusalem; secondly, that the border of abominations is the same spot, the circuit of the holy place, or of Jerusalem, rendered abominable by the objects, which are to be seen in those sacred precincts; thirdly, that the abominable objects placed there are not to be of Israelitish fabrication, or to be introduced by Israelites, but are to be the work of the desolator, and planted there by his hands; and fourthly, that the desolator himself is not a single person, but an army, or rather an hostile empire, appearing in force by its armies, encompassing the city and prepared to destroy it. Nothing can well be grander or more striking than the image, under which the subject is presented by the prophet. The desolator is exhibited standing upon the outskirts of the devoted city, which he is polluting by his abominations, and thence surveying with the eye of an evil genius the objects of his malice or his cupidity, which he is maliciously bent to destroy, or greedy to devour.
It reminds one of the splendid passage in Callimachus*;

Lo, what a stern destroyer sits aloft;

From yonder mount, as from a watch tow'r high

Marking his fair occasion! With fell swoop

He'll pluck thee quick from thy deep-seated base

And overturn.

The armies, that encompassed Jerusalem, as

we have before seen, were Roman. They were

the desolator: or rather, as before noticed, the

empire, in whose name and power they stood,

was the desolator. Of course those armies

brought with them their military ensigns, which

with their encampments they planted in hostile

array round about the city, or on its border†. Those ensigns were eagles and images of their

emperors; idols, to which the Roman soldier was

accustomed to pay his superstitious adorations.

Accordingly they are called by Tacitus, "the peculiar deities of the legions‡," and the "Gods of war.§." He tells us also, that when the

* Απαγγειαν ενε ηφεος ε. τ. λ. Callimachi Hym. ad De-

† Castris ante mænia Hierosolymorum positis, instruc-
tas legiones ostentavit. Taciti. Hist. l. 5, c. 10. Josephus

informs us, that Titus encamped before the city in three

divisions. But in the progress of the siege some alterations

took place in the encampment. De Bell. Jud. lib. 5. cap.

2, 3, 7.

‡ Taciti Annal. l. 2, c. 17. § Hist. l. 3, c. 10.
seditious legions would have vented their rage on Plancus, that senator "embraced the ensigns and endeavoured to protect himself by the power of religion; but if Calpurnius the eagle-bearer had not repelled the last extreme of violence, a legate of the Roman people, in a Roman camp, would have stained the altars of the Gods with his blood*." Suetonius also relates, that "Artabanus, king of the Parthians, adored the eagles and military ensigns and the images of the Caesars†;" and Livy informs us, that the Roman soldiers were accustomed "to swear by their military ensigns and eagles‡." Lastly, Tertullian declares, that "the whole religion of the camp is to worship the ensigns, to swear by the ensigns, to prefer the ensigns to all other Gods.§." At

* Annal. l. 1, c. 39. † Caligula, c. 14.
‡ Liv. l. 26, c. 48. So Lucan introduces Lelius swearing fidelity to Caesar "per signa decem felicia castris." Pharsalia, l. 1, v. 370.
§ Tertul. Apolog. cap. 16. That strenuous and bitter exposers of the sin and folly of idolatry little imagined, that this heathen practice would ever be adopted in the armies of christians. Yet, after the conversion of Constantine, the Labarum, or standard of the cross, was exhibited to the adoration of the imperial armies. "This warlike ensign," says Sozomen, "was accustomed to be borne always before the emperor and to be adored by the soldiers. And for this reason I think it was, that Constantine turned the most noted signal of the Roman empire into the ensign of Christ, that by continually seeing it and paying reverence to it, his subjects might be rechaimed from their ancient religious wor-
the siege of Jerusalem then it is plain, that
the Romans begirt the city with idols and idola-
trous worship. Now idolatry, with all that re-
lates to it, is in the language of the old testament
an abomination, or abominable thing, and is so
denominated by the same word, as is used here*. Accordingly Suidas tells us, that "every image
and every figure of man was called among the
Jews an abomination†;" and St. Basil observes,
that "it is the custom of scripture to call idols by
a proper term, abominations‡." In this man-
ner Daniel traces out a principal feature in the
character of the desolator, that is to say, his ido-
latry. Messiah would not "destroy those mur-
derers and burn up their city§" by armies form-
ed of his own faithful subjects; but by the
idolatrous legions of the God of this world, whom
he pressed into his righteous service and made
for the occasion "HIs."

* 1 Kings, xi. 5, 7. 2 Kings, xxiii. 13, 24, Jeremiah,
xxi. 34. Ezekiel, viii. 10. xx. 7. Zechariah, ix. 7. The
word navim also is frequently used; ex. gr. Exodus, viii. 26,
Isaiah, xlv. 19.
† Suidae Lex. in v. βδελυγμα.
‡ Suicer supplies this and other citations from the fathers
to the same purpose. Lex. in v. βδελυγμα.
§ Matthew, xxii. 7.
AND THAT UNTIL HE SHALL BE CONSUMED, 
AND THE DETERMINED JUDGMENT SHALL 
HAVE BEEN POURED UPON THE DESOLATED.

This last clause is not intended, like the two former parts of the supplement, to insert any thing omitted, or to explain any thing left doubtful, in the body of the prophecy; and therefore is not to be referred to any portion of the seventy weeks or to any particular predicted to take place therein; but is superadded to the whole, as containing a prediction of events that extend far beyond the main purpose and avowed subject of the prophecy, into an undefined, and in fact yet unarrived, futurity. The events foretold are two; first, in plain terms, the consumption or extermination of the power destined to desolate Judah and Jerusalem, and then, figuratively, the cessation of the divine wrath against that city and people; whence also we conclude by implication, their restoration to the divine favour, and consequently to prosperity and happiness.

The connective above rendered _and that_, or _even_, briefly repeats what has just before been said of the destroyer, and combined with the following words predicts the continuance of the desolation begun and effected by him to an unnamed, and probably very remote, period. The repetition however is not to be so taken, as if it
were restrained to the circumstance last mentioned, that the desolator will be on the border; as if he were to do no more than merely to pitch his camp with its abominations around Jerusalem. Such an exposition would go the length of making the prophet contradict himself; for it has been already declared with the utmost plainness, that the city and sanctuary shall fall together in a war of overwhelming calamity, bringing in a determined judgment of desolations. Now in order to inflict that sentence, the desolator must enter upon the city; and consequently must quit his position on the circuit of it. But as it thence appears, that he is not by the prophecy restrained to his encampment on the border, so neither can he be supposed to retain that border in a state of perpetual pollution by the actual presence of his abominations. His idols then may be removed. And since they are removable, it follows, that we cannot from the prophecy infer his unceasing perseverance in idolatry. That consequently is predicted only as an accidental part of his character, prominent indeed at the time of his besieging Jerusalem, but separable at a future period. Neither are we authorized by the prophet to limit the continuance of the desolations of Jerusalem by that of the dominion, or even of the existence, of the original destroyer. It is indeed, declared,
that the enemy, who shall first rear the banners of his idolatry before Jerusalem, shall retain possession of the city, and of course of Judea also, in a desolated condition, until he himself shall be consumed. But not an hint is given to warrant us in supposing, that the termination of the desolations is involved in the ruin of that particular desolator. For anything that is said, there may be, as in truth there has been, a succession of desolators; a fact, which, though it be not strictly deducible from the passage, might nevertheless, even previously to the event, have been expected from it; for nothing could be more natural, or more agreeable to the common custom of language, than to accept the word desolator in an extensive signification, so as to comprehend all the successors of the first destroyer, who might hold Jerusalem in a state of desolation, until they also, each in his turn, should undergo the like catastrophe.

In conformity with the above observations we find, that heathen Rome having laid Jerusalem desolate, held it in that condition, until she herself was consumed before the progress of christianity and by the arms of Constantine. When heathen Rome had passed away, christian Rome, before her own idolatries commenced, succeeded; and continued the desolation. We know the his-
tory of Julian's abortive effort to defeat the divine oracles, and thereby to invalidate the evidences of christianity. The exigency and greatness of the occasion called for divine interposition; and the seal of miracle was set upon the roll of prophecy. The infidel historian of the decline and fall of the Roman empire* has stated the evidence with so much fairness, and has so convincingly betrayed the weight and sharpness, with which he felt its power, that pity represses the smile, which might else be excited by his clumsy and ineffectual attempts to escape from the necessary conclusion. It is incontrovertibly certain, that the apostate emperor was against his will obliged to hold Jerusalem in her desolations, and his successors continued so to do, till they were expelled by the Mahometans, who continued the scene. The desolation was not interrupted during the short period, for which the crusaders gained and held possession; nor did it cease with the kingdom of Jerusalem, which they had established, when they were obliged to yield it up to the hands of Saladin; nor afterwards, when the Turks acquired the dominion. These last, now standing upon her border, possessing her ruins and her ravaged territory, sustain the character, so completely in unison with their whole history, of the

desolator of Jerusalem, and will continue to sustain it, until, like her other desolators, they also shall be consumed. They may probably be the last power, into whose hands the desolations of Jerusalem may be committed; but to determine that is not of this time and place. The final consumption however of these cruel and haughty oppressors reminds us of the triumphant language of Isaiah; "associate yourselves, O ye peoples, and ye shall be broken in pieces; gird yourselves and ye shall be broken in pieces; gird yourselves and ye shall be broken in pieces*."

The last part of this verse, and the concluding words of the prophecy declare farther, that the desolator shall retain possession of Jerusalem and its territory, until the determined judgment shall have been poured out upon the desolated, that is to say, upon the desolated people, or nation. The determined judgment is the same as the judgment mentioned in the twenty sixth verse. That is pronounced to be a judgment of desolations; and this being poured out by means of a desolator upon the desolated, must likewise be a judgment of desolations. Nor are they merely the same thing in kind, but in fact: they are completely identical. For the war is unto destruction. It is appointed, not, like

* Isaiah, viii. 9.
other wars, merely during its progress to sack the city and lay waste the country, which upon its retreat or cessation might recover from the calamity; but in the complete deletion of the prime objects of contention, on which every inferior one depended, to leave behind it destructions permanent and irretrievable from generation to generation. This state of things brought on by the war is certainly a judgment of desolations. It seems to afford no room or opportunity for any posterior judgment to be poured out upon the same subjects. Jerusalem, its sanctuary, its territory, government, and people are all "swept with the besom of destruction" and rendered incapable of undergoing a farther or future desolation. The judgments therefore of the twenty sixth and twenty seventh verses begin at the same point, are brought about by the same event, are wrought upon the same city, people, and government; and consequently are one and the same judgment.

This identity of the two judgments is strongly corroborative of the exception made in the second chapter of this work* to our authorized version, as well as to others, of the twenty sixth verse;—until the end of the war desolations are determined, or until the end of a war carried on with
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rapidity, or firmly decided upon, \textit{shall be desolations}. For by these renderings the desolations are predicted as ending with the war; whereas in point of truth and fact the end of the war is appointed for the commencement of the desolations. Accordingly the \textit{judgment of desolations} is not connected with the war by any conjunction; neither is it to be taken in apposition with it; but agreeably to a very common idiom of the Hebrew language, we are to understand the substantive verb, \textit{shall be}, that is, \textit{shall be carried into effect}, \textit{executed}: or we may borrow from the last verse the verb \textit{גֵּפָנָה, shall be poured out}.

To return. It is necessary to explain the sense in which we are to take the term \textit{desolations}. The word is not to be referred to a state of things absolutely and totally desolate; as if Judea, or even the site of Jerusalem, were destined to lie forever a mere waste, a solitude, entirely destitute of human habitations and inhabitants. The desolations are poured out in judgment, not upon the \textit{land}, but upon its proper \textit{possessors}, the Jews. And if it be desolate in respect of them; if they be no more the people of the land; if they no more possess a leader therein; if they no longer have an holy city sanctified and adorned by a temple, in which the priesthood of the nation, the sons of Aaron, worship and honour the God of Israel.
then is a judgment of desolations poured out upon it, according to the notions of any Jew, especially of a patriot like Daniel. But this is in fact the state of things now existing at Jerusalem. The Jewish language, Jewish laws, Jewish religion, Jewish leader, Jewish nation have been ever since its destruction in September, A.D. 70, and still are perished from it; and in their stead foreign tongues, foreign usages, foreign institutions, foreign religions, foreign nations prevail throughout.

The judgment of desolations however is plainly expressed to be a determined judgment; determined, not so much as to the measure of its severity, for that seems almost without measure; "for under the whole heaven hath not been done, as hath been done upon Jerusalem;" but as to its period. It intimates, that the effusion shall some time cease, that the phial of vengeance will be exhausted. When the divine judgments shall have reached their destined termination, and when that other event, which is evidently synchronous with it, or rather the signal of it, the consumption of the last desolator, shall have taken place, then there will be nothing to hinder the revival and restoration of Jerusalem. Then not only her desolations will cease; but, as seems evidently to be implied, an unlimited period of ease, comfort,
and prosperity will return to the city and people of Judah, with the returning favour of the Almighty. No conclusion could be better calculated than this, to answer to the full the original motive cause of the prophecy, the consolation of Daniel. One cannot however but remark the severe and awful brevity, by which curiosity is repressed, and the weightiest matters destined perhaps ever to take place in the world, are left unproduced and buried like germs and embryos in the womb of time. By "comparing spiritual things with spiritual," and the result of that comparison with the records of history, with the present aspect of human affairs, and with the promise of future contingencies, we might perhaps succeed in evolving into a degree of probable expectation some of the particulars, which are closely and darkly folded up in these pregnant words. But such is not the object of the present work, which would thereby be converted into a general dissertation on the prophecies of the latter times.

It will not however be beside our purpose to observe, that in xii. 7, Daniel speaks of a period, when "He that liveth for ever shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people;" that Hosea, in iii. 5, predicts those "latter days," when Israel, after having abided many days,
without king, or prince, or sacrifice, or ephod, or Teraphim, "shall return and seek the Lord their God and David their king;" that our Saviour himself, in Matthew, xxiii. 39, and Luke, xiii. 35, fixes the cessation of the desolation of the temple and his return to it, to the point, when the Jews shall acknowledge him with blessings, as "coming in the name of the Lord;" that in Luke, xxi. 24, he limits the term destined for the dispersion and captivity of Judah, and the treading down of the temple by the Gentiles, to the period when "the times of the Gentiles shall be fulfilled;" and that St. Paul also, in Romans, xi. 25, restricts the duration of the "blindness in part which hath happened unto Israel," to the time when "the fulness of the Gentiles shall be come in." All these passages point to some period for the termination of the unbelief, the sin, or the sufferings of God's ancient people. The nature and order of the events contemplated in each is therefore not only consistent but cognate; and the very turn of the expressions, in which the predictions are given, is strongly similar. There is therefore no reason to doubt, that the period, to which they all point, is the same; a period of redemption and restitution to Judah, and even to all Israel; a period also of satisfaction and contentment to the Gentiles; a period when the mysterious
counsels of the Almighty, in his dispensations to both branches of his church, shall be fully revealed by the event in brightness, consolation, and glory. Then a literal interpretation may be justly ascribed to those words of the prophet*, which at present we can understand only in a figurative and spiritual sense; "Jehovah will comfort Zion; he will comfort all her waste places; and he will make her wilderness like Eden and her desert like the garden of the Lord; joy and gladness shall be found therein, thanksgiving and the voice of melody."

* Isaiah, li. 3.
ARRIVED now at the consummation of his labours, it is with awe and trembling, not less than with satisfaction and gratitude, that the author turns back his thoughts to the subject of them, in all its serious, important, and, it may almost be said, tremendous bearing, on the revelation which God has given in the holy scriptures. For the prophecy which has passed under our review, though comprehended in the compass of four verses, is of the most bold, decisive, and eventful character, resting its evidence to the truth on the accomplishment of a great variety of remarkable and extraordinary incidents, predicted to take place under no less than seven different terms, each consisting of one or more septenaries, or weeks of years, or of a part or parts of such weeks; it being evident, that every division of
the principal term constitutes of itself a separate one. Now since all these terms must have expired many ages since, it follows, that if any one of them can be proved to be erroneously fixed in the prophecy, or if any of the numerous events appointed to be fulfilled in them has not taken place at all, or took place at some other period, than that, which in the prophecy is allotted to it, then the evidence, which the prophecy bears to the religion of Christ, will be materially, if not wholly, invalidated, and perhaps a degree of suspicion will be thrown on the prophetical evidence of Christianity in general. Or again, if any part of the prophecy has not received for itself an intelligible and consistent interpretation, or if sufficient proof has not been adduced of its completion; then the citation of it, as an evidence in favour of Christianity, is nothing better than the production of a witness, who cannot testify to more than a part of the facts, the whole of which he is summoned and expected to prove; and who consequently leaves the cause, if uninjured, at least still undecided, still in doubt and jeopardy.

It will certainly be remembered, that the principal avenues, through which escape might have been effected on the detection of any failures, have been carefully closed by the author against
himself in the early parts of his work. In the course of the examination, into which it was necessary to enter, of certain alterations in the Hebrew text proposed by two learned authors, it was found, not only that those alterations were unwarranted by any sufficient or even plausible authority, but that with the exception of three words, over each of which some doubt might hang as to a single letter, without however affecting at all the construction, or in any material degree the meaning, of the sentence in which they occur, the text might with great reason be deemed faultless and perfect. Therefore, if a clear and satisfactory exposition of the prophecy, and proof of its accomplishment accordingly, as it now stands in our Hebrew bibles, has not been afforded in the foregoing dissertation, he cannot turn round upon the gain-sayer with the plea, that there are errors and corruptions in the original text, which, until they can be removed, must partially obscure the meaning of the prediction and prevent any man from offering a correct interpretation or shewing the complete fulfilment of it. And even as to the translation, although it be a merely human performance, liable to objection and controversy, yet even here, having taken a minute review of the Hebrew words and phrases, of which the passage consists, having
attained, as he conceives, to a correct understand-
ing of them, having professedly rejected and re-
nounced all forced renderings made to favour par-
ticular interpretations, and having followed by choice and avowedly the path of our learned English translators, without any deviations, ex-
cept what the necessity of the case compelled, or perhaps the offer of a more expressive word per-
suaded him to admit, the author is precluded from every pretence, that would impute any awkwardness in his expositions, or any failure in his proofs of accomplishment, to a defect in the translation, or to difficulties in the phraseo-
logy of the original composition.

But if, on the other hand, under these circum-
stances, and after due consideration had of the obscurity, which, as mentioned in the preface, almost necessarily impends over a chronological prophecy, an interpretation has been given, na-
tural, consistent, and intelligible; and if the ac-
complishment thereof, through all its periods, and in all its events, has been ascertained to any high degree of probability; then it must be con-
fessed, that the spirit of the all-knowing God, by the ministry of his angel, dictated to Daniel the substance, and probably the very words, of the prophecy; that his Almighty providence directed the affairs of the world, so as to bring about the
things predicted in it; and that by the correspondence of the two, the divine origination of christianity and especially the Messiahship of the Lord Jesus Christ are established on foundations, as sure as the spirit of prophecy seems capable of affording.

It is true, that in several instances the accomplishment of its predictions is not and cannot be ascertained by such direct historical evidence, as to bring the facts exactly up to the very point of time fixed by the prophecy. But upon that deficiency no objection of any importance can be grounded, when, as in the case of the going forth of the word to rebuild Jerusalem, it is shewn, that an answerable event began to take place not long after the time fixed; and that, not only the general state of worldly affairs at that juncture was such, as to allow of our dating the fact at the period predicted, but that particular and sufficient causes and motives existing among human agents are assignable for giving it effect at that precise moment. For although it must be allowed, that in the case of a chronological prophecy the ability to assign the specific dates of events in agreement with its predictions affects the mind with a livelier and more satisfactory sense of its verification, than when that correspondence can be made out only by bringing together a multi-
tude of facts and thence deducing the accomplishment, not to absolute exactness, but only to an approximation thereto; yet it does not follow, that the former kind of proof is peremptorily to be insisted on as necessary, or even to be sought with great anxiety; much less, that disappointment, and still less, that incredulity is the justifiable consequence of attaining only the latter. In fact there is not such a difference between the two, as may at first be supposed; and the more instant effect of the former is to be ascribed, not wholly to the superior force and decision, with which it bears upon the subject, but in an equal, perhaps greater, measure, to the readiness, with which a single point strikes the understanding, and to the facility, with which it is comprehended, in comparison with a conclusion, which is the result of labour in examining, comparing, and estimating the numerous facts and circumstances drawn together from various and dissimilar quarters. When attentively weighed, the latter kind of proof comes little behind the former; and it may not be too much to affirm, that in the instances above alluded to, it is not less satisfactory to the diligent and patient enquirer, than if Ezra had recited at length the royal edict of Xerxes, and given us the day of its date, and fixed the time when the Jews in consequence began to rebuild their
city walls. So, in regard to the period assigned to St. Paul's conversion, we have no witness testifying immediately to it; but we find nothing against it; on the contrary, everything pointing in that direction. We are in the situation of a man in search of a particular spot. He does not find a beaten track bringing him quite up to it; but he discerns numerous scattered vestiges, which, whether traced backward or forward, conduct him towards a point, which he is sure cannot be far from that required. In such case the concurrence of any additional circumstance becomes a proof to him, little short of certainty, that all those vestiges did originally meet at, and terminate in, that point of general tendency; and consequently that he has found the object of his search. The history of the Acts of the apostles relates a remarkable event, without giving its date, which is the thing required. All the circumstances both preceding and subsequent, when traced each way from two ascertained periods, bring us near to a certain point of time. We are therefore inclined to think that the date sought for. But in addition to this we find an event foretold in ancient prophecy answering, when carefully examined and interpreted, to that in the history, and assigned to a period corresponding exactly with the point, to which we have
been so nearly led. We doubt not then that we have attained the object of our search; we doubt not that the historical date, had it been accurately marked, would have agreed with the prophetic one. There is a defect in a Mosaic picture; you find a piece that fits and fills the vacancy. Do you doubt, that it is the piece wanted, because you did not actually see it displaced; or because you never saw the picture in a perfect state?

Hence it may also be fairly argued, that if in the investigation of a chronological prophecy, so various and complex as this of the seventy weeks, while in some particulars the veracity of its predictions may be proved by specifying the dates of events in immediate concord with them, it be found, that in others the same end is attainable only by bringing forward the general agreement of times and circumstances instead of specific facts, and to the amount of strong probability alone; the very variety in the kinds, modes, and degrees of evidence tends rather to strengthen the general result of the enquiry: especially it has the effect, which has been noticed before, of obviating, or rather of preventing, all suspicion of the historical dates being fabricated in order to correspond with the prophecy. A violent and unprincipled adversary in the spirit of Porphyry might hazard the suggestion,
that the date of Ezra's or of Nehemiah's government had been interpolated into their books; but who would ever venture to hint a suspicion, that the victory of Cimon, the general condition of Persia, the relative situation of Jerusalem, and the account of its restoration both literally and figuratively, or the various facts and circumstances in the Acts of the apostles, are all historical imposts coaxed into the volumes of profane, as well as sacred authors, in order to answer to the prophecy.

As it may tend to strengthen and confirm the conviction, that so much has been attained in the foregoing work, I will here lay before the reader a comprehensive survey of the whole prophecy with its interpretation and accomplishment.

I. The prophecy lays down a term of seventy weeks or four hundred and ninety years, limiting thereto the duration of Jerusalem in a restored state, as a defenced city, inhabited by a people professing the true religion, and ruled both civilly and ecclesiastically according to the laws of Moses. As the term certainly ended with the destruction of Jerusalem in A. D. 70, so its commencement was thence computed backward to the year B. C. 420; at which time we found the prediction met by answerable events. It was at that time, that Nehemiah on his second visit to Jerusalem
finally succeeded in bringing the city of his fathers into the state required by the words of the angel. Consequently the complete restoration and final ruin of the city fully answer to the beginning and end of the predicted term.

II. No less than six remarkable particulars, of a spiritual and religious nature and of the highest importance, are appointed to take place before the conclusion of the principal term; and these having been carefully examined and interpreted, are found to have been fulfilled accordingly.

III. Next in the order of the prophetic narrative, but previously to the before mentioned term in the order of time and of events, we find another term of seven weeks or forty nine years. This is especially restricted to the work of restoring Jerusalem; yet it is not dated from the actual undertaking of that work, but from the period when the word of the Lord went forth to rebuild the city; and thence it reaches to that of its entire completion in all its parts; that is to say, to the very point where the term of four hundred and ninety years is appointed to commence. Accordingly we have seen, that at a time shortly subsequent to the period, to which we are here referred, or the year B.C. 469, the Jews had actually begun the principal and fundamental part of the work of restoration in the rebuilding of
their city walls; whence it was argued, that they must have received previous permission so to do; and that consequently an edict to that effect must have issued from the king of Persia; and then it was found, that in the year 469, the very point, to which we are conducted by computing forty-nine years backwards from the year 420, the turn and order of political affairs was such, as would reasonably encourage the Jews to seek, and would powerfully incline the Persian court to grant them, permission to fortify and restore the city of their fathers. Thus it appeared, that the going forth of the divine word in heaven was simultaneously echoed by the correspondent movements of men on earth; and since the completion of the work is found to coincide with the end of the term, the conclusion is undoubted, that we have both attained to a right interpretation of the prediction, and that it has been fulfilled accordingly.

IV. The great term of seventy weeks is divided into two unequal parts or terms: the one, beginning at the same point with the original term, extends onwards as far as the sixty second week. During this long period of four hundred and twenty seven years and more, it is predicted, that Jerusalem shall subsist in her restored state, as to her walls, buildings, and polity; though at the same time it is pretty plainly intimated, that her
prosperity will be subject to many drawbacks and perhaps great reverses; for it is added with considerable emphasis, both in respect to this part of the term, and to the remaining weeks of it, as well as to the former term of seven weeks, that "the times shall be with straitness." This prediction also we have seen to be verified by the event. Jerusalem did so subsist in a restored state; and although the times did at certain periods bear the appearance of prosperity and security, yet was their general aspect deeply overcast with gloom and difficulty, with distress of circumstances and anxiety of mind.

V. At the end of the former division of the term, that is to say, at some time in the course of the sixty second week, it is declared, that Messiah shall appear as leader, finding the state of things in his capital and kingdom, as above described. Accordingly we have seen, that in the first year of the sixty second week, answering to A. D. 8, the Lord Jesus, the true Christ or Messiah, then in the twelfth year of his age, did appear as leader, and found Jerusalem subsisting in a generally prosperous state, governed and regulated in its civil and ecclesiastical polity according to the law of Moses; and yet that the times, as well as those preceding, were with straitness.
VI. The second term taken out of the seventy weeks extends from the first year of the sixty second to the final expiration of the whole term, and predicts the cutting off of Messiah, the contempt and rejection of him by the Jewish people, and the just retribution inflicted by him on their wickedness, in the destruction of their city and sanctuary, with their government political and ecclesiastical, and in the total devastation of their territory by a vast inundation of foreign invaders, who are to carry on the wasteful war, quite to the conclusion of the weeks, when the determined judgment of desolations will commence. Answerably to the prediction of these numerous, eventful, and very terrific particulars, we have found, that in the course of the latter division of the seventy weeks the Lord Jesus Christ was cut off by his crucifixion; that is to say, in the third year of the sixty fifth week; nationally disowned, despised, and rejected by the Jews; that at the close of the weeks the Roman armies besieged and took Jerusalem, burnt and totally destroyed the city and the sanctuary, and put an utter end to the Jewish government, having brought the work of destruction to a conclusion in the month of September, in the year of our Lord 70, when the seventy weeks expired; and thereupon the determined judgment of desolations took effect, being
appointed for a period, which the divine wisdom has not seen fit to reveal to us.

VII. The twenty-seventh verse, which is supplemental to the prophecy, contains the prediction of a term consisting of only a single week or seven years. This we have found to be parcel of the seventy weeks, though not an integral one of their number, but compounded out of two separate and integral weeks. During this week it is declared, that Messiah will confirm to the Jews the covenant promised by God to their fathers; yet not to all the Jews, but only to many of them; to none however but Jews. The prediction we have seen verified by the event, in the ministry of our blessed Saviour. That began in the sixth year of the sixty-fourth week, that is to say, in the autumn of the year 27, when at his baptism he was formally invested with the character of apostle and high-priest of the new covenant; and was thenceforth carried on by his personal labours till the passover of the year 31, or the third year of the sixty-fifth week. The ministry was afterwards committed to the twelve apostles, and was by them continued to the autumn of the year 34, or the sixth year of the sixty-fifth week, making in the whole one week of years, and that compounded of parts of the sixty-fourth and sixty-fifth weeks. During all this period the gospel
was preached, the covenant was confirmed, and that effectually to many of the Jews, and though to only a part of the nation, yet to none other.

VIII. The subordinate term of one week, like the principal one of seventy, is subdivided into two minor terms, of half a week each, by the prediction of a very extraordinary event, the cessation of the sacrifices and meat-offerings of the Mosaic law taking place in the midst of the week. That cessation took place at the offering of our blessed Saviour Jesus Christ once for all. Thereby an end was put to the whole course of legal oblations and ceremonies; though not formally and actually, for the daily sacrifice continued to be offered till within a few weeks of the capture of Jerusalem, yet virtually and effectually, and to all intents and purposes, so far as they were obligatory on the consciences of believers. This great event came to pass, as just before mentioned, at the passover of the year 31, that is to say, in the middle of the week of the covenant confirmed, which accordingly was equally divided into two half parts, during the former of which the covenant was confirmed to Jews alone by the personal ministry of Messiah under the law of Moses.

IX. The latter term of half a week is allotted in the prophecy to the confirmation of the covenant after the cessation of the Mosaic offerings,
as aforesaid. Accordingly we have seen, that the Lord Jesus did, after his crucifixion and ascension into heaven, go on to confirm the covenant by the ministry of his apostles to many Jews, but to Jews only, until the expiration of three years and an half. Then, by a very signal miracle and by the glorious appearance of the Lord himself to St. Paul, that illustrious man was called to and invested with the apostleship of the Gentiles, whenceforward the covenant of salvation was opened to them, and of course the restricted ministry of it to Jews alone virtually ceased.

X. The penultimate clause of the prophecy, which seemed to involve great difficulty on account of its discrepancy with the evangelical citations, has been proved to be in perfect harmony therewith; and has been explained to signify, that the invader destined to besiege and to destroy Jerusalem, would be an heathen idolater, fixing the abominations of his idols around the devoted city. This, it has been shewn, that Titus and his army fully accomplished, when they pitched their camps about Jerusalem, rearing all around the standards, which were idolatrous objects of adoration to the Roman legions, and when they afterwards destroyed the city and made it a desolation.
XI. The concluding words of the prophecy predict, that Jerusalem, and doubtless the circumjacent and subject territory, will be held in their state of desolation by the enemy, or by some succession of hostile powers, until they shall all be consumed, each in his proper turn; and until the judgment, determined by the divine providence to a certain period, shall have been poured out upon the desolated people, as it were a vessel of wrath gradually, but completely emptied of its calamitous contents. The former part of the limitation has been justified by the event. Every potentate, who has hitherto held possession of the desolate heritages of Israel and Judah, has been consumed; and the race of sovereigns, which have now continued for many centuries to shake a rod of iron over them, making desolation more desolate, give manifest symptoms that the last hour of their tyranny is drawing nigh. Whether, on the downfall of the Turkish monarchy, it will be succeeded by another desolator, the prophecy does not afford any means of deciding; and in such a case neither the prudence of an expositor will permit, nor any just notion of reverence in the reader will require, him to hazard conjectures. Since also the exhaustion of the phials of judgment is still future, and the restoration of the people and holy city of Daniel is
rather implied than expressed, I have refrained from all attempts at a particular interpretation or minute discussion of those subjects; in compliance with that humble and retiring diffidence, which becomes a man, who has felt the difficulties attending the investigation of predictions already fulfilled, in looking to those futurities, which the spirit of prophecy has yet but dimly and faintly disclosed to the searchers of his awful though animating records.

Such is the testimony, which, under the translation and interpretation here brought forward, the prophecy of the seventy weeks of Daniel bears to the truth of the Christian religion and to the pretensions and character of its author, as Messiah which was to come; a testimony so extensive, so circumstantial, so exact, so decisive, as to render belief in him the most reasonable of moral conclusions, as it is also the first of religious duties. For myself I look with adoring thankfulness to the Father of Lights, the author of all spiritual understanding and grace, who hath given or allowed me to draw from this sacred source such heart-felt and heart-cheering satisfaction as to the truth of his inspired word: and if he condescend to make me the humble instrument in his hand of conveying the like to others,—to his name alone be the praise. "He
doeth according to his will in the army of heaven and among the inhabitants of the earth.”—“His way is in the sea and His path in the great waters and His footsteps are not known:”—save where He hath enabled us to trace them by the clue of revelation. For in very deed “He hath shewn us the former things what they be, and the things that are to come hereafter, that we may know that he is a just God and a Saviour, and none beside him.” “O house of Jacob, come ye and let us walk in the light of the Lord!”—“Look unto him and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth!”

THE END.
ERRATA.

Page 11, line 2, dele the comma after "notwithstanding" and place it after "LXX."

52, line 10, for "ונ" read, ונו.

97, line 11, for "לדנון" read,的命运.

156, line 21, for the period put a comma.

171, line 22, for "although" read, if it be.

197, line 31, before "even" insert, yet.

263, line 14, for "third" read, fourth.

274, line 2, for "than" read, as.

313, line 9, for the period put a colon, and dele "that was not."

325, line 27, for "perceived" read, perceivable.

336, line 20, for the comma put a period.

344, line 18, for "entered upon" read, was concluding.

351, line 8 of the second note, after "word" insert, consisting of five letters.

384, line 16, after "prefixed" insert, which it has not here.

418, line 9, before the second "in" insert, and.

419, line 23, dele "it."

472, line 20, dele "therefore."
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