A NEW ANALYSIS
OF
CHRONOLOGY AND GEOGRAPHY,
HISTORY AND PROPHECY:

IN WHICH
THEIR ELEMENTS
ARE ATTEMPTED TO BE EXPLAINED, HARMONIZED, AND
VINDICATED,
UPON SCRIPTURAL AND SCIENTIFIC PRINCIPLES;
TENDING TO REMOVE THE IMPERFECTION AND DISCORDANCE OF
PRECEDING SYSTEMS, AND TO OBFUDE THE CAVILS OF
SCEPTICS, JEWS, AND INFIDELS.

BY THE
REV. WILLIAM HALES, D.D.
RECTOR OF KILLESANDRA, IN IRELAND; AND
FORMERLY FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, AND PROFESSOR OF ORIENTAL
LANGUAGES IN THE UNIVERSITY OF DUBLIN.

SECOND EDITION, CORRECTED AND IMPROVED.

IN FOUR VOLUMES.
VOL. II.
CHRONOLOGICAL HISTORY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT AND THE APOCRYPHA.

LONDON:
PRINTED FOR C. J. G. & F. RIVINGTON,
ST PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD,
AND WATERLOO-PLACE, PALL-MALL.
MDCCCXXX.
THE PROPHECY OF THE SEVENTY WEEKS *.

24. "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people, and

* This illustrious prophecy Sir Isaac Newton justly represents as "the foundation of the Christian religion; for we have, in this short prophecy, a prediction of all the main periods relating to the coming of the Messiah; the time of his birth, that of his death, that of the rejection of the Jews, the duration of the Jewish war, whereby he caused the city and sanctuary to be destroyed, and the time of his second coming." —"for it is not to be restrained to his first coming only." Newton on Daniel, p. 25, 137.

To deny these, and their application to Jesus Christ, has been the great object of Jewish writers. And David Levi, treading in the steps of his predecessors, has attempted to explain away the meaning of the prophecy in these respects, while he undesignedly verifies the present interpretation in others; and, upon the whole, is a valuable auxiliary to the present interpretations. See his Letters to Dr. Priestley.

1. He judiciously counts the time by weeks of years. "These seventy weeks," says he, "are, without doubt, 490 years." Thus adopting the authority of the ancient Versions, and most approved Jewish and Christian expositors, and rejecting the reveries of Michaelis, Dathe, Blaney, those Christian professors of Hebrew, who count not "70 weeks," but "70 seventies," 4900, or "many seventies," by a vague and indefinite hypothesis.

2. He correctly terminates the prophecy with the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, with Mede and Scaliger, A.D. 70.

3. Though he nominally begins the prophecy with the former destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, professing to follow the incorrect chronology of Ganz, (shewn before to fall short of the truth no less than 166 years,) yet, in reality, he dates the commencement from the time of Nehemiah's reform, B.C. 420, as may appear from the following sketch of his argument: Letters, &c Part II. 80—102.

"The Jewish nation, at their return from Babylon, did not undergo a thorough reformation, but on the contrary, still continued in many of their sins; for, in the first place, they had not entirely put away the strange women, (Neh. xiii. 4—24,) neither did they give the proper portion to the Levites, (ver. 10,) they also profaned the sabbath, (ver. 15,) and oppressed each other with usury, (ver. 1—3.) And they persisted in their sins during the second temple. The prophet Daniel, therefore, foretold that God, of his long suffering toward Judah, would wait, not only seventy years, (as in the Babylonish captivity,) but even seven times seventy years; after which, their kingdom should be cast off, and their dominion cease, and they themselves return in captivity by the Romans."

4. And he thus excellently explains the magnificent exordium of the prophecy.

"Seventy weeks are determined," 1. "to finish the transgression," i.e. idolatry; 2. "to accomplish their sin," i.e. whoredom; and 3. "to make atonement for iniquity," i.e. murder, which they added to their former sins, instead of repenting, during the second temple.

Here Levi candidly confesses the leading sins of his nation, especially that crying sin of murder, from "the murder of the prophet Zechariah the son of Barachiah, even between the sanctuary (vaev) and the altar," Matt. xxiii. 35, soon after their return, to the murder of Jesus Christ, which filled up the measure of theirs and their forefathers' iniquities, and which was retaliated by "the oppression, misery, and almost universal contempt under which, he complains, the Jewish nation are still labouring." —"All this was to come upon them," says he, "for the abominations which they had committed.
upon thy holy city, to complete the transgression and consume sins; to expiate iniquity, and introduce everlasting righteousness during both the first and second temples.” And he apprehends that “this is to last until they shall either thoroughly repent, or receive the full punishment for all their iniquities,” and then “to bring in everlasting righteousness,” or by means of the restoration of the Jews, to bring all nations to the knowledge of the one true God, Isai. ii. 2, 3, and xviii. 3, and Zeph. ver. 3—9. Letters, Part I. and II.

5. He supposes the parenthetical prediction, ver. 25, to refer to the first return, after the Babylonish captivity, and “the continued troubles and alarms they underwent from their enemies, during the building of the temple and repairing the wall,” as mentioned by Ezra, iv. 1—12, and Nehemiah, iv. 16. But this cannot be; for the promise to Daniel, “thou shalt return,” was not fulfilled at the first return, which he survived, and soon after died in captivity; it remains, therefore, to be fulfilled, at the last return, at the resurrection of the just, as expressly repeated to Daniel at the close of the book. “But go thou thy way till the end, for thou shall rest [till then,] and shalt stand in thy lot at the end of [the 1260] days,” xii. 13.

6. He rightly considers the important term דָּבָר, Dabar, both in ver. 23 and 25, as equivalent to the fuller expression, דברי יְהוָה, Dabar Yahoh, “the word of the Lord,” at the beginning of the chapter, ix. 2; and, indeed, that the personal Word, or Oracle, is meant in this prophecy, appears from the parallel prophecy of Ezekiel, evidently alluding to Daniel’s intercession and supplication for his people, which the Oracle declared to Ezekiel should be ineffectual to avert the second captivity, even though it were supported on each side by those two most powerful intercessors, Noah and Job, Ezek. xiv. 12—20.

Levi justly censures the rendering of this term, “commandment,” in the English Bible, “by which Christians have confounded the prophecy, and bewildered themselves, so as to have no fixed period from whence to begin the seventy weeks.” See the preface to this volume.

7. The last clause of the exordium, “to anoint the Holy of Holies,” he understands of “the consecration of the second temple.” But the most learned Jewish doctors, Abar-banel, Manasseh ben Israel, &c. confess, that the Holy of Holies, or sanctuary of the second temple, was never anointed or honoured with the Shechinah, or divine glory, like Solomon’s. And Nachmanides has given the true exposition: “This Holy of Holies is the Messiah who is sanctified (or separated) from the sons of David.” It should therefore be rendered the Saint of Saints, to remove the ambiguity.

And the Saint of Saints was actually “anointed with the Holy Ghost, and with power,” at his baptism, and again, at his transfiguration, Acts x. 38; and “with the oil of gladness above his fellows,” at his resurrection, Psalm xlv. 7, ii. 7, Heb. 1.1—8. Levi unskilfully objects, that the emphatic, or demonstrative prefix, is wanting to מָאשֶׂי, Messiah, or “anointed;” but it is superfluous, because of “the Leader,” to which it is adjoined.

And the Messiah was also “the Leader,” as we have seen that epithet applied to him, 1 Chron. v. 2, Isai. iv. 4, Matt. ii. 6, citing Micah v. 2. Both, therefore, are epithets of Christ; David Levi, then, is guilty of a palpable violation of the unity of the prophecy, (of which he can scarcely be conceived to have been ignorant,) when he split these terms; applying Messiah, or the anointed, to king Agrippa, who, he says, was cut off by Vespasian, in the middle of the last week, A.D. 68; and the Leader, to Cyrus, ver. 25, and to Titus, ver. 26, thus introducing a trinity of persons into the prophecy, the most revolting and incomprehensible.
The hypothesis indeed, confutes itself: Cyrus could not be the first leader, nor Titus the second. For the first was to come after seven weeks and sixty-two weeks, or sixty-nine weeks, near the close of the prophecy. Nor could Cyrus come after the seven weeks singly, as he understands it; because the seven weeks actually commenced long after his death. And Titus could not be the second leader, because the word of the original is uniformly applied in the Old Testament, either to the kings of Israel or Judah, or to the rulers of their households, and never to a foreign or hostile prince. See Calashi's Concordance.

Agrippa was king of Galilee, and never was "anointed" king of the Jews; nor was he cut off in A.D. 66: for both he and his sister Berenice, (the mistress of Titus,) were alive in A.D. 69, when they assisted Vespasian against Vitellius. Josephus also cites two letters of Agrippa, written after his history of the Jewish war. And Photius, in his Bibliotheca, cites Justus the Tiberian, as representing that Agrippa received an enlargement of his kingdom from Vespasian; and died after a long reign of fifty-one years, in the third of Trajan, A.D. 100.

8. Levi renders literally the concise phrase, ver. 26, "and not to him," as if signifying "there shall be no more of him," (Agrippa,) for "after his death, there shall be no more kingly power to the Jewish nation unto this day." But the Vulgate expresses its true meaning: Et non erit ejus populus qui eum negaturus est. "And the people that shall deny him shall not be his;" as Moses predicted,

"Their own iniquity hath corrupted his children, (now) not his,
A perverse and crooked generation," Deut. xxxii. 5.

9. Following the English Bible, Levi renders the Hebrew חנן, Chanaph, "overspreading;" but it literally signifies "a wing," and here probably denotes the same as πτερυγιον του ιερου, the "pinnacle of the temple," Matt. iv. 5, or the portico, or battlement of the temple, or "holy place," where "the abomination of desolation," or the idolatrous, and therefore abominable desolating standards of the Romans were to be "placed" at the siege, Matt. xxiv. 15. See Vol. I. p. 430. "The daily sacrifice, then absolutely taken away" at the destruction of the temple, was "virtually abrogated" when the Messiah was cut off, according to Eusebius. See Vol. I. p. 94-100.

P.S. The three aforesaid professors of Hebrew, Michaelis, Daithé, and Blaney, conspired to set aside the prophet Daniel's testimony to the violent death of the Messiah, by a most unwarrantable change of the received punctuation; reading the verb חנן, actively, ichareth, "He shall cut off" [the people of the Jews,] instead of ichareth, passively, "he shall be cut off;" in defiance of all the ancient Versions, and the grammatical construction of the whole passage, and of the parallel passage of Isaiah, liii. 8.

"He was cut off from the land of the living:
Through the wickedness of my people [Isaiah's people,]
He was smitten to death."

Here the corresponding verb חנן, Nigazar, is indisputably passive, and must be rendered, "He was separated, or cut off." See a critique on the German professors, Michaelis, Daithé, and Eichorne, respecting this prophecy, in the Inspector, p. 194-199. Eichorne rejected the book of Daniel entirely; and Michaelis, after labouring with much perverse ingenuity, like the cuttle fish, to perplex and confound the meaning, concludes, that "so far from counting the prophecy of seventy weeks, the great bulwark of the
25. "Know then and understand:

From the going forth of the Oracle to restore [thy people] and to rebuild Jerusalem, until Messiah the Leader, shall be seven weeks and sixty-two weeks.

(Thou shalt return, [and thy people, at the end of the vision of 2300 days,] and Jerusalem shall be rebuilt*, both the street and the breach [of the wall,] even in straitness of times.)

26. "And after the sixty-two weeks shall Messiah be cut off; and [thy people] shall not be His †: a people of the Leader to come shall destroy both the city and the sanctuary§; and its end shall be in a deluge. And until the end of the war, desolations are decreed.

27. "But one week shall establish a [new] covenant with many ||; and half of the week shall abrogate the [daily] sacrifice and oblation¶. And upon the pinnacle [or battlement of the temple shall stand] the abomination of desolation**, even until the consummation [of the 2300 days ††:] But, then the decreed [desolation] shall be poured [in turn] upon the Desolator ‡‡.

This chronological prophecy, (which I have attempted to render more closely and intelligibly, supplying the ellipses necessary to complete the sense of the concise original,) was evidently designed to explain the foregoing vision, especially in its chronological part of the 2300 days: at the end of which the predicted "desolation of the Jews" should cease, and their "sanctuary be cleansed," or their temple finally be rebuilt; by determining a certain fixt point or epoch within it, namely, the destruction of the city and temple of Jerusalem by the Romans, A.D. 70, for, counting backwards from thence seventy weeks of days, or $70 \times 7 = 490$ years §§, we get the beginning of the period,

\[
\text{Christian religion, he, on the contrary, was most apprehensive of its cause being under-}
\text{mined thereby.}
\]

* Deut. xxx. 3; 2 Sam. vii. 10; Isai. lx. 10; Tobit xiv. 5, &c.
† Isaiah lii. 8.
‡ Exod. vi. 7; Deut. xxxii. 5; Hos. i. 9; John xix. 15.
§ Dan. viii. 12; Matt. xxii. 7; John xi. 48.
|| Isai. xlix. 8; Jer. xxxi. 31; Heb. ix. 15; John xi. 42; Acts ii. 41, iv. 4, vi. 1—7.
¶ Heb. vii. 27.
** Matt. xxiv. 15.
†† Dan. viii. 14; Luke xxii. 22; Rom. xi. 25.
 §§ Days are put for years in scriptural and prophetic language, see Levit. xxv. 8; Numb. xiv. 4; Ezek. iv. 6.
B.C. 420; and this being known, the end of the period also, A.D. 1880; for \(420 + 1880 = 2300\).

The destruction of Jerusalem, therefore, divides the whole period into two unequal parts; the former, consisting of 490 years, beginning B.C. 420; the latter, of 1810 years, ending A.D. 1880.

I. The former part, and its divisions, noticed in this vision, are first to be considered.

1. The seventy weeks, or 490 years of which it consists, are historically divided into 62, 7, and 1, weeks; and the one week, subdivided into a half week. At the expiration of \(62 + 7 = 69\) weeks, or 483 years, Messiah the Leader was to send forth "his armies, (the Romans,) to destroy those murderers, (the Jews,) and to burn their city," Matt. xxii. 7. And, accordingly, the Jewish war commenced in the last, or seventieth week, A.C. 65, during the administration of Gessius Florus, whose exactions drove the Jews into rebellion, according to Josephus, Ant. XX. 10, 1.

2. "After the sixty-two weeks," but not immediately, "the Messiah was cut off;" for the sixty-two weeks expired A.D. 14; and the one week, or passion week, in the midst of which our Lord was crucified, A.D. 31, began with his public ministry, A.D. 28, and ended with the martyrdom of Stephen, A.D. 34. (See the Articles of the Ministry of Christ, and Gospel Chronology, Vol. 1. p. 94—101, in which is given the luminous account of the passion week, in reference to Daniel's prophecy, by Eusebius.) The passion week, therefore, began two weeks after the sixty-two weeks, or at the end of sixty-four weeks; and there were five weeks, or thirty-five years, after the passion week, to the destruction of Jerusalem. So that the seventy weeks must be chronologically divided into sixty-four, one, and five weeks*. For the one week in the prophecy is evidently not the last week of the Jewish war, and cannot, therefore, follow in the order of time, the sixty-two and seven weeks.

The magnificent opening of the prophecy itself, seems to blend

---

* This simple and ingenious adjustment of the chronology of the seventy weeks, considered as forming a branch of the 2300 days, was originally due to the sagacity of Hans Wood, Esq. of Rossmead, in the county of Westmeath, Ireland, and published by him in an anonymous Commentary on the Revelation of St. John, London, 1787. Payne, 8vo. Whence I republished it in the Inspector, 8vo. 1799. And afterwards, in the Orthodox Churchman's Magazine, 1803; and now more correctly, 1809.
the fortunes of the Jews and of mankind together, in the important period destined, 1. "To complete the transgression, and consummate the sins" of the Jewish nation, "when their transgressions should come to the full," or they should "fill up the measure of the iniquity of their forefathers," Matt. xxiii. 32, by rejecting and "cutting off" the MESSIAH, Isai. liii. 8; Acts ii. 23, iii. 13-15, v. 30, 31. 2. "To cover or expiate the iniquity of the human race, by the voluntary sacrifice of himself," Isai. liii. 4-6; 1 Pet. i. 19; Heb. ix. 26; John i. 29, &c.; and also "to introduce everlasting righteousness," during "the kingdom of the God of Heaven," and of his saints," which he was to found and establish upon earth; thence to be translated to heaven at the end of the world, Dan. vii. 13, 14, &c.; 1 Cor. xv. 23-28, &c. And, 3. "To seal, or close prophetic vision," when the grand scheme of Divine economy, in the Patriarchal, Mosaical, and Evangelical dispensations, should be sufficiently revealed to mankind by our Lord and his apostles, before the end of the seventy weeks; after "the Saint of Saints should, on his resurrection, be anointed," or "invested with all authority in heaven and earth," Matt. xxviii; Rom. i. 4, &c.

"The decree of the Oracle for restoring the Jews, and rebuilding Jerusalem," could not refer to their return from the Babylonish captivity, which was now past, and the city rebuilt by Nehemiah, long before the commencement of the prophecy, B.C. 420, in the fourth year of Darius Nothus; it must, therefore, relate to the final restoration of the Jews, and rebuilding of their city, after the long-continued desolation which was to follow the Roman captivity, and to end with the period of 2300 days. Then follows a parenthetical apostrophe to the prophet himself, foretelling his, (and his people's,) final return, at "the end of 2300 days," or "resurrection of the just," Dan. xii. 13; Luke xiv. 14, &c. analogous to the parenthetical remark in Nathan's prophecy to the same effect, 2 Sam. vii. 10, and the rebuilding of the city, Isai. lx. 10; Ezek. xlviii. 30; Zech. ii. 4.

When the Jews should reject and cut off the MESSIAH, they should also be rejected by him, and "no longer his" peculiar people, as expressly foretold by Moses, Deut. xxxii. 5, (more correctly translated,) and by the prophets, Hosea i. 9, &c., until their final adoption, Zech. viii. 8; and "the Roman armies" were to be sent, as "a people of MESSIAH TO COME" in judgment, in order to be the executioners of indignation against
that "wicked and apostate generation" of the Jews, Matt. xxiii. 35, 36.

"The abomination of desolation," were the desolating standards of the Roman armies, which were held in abomination by the Jews, on account of the idolatrous worship paid to the images of their gods which they displayed. The phrase occurs in the same sense afterwards, xi. 31, xii. 11; and its signification is ascertained by our Lord himself, in his reference to, and citation of this very prophecy of Daniel, Matt. xxiv. 15, as explained of "the Roman encampments besieging Jerusalem," Luke xxi. 20. This testimony of our Lord himself, is decisive to prove that the seventy weeks expired with the destruction of Jerusalem *, A.D. 70, and, consequently, that they began, B.C. 420. And the fourth and last vision of Daniel is also decisive to prove, that the joint beginning of the 2300 days and seventy weeks, was in the reign of Darius Nothus, xi. 1, 2.

II. The latter part of the grand period of 2300 days, consisting of 1810 years after the destruction of Jerusalem, in like manner, contains three remarkable numbers of dates, 1260, 1290, and 1335 days, noticed in the last chapter.

THE 1260 DAYS.

This was the disastrous period of a time, times, and division (or half) of a time, during which the papal little horn of the fourth beast, or Roman empire, now become Christian, should "make war with the saints of the Most High, prevail against them, and wear them out," by various modes of persecution and oppression, until the time of the end, and the judgment of the

* This also is the opinion of the Jews, as we have seen in the foregoing note, reviewing Levi's interpretation, and of the most skilful Christian commentators and chronologers, Mede, Scaliger, Wood, &c. The fullest exposition of Mede's opinion, is in the following passage of his works, p. 663.

"These seventy weeks of Daniel are a little provincial calendar, containing the time that the legal worship and Jewish state was to continue, from the rebuilding of the sanctuary under Darius Nothus, until the final destruction thereof, when the calendar should expire: within the space whereof their commonwealth and city should be restored; and sixty-two weeks after that, the Messiah be slain for sin; and at the end of the whole seventy, their city and temple again destroyed, and their commonwealth utterly dissolved."

Mede, however, confounded Darius Nothus with Darius Hystaspes, "in the second year of whose reign, the whole temple, after a long interruption, began to revive," p. 697. It was in the fourth year of Darius Nothus, that Nehemiah's reform was completed, b. C. 420.
ANCIENT OF DAYS, Dan. vii. 21—26. And this is afterwards described, as during which, "the power of the holy people should be scattered," xii. 7.

A time in the Chaldee language frequently signifies a year; and is so understood by Daniel himself, iv. 25—34; and in the phrase "at the end of the times, even of years;" which is paraphrased in the English Bible "after certain years," xi. 18, the period therefore denotes three years and half, or forty-two months, or (allowing thirty days to the primitive month,) 1260 days, as this mysterious period is explained in the apocalypse, Rev. xii. 14, xi. 2, 3, xii. 6. This woful period of persecution is to expire along with the grand period in A. D. 1880, "after which the holy people, or saints, are to be delivered;" therefore, counting backwards from thence, we get A. D. 620 for the time of its commencement: which corresponds, as we have seen, with the Bangorian war in Britain.

It is truly remarkable, that the Mahometan power in the east, sprung up the very same year; for "the false prophet," as Mahomet is styled in the Apocalypse, in A.D. 620 or 621, broached his celebrated journey to heaven in company with the angel Gabriel, which was so ill received by his countrymen at first, that he was forced to fly from Mecca, A.D. 622, whence the Arabian era of the hejira, ("flight,"') commenced; upon which he published his commission from God, in the Koran, to persecute infidels *

The joint persecutions of the eastern and western apostacy, are foretold in the Apocalypse, chap. xiii. as will be shewn in the sequel.

This commencement of the 1260 days, analytically deduced, by a chain of reasoning from the context, is surely preferable to A.D. 606, adopted by Bishop Newton, Faber, and others; upon the hypothetical ground that this was the year in which the title of universal Bishop was conferred on the Pope, by the usurper Phocas; and the same year also in which Mahomet retired to his cave in Mount Hara, to fabricate his imposture. Neither of these events, in themselves, properly constituted, though they were the forerunners of persecution, not long after.

To comfort the faithful under the gloomy prospect of the corruptions of the Romish Church in the west, and the consequent

* See Sale's Prelim. Discourse, p. 39—49; and Koran, p. 236, and 149, 278.
persecutions of the saints produced thereby throughout this period; the prophet was favoured (and by the spiritual High Priest himself, who solemnly announced the term of it,) with a cheering, but transient glance of the blessed Reformation, which took place in the course of it, by those wise and pious persons, who protested against the errors of the Church of Rome.

THE 1290 DAYS.

"Many shall be purified, and made white, and proved, [in the furnace of persecution,] while the wicked shall do wickedly [in persecuting them.] And none of the wicked shall understand [these prophecies,] but the wise shall understand. Now, from the time that the daily [sacrifice] shall be taken away, and the abomination of desolation set up, there shall be 1290 days," xii. 5—10.

The date of the destruction of Jerusalem, A.D. 70, is here marked by its two peculiar characters, in the second, third, and fourth visions. Counting forwards, therefore, from thence 1290 years, we get A.D. 1360, the precise year in which John Wickliffe first began to preach against the errors of the Church of Rome, at Oxford, in England, who may justly be styled the harbinger of the Reformation, England's morning star.

1. This is no novel hypothesis: it is as old as the Reformation itself. So early as the year 1390, Walter Brute, an Englishman, in the reign of Richard II. published a treatise Of the revelation of Antichrist in Britain, in which is the following remarkable passage, cited by Fox, in his Monuments, Vol. I. p. 441.

"Yet is she [the Church of Rome,] ignorant that within a little while, shall come the days of her destruction:——Because, that from the time the continual sacrifice was taken away, and the abomination of desolation placed, there be passed 1290 days, according to Daniel. And the chronicles added, do agree to the same," [A.D. 70 + 1290 = A.D. 1360.] Indeed from this, and other passages of his work, Walter Brute appears to have been a man superior to the dark age in which he lived, and to have had a surprising insight into the principal prophecies respecting popery.

2. John Bale, Bishop of Ossory, who flourished about the time of the introduction of the Reformation into Ireland, A.D.
1535, in his valuable work, *De Scriptoribus Britannicis*, delivers the following encomium upon Wickliffe.

"The eternal Father raised him up, by his Spirit, in the year after our Saviour's nativity, 1360, to stand forth a magnanimous champion of Jesus Christ, in defence of his truth, amid the darkness of impious locusts, (Rev. ix. 2, 3,) and to become the most invincible instrument of that age, against Antichrists."

3. Henry Wharton, that very learned English divine, who flourished near the close of the seventeenth century, in his Appendix to Cave's History, thus describes him and his doctrines:

"He began to be famous in the year 1360. About which time he first sharply attacked, both in his preaching and writings, the grievously increasing superstitious of the age,—the enormous tyranny of the pope of Rome over the Church, now grown inveterate,—the erroneous dogmas of faith universally received in the schools,—and that most scandalous depravity of vicious morals, admitted by all, and even defended by most; and especially he maintained, with equal constancy and erudition, the rights of the royal authority, and of the ecclesiastical order against the enormous usurpations of the see of Rome, and of the Mendicant Friars."

4. The author of *Sacra Heptades*, or a Treatise on Daniel's seventy weeks, cited by the learned Whiston *, in his Treatise on the Revelation in 1706, p. 240, explains it in the same way.

"If we take Daniel's era, that is, the ceasing of the daily sacrifice, by the destruction of the temple, which was in the year of our Lord 70, and add unto that number 1290, limited by the same prophet, it cometh to the year of our Lord 1360. About which time the excellent John Wickliffe, in England, and shortly after Johannes de Rupescissa, in France, (whose labours on the Apocalypse are said to be extant,) prophesied, or rather declared, many prophecies of the Apocalypse concerning Antichrist."


---

* This simple and obvious solution, adopted by Whiston, above a hundred years ago, has been strangely overlooked by succeeding commentators, down to the present time; arbitrarily assuming, that the 1290 and 1335 days began along with the 1260. Hence Faber's perplexities, and new coinage of "the afterhood of the times."
"He began to make a noise in 1360, by strongly opposing the attempts of the Monks, who, under colour of their exemptions, violated the rules and statutes of the university of Oxford. — In 1380, he undertook an English translation of the Bible. — In 1381, he began to attack the dogma of transubstantiation. — Among other things, he said, that for several years past, [from about the time of Radbertus, A.D. 820,] the Church had erred respecting the sacrament of the Eucharist; and that he was resolved to bring her back from idolatry to the service of the true God."

The determination of the commencement of Wickliffe's testimony, in the year 1360, by so many independent authorities, is really remarkable.

THE 1335 DAYS.

"Blessed is he that waiteth, and cometh to the 1335 days," xii. 12.

This is evidently a continuation of the former sentence, announcing a later period to be counted from the same fixed date, A.D. 70, which will bring us to a more advanced stage of the Reformation, when John Huss began to preach against the corruptions of the Church of Rome, at Prague in Bohemia, A.D. 1405. The correctness of this date is also vouched by the following authorities:

1. The author of Sacra Heptades thus proceeds: "Besides that number of 1290, the number 1335, to which the prophet Daniel gives a blessing, is also fulfilled: for, account that from the desolation of the temple, and ceasing of the daily sacrifice, which happened about the same year of our Lord 70; add, I say, to that 70 the number 1335, and it cometh fully to the year of our Lord 1405. — Soon after which time, was assembled the great Councell of Constance. — In the same Councell, the godly Bohemians, Johannes Huss, and Hieronymus Pragensis, openly protested against the Pope; saying, that if he did not follow Christ in his life, he was not Christ's vicar."

2. L'Enfant gives the following account: Tom. I. p. 26, 205. "John Huss rendered himself very famous in 1405, by his preachings in Bohemia, at the celebrated chapel of Bethlehem, [in Prague,] of which he was curate. — It does not appear that he was accused of any innovation before this time."
These luminous interpretations of our early Protestant divines, derive additional force and authority from the Apocalypse. For, as we owe to the visions of John the true interpretation of Daniel’s mysterious time, times, and half a time; so to his subsequent visions we likewise owe a fuller revelation of the illustrious harbingers of the Reformation, Wickliffe and Huss, and also of its founder, Luther; in the following remarkable description of the three detached angels, or luminaries of the Church, following each other in succession.

1. The first angel is thus described, Rev. xiv. 6, 7. “And I saw another angel flying in mid-heaven, having the everlasting Gospel to preach to the dwellers upon the earth, even to every nation, and tribe, and tongue, and people; saying, with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to Him, for the hour of his judgment is come: and worship Him who made the heaven and the earth, the sea and water-springs.”

This angel, who is styled “another,” as being different from those of the celestial choir who sung the new song of the Lamb, Rev. xiv. 3, vii. 11, excellently represents the evangelist Wickliffe, who, by his vernacular translation of the Bible, first made, as it were, a republication of the primitive Gospel; which heretofore had been sealed or locked up from the vulgar of every nation of Europe, in the learned languages, and prohibited from the laity, by the spiritual tyranny of the see of Rome, wishing to rivet the chains of her votaries, by the blindness of ignorance. This first harbinger of the Reformation, warned the western world against “worshipping the creature instead of the Creator,” in compliance with the reigning superstitions and idolatries of the Church of Rome. By a usual anticipation in Scripture, God’s impending “judgments” are denounced as already come.

2. The second angel is thus described, ver. 8.

—“And another angel followed, saying, Babylon is fallen, is fallen, that great city! because she hath made all the nations drink of the poisonous wine of her fornication.”

This second angel, with equal propriety, represents Huss, the disciple and the follower of Wickliffe: who preached still more pointedly against the errors and corruptions of the Church of Rome; and foretold her doom, under the title of the mystical Babylon, that mother of harlots, or fruitful parent of superstition and idolatry in the west, as Babylon had been in the east, even
from the days of Nimrod, Gen. x. 9, 10, and of rebellion, Gen. xi. 1—9; whose fall he anticipates in the language of Isaiah's watchman, "Babylon is fallen, is fallen, and all the graven images of her gods He hath broken to the ground," Isai. xx. 9.

3. The last angel is thus described, ver. 9—11.

—"And a third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, If any one worship the wild beast and his image, and receive [his] mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of God's wrath, poured out, unmixed, into the cup of his indignation: and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone, before the holy angels, and before the Lamb; and the smoke of their torment ascendeth for ever," &c.

In this third angel, the sagacity of Mede first described the faithful representative of Luther *, who, in the next century, A.D. 1517, "followed the other two; and warned the votaries of the beast, of the dreadful danger that impended over them, if they still persisted in following him; and therefore persuaded them, casting off all delay, to withdraw themselves forthwith from his company; that by this means, they would consult their own salvation; for that after this [notice,] his adherents could not be saved. This preaching, the most remarkable of all, was most happily discharged in the age before this, (says Mede,) by means of Luther and his successors: which, indeed, was followed by that excellent reformation of the Churches, when men everywhere, now not singly, as at the voice of the preceding angel, but by provinces and tribes, in order to assert and purify Religion, shook off the yoke of the beast every where." Mede's Works, p. 518.

Wickliffe and Huss, indeed, were the harbingers of this illustrious champion of the Reformation, who so boldly and successfully proclaimed "the terrors of the Lord to persuade men." Their preaching was local, and confined to their own pale, or neighbourhood, and could not have an extensive influence. But in the riper age of Luther, many powerful causes co-operated to disseminate and propagate his doctrines, which either did not exist before, or did not till then combine their full and irresistible force.

* Whitaker and Faber suppose, that the first angel was Luther, the second Calvin, and the third either their disciples or the Church of England, which is neither Lutheran, Calvinistic, nor Arminian. But the present earlier arrangement of Wickliffe, Huss, and Luther, is surely preferable.
1. Luther's republication of the everlasting Gospel in the German language, spread, with inconceivable rapidity, throughout the continent of Europe, and laid the axe to the root of the corrupt tree of Romish idolatry, superstition, and immorality, by exposing them in all their hideous deformity, to public view and abhorrence.

2. The invention of the art of printing in Germany, some time before, greatly facilitated the circulation of the writings of the Reformers, Luther, Zuingle, Calvin, Beza, Erasmus, Cranmer, Ridley, &c. among all ranks in Europe, from the highest to the lowest of the laity, among whom the Bible and its doctrines had been hitherto, in a great measure, sealed or shut.

3. The revival of letters in the west, after the dark middle ages of Gothic ignorance, and the introduction of the Greek classics, on the taking of Constantinople by the Turks, and the avidity with which all the ancient authors were then studied, contributed to open the minds of men, and lead them to assert the right of private judgment in matters of religion and morals, and to emancipate them from the spiritual tyranny of the Church of Rome, impiously claiming infallibility, and implicit belief and obedience to her decisions and decrees, however revolting or repugnant to Reason and Scripture *. 

In the lives and deaths of those illustrious reformers, we have "a noble specimen of the patience of the saints; of those who keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus Christ!" Rev. xiv. 12.

FOURTH VISION.

This last vision, in the third year of Cyrus, not long before the prophet's death, was ushered in with circumstances of peculiar solemnity; with the presence of Christ himself and his angels; both appearing in human form. First, the spiritual High Priest cloathed in linen, as on the great day of atonement, appeared in glory to Daniel, and spoke to him; and when he heard the voice of his words, he fell into a trance with his face to the ground. The prophet alone saw this great vision, for his trembling attendants fled to hide themselves, x. 1—9.

Daniel was raised from his trance by the hand that touched

* See in Robertson's History of Charles V. a masterly account of the rise and progress of the Reformation, Vol. II. p. 78—121.
him, (probably of the angel Gabriel,) who encouraged him nearly in the same terms as in the former vision of the seventy weeks. And who again came in human form, and touched and strengthened him, that he might shew him the Scripture of truth: representing himself as assisted by Michael, one of the chief princes, and Daniel's prince; who therefore could be no other than the Spiritual High Priest, or Christ, signified by the name, "Who is like God," ver. 10—21. Cyrus is supposed to be "the prince of Persia, who for one and twenty days withstood" the decree of the return of the Jews, Ezra i. 2.

This last prophecy contains four parts in the eleventh chapter, and an appendix in the twelfth.

1. The first part explains the overthrow of the Persian empire, under Darius Codomannus, the last king, by Alexander the Great; and the division of his great empire among his four generals, xi. 2—4, as already explained.

2. The second details, with minute historical precision, the intermarriages and wars of the kings of the north and south, or of Syria and Egypt; and the oppressions and persecutions of the Jews, between these two contending powers, till the depression of Syria by the Romans *, ver. 5—30.

3. The third takes up the conclusion of the second vision, and relates in continuation, the proceedings of the Romans, after the removal of the daily sacrifice, and setting up the abomination of desolation, at the destruction of Jerusalem, A.D. 70, their various persecutions, blasphemies, apostacies, and innovations, Heathen and Christian †, ver. 30—39.

4. The fourth recounts the war of the wilful king with the king of the south, his expedition into the glorious land, of Palestine; his conquests of many countries in the east, except Moab, Edom, and Ammon, and in the south of Egypt, Libya, and Ethiopia. His return, in consequence of tidings from the east and north, which shall trouble him; his planting the tabernacles of his palace in the glorious holy mount, between the two seas; and his final destruction, without any to help him, ver. 40—45.

This last part of the prophecy appears to be unfulfilled; and to coincide, in point of time, with the third woe in the Apoca-

* This second part is particularly explained in the ensuing period.
† This third part is explained in the last period, in the Apocalypse.
lypse. They are therefore both sealed or shut up at present, till further lights shall be furnished by the events.

THE APPENDIX.

1. Michael's vindication of the saints, seems to correspond to the war in heaven between Michael and his angels and the Devil and his angels, Rev. xii. 7—11, probably when Christianity was established in the Roman empire, on the ruins of Paganism, under Constantine the Great.

2. A time of great trouble, such as never was since there was a nation, till the time of the end, or expiration of the persecuting period of a time, times, and half a time, or 1260 days, when the first resurrection shall take place of all that shall be found written in the book of life, Rev. xx. 4, John v. 25, &c.

3. The general resurrection, when the wise and good shall awake to everlasting life, and the wicked to shame and everlasting contempt, Rev. xx. 11—13, John v. 28, 29, &c.

4. The commencement of the Reformation in England, by Wickliffe, 1290 days after the destruction of Jerusalem, A.D. 70, or A.D. 1360.

5. Its progress in Germany by Huss, 1835 days after, A.D. 1405.

6. Promise to Daniel that he shall stand in his lot, at the end of 1260 days, or first resurrection.

EIGHTH PERIOD.

FROM NEHEMIAH'S REFORM TO THE BIRTH OF JOHN THE BAPTIST, 415 YEARS.

PERSIAN DYNASTY.

JEWISH HIGH PRIESTS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priest</th>
<th>Y.</th>
<th>B.C.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eliashib</td>
<td>7 last</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joiada or Judas</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan or John</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaddua or Jaddus</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MACEDO-GRÆCIAN DYNASTY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priest</th>
<th>Y.</th>
<th>B.C.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Onias</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon the Just</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The chronology of this period is collected from Nehemiah, the Maccabees, Josephus, and the Chronicon Alexandrinum. Nehemiah has given the succession of six high priests, from the return of the Jews after the Babylonish captivity, to the end of his own time, Nehem. xii. 10—26, Josephus has added nine more, to the regency of Judas Maccabaeus. Ant. xx. 9, 1. But his present amount is incorrect; for it assigns to the fifteen, 414 years, instead of 372. The Fasti Siculi, or Chronicon Alexandrinum*, gives the detail more correctly, as published in Prideaux chronological tables, with some emendation, Vol. II. p. 127. Prideaux has judiciously altered the administration of

* This valuable record was found in an old library in Sicily. It was published with a Latin Version, A.D. 1624; and a short preface, written by Peter, Patriarch of Alexandria.
Simon the Just, from fourteen years to nine; following Eusebius, as more conformable to the Maccabees and Josephus. But the regency of Judas Maccabeus, which he dates at his father's death, B.C. 166, is here postponed till the death of Menelaus the high priest, when it was formally acknowledged by Antiochus Eupator, king of Syria, three years after, B.C. 163, which agrees with the duration of the Asamonean Dynasty, according to Josephus, reckoning it 126 years till the death of Antigonus. And the accession of John Hyrcanus, is dated B.C. 136, a year earlier than by Prideaux, because it agrees with Scripture, 1 Mac. xvi. 14; and with Josephus, stating that the year after his accession, B.C. 135, was a sabbatical year, as it actually appears to have been, according to the present system of chronology.

The last act of Nehemiah's reform, was the expulsion of a son of Joiada, and grandson of Eliashib the high priest, for marrying the daughter of Sanballat the Horonite, or Moabite, Nehem. xiii. 18, in the thirty-third year of Eliashib's pontificate of forty years, and therefore when Eliashib was old. This critically harmonizes with B.C. 420, the commencement of Daniel's grand prophetic period of 2300 days, and also of the seventy weeks *

Nehemiah lived to a very advanced age; for from the date of his commission, B.C. 444, to the succession of Jaddua, B.C. 341, whom he notices, xii. 22, was an interval of 103 years. His age, therefore, could scarcely have been less than 180 years, equalling Jehoiada's, 2 Chron. xxiv. 15. Thus did "God" hear his repeated prayers, and "remember him for good," and for "his good deeds," his exalted piety, patriotism, and disinterestedness, bless him with uncommon "length of days, riches, and honours," in this life.

The apocryphal books of Maccabees and Josephus, are our chief guides in the history of this period. The first book of Maccabees, and the most correct, ending with the accession of John Hyrcanus, was probably written by the direction of that prince. The second, which is more minute and circumstantial, and abounds more in the marvellous, does not reach so far. It is an abstract of the five books of Jason, a Jew of Cyrene. There are two more books of Maccabees attached to the Alexandrine copy of the Septuagint Version. The apocryphal books

* Prideaux dates this last act too low, B.C. 409, to accord with his scheme of the seventy weeks, when "Joiada was high priest, who was the son of Eliash'ib," which offers violence to the text, Vol. I. p. 326.
use the era of Seleucidae, beginning B.C. 312, with the murder of Alexander's son, Ægus, but with some variation, as explained in the first volume, p. 173, 174.

JEWISH HIGH PRIESTS.

After Nehemiah, there were no more Persian governors sent to Judea. It was annexed to the province of Coele Syria, and the administration of Jewish affairs left to the high-priests; subject however to the control of the provincial governors.

Jonathan, (or, as Josephus calls him, John,) who came from the bad stock of Eliashib, in the eighth year of his pontificate, atrociously murdered his own brother Jesus, within the sacred precincts of the sanctuary itself, jealous of his superior interest with the Persian governor, Bagoses, who intended to make him high-priest. On hearing the horrible deed, Bagoses went to the temple, and when the priests attempted to hinder him from entering the sanctuary, he indignantly replied, Am not I purer than the murdered person there! For this he persecuted the Jews, and laid a heavy tribute on the lambs offered for burnt sacrifices, which was not remitted till the accession of Ochus to the crown of Persia, B.C. 358.

Afterwards the Jews incurred the displeasure of this prince, by joining, probably, with the revolted provinces of Phœnicia and Egypt. For which he took a severe revenge, for he marched into Judea, besieged and took Jericho, and carried away a great number of captive Jews, whom he transplanted into Egypt southwards, and into Hyrcania northwards.

This severity, perhaps, deterred the Jews from joining Alexander the Great at first, when he invaded the Persian dominions. For they declined his overtures, and refused to send him provisions while he was engaged in the siege of Tyre. Provoked at this, he threatened to punish them. Accordingly, in B.C. 332, after he had reduced Tyre, he marched towards Jerusalem with his army, but he was met at Sapha, an eminence near Jerusalem, which commanded a view of the city and temple, by a solemn procession, consisting of the high-priest dressed in his pontifical robes, attended by the priests in their proper habits, and the rest of the people in white garments, as Jaddua had been commanded, in a vision of the night. When they approached, Alexander, struck with awful respect, advanced alone to meet the high-priest, saluted him first, and adored the sacred
name of God, written on the front of his mitre, to the great surprise and disappointment of the Phœnicians and Chaldeans, who attended the king, expecting his orders to destroy the priests and plunder the city. While they stood amazed, suspecting that Alexander had lost his senses, Parmenio, his confidential friend, came up, and asked him the reason of his conduct. The king replied, “I adore not the high-priest, but the God with whose priesthood he is honoured. When I was at Dios in Macedonia, and considering in myself how to subdue Asia, I saw in a dream such a person, in his present dress, who encouraged me not to delay, but to pass over with confidence, for that himself would lead my army, and give me the Persian empire. Since, therefore, I have seen no other person in such a dress as I now see him, and recollect the vision and exhortation in my dream, I think, that having undertaken this expedition by a divine mission, I shall conquer Darius, overthrow the Persian empire, and succeed in all my designs.” Having spoke thus to Parmenio, he presented his right hand to the priest, and went into the city, attended by the priests, and going to the temple, he sacrificed according to the high-priest’s directions, and treated the pontiff and the priests with distinguished honours. The book of Daniel was then shewn unto him, in which it was foretold that one of the Greeks should overthrow the Persian empire; pleased at which, and thinking that he was the person meant, he dismissed the multitude. The day after, summoning them to his presence, he desired them to ask whatever favours they chose, and at the high-priest’s request, he granted them the free enjoyment of their national laws, and an exemption from tribute every seventh year. He also promised to permit the Jews in Babylon and Media to enjoy their own laws, and offered to take with him, on the expedition, any of the people that chose to share his fortune, promising them the free use of their own customs and laws, which induced many to join him. Ant. XI. 8, 4, 5.

This relation of Josephus is confirmed by Origen, cont. Cel. sum, Lib. V. p. 265, and is perfectly credible in itself. The same spiritual high-priest who revealed to Daniel the vision of the he goat, and the overthrow of the Persian empire by Alexander the Great, might also have thus induced and encouraged the Macedonian himself to undertake the expedition. And surely as an instrument of Divine chastisement, he was as worthy.
of being favoured with Divine communications as Nebuchadnezzar or Belshazzar.

A fact of such public notoriety as the change of Alexander's wrath suddenly into mildness, in the presence of such a multitude of spectators, could not have been fabricated without detection; nor could it have been more rationally accounted for than by Alexander's relation. The historian Justin seems also to allude to this transaction, where he remarks that "Alexander was met by many kings of the east with mitres*.”

“When Alexander afterwards wanted to rebuild the temple of Belus at Babylon, and employed all his soldiers in turn to remove the rubbish, the Jews alone refused to assist in the work, and suffered many stripes for their refusal, and paid heavy fines, until the king, being struck with their firmness, pardoned, and gave them an exemption. They also, on their return home, pulled down the temples and altars that had been erected by the colonists in their land, and paid a fine for some to the sатraps or governors, and received a pardon for others.” This account Josephus cites from the Greek historian Hecateus, contr. Apion. I. 22, p. 1348; and it tends to confirm Alexander's visit to Jerusalem, and the recruiting of his army among the Jews. Their zeal on this occasion leads us to conclude, that Jaddua was a wise and good pontiff, and that during his administration he endeavoured to uphold Nehemiah's reform. Of this he gave a signal instance in the expulsion of his own brother Manasses, for marrying the daughter of Sanballat †, governor of Samaria, as we learn from Josephus, Ant. XII. 8, 2. He and his people, therefore, who concurred therein, were likely to be favoured with divine support and protection.

The apostate Manasses was made high-priest of the temple built by Sanballat, on Mount Gerizim, near Samaria, and proved a great annoyance to the Jews, by harbouring all that were banished or fled for this and other offences, by fomenting disturbances at Jerusalem, and by promoting a rivalship between the two temples at Jerusalem and Mount Gerizim; the Jews contending that sacrifices ought to be offered only at Jerusalem; the Samaritans at Mount Gerizim, where Joshua, they

* Alexandrum obviam cum infulis, multos orientis reges habuisse. Lib. XI. 10.
† This Sanballat, who was a Cuthite, sent by Darius Codomanus, the last king of Persia, to be governor of Samaria, is not to be confounded with "Sanballat the Horonite," or Moabite, Neh. xiii. 28, in the reign of Darius Nothus.
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said, built the first altar, Joseph. Ant. XII. 1, 1. And this controversy subsisted till our Saviour's time, and created a mortal antipathy between the two sects, John iv. 9—20; Luke ix. 51—56; John viii. 48.

THE SAMARITANS.

These originally were a heathen colony of Babylonians and Cuthites, settled in the country of Samaria, by Esarhaddon, king of Assyria, on the captivity and deportation of the ten tribes, who "feared the Lord, and served their own gods," at the same time, 2 Kings xvii. 24—34, or worshipped the God of Israel, but in an idolatrous manner, until Manasses, and the fugitive Jews who flocked to him, taught them to reject all idolatry, and worship the true God only, according to the Mosaical law. And from this time they may truly be reckoned a sect of the Jewish religion.

The Samaritans, in common with the Jews, admitted the authority of the Pentateuch, but rejected all the other books of the Jewish Canon, or rather held them to be apocryphal, or of inferior authority. That they did not entirely reject them is evident from their expectation of the Messiah or Christ, not only as a "prophet" or divine instructor, like Moses, but also to be "the Saviour of the world," John iv. 25—42. But these titles of Messiah and Saviour were borrowed from the Psalms and the Prophets. Nor is it likely that Manasses himself, a Jewish priest, and a reformer of their religion, would have disclaimed the prophetic Scriptures, when he established the paramount authority of the books of Moses, and introduced them in the Samaritan, or ancient Phænician character, transcribed therein from the Chaldee of Ezra's canon.

It has been imagined, but rather without sufficient foundation, that the present Samaritan copy of the Pentateuch was first introduced at the time that Esarhaddon sent to the heathen colonists one of the captive priests to teach them the way (or worship) of the God of the land, who came and dwelt at Bethel, and taught them how they should fear the Lord, 2 Kings xvii. 27, 28. But it is no where mentioned that he brought with him a copy of the law of Moses; he might have taught them by tradition; or, if otherwise, it is clear the Samaritan copy, now extant, was transcribed from the Jewish of Ezra; for I. It retains all the supplemental passages attributed to that
scribe, and therefore could not have been of earlier date. 2. Many of the variations in the Samaritan copy are evidently occasioned by the mistake, or confounding of similar letters in the Chaldee character, Beth and Caph, Daleth and Resh, &c. which are unlike, and therefore in no danger of being confounded in the Samaritan. And 3. Some passages are wilful corruptions of Ezra's text, as in Deut. xxvii. 4, where, to uphold their heresy of erecting an altar upon Gerizim, and making it the mount of blessing, rather than Ebal; and after the ten commandments, in the twentieth chapter of Exodus, they interpolated an additional precept from the eleventh and twenty-seventh chapters of Deuteronomy, for erecting the altar in Mount Gerizim instead of Mount Ebal, and offering sacrifices to God thereon. Still, however, a Samaritan copy, even so early as the time of Manasses, is highly valuable, as furnishing several important various readings, which are a considerable improvement upon the present Masorete text; such as Gen. iv. 8, Exod. xii. 40, &c. noticed before; and a confirmation of the prolongation of the patriarchal generations, from the flood to Abraham, adopted in this work. See Vol. I. p. 282, &c.

The second point of difference between the Samaritans and the Jews, was, and still is, their rejection of all traditions, strictly adhering to the written law. Hence they were better disposed for the reception of the Gospel than the Jews, who often "made the law of none effect, or transgressed it by their traditions," "teaching for doctrines the commandments of men," Matt. xv. 8—9; and, accordingly, the spiritual "harvest" of the Gospel, "ripened" much sooner among them than among the Jews, John iv. 35—42.

The belief of the resurrection of the dead, and of a future state of retribution, prevailed among the Samaritans as well as the Jews. And this furnishes a popular refutation of Bishop Warburton's paradox, that "Moses stands single amongst ancient and modern legislators, in teaching a religion without the sanction, or so much as the mention, of a future state of rewards and punishments:" for, not to insist on the internal evidence to the contrary, already adduced in the foregoing part of this volume, we may reasonably ask, Whence then did the Samaritans derive this doctrine, if not from the religion of Moses?

The death of Alexander the Great, B.C. 324, in the midst of his prosperity and of his excesses, during his ominous attempt
to rebuild the temple of Belus at Babylon, which had been devoted to destruction, never to be rebuilt, by the sure word of prophecy, was calamitous to the Jewish nation. For, amidst the contests that prevailed among Alexander's successors, each striving for the mastery, and celebrating his death, as he himself foretold, with funeral games the most bloody; "evils were multiplied in the earth," 1 Mac. i. 9; and the Jews, from their intermediate situation, lying between the two powerful kingdoms of Syria northward, and Egypt southward, were alternately harassed by both *. "They resembled a ship tossed by a hurricane, and buffeted on both sides by the waves, while they lay in the midst of contending seas," according to the imagery of Josephus, Ant. XII. 3, 3.

At the first partition among the generals, after Alexander's death, the provinces of Coele Syria, Phœnia, and Judea, were allotted to Laomedon, as governor, and confirmed to him by a second. But Ptolemy Lagus, the natural brother of Alexander the Great, and governor of Egypt, soon wrested them from him, and besieged Jerusalem, which adhered to Laomedon, with a great army, and taking advantage of the Sabbath-day, stormed it, without any resistance from the inhabitants, B.C. 322. He treated them at first with great severity, and carried away a hundred thousand captives to Egypt, and, according to Appian, demolished their walls. But afterwards, wishing to attach a people so faithful to their governors, and so important as a barrier on his northern frontier, he restored all their former privileges under Alexander, entrusted to them the garrisoning of the most important fortresses of Egypt, Judea, and Samaria, and gave great encouragement to the Jews to settle in his new capital of Alexandria, by a wise and liberal policy. He also extended his conquests to Cyprus, Arabia, Libya, and Ethiopia, and became great.

But Seleucus, the governor of Babylon and of the eastern provinces, was greater; for, first he conquered Antigonus, and seized his provinces of Syria and Asia Minor; and at last he conquered Lysimachus, governor of Thrace, who had before annexed Macedon to his dominions. Thus Seleucus, surnamed Nicator, "conqueror," united three of the four kingdoms into which Alexander's empire was split; and was reckoned by Ap-

* See the Tables of Egyptian and Syrian kings, Vol. I. p. 164 and 175.
Ptolemy, "the greatest king after Alexander." And so Daniel represents him:

"And the king of the south, [Ptolemy,] shall be strong; but one of his [Alexander's] princes, shall be strong above him, and have dominion: his dominion shall be a great dominion," Dan. xi. 5.

Ptolemy retained the possession of Judea, until the ambitious and turbulent Antigonus wrested it from him in turn, B.C. 312. But after the decisive battle of Issus, B.C. 302, in which Antigonus was defeated and slain, by the confederate forces of Seleucus and Lysimachus, Ptolemy quietly recovered and retained this important province, and by the wisdom of his government, he promoted the prosperity of the Jews, and gained their affection. The reign of Ptolemy is dated in the Canon, B.C. 305. For he did not assume the title of king, until after the extinction of "Alexander's posterity," by the murder of his natural son, Hercules, the year before; when the other generals also "put on crowns," 1 Mac. i. 9.

Judea was happy during his reign, in an excellent and patriotic high-priest, Simon, surnamed the Just. He repaired and fortified the city and the temple, with strong and lofty walls, and made a spacious cistern, or reservoir of water, "in compass like a sea," as we learn from his beautiful eulogy, the last in the book of Ecclesiasticus, 1. 1—24. But his greatest and most important work, was the completion of the Canon of the Old Testament, by the addition of the books of Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles, Esther, and the prophecies of Malachi. He was the last president of the great council, or sanhedrim, among the high-priests; and was succeeded in that office by Antigonus Sochæus, a man of great learning and consummate piety. His doctrines, however, were too refined and spiritualized for ordinary apprehensions; he held that God was to be served, wholly from disinterested motives of pure love and reverence, founded on the contemplation of his infinite perfections, uninfluenced by the sordid expectation of reward, or servile fear of punishment. Hence they were either misunderstood, or perverted by his followers; of whom was Sadok, the founder of the atheistical sect of the Sadducees, who ultimately denied a resurrection, or future state of rewards and punishments; contending that there was neither angel nor spirit, but that death was an eternal sleep, Matt. xxii. 23; Acts xxiii. 8. This pernicious sect prevailed.
principally among the rulers, the rich, and noble, and even among several of the priests. They agreed with the Samaritans in receiving only the books of Moses as canonical, and in rejecting the traditions of the elders; and were the most violent persecutors of the Christians after our Lord's resurrection, Acts xxiii. 6.

Ptolemy Philadelphus, who succeeded his father Lagus, B.C. 285, was a great encourager of learning, and patron of learned men. Under his auspices was executed that excellent translation of the Old Testament into Greek, called the Septuagint, from the seventy or seventy-two interpreters, said to have been employed therein. At this time Eleazer, the son of Simon the Just, was high-priest, who furnished the king with a correct copy of the Hebrew Scriptures. Usher dates this translation, B.C. 278. At first, it is probable that only the Version of the Pentateuch was completed, and at the same time, perhaps, of the Psalms and Proverbs; for these three are much more correct, and written in a purer style than the rest; the whole, however, was finished not long after.

Seleucus Nicator survived his victory over Lysimachus only seven months, when he was treacherously slain, B.C. 280, by Ptolemy Keraunos, the younger brother of Ptolemy Philadelphus, king of Egypt, who was then a refugee at the court of Seleucus, and had been most kindly received by him. He was succeeded in his eastern dominions by Antiochus Soter, his son, to whom he resigned his favourite queen, Stratonice, because the prince was passionately in love with her. From this incestuous marriage, sprung all the kings of Syria, who so tyrannically oppressed the Jewish nation.

Antiochus Soter was succeeded by his son Antiochus Theus, B.C. 261, who carried on a long war with Ptolemy Philadelphus; and at length concluded a peace with him, on the condition of divorcing his wife and sister, Laodice, and disinheriting her two sons, and marrying Berenice, the daughter of Philadelphus, on whose issue he agreed to settle the crown of Syria, B.C. 252. But Philadelphus dying in B.C. 247, he took back his former wife, Laodice; who, fearing his fickleness, poisoned him, and set her son, Seleucus Callinicus, upon the throne, B.C. 246. Callinicus, in the beginning of his reign, at the instigation of his mother, seized Berenice in the asylum of Daphne, near Antioch, the capital of Syria, and slew her, with her young son,
and many of her attendants. Whereupon Ptolemy Euergetes, her brother, slew Laodice in return, made war upon Callinicus, took from him Phœnicia, Syria, Cilicia, and several of his eastern provinces, and carried back into Egypt 40,000 talents of silver, and 2500 images of gods, among which were the gods of Egypt, carried away by Cambyses*; and survived Callinicus four years. Which is thus described in

**DANIEL'S PROPHECY.**

"And at the end of [several] years, they, [the kings of the south and north,] shall connect themselves together [by marriage:] for [Berenice,] the king's daughter of the south, shall come to the king of the north, to make an agreement. But she shall not retain the power of the arm, [or her interest with Antiochus; who, after some time, brought back his former wife, Laodice, and her children, to court:] Neither shall he, [Antiochus,] stand, nor his arm; [for he was poisoned;] and she, [Berenice,] shall be given up, and they that brought her, [her Egyptian attendants,] and he whom she brought forth, [her young son,] and he that strengthened her in those times. [Her father, Philadelphus, who died shortly before.]

"But out of a branch of her root shall one stand up in his estate, [her brother Euergetes,] who shall come with an army, and shall enter into the fortresses, [or the fenced cities,] of the king of the north, and shall act against them, and prevail; and shall carry captives into Egypt, their gods, with their princes and precious vessels of gold and silver. And he shall continue some years after the king of the north. So the king of the south shall come into the kingdom [of the north,] and shall return into his own land [of Egypt,]" Dan. xi. 6—9.

During the reign of Euergetes, Onias, the high priest of the Jews, the son of Eleazer, who succeeded Manasses the son of Jaddua, by his sordid avarice, and embezzlement of the tribute of twenty talents of silver, usually paid to the Egyptians, so provoked the king that he threatened to confiscate the lands of Judea, and sent a colony of soldiers to occupy them. But fortunately for the whole nation, he was appeased by the policy and address of Joseph, the high priest's nephew; who gene-

---

* For this restoration of their gods, the idolatrous Egyptians gave him the title of Euergetes, "benefactor."
rously borrowed the money upon his own credit, paid the tribute, and so ingratiated himself at the Egyptian court, that he obtained the lucrative post of farming the king's revenues in the provinces of Cœle Syria, Phœnicia, Samaria, and Judea.

In Syria, Seleucus Keraunus, inheriting the remains of his father's kingdom, B.C. 225, and thinking to recover the rest, raised a great army against the revolted king of Pergamum; but was poisoned by two of his generals, after a short reign of two years. His brother and successor, Antiochus Magnus, B.C. 223, carrying on the war, recovered almost all Asia Minor, Media, Persia, and Babylonia. In the third year of his reign he invaded and recovered great part of Cœle Syria; and the next year returning to invade Phœnicia, he beat the army of Ptolemy Philopator, who in B.C. 222, had succeeded his father Euergetes in Egypt. He then invaded Palestine, and the neighbouring parts of Arabia; and the third year returned with an army of 78,000 men; but Ptolemy coming out of Egypt with an army of 75,000, fought and routed him at Raphia, near Gaza, between Palestine and Egypt, and recovered all Phœnicia and Cœle Syria. These wars are thus described in

DANIEL'S NEXT PROPHECY.

"But his sons, [Seleucus Keraunus and Antiochus Magnus, the sons of Callinicus,] shall be stirred up, and shall gather a great army. And one [of them, Antiochus Magnus,] shall come effectually, and overflow [Cœlesyria,] and pass through. Then shall he return, [the next year,] and be stirred up, [marching even] to his fortresses, [the frontier towns of Egypt.] And the king of the south, [Ptolemy,] shall be moved with choler, and come forth, [the third year,] and fight with him, even with the king of the north, [Antiochus;] and he, [Antiochus,] shall lead forth a great multitude; but the multitude shall be given into his [Ptolemy's] hand [at the battle of Raphia,"] Dan. xi. 10, 11.

After this decisive victory, Ptolemy made an imprudent peace with Antiochus, whom he might have dispossessed of his dominions, if he had pursued his success. He then visited the cities of Cœle Syria and Palestine, which had submitted to him, and among the rest in his progress, Jerusalem. Here he offered sacrifices in the temple, and was desirous of entering into the
sanctuary, being greatly lifted up by pride and presumption*. When Simon II, at that time high priest, remonstrated that it was unlawful even for the priests to enter the inner sanctuary, he answered haughtily, that although they were deprived of that honour, he ought not †, and pressed forward. But while he was passing through the inner court of the temple, he was shaken "like a reed, and fell speechless on the ground," either by the terrors of the Lord, or by his own superstitious fears; and was carried off from the temple half dead; and departed with heavy displeasure against the whole nation of the Jews. At his return, therefore, to Alexandria, he began a cruel and impolitic persecution against the Jewish inhabitants, B.C. 216, in which, according to Eusebius, 40,000 Jews were slain, or 60,000 according to Jerom. These proceedings are thus foretold in

DANIEL'S ENSUING PROPHECY.

"And the multitude being taken away [of the Syrians,] his heart shall be lifted up; and he shall cast down many myriads [of his own subjects;] but he shall not be strengthened by it; for the king of the north shall return," &c. Dan. xi. 12, 13.

About twelve years after the battle of Raphia, Ptolemy Philopator died, B.C. 205, a monster of cruelty and profligacy of every kind. He is accused, by some historians, of having murdered his father, his mother, and his brother; he killed his high-minded wife and sister, Arsinoe, who had shared with him the dangers of the battle; he gave himself up to the harlot Agathoclea and her brother his minion; and his death was followed by the massacre of all his unworthy favourites. He left his crown to his son, Ptolemy Epiphanes, a child of five years old. Thereupon Antiochus Magnus, confederated with Philip, king of Macedon, to invade and divide between them the dominions of Epiphanes. Hence arose a various warfare between Antiochus and the generals of the Egyptians; each of them, seizing, in turn, Phœnicia, Judea, and Coele Syria, whereby these countries were much afflicted by both parties. First Antiochus reduced them, B.C. 203, the Jews willingly submitting

* ἡ μάλιν τῆς τιμῆς, ἐμε ὦ δει, ibid.
† ἔκεινοι εστηρηνται ταυτής τῆς τιμῆς, ἐμε ὦ δει, ibid.
to him; but Scopas, the Egyptian general, recovered them in B.C. 199, who was odious for his rapacity. Next year, B.C. 198, Antiochus fought and routed Scopas, near the fountains of Jordan, besieged him in Sidon, took the city, and easily recovered Syria and all Palestine from Egypt. And in order to attach the Jews to his interest, who were now hostile to the Egyptians, he published an edict prohibiting all strangers from entering the temple of Jerusalem; and he colonized Lydia, Phrygia, and other districts of doubtful fidelity, with Jews from Babylonia as well as Palestine; and frequently reinforced their colonies. A circumstance which accounts for the great numbers of Jews scattered throughout those countries at the preaching of the gospel, 1 Pet. i. 1, James i. 1.

The defeat of his ally, Philip of Macedon, at the battle of Cynocephalae, next year, B.C. 197, by the Romans, to whom he imprudently gave no support; and his apprehensions of that republic, now growing formidable to the east, induced him to temporize with the Egyptians, and to offer his beautiful daughter, Cleopatra, in marriage to the young king, Ptolemy Epi-phanes, when he should become of age; promising, as her dower, to restore the provinces of Coele Syria and Palestine, which he had wrested from Egypt. She was then betrothed to him, and the marriage took place at Raphia, when he was eighteen, B.C. 192. But Antiochus still kept possession of the provinces to be ceded *, and endeavoured to corrupt his daughter to betray her husband's interests. But he was disappointed. She was more attached to Ptolemy than to her father; and being probably dissatisfied at his breach of promise, she joined her husband in an embassy to Rome, next year, to congratulate the Romans on driving Antiochus out of Greece, and to assure the senate of the readiness of the king and queen of Egypt to obey their directions.

For Antiochus having, as he imagined, secured peace with Egypt by this marriage, imprudently embarked in a war with the Romans, invading their allies, instead of directly invading

* Jerom and Appian say that Antiochus surrendered these provinces; and Josephus appears to concur with them, intimating that their revenues were paid to the king of Egypt, Ant. XII. 4, 1. But Poybius denies it; and they were certainly in the possession of the sons of Antiochus, namely, Seleucus Philopator, 2 Mac. iii. 3, and Antiochus Epiphanes, 2 Mac. iv. 7, the great persecutor of the Jews, who received tribute from them, 1 Mac. i. 29.
Italy itself, and carrying the war into their own country, according to the sage advice of Hannibal. With a formidable fleet he subdued most of the maritime towns of Asia Minor, Thrace, and Greece, and several of the islands, Samos, Euboea; thus strengthening their attachment to the Romans; who by an artful and refined policy, had proclaimed liberty to all the cities and states of Greece, B.C. 196, in order to detach them from Philip of Macedon, and to break the power of the Achean league; and thereby had rendered themselves highly popular.

The Romans, therefore, readily espousing the cause of their allies, and Philip cordially concurring, Acilius, the Roman consul, defeated Antiochus at the straits of Thermopylae, and drove him out of Greece; and soon after, Livius and Emilius defeated his fleet near Phocaea, B.C. 191. Next year, Cornelius Scipio, and his brother Africanus, crossing over into Asia, obtained a decisive victory over Antiochus, near the city of Magnesia, principally by the assistance of Eumenes, king of Pergamos, B.C. 190. From Antioch, the fortified capital of Syria, to which Antiochus fled after the battle, he was forced to sue for peace; which was granted to him by the conquerors, upon the most humiliating conditions. 1. That he should surrender all Asia Minor, westwards of Mount Taurus, to Eumenes, king of Pergamos; 2. That he should defray the whole expences of the war; 3. That he should pay an annual tribute of a thousand talents*; and 4. That he should send twenty hostages to Rome, and among them his younger son, Antiochus, afterwards called Epiphanes, as pledges for the performance of these conditions.

After this, Antiochus retired to the eastern provinces that still remained to him, where he endeavoured to collect the arrears of tribute due to him, in order to defray his heavy engagements to the Romans. There he was slain two years after, in a sacrilegious attempt to rob the rich temple of Jupiter Belus, at Elymais in Persia, by the natives. These transactions of his reign are thus foretold in

DANIEL'S CONTINUATION.

"For [Antiochus,] the king of the north shall return, and shall set forth a multitude greater than the former; and shall

* The writer of the second book of Maccabees says, two thousand talents, viii. 8. But this might have included an arrear due at that time.
certainly come after certain years, [twelve,] with a great army, and with much riches. And in those times there shall many stand up against the king of the south, [particularly the Macedonians.] Also the sons of the revolters of thy people, [the Jews, Samaritans, &c.] shall exalt themselves, [or affect independence,] to establish the vision, [or bring on the predicted calamities,] but they shall fall [by Scopas.] So the king of the north shall come, and cast up a mount, and the arms of the south [Scopas, &c.] shall not withstand; but he, [Antiochus,] that cometh against him, shall do according to his own will, and none shall stand before him. And he shall stand in the glorious land, [Judea,] which shall be perfected, [or prosper] in his hand.

"He shall also set his face to go with the strength of all his kingdom [to Raphia,] and make an agreement [or treaty] with him, [Ptolemy,] and shall give him [in marriage his] daughter [Cleopatra, the fairest] of women, corrupting her; but she shall neither stand on his side, nor be for him, [but for her husband.]

"And after this he shall turn his face to the isles, [westward,] and shall take many. But a [Roman] prince, for his own behalf, [and to support his allies,] shall cause the reproach offered by him to cease: without his own reproach, he shall cause it to turn upon him. Then shall he turn his face towards the fort of his own land, [Antioch, in his flight eastward:] but he shall stumble, and fall at [Elymais,] and not be found," Dan. xi. 18—19.

Antiochus was succeeded by his eldest son, Seleucus Philopator, B.C. 187, during the pontificate of Onias III. "when the holy city was inhabited with all peace, and the laws were kept very well, because of the godliness of Onias the high priest, and his hatred of wickedness."— "And Seleucus himself, out of his own revenues, bore all the costs belonging to the service of the sacrifices," 2 Mac. iii. 1—3. But upon the information of Simon, who was made governor of the temple, and had quarrelled with Onias, that the treasury of Jerusalem was exceedingly rich, and abundantly more than sufficient to supply the sacrifices; the king, who was straitened for money to raise the Roman tribute, sent his treasurer, Heliodorus, to seize and bring him the money. This sacrilegious attempt, however, failed; for Heliodorus was encountered by a celestial apparition, scourged severely by two angels, and carried off speechless by his guard for dead,
until restored by the prayers of Onias, iii. 4—40. Josephus repeats the same, but attributes it to Apollodorus, governor of Coele Syria and Phœnicia. De Maccab. § iv. p. 1395.

Seleucus was inclined to shake off the Roman yoke, but had not courage to attempt it. He was indeed no more than a tax-gatherer for them, during the twelve years of his reign; when he was murdered by his ambitious and wicked treasurer, Heliodorus, who usurped the kingdom.

These circumstances are thus foretold by Daniel.

"Then shall [Philopator] stand up in his estate, a raiser of taxes, in the glory of the kingdom. But within a few days, [or years.] he shall be destroyed; neither in anger, nor in battle, [but by domestic treason]."

At the time of his death, his younger brother, Antiochus, who had been exchanged as a hostage, for his son Demetrius, at Rome, was then on his way home at Athens; and had sufficient address to ingratiate himself so with Eumenes, as to prevail on him to expel the usurper, and place him on the throne; and with the Syrians and Romans, to suffer him to reign in exclusion of the rightful heir, young Demetrius. On his accession, B.C. 175*, he was styled Epiphanes, "illustrious," by the usual adulation of the Syrians; but from the wild and disgraceful freaks and excesses into which he ran, joined to the utmost profusion and extravagance, to support his interest with his subjects, and the Romans, he was nicknamed Epimanes, "the madman;" in greater conformity with his scriptural titles of "a vile person," and "a wicked root." With the history of his persecution of the Jews, the books of the Maccabees properly commence, 1 Mac. i. 10, 2 Mac. iv. 7.

The first act of his reign was the deposal of the worthy Onias III. whose sacred office he sold for 440 talents of silver, to his younger brother, the unprincipled Jesus, who assumed a Greek name, Jason; who gave him 150 more, for licence to erect a place of exercise at Jerusalem, for the youth of the city, according to the heathenish customs of the Greeks. Jason, however, did not long enjoy his ill-gotten dignity; three years after, he was supplanted, in turn, by his younger brother, Onias IV. or, by his Greek name, Menelaus, who gave the king three hundred talents more for the high priesthood than Jason had given;

* "In the 137th year of the kingdom of the Greeks," or era of Seleucidae, 1 Mac. i. 10.
and Jason was compelled to fly into the country of the Ammonites; mean while, the wickeder Menelaus stole some golden vessels out of the temple, and sold them at Tyre and the neighbouring cities; and when reproved by his brother, the exiled Onias, he prevailed on Andronicus, the king's deputy at Antioch, to murder him: for which Andronicus was justly slain on the same spot, by the king. Josephus omits these circumstances of the sale of the pontificate; but from the character of all the parties concerned, they are highly credible.

Upon the accession of his young nephew, Ptolemy Philometor, to the throne of Egypt, which took place after the death of his mother and guardian, Cleopatra, in B.C. 172, he sent ambassadors to Alexandria to assist at the coronation; and there discovered that the ministers of the young king meant to renew their master’s claim to the provinces of Cæle Syria, in right of the original partition treaty, in the reign of Ptolemy Lagus, and of his mother’s dower.

Antiochus denied the claim, and despising the youth of Ptolemy, repeatedly invaded Egypt. In his first expedition, B.C. 171, he, on his way, was bribed to acquit the infamous Menelaus of a charge brought against him by the Jews, of robbing the temple of many of the golden vessels, 2 Macc. iv. 39—50, and afterwards gained a victory over the Egyptians at Pelusium. Next year, B.C. 170, he not only completely defeated the Egyptian army, but took Philometor prisoner, and subdued the whole country, except the capital, Alexandria. While he was thus employed, on a rumour of his death, Jason, with a party, surprized the city of Jerusalem, massacred the citizens, drove Menelaus, his brother, into the castle, and possessed himself of the principality. But he was soon expelled a second time, and perished miserably at length, a refugee in the strange land of Lacedæmonia. Antiochus, thinking mean while, that Judea had revolted, returned in great wrath from Egypt, took the city by assault, destroyed fourscore thousand persons, during a massacre of three days, plundered the temple of all its treasures, vessels, and golden ornaments, and carried away eighteen hundred talents to Antioch, 1 Mac. i. 20—28, 2 Mac. v. 1—23.

In his third expedition to Egypt, B.C. 169, he laid siege to Alexandria, where the Egyptians had proclaimed the younger brother of Philometor king, under the name of Euergetes II, nicknamed afterwards Physcon, from his corpulence. In oppo-
sition to whom, Antiochus left Philometor at Memphis, as titular sovereign, and also a strong garrison in Pelusium, the key of Egypt. But the brothers came to a mutual good understanding, united against their unnatural uncle, and sent an embassy to Rome, imploring protection. This brought on a fourth invasion, B.C. 168; but when Antiochus was within four miles of Alexandria, he was met at Eleusis by the Roman ambassadors, at the head of whom was Popilius Lænas, with whom he had been acquainted during a residence of thirteen years at Rome. Rejoiced to see him, Antiochus stretched out his arms to embrace him, but the Roman rejecting his salute, first sternly demanded an answer to the written orders of the senate, which he presented. The king declaring that he would deliberate on their contents with his friends; Popilius traced a circle round the king on the sand, with his rod; saying "I require your answer before you quit this circle;" then Antiochus, with a faltering accent, replied, "I will obey the senate;" and immediately withdrew his army from Egypt. Such was the terror inspired by these haughty republicans of "fierce countenance," as they were characterized by the prophets, Moses, Isaiah, and Daniel. But this was after the conquest of Macedon that same year.

Upon this disgraceful repulse, while he was marching home-ward, he sent Apollonius his general, with twenty-two thousand men, to vent his fury upon the unfortunate inhabitants of Jerusalem, who had been groaning for two years under the complicated tyranny and rapacity of Philip, the Phrygian governor, "more barbarous than his master;" and of Menelaus the apostate high priest, "worse than all the rest, who bore a heavy hand over the citizens, having a malicious mind against his countrymen the Jews," 1 Mac. i. 29, 2 Mac. v. 22—24.

Apollonius, who was also "chief collector of tribute," coming, in appearance, peaceably to Jerusalem, suddenly attacked it on the sabbath-day, slew great multitudes of men, and sold the women and children for captives; and then fortified the city of David on Mount Sion, for a citadel, "to lie in wait against the sanctuary, and to be an evil adversary unto Israel," 1 Mac. i. 29—36, 2 Mac. v. 24—26.

To crown the extravagance of his rage, Antiochus now issued a decree for establishing the Grecian idolatry throughout his dominions, "that all should become one people, conform to his religion, worship his idols, and relinquish their own laws, and
follow the strange laws of the land, under the pain of death *.”
To this decree all the heathen conformed; and many also of the
Jews apostatized to his religion, sacrificed to idols, and profaned
the sabbath. And in the course of the same ominous year, B.C.
168, about six months after the capture of the city, the temple
of Jerusalem was dedicated to Jupiter Olympius, and by the
consent of the Samaritans, the temple on Mount Gerizim to
Jupiter Xenius, “the defender of strangers,” as the inhabitants
now affected to consider themselves disclaiming kindred with
the Jews; an idol, or “the abomination of desolation,” was set
up on the altar of the Lord at Jerusalem, on the fifteenth day of
the ninth month Casleu; and on the twenty-fifth of the same
month, sacrifices were offered upon the idol altar, built beside
the altar of God; and idol altars were erected on every side,
throughout the cities of Judea; on which the king’s commis-
sioners enforced obedience to the edict. And an old Athenian
minister, well versed in all the heathenish rites, was sent to
Jerusalem to take care that they should be duly executed,
1 Mac. i.41—59, 2 Mac. vi.1—3.

The remarks of the sacred historian on the profanation of the
temple, and on the sufferings of the Jews, are equally pious and
judicious.

"THE LORD was angry for a while, on account of the sins
of them that dwelt in the city; and therefore his eye was not
on the [holy] place, [to protect it from profanation.”]—“For GOD
did not chuse the people for the place’s sake; but the place for
the people’s sake.”——“These punishments were designed, not
for the destruction, but for the chastening of our nation:—for
it is a token of his great goodness, when wicked doers are not
suffered for any long time [to persist in their wickedness,] but
are punished forthwith,” &c. 2 Mac. v. 17—19, vi.12—17.

Antiochus commanded and superintended the most horrible
tortures of the Recusants: witness the martyrdom of the vener-
able Eleazar, in his 90th year; for refusing to eat swine’s flesh,
2 Mac. vi. 18—31; witness the heroic mother and her seven

* This general persecution seems to have been raised, not from any regard to his own
religion, but from a regular plan, and deep laid scheme of plundering the temples
throughout his dominions, after he had suppressed their worship. For the temples
were not only enriched by the offerings of the votaries, but from their sanctity were the
great banks of deposit, and grand magazines of commerce. Gillies’s History of the
World, Vol. II. p. 46.
sons, who nobly set the tyrant at defiance, and professed their faith and hope that "THE KING OF THE WORLD would raise them up who died for his laws, to everlasting life;" and threatened their tormentor, that "he should have no resurrection to life, but receive just punishment for his pride, through the judgment of God," chap. vii.

When this dreadful persecution had raged about half a year, God raised up a deliverance for his people in the noble family of the Asamoneans, Mattathias and his sons. He was the son of John, the son of Simeon, the son of Asamoneus, 1 Mac. ii. 1, Joseph. Ant. XII. 6, 1; and a priest of the course of Joarib, the first of the twenty-four courses appointed by David, 1 Chron. xxiv. 7, descended from Phineas, the son of Eleazar, the elder branch of Aaron's family, 1 Mac. ii. 54, whose five sons were Johanan, Simon, Judas called Maccabeus, Eleazar, and Jonathan. He was also "a ruler, and an honourable and great man in the city of Modin; and strengthened with sons and brethren." Modin was a town near the sea side, 1 Mac. xiii. 26, about four miles from Diospolis, or Lydda, and a mile from Joppa, or Jaffa. Wells.

Apelles, the commissioner of Antiochus, having attempted to carry into execution the royal edict at Modin, endeavoured to persuade Mattathias, as a person of the first distinction and consequence there, to set the example; but he undauntedly refused, and said aloud, "Though all the nations under the king's dominion hearken unto him, to apostatize everyone from the religion of their fathers, and consent to his commandments; yet will I, and my sons, and my brethren, walk in the covenant of our fathers. God forbid that we should forsake the law and the ordinances. We will not hearken to the king's words to transgress our religion, on the right hand or on the left;" and animated with the zeal of his ancestor Phineas, in the Midianite fornication and idolatry, Numb. xxv. 7, 8, he slew an apostate Jew, who was going to offer sacrifice on the idol altar; and killed the commissioner himself, who compelled men to sacrifice, and pulled down the altar, and proclaimed throughout the city, "Whosoever is zealous for the law, and a maintainer of the covenant, let him follow me." Then he and his sons fled to the mountains, (only ten persons in all,) and forsook all that they had in the city, 1 Mac. ii. 15—28, 2 Mac. v. 27. Joseph. Ant. XII. 6, 2.
To quell this insurrection, when many of the inhabitants had left the city, with their wives, children, and cattle, to dwell in the wilderness, the Syrian garrison at Jerusalem pursued them, and destroyed them all on the sabbath day, to the number of a thousand persons, without any resistance on their part; from a scrupulous adherence to the law of the sabbath, 1 Mac. ii. 29—38.

Whereupon Mattathias and his small party, agreed to fight in their own defence on the sabbath day, that they might not be exterminated; and being joined by a gallant band of Assideans, or “volunteers, wholly devoted to the law,” and by others that fled from persecution, they went, (chiefly by night,) throughout the country, and pulled down the altars, and pursued the proud persecutors; and the work prospered in their hand, till the death of Mattathias, B.C. 167, who recommended his second son Simon, to be their counsellor, and the valiant Judas, his third, to be their captain *, 1 Mac. ii. 49—70. Judas, most probably, derived his surname, Maccabeus, from a cabalistical word, formed of M. C. B. I. the initial letters of the Hebrew text, Mi Chamoka Ba Liam Iahoh, “Who is like unto Thee among the gods, O Lord?” Exod. xv. 11, which letters might have been displayed on his sacred standard; as on the Roman ensigns, S. P. Q. R. Senatus populus que Romanus.

**ASAMONEAN PRINCES.**

**JUDAS MACCABEUS.**

This valiant chieftain, with his noble brothers, maintained a religious war for twenty-six years, from the time of the insurrection of Modin, with five successive kings of Syria; destroyed above two hundred thousand of their best troops, and finally established the independence of their own country, and the aggrandizement of their family. Such a triumph of a petty province over a great empire, is scarcely to be paralleled in the annals of history. But the Lord fought for Israel, while they were re-*

* In the year B.C. 167, the insurrection began to be embodied by the appointment of a chief, Judas Maccabeus, round whose standard the insurgents could rally; but it was not until the death of the high priest, Menelaus, and the appointment of Judas to be governor, by Antiochus Eupator, B.C. 163, that the Asamonean dynasty began.
religious and virtuous, and put their whole trust in Him; and the inflexible spirit of the Jewish nation has ever grown more rigid under persecution, and their zeal waxed hotter in the furnace of adversity.

The first enterprise of Judas, B.C. 167, and his small but resolute band, was against "Apollonius that detestable ring-leader," in massacring the citizens of Jerusalem, whom he defeated, though at the head of a great host, and slew, and took his sword, like that of another Goliath, slain by David, with which he afterwards fought all his life long, 1 Mac. iii. 10—12.

His next was the defeat of Seron, a Syrian general, and a mighty host of Grecising Jews and apostate Samaritans, with a small company, whom he encouraged in the language of Jonathan the son of Saul; "With the God of Heaven it is all one to deliver with a great multitude, or a small company," &c. 1 Mac. iii. 13—24.

The king of Syria, Antiochus Epiphanes, filled with indignation at the successes of Judas Maccabeus, whose fame had spread through all the neighbouring nations; while he went himself into the eastern provinces to recruit his exhausted finances, appointed his kinsman Lysias, regent of all the western provinces, from Euphrates to Egypt, and commissioned him to raise and march an army to extirpate the Jews, and to plant a colony of strangers in their room.

Lysias, therefore, the next year, B.C. 166, sent a great army of forty thousand foot, and seven thousand horse, under Nicanor and Gorgias, an experienced general, to invade Judea; and so confident were they of victory, that Nicanor proclaimed a sale of the captive Jews beforehand, at the rate of ninety for a talent, or about two pounds sterling a head, which drew a thousand merchants from the sea coast of the Syrian camp at Emmaus, near Jerusalem, to make a cheap purchase of slaves. In this imminent peril, Judas and his party assembled at Maspeh, or Mizpeh, where they fasted and prayed at that sacred place of national congress, in time of old, and afterwards, Judas, in obedience to the law, Deut. xx. 5, dismissed all such of his men, as in the course of the passing year had built houses, betrothed wives, or were planting vineyards, or were fearful; which reduced his little army from six thousand to three thousand men, 1 Mac. iii. 27—57, 2 Mac. viii. 1—16.

Gorgias, with a chosen party of troops, 5000 foot, and 1000
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horse, marched by night to surprize the army of Judas; but the Jewish general being apprized of his design, left his camp, and marched to attack, separately, Nicanor in the morning; routed his army, and slew three thousand of them, and set fire to their tents; and then quitting the pursuit and the spoil, returned to attack Gorgias and his party; who fled at the sight of the smoke of their tents, and the appearance of the conquerors drawn up in battle array; after which the Jews spoiled their camp, and got great riches, and seized all the money brought by the slave merchants. Nicanor, after his defeat, fled in disguise to Antioch, declaring that "the Jews had God to fight for them; and that they could not be hurt, because they followed the laws which he gave them," 1 Mac. iv. 1—25, 2 Mac. viii. 21—36.

Immediately after, the Jews defeated another Syrian army under Timotheus and Bacchides, and slew above twenty-thousand men, reduced several strong holds, and charitably divided the united spoils with the maimed, the orphans, the widows, and the aged, 2 Mac. viii. 28—30.

Next year, B.C. 165, Lysias assembled a greater army of sixty thousand choice foot, and five thousand horse, and marched himself at their head, to invade Judea on the eastern side; and entered Idumea, which was now confined to the region westward of the Asphaltite lake, which formerly had belonged to the tribes of Simeon and Judah, but after the captivity, when it lay desolate, had been occupied by the Edomites, from Arabia Petraea (the ancient Idumaea) who made Hebron their capital city, and rebuilt the strong fortress of Bethsura, on their frontier, originally built by Rehoboam, 2 Chron. xi. 7. At this advantageous post Lysias encamped, and was encountered by Judas with only ten thousand men, who gained a most signal victory, killing five thousand on the spot, and putting the rest to flight. Observing that the Jews fought like men determined to conquer or die, Lysias did not venture to renew the engagement with his disheartened troops, though still much exceeding the Jews in number, but retired to Antioch, designing to bring a much greater army next year, 1 Mac. iv. 28—35.

Judas, availing himself of this respite from war, marched with his army to Jerusalem, which he recovered; he purified the city and the temple from the heathen pollutions, took down the old altar which had been profaned, and laid by the stones in a convenient place of the temple mount, until there should come a
prophet to shew what should be done with them, in evident expectation of the prophet like Moses. He then built a new altar of whole or unhewn stones; repaired and furnished the temple and sanctuary with all the sacred utensils; and on the twenty-fifth day of the ninth month Casleu, B.C. 165, (precisely three years after its profanation) he restored the regular service of the temple, offered sacrifice according to the law, on the new altar of burnt-offering, and celebrated the feast of the new dedication of the altar, (εγκαινιασμον.) And this was "the feast of new dedication" (εγκαινια) "in winter," or about the winter solstice, which Our Lord, the true prophet like Moses, attended, John x. 22, the time exactly corresponding. It could not be the feast of dedication of Solomon's temple, which was celebrated in the seventh month, about Autumn, 1 Kings viii. 2, 2 Chron. v. 3, nor of Zerubbabel's temple, in the last month Adar, about the beginning of Spring, Ezra vi. 15, 1 Mac. iv. 36—59.

To secure the temple service from the incursions of the Syrian garrison in the citadel, he fortified the temple mount (now called Sion) with high walls and towers, and set a garrison therein; and he also fortified Bethsura on the frontier, to be a defence against Idumea, lying nearly midway between Jerusalem and Hebron, 1 Mac. iv. 60, 61.

During this disastrous war which he had kindled in the west, Antiochus Epiphanes was not more successful in the east. Like Antiochus, his father, he attempted to plunder the rich temple at Elymais, in Persia, and was repulsed and wounded, and, according to Jerom, slain in the attempt; but according to the Maccabees, he lingered for some time with a loathsome and incurable disease, confessing that he was smitten by the hand of God, as a judgment for his plunder and profanation of the temple at Jerusalem, and his persecution of the Jews. He died in the beginning of the year, B.C. 164, soon after the foregoing transactions, 1 Mac. vi. 1—16, 2 Mac. ix. 1—28.

The leading occurrences of his reign are thus foretold in

DANIEL'S CONTINUATION.

"And in his [Seleucus Philopator's] estate shall stand up a vile person, [Antiochus Epiphanes] to whom they [the Syrians,

* The author of the second book of Maccabees says, "after two years," according to his later commencement of the era of Seleucidae, 2 Mac. x. 3. See Vol. I. p. 175.
who set up Heliodorus shall not give the honour of the kingdom. Yet he shall come in peaceably, and obtain the kingdom by flatteries, [to Eumenes, king of Pergamus, the Syrians, and the Romans.] And the arms of the overflower [Heliodorus] shall be overflowed with a flood before him, and be broken; yea also the prince of the covenant, [the Jewish high-priest, Onias, deposed by him.]

"And after the league made with him, [his nephew, Ptolemy Philometor, king of Egypt] he shall work deceitfully; for he shall come up, and shall become strong, [in Phœenia] with a small people [or retinue.] And he shall enter into the quiet and plentiful cities of the province [of Phœenia] and shall do that which his fathers and his fathers' fathers have not done: [or shall outdo them in donations] he shall scatter among them profusely the prey, and the spoil, and the riches; [he had collected by plunder elsewhere, and from his own revenues, in order to attach the Phœniакians to his interest.] Yea, and he shall forecast his devices against the strong holds, [of Egypt] even for a [convenient] season.

"And he shall stir up his power and his courage against the king of the south, [Ptolemy Philometor] with a great army; and the king of the south shall be stirred up to battle with a very great and mighty army, but he shall not stand: for they [even Antiochus and his counsellors] shall forecast devices against him; yea, they that feed of the portion of his meat, [Ptolemy's tutor, Eulaeus, and Macron, governor of Cyprus] shall betray and destroy him: [so that Ptolemy shall be taken prisoner.] And both these kings' hearts shall be to do mischief to each other;] and they shall speak lies at one table. [Antiochus shall pretend to restore the crown to Ptolemy, and Ptolemy shall pretend to oppose his brother, set up by the Egyptians on his captivity.] But it shall not prosper [on either side, for the war shall not cease, or come to] the end, which shall be at the time appointed. Then shall he [Antiochus] return into the land with great riches, and his heart shall be against the holy covenant, [or the Jewish temple and religion] and he shall do [according to his will, and spoil the temple of Jerusalem] and return into his own land.

"At the time appointed he shall come again towards the south [Egypt]; but the latter [coming] shall not be as the former. For the ships of Chittim [or the Romans] shall come
against him, [with ambassadors from Rome, commanding him to desist.] Therefore he shall be grieved, and return [towards Syria].

"And he shall have indignation against the holy covenant; so shall he do, he shall even return, and have intelligence with them that forsake the holy covenant, [the apostate Menelaus, and his party, to set up the Grecian idolatry, and abolish the Jewish religion.]" Dan. xi. 21—30.

These prophecies of Daniel, foretelling the sufferings and persecutions of the Jews, from Alexander's successors in Syria and Egypt, till the end of the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, during a disastrous period of 160 years, are, if possible, more surprising and astonishing than even his grand prophetic period of 2300 years, and the several successions of empire, or the four temporal kingdoms, that were to precede the spiritual kingdom of God upon earth. The magnificence of the whole scheme, comprising the fortunes of all mankind, seems to be an object suitable to the Omniscient Governor of the Universe, calculated to excite awe and admiration; but the minuteness of detail exhibited in this part, exceeds that of any existing history of those times. The prophecy is really more concise and comprehensive, and yet more circumstantial and complete, than any history. No one historian has related so many circumstances, and in such exact order of time and place, as the prophet; so that it was necessary to have recourse to several authors, Greek and Roman, Jewish and Christian, for the better explaining and illustrating the great variety of particulars contained in this prophecy. And if the authors who wrote of these times were all extant, or all entire, (neither of which is the case,) we should unquestionably have still greater reason to be astonished at the consummate exactness of the prophecy. Even the infidel Porphyry, who had access to several sources of information, now lost, was so confounded by this exactness, that he was driven to deny the authenticity of the prophecy itself, declaring that it could not possibly have been written before, but after, the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes. But the prophecy is so intimately connected with the preceding and following parts of the vision, which relate to the Macedonians and Romans, that it must have been written by the same hand, and therefore be esteemed equally genuine with the whole book of Daniel. The astonishing exactness, indeed, with which this minute prophetic detail has been
fulfilled, furnishes the strongest pledge, from analogy, that the remaining prophecies were, and will be, as exactly fulfilled, each in their proper season.

Antiochus Eupator, the son of Epiphanes, a child of nine years old, was set up as king by his guardian Lysias, B.C. 164. His reign was short and turbulent, and his end unfortunate. Lysias, at the beginning, renewed the war against the Maccabees, with an army of four-score thousand foot, to revenge the signal defeat of the army of Timotheus, who was killed with his brother Chereas; but he was put to flight shamefully, with the loss of eleven thousand foot and sixteen hundred horse slain in the battle. Considering, then, with himself, as a man of understanding, that the Hebrews could not be overcome, because the Almighty God helped them, he offered them peace, on condition that they would be loyal to the state: to which they agreed; and Lysias obtained a decree from the king, dated the same year, that they should no more be required to conform to the heathen customs and worship, but allowed to live according to their own laws; and Menelaus, the apostate, who had laboured to promote it, was sent back "to comfort them," and to be reinstated in the pontificate, 2 Mac. x. 14—38, xi. 1—38.

But this peace was of short continuance. The Jews were again molested by the governors of the Syrian provinces, and by the neighbouring nations, the Joppites, Jamnites, Arabians, and Idumeans, whom Judas successively reduced, after a bloody warfare, the particulars of which are detailed, 2 Mac. xii. 1—37.

All this while, the citadel of Jerusalem, which was garrisoned by Syrians and renegade Jews, proved a great annoyance to the temple worship, and, in the absence of Judas, actually "shut up the Israelites round about the sanctuary." Judas, therefore, on his return, after the defeat of Gorgias, the governor of Idumea, purposed to destroy such pestilent neighbours, and besieged them with all the people, B.C. 163; but some of the besieged, forcing their way through in a sally, went to the king, and complained of the hostility of the Jews to the Syrian government, that they persecuted its friends, had fortified the temple and Bethsura, and were besieging the citadel; and would soon withdraw themselves from his dominion, unless they were speedily prevented, 1 Mac. vi. 18—27.

Provoked at this intelligence, the king assembled a vast army
of a hundred thousand foot, twenty thousand horse, and thirty-two war-elephants, and with Lysias marched to Idumea, and besieged Bethsura. Judas, therefore, quitting the citadel, advanced to attack the king's army on the way, and slew about six hundred men; and his brother Eleazar, in the battle, attacked, as he thought, the king's elephant, got under him, stabbed him in the belly, and was crushed to death by the fall of the huge animal upon him. Finding the Syrian army, however, too strong, the Jews desisted from the attack, and retreated; and Bethsura soon after surrendered for want of provisions, for it was a sabbatical year of rest to the land*. The Syrians next proceeded to Jerusalem, and besieged the temple fortress, which was reduced also to the last extremity by famine, and must have soon surrendered, had not Eupator, and his guardian Lysias, been recalled by a civil war at home, commenced by Philip, whom the late king, when dying, had appointed regent, in exclusion of Lysias, with whose ill success against the Jews he was highly dissatisfied. Whereupon, hearing of this competitor, the king and his council renewed the peace with Judas upon the former terms, that the Jews should be allowed in future to live according to their own laws; broke up the siege, but violated the treaty by demolishing the strong walls of the temple mount; and then marched to attack Philip, who had got possession of Antioch, the capital, and defeated and slew him there, 1 Mac. vi. 28—63.

On this occasion, the high-priest Menelaus, the author of all these mischiefs, met with his deserts. At the approach of the Syrian army, he had abandoned his countrymen, and encouraged the king to invade Judea, "with great dissimulation;" not "for the safeguard of the country," nor regard to the Syrian interest, as he pretended, but because he thought "to have been made governor himself," if Judas and his party were destroyed. But the intended mischief recoiled on his wicked head: when the peace was concluded, he was sentenced to be suffocated in ashes, and died miserably at Berea, while Judas was promoted.

* This is confirmed by the Chronology. The first general sabbatical year, after the second division of the conquered lands by Joshua, began B.C. 1589, as shewn before. From this, subtracting B.C. 162, the remainder, 1427 years, gives the length of the whole period inclusively; which, divided by the sabbatical period of seven years, leaves no remainder. Therefore, the last year, B.C. 163, was itself a sabbatical year.
to be chief governor*, from Ptolemais unto the Gerrhenians, 2 Mac. xiii. 3—24.

Jacimus, or Alcimus, was appointed high-priest in his room, B.C. 163, to the exclusion of the rightful successor, Onias, the son of the worthy Onias, who, at the instigation of his wicked brother Menelaus, had been slain at Antioch. Upon this disappointment, Onias retired in disgust to Egypt, where he was appointed high-priest to a temple which he built at Heliopolis, and which subsisted nearly as long as that at Jerusalem, when both were destroyed in the reign of Vespasian.

But Alcimus, for his proflicacy, and attempt to revive the heathenish rites, was soon expelled by the Jews, 1 Mac. vii. 5.

Soon after the defeat and death of Philip, another and more formidable competitor sprung up, to the destruction of Eupator and Lysias. Demetrius, the son of Seleucus Philopator, and the rightful heir of the crown, had been kept as a hostage, and afterwards in an honourable captivity at Rome, during the reign of his uncle Epiphanes, and on his death, solicited the senate for leave to return to Syria, but that politic body, preferring a minor like Eupator on the throne of Syria, to a prince in the prime of life, of considerable talents and ambition, refused his request; whereupon Demetrius privily escaped from Rome, and landed with "a few men†," only eight friends and their servants, at Tripolis, in Phoenicia; was joined by several of his adherents, under the persuasion that he was patronised by the Romans, and advanced to Antioch, where the army declared for him, and secured Eupator and Lysias, and, as a proof of their sincerity, brought them to Demetrius. But he said, "let me not see their faces," so they were slain by the army, B.C. 162, 1 Mac. vii. 1—4; 2 Mac. xiv. 1, 2.

Now when Demetrius was established upon the throne of his kingdom, all the wicked and ungodly men of Israel, the traitors and apostates, with Alcimus at their head, came to him, and accused Judas and his party of killing the king's friends, and

* From this year, B.C. 163, Josephus dates the accession of Judas Maccabeus to the principality of Judea; reckoning from thence to the death of Antigonus, the last of the dynasty, (B.C. 37,) 126 years current, Ant. XIV. 16, 4, or 125 years complete, Ant. XVII. 6, 3.

† Demetrius is represented, 2 Mac. xiv. 1, as "having entered the haven of Tripolis with a great power and navy;" but Polybius, the intimate friend of Demetrius, and the adviser of his flight from Rome, confirms the correcter account, 1 Mac. vii. 1.
expelling themselves; whereupon the king appointed Alcimus high-priest, (who was desirous of recovering the office,) and sent Bacchides, governor of Mesopotamia, in whom he could confide, to reinstate Alcimus, and take vengeance on his enemies with a great force. After in vain attempting to entrap Judas and his friends deceitfully, by fair professions, Bacchides slew sixty of the Assideans, who were the foremost of the children of Israel to seek peace on this occasion, and came to treat, foolishly concluding, that "a priest of the seed of Aaron, Alcimus, who came with this army, would do them no wrong." After this perfidious massacre, Bacchides committed the country to Alcimus, left him a force to support him, and returned to the king, 1 Mac. vii. 4—22.

But Judas and his party having got the upper hand, Alcimus was again expelled, and went a second time to Demetrius, bitterly complaining of Judas as a fomenter of war and sedition, and that as long as he lived, it was not possible that the state should be quiet. Whereupon the king sent Nicanor (who had been defeated before), with a great army, to destroy Judas and his brethren. At first, he endeavoured to entrap him by fair professions, but the wary Jewish general was not to be so caught, He then attacked Judas, but was defeated with the loss of five thousand men. Nicanor then waited for reinforcements from Syria, and when he had received them, renewed his attacks, but was defeated again, and slain, and his army so completely destroyed, that not a man out of thirty-five thousand escaped to carry the news to Antioch*. Thus the land obtained rest for a little while. This great victory was obtained on the thirteenth day of the month Adar, B.C. 160, in the beginning of the Julian year, 1 Mac. vii. 23—50; 2 Mac. xiv. 2—46; xv. 1—37.

Judas, having heard of the power, prowess, and policy of the Romans, how they had made extensive conquests in Spain, Macedon, and Asia, supported their friends, and humbled their enemies, took the opportunity of this respite to send an embassy to Rome, proposing an alliance with them, in order to be protected from the oppression of the Syrians. This, says Josephus,

* This is the simple account of the first book of Maccabees, and it is much more probable than the long detail of the second. The supposed reconciliation of Nicanor with Judas, "that he would not willingly have Judas out of his sight, for he loved the man from his heart," 2 Mac. xiv. 24, is inconsistent with his character, that he bore a deadly hate unto Israel, 1 Mac. vii. 26, and with his subsequent conduct.
was the first treaty between them and the Romans, who received their ambassadors graciously. The senate, according to their systematic scheme of subjugation, readily granting liberty to those who were under foreign dominion, that they might detach them from their rulers, and afterwards enslave them, when a fit opportunity offered. Accordingly, they made a defensive and offensive alliance with the Jews, and also wrote a letter to Demetrius, commanding him to desist from persecuting the Jews, and threatened him with war if he persisted. But before the ambassadors returned from Rome, (for it was a very great journey,) Judas was slain in a furious conflict with Bacchides and Alcimus, whom Demetrius had sent with the flower of his army to avenge the destruction of Nicanor and his host. For Judas, with desperate resolution, at the head of eight hundred men only, the rest having deserted him, charged the Syrian host, defeated the right wing, and pursued them to Azotus; but the left wing, being unbroken, pursued him closely in turn, and, after a most obstinate engagement, slew him, and the remnant of his men fled. Then Simon and Jonathan, his brothers, having made a truce, buried his body in the family sepulchre at Modin, in the neighbourhood, and all Israel mourned for him many days, saying, How is the valiant fallen that delivered Israel! 1 Macc. viii. 1—32; ix. 1—21.

Judas Maccabeus has been censured, as having taken a very improper step in courting the protection of the Romans, who were idolaters; a measure which was attended with fatal consequences to himself and his nation; for in consequence of this distrust in the Lord, who had hitherto so wonderfully protected him and his men, he was left to fight his own battle with disheartened troops; the Lord withholding the aid he expected from his new allies, which was altogether unnecessary while the Lord fought for Israel. See Mrs. Trimmer's Sacred History, Vol. IV. p. 352—355.

In vindication, however, of this heroic patriot, we may observe that he had devoted his life to the service of his country, according to his father's dying advice, "Be zealous for the law, and give your lives for the covenant of your fathers," 1 Mac. ii. 50.

* This is the reflection of Justin: A Demetrio cum defectissent Judaei, amicitia Romanorum petita, primi omnium ex Orientalibus libertatem receperunt: facile tunc Romanis de alieno largiendiibus, Lib. XXXVI. cap. 3.
And there were strong reasons for him to think that the time was now come for this sacrifice of himself:—1. His principal friends and steadiest supporters heretofore, the Assideans, had betrayed symptoms of disaffection, and were the foremost to seek peace with Bacchides, and to receive Alcimus as high-priest, whose enmity to him was notorious. 2. Immediately before the last battle, he was basely deserted by a great majority of his army of three thousand chosen men, who, if they had remained, would probably have defeated the left wing of the enemy, as easily as he, with eight hundred, defeated the right. His grief, indignation, and despair, indeed, are strongly depictured in his answer to his men advising a retreat:—God forbid that I should do this thing, and fly: IF OUR TIME BE COME, let us die manfully for our brethren, and let us not stain our honour*. This was not the language of a man “troubled in mind and sore dismayed,” “because danger presented itself to his view in all its horrors,” as inconclusively argued by Mrs. Trimmer, for danger he was inured to, and braved rather too rashly; but because “he was solicitous for his country's honour, and his own fame,” as she admits in the very next sentence. This, indeed, is a just interpretation of his answer, and the true explanation of his conduct. 3. The Jews were not prohibited by the law of Moses from forming alliances with foreign nations, provided they were beyond the pale of the devoted land of Canaan, and Joshua readily concluded a treaty with the Gibeonites, supposing them to be such, nor durst he break it, notwithstanding the imposition on their part. Even within the pale, David and Solomon made alliances with the Tyrians, and are not censured for so doing by the sacred historians. And now, in a case of the most imminent peril, when Judas was contending with the whole force of a mighty empire, bent on his destruction, was he not fully warranted, in self-defence, to seek succour from the most powerful nation at that time in the world? who had conquered Macedon, and humbled Syria and Egypt, and were then renowned for their “moderation, good government, obedience to their consuls, and freedom from envy and emulation;” according to the sacred historian, reciting his motives, without the slightest imputation on his conduct, which was afterwards wisely adopted and followed by his brothers, Jonathan and Simon.

* Dulce et decorum est pro patria mori. Hor.
The death of Judas was followed by a merciless persecution of his adherents, and "there was great affliction in Israel, such as was not since the time that a prophet was not seen among them," i.e. from Malachi's death. Whereupon they elected his youngest brother, the valiant Jonathan, to be their prince and leader, as the fittest to supply his place, 1 Mac. ix. 23—31.

Bacchides, hearing this, sought to slay Jonathan, but he and Simon, and his party, fled to the fens of Jordan, and sent off their goods and baggage, under the care of their eldest brother John, to a place of security among the Nabathean Arabs of the desert. But on the way thither, they were attacked by another Arab tribe, the Jambrians, who slew John and the escort, and plundered the baggage, for which Jonathan, soon after, inflicted a severe retaliation upon a bridal procession of the Jambrians, whom he attacked, and slew the greater part, and took their spoils. Upon this, Bacchides attacked them in their camp on the sabbath-day, but the Jews repulsed him, slew a thousand of his men, and then swam across the Jordan and escaped. Not venturing to pursue them, Bacchides returned to Jerusalem, and repaired several of the fortresses in Judea, strongly garrisoned the citadel, Bethsura and Gazara, took the sons of the principal Jews as hostages for their good behaviour, and confined them in the citadel; and after the sudden death of Alcimus, the high-priest, who was struck with a palsy while he was giving orders to pull down the walls of the sanctuary, which separated it from the outer court of the Gentiles, Bacchides returned to Syria that same year, B.C. 160, and molested the Jews no more for two years, 1 Mac. ix. 32—57.

But at the end of that time, the adverse faction, envying his tranquillity, framed a plot to surprise and seize Jonathan and his adherents in one night throughout the land, and prevailed on Bacchides to return with his army to carry it into effect.

* Josephus, by mistake, assigns the three years of the pontificate of Alcimus to Judas, Ant. XII. 11, 2, for Judas never was high-priest. But he tacitly corrects the mistake afterwards, Ant. XX. 9, in his catalogue of the high-priests, stating that Alcimus held the office three years, (instead of four years, in the former place, Ant. XII. 10, 6,) and that it was then vacant for seven years, until the appointment of Jonathan.
But Jonathan discovered it, and slew about fifty of the conspirators, and retreated with Simon and his friends to Bethbasi, in the wilderness, which they fortified. There they maintained a long siege against Bacchides, and finally defeated him; so that in his rage and disappointment he slew several of his unlucky advisers, and accepted proposals of peace from Jonathan, exchanged prisoners, and swore to molest him no more, and then returned into his own land, and came not any more unto their borders. Thus the sword ceased from Israel. We may date this peace, B.C. 156.

Jonathan now dwelt peaceably at Michmash, about nine miles north of Jerusalem, and a strong post; and began to govern the people according to the law, and to reform the state, by destroying the ungodly men, the apostates, out of Israel. 1 Mac. ix. 58—73.

Three years after, B.C. 153, a new competitor for the crown of Syria sprung up, Alexander Balas. This roused Demetrius from the shameful indolence and debauchery in which he indulged himself, living secluded in a strong castle near Antioch, and utterly neglecting the administration of the kingdom. Balas was the reputed son of Antiochus Epiphanes, but in reality an impostor of Rhodes, set up in opposition to Demetrius by the kings of Egypt and Pergamus, whom he had offended, and patronized by the Romans, who never forgave his flight from Rome, and assumption of the throne of his ancestors, without their consent; and now by a decree, empowered the impostor to raise forces for the recovery of the kingdom, with which he sailed to Ptolemais, secured that city, and was joined by numbers of the Syrians disaffected to Demetrius, 1 Mac. x. 1, 2.

This competition proved highly advantageous to Jonathan and the Jews, the rivals vying with each other who should purchase his assistance by honours and immunities. First Demetrius, by letter, appointed Jonathan his general in Judea, and empowered him to levy forces, and furnish them with arms, as auxiliaries, and restored the hostages in the citadel, whom Jonathan delivered to their parents. Then, quitting Michmash, he settled himself at Jerusalem, and recovered all the fortresses in Judea which Bacchides had garrisoned, the Syrians forsaking them, except the citadel and Bethsura, which still held out, they being garrisoned by apostate Jews, who had no other refuge. He also repaired the city, and rebuilt the walls of the
temple mount, which *Eupator* had thrown down, 1 Mac. x. 3—14.

On the other hand, *Balas*, who had assumed the title of *king*, under the name of *Alexander*, by letter also, appointed *Jonathan* high priest*, and sent him a purple robe and crown, as *Ethnarch*, or prince of *Judea*, to gain his friendship and assistance. So in the seventh month of that same year, B.C. 153, at the feast of tabernacles, *Jonathan* put on the holy robe of the high priest, and levied forces, and provided arms, x. 15—21.

Hearing this, *Demetrius* resolved to outbid *Alexander*, and offered *Jonathan* further immunities and rewards, a release from tributes, customs on salt, and crown taxes, and the addition of the three governments of *Apherema, Lydda*, and *Ramathem in Samaria*, and the government of *Galilee*, to that of *Judea*; the freedom of the holy city, and exemption of its borders from tenths and tributes; the restoration of all captives that had been carried out of the land of *Judea* from all parts of the kingdom of *Syria*, with remission of their tribute, and even of their cattle; and immunity and toleration for all the *Jews* within the realm to celebrate their festivals, sabbaths, new moons, and solemn days, without molestation or hindrance in these, or in any other respects; and in return, he required an enrollment of thirty thousand *Jews*, to be paid by the crown, and to serve in the garrisons and places of trust, with liberty to live according to their own laws. He also offered the sea port of *Ptolemais*, in *Palestine*, with its territory, as a free gift to the temple of *Jerusalem*, for the necessary expenses of the temple; and a remission of the five thousand shekels of silver, which had been annually paid to the king out of the revenues of the temple, because they appertained to the officiating priests; and to make the temple itself an asylum for debtors to the king, or for any other matter; and to pay the expenses of repairing and fortifying *Jerusalem*, and the temple mount, out of the royal treasury.

The list of these offered exemptions, immunities, and privileges, is curious: it demonstrates the greatness and extent of the oppressions and exactions of the *Syrian* government, respecting the *Jews*, throughout the empire; and it furnishes a sufficient excuse for *Jonathan* and the people, for rejecting them from

---

*This dignity continued in the *Asamonean* line till the usurpation of *Herod the Great*. It was conferred on *Jonathan*, after it had been seven years vacant from the death of *Alcimus*. Joseph. Antiq. xx. 9.*
the insincere Demetrius, and preferring the alliance of Alexander, x. 22—47.

Both kings having taken the field with their armies, next year, B.C. 152, Demetrius, who wanted neither courage nor conduct, when sober, gained the victory in the first battle; but Alexander, being supported by the confederate kings, and by the Romans, the next year, B.C. 151, fought a decisive battle, in which he defeated and slew Demetrius, x. 48—50. Justin, lib. xxxv. c. 2.

Alexander now sought Cleopatra in marriage, the daughter of his friend, Ptolemy Philometer, king of Egypt, whom he met, and married with great pomp, at Ptolemais; and there treated Jonathan, who had ably supported him in the war, with distinguished honours, ranking him among his chief friends, and making him a duke and partaker of his dominion, x. 51—66.

But Alexander, when established in the kingdom, fell into the same fatal excesses as his predecessor, took no care of the government, but left it solely to his favourite Ammonius, who slew Laodice *, the sister of Demetrius, and the unfortunate widow of Perseus, king of Macedon, and Antigonus, a remaining son of Demetrius; whose two other sons, Demetrius and Antiochus, had been sent during the war for security to Cnidus, in Crete.

When Ammonius had made Alexander and himself odious to the Syrians, in the third year of his reign, B.C. 148, young Demetrius came out of Crete, with a band of Cretans, whom Lasthenes, his friendly host, had hired; landed in Cilicia, and soon collected a great army to assert his right to the crown, and gained over to his interest Apollonius †, governor of Cæle Syria, whose first proof of attachment to his new master was the invasion of Judea, which adhered to Alexander; and having encamped at Janniah, on the sea coast, as we have seen, sent a challenge to Jonathan, to come down from the mountains, and fight him there in the level plain. Jonathan accepted the challenge, and with ten thousand men took Joppa in the sight of

* Among the Arundel marbles is an inscription to this queen, upon a statue erected to her. "The people of Delos erected this for queen Laodice, the daughter of king Seleucus, and wife of king Perseus, because of her virtue and piety to the temple, and her beneficence to the people of Delos." Prideaux, Vol. II. p. 116.

† Apollonius was one of the eight Syrian friends, with whom Demetrius had escaped from Rome, and now therefore naturally espoused the cause of his old master’s son.
the enemy, defeated them, pursued them to Azotus, which he took, and burnt the temple of Dagon, and slew with fire and sword nearly eight thousand men. For this essential service, Alexander sent Jonathan a gold buckle or clasp, such as was worn only by the royal family, and gave him Accaron, or Ekron, on the sea-coast, with the territory thereto belonging, x. 67—89.

Alexander, who had shut himself up in Antioch, now applied for succour to his friend and father-in-law, Ptolemy Philometor, who accordingly brought a considerable army and fleet to his assistance, B.C. 147, and entered Syria; but having discovered a plot formed to take away his life, by the wicked minister Ammonius, who was afraid that the king of Egypt came to conquer Syria for himself; and the infatuated Balas refusing to surrender his favourite to public justice, thereby making the crime his own; Ptolemy therefore, in resentment, took away his daughter Cleopatra, and offered her in marriage to Demetrius, the rightful heir of the crown, whose cause he now espoused. Demetrius thankfully accepted the offer; and the Greek citizens of Antioch, having mutinied against Ammonius, slew him, endeavouring to escape in the disguise of female apparel; and Balas avoided a similar fate by flight. The inhabitants of Antioch then offered the crown of Syria to the king of Egypt, whose character for justice and clemency, even to a fault, was well known; but he refused the offer, and recommended to them the lawful heir, saying, that the crown of Egypt was sufficient for him. And sound policy recommended the dictates of justice, for he would probably have drawn down upon himself the indignation of the Romans by uniting both kingdoms, and their invasion would have been coloured by the claim of his new son-in-law. The battle of Antioch, next year, decided the contest in favour of Demetrius II. Balas was defeated, and fled for shelter into Arabia, but his host Zabdiel sent his head to Ptolemy five days after the battle, who died himself the third day after, of the wounds he had received. The death of these two kings of Syria and Egypt in the same year, B.C. 146 *, forms a chronological character for adjusting the reigns of both, as in the foregoing tables of the first volume of this work.

This representation of the disinterested conduct of Ptolemy

* This year was remarkable for the destruction of the two cities of Carthage and Corinth by the Romans.
Philometor, and the provocation he received, is furnished by Josephus, Ant. XIII. 4, 6—8, and differs from that of the author of the history of the Maccabees, who represents Ptolemy as setting out with a deceitful design to get Alexander's kingdom, and join it to his own; that he slandered Alexander, in charging him with a design to slay him; and that when he entered Antioch, he set the two crowns of Syria and Egypt upon his own head. This account, written evidently by a partial friend of Alexander's, carries with it internal marks of misrepresentation; and thence, we may conclude, that Josephus, to whom it was well known, tacitly rejected it, 1 Mac. xi. 1—19.

Demetrius II. chose Lasthenes, the Cretan friend, with whom he had found an asylum, and whom he considered as "a father," 1 Mac. xi. 31, his prime minister. But Lasthenes, by his imprudence, or his inexperience for such an office, injured materially his master's interests. The first false step of the government was the massacre of the Egyptian soldiers, whom Ptolemy, his father-in-law, had left to assist in garrisoning the fortresses in the maritime towns, who, by the orders of Demetrius, were put to death by their Syrian associates; upon which, in disgust, the rest of the Egyptian army returned to Egypt, and would no longer support him. The next was, that in his security, thinking he had no other enemies to fear, he disbanded the greatest part of his army by a mischievous economy, retaining in his pay only his Cretan band, and some other mercenaries, thus depriving himself of the sheet anchors of his throne.

In the mean while, Jonathan availed himself of this respite, to besiege the citadel of Jerusalem, which had so long been a serious annoyance to him while in the hands of the Syrians and apostate Jews. Whereupon complaint having been made to Demetrius by some of the latter, he cited Jonathan to answer for his conduct before him at Ptolemais. Jonathan obeyed the summons, but left orders to prosecute the siege with vigour, and took with him divers rich presents for the king and his ministers, and so ingratiated himself into the favour of Demetrius, that he confirmed him in the high priesthood, and all his other honours, and ratified all the offers of his father, which Jonathan had declined when he preferred the friendship of Balas, xi. 19—38.

But the citadel still holding out, Jonathan applied to Demetrius to withdraw his garrisons from it, and from the other for-
tresses of Judea; which the king promised to do, provided Jonathan would send him a reinforcement, to quell the disturbances that broke out at Antioch, by his misconduct and cruelty, in persecuting his father's enemies, after he had disbanded and alienated his veteran troops. Accordingly, he sent three thousand Jews to Antioch; who, in a great insurrection, supported the king, and slew a hundred thousand of the citizens, and forced the rest to sue for peace; and then returned home loaded with honours and spoils. But Demetrius repaid the services of Jonathan with ingratitude; when he thought that the land was quiet, and that he had no further occasion for him. He broke his engagements at Ptolemais, demanded taxes, tribute, and tolls, as before, and threatened him with war, unless they were paid: whereby he alienated the Jews as much as the rest of his subjects, xi. 41—53.

At this juncture, Diodotus, afterwards called Tryphon, who had served Alexander Balas as governor of Antioch, and was therefore hostile to Demetrius, went into Arabia, and at length prevailed upon Zabdiel, who had murdered Alexander, and retained his son Antiochus in his hands, to send the young prince with him to lay claim to the crown of Syria. Whereupon all the disbanded soldiers and malcontents joined him, and in a pitched battle defeated Demetrius, took his elephants, and won Antioch, xi. 39—56.

As soon as Antiochus was crowned, under the title of Epiphanes, B.C. 144, he wrote to invite Jonathan to join him, offering him all the conditions which Demetrius had broken; and appointing his brother Simon lieutenant from the mountain between Tyre and Ptolemais, on the sea coast, called "the ladder of Tyre," unto the borders of Egypt. Jonathan accordingly espoused his cause, and by the assistance of the Syrian forces, expelled the hostile garrisons from Gaza, Bethsura, and Joppa; only the citadel at Jerusalem still held out for Demetrius, and maintained a long siege, xi. 57—62.

Jonathan now renewed the former alliance with the Romans, and made a league with the Lacedemonians, because the Jews and Lacedemonians were "brethren, both of the stock of Abraham," xii. 1—23.

Tryphon designing to remove the young king, Epiphanes, out of the way, in order to put the crown upon his own head, first invaded Jonathan, as the principal obstacle to his ambition.
But Jonathan advancing to meet him with an army of forty thousand chosen men, Tryphon did not venture an engagement, but under pretext of receiving him honourably, gave him gifts, and prevailed on him to disband the greater part of his men, assuring him that he came only with the design of putting him in possession of Ptolemais, and the rest of the stipulated fortresses. Jonathan was over-reached, and dismissing the rest, went, with a thousand men only to Ptolemais, where he was taken prisoner, and all his men slain, when they had entered the town peaceably; and not long after he was put to death by the perfidious Tryphon, who next slew his young master, and put on his blood-stained crown, B.C. 143, xii. 39—48, xiii. 1—31.

SIMON.

On the base capture of Jonathan, his brother Simon offered his services to his drooping countrymen: “Since all my brethren are slain for Israel’s sake, and I alone am left, far be it from me to spare my own life in any time of trouble, for I am no better than my brethren: doubtless I will avenge my nation and the sanctuary, and our wives and children; for all the heathen are gathered to destroy us of very malice.” Encouraged and animated by this generous offer, the people elected him their leader in the room of Jonathan, xiii. 1—9.

The first act of Simon was to repair the fortresses in Judea, and furnish them with provisions, in order to put the country in a posture of defence; the next was, notwithstanding the ill-treatment the Jews had received from Demetrius, (who after his defeat by Trypho, had abandoned himself to sloth and luxury at Laodicea,) yet preferring him to his perfidious rival, Simon sent respectfully to treat with him about a renewal of the former terms of accommodation; to which Demetrius gladly agreed, and confirmed them all; with an act of amnesty for all past offences. From this grant, the Jews date the independence of their country, and freedom from the Syrian yoke, B.C. 143; and thenceforth computed the times from this era of Simon’s reign, as high priest, and ethnarch, or prince of the Jews, instead of the era of Seleucidae, of Contracts, or of Alexander’s successors, as before, xiii. 33—42.

At his election, however, by the people, therewas a very remarkable reservation made on their part: that “the Jews and
priests were well pleased that Simon should be their governor and priest, [he and his sons] for ever; until there should arise a FAITHFUL PROPHET," or THE MESSIAH, xiv. 41.

The next care of Simon was to reduce the strong fortresses that still held out. He besieged Gaza, and when his men had scaled the walls, the inhabitants threw themselves upon his compassion: "Deal not with us according to our wickedness, but according to thy mercy;" whereupon he generously spared their lives, but for their idolatries made them evacuate the city. After which, the citadel at Jerusalem, which had been so long a thorn in the sides of the Maccabees and their friends, was compelled, by the rigorous blockade, and by famine, to surrender next year, B.C. 142, xiii. 43—51.

Finding his son John a valiant man, Simon made him captain-general of all his forces, and sent him to reside in Gazara, near Joppa, on the sea coast; while he made the temple mount at Jerusalem his own residence, which he strongly fortified. His palace, probably, stood on the site of the castle of Antonia afterwards, xiii. 52, 53.

In the third year of his reign, B.C. 141, Simon renewed the former alliance with the Romans and Lacedemonians, and sent a present to Rome of a great shield of gold, weighing 1000 mine, and worth, at the lowest computation, fifty thousand pounds sterling. This was accepted; the senate not only renewed the league, but sent letters also to Ptolemy, king of Egypt, Attalus, king of Pergamus, Ariarathes, king of Cappadocia, Demetrius, king of Syria, and Arsaces, king of Parthia, and to all the cities and states of Greece, Asia Minor, and the isles in alliance with them, to treat the Jews as their friends and allies; and to deliver up to Simon, the high-priest, all such traitors and fugitives, as should fly to them for protection, xiv. 24—27, xv. 15—24.

The same year Demetrius invaded, with a great army, the eastern provinces which had revolted, and was at first successful; but at last was surprised, and made prisoner by Arsaces, the founder of the Parthian empire. For his exploits in Hyrcania, during this war, John, the son of Simon, was surnamed Hyrcanus. During his captivity, Demetrius married the sister of the Parthian king; which gave such offence to his queen, Cleopatra, who had fled to Seleucia, for protection against the usurper Tryphon, with her two sons by Demetrius, that she offered the crown of Syria to his brother Antiochus, (afterwards called
Sidetes, from his passion for hunting,) on condition that he would marry her. He accepted her offer, and assumed the title of "king," and wrote a letter next year, B.C. 140, "from the isles of the sea," from Cyprus, his residence, where he had remained after his brother's accession, "to Simon the high-priest and ethnarch, (or prince of his nation,) and to the people of the Jews," announcing his intention of coming to recover his father's dominions from the usurper Tryphon; and to secure their assistance, confirmed all the grants of his father and of his brother, in their full extent, with the additional prerogative to Simon, of "coining money for his country with his own stamp.*" xv. 1—4.

The next, or fifth year of Simon's reign, B.C. 139, Antiochus "came into the land of his fathers," to attack Tryphon, who was deserted by most of his forces, so that few were left with him. He fled, therefore, to Dora from Antiochus, who besieged him there; and afterwards, by ship, to Orthosia, another maritime town of Phœnicia; and again, from thence, to Apamea, his native city, where he was taken, and put to death, as he most richly deserved, xv. 10—37. Joseph. Ant. XIII. 7, 2.

Elated with success, and forgetting the services of Simon and the Jews against his rival, Antiochus basely broke his engagements, reclaimed the citadel of Jerusalem, the strong cities of Joppa and Gazara, or a hundred talents in lieu of the two latter, and demanded five hundred talents for tribute and damages, otherwise, that he would make war against them; and he sent Cendebeus, with a powerful army, to invade Judea; but he was defeated by the Jews, under the conduct of Simon's two eldest sons, Judas and John, xv. 26—41, xvi. 1—10.

The peace, however, procured by this victory, was not permanent. In the year, B.C. 136, the venerable Simon, and two of his sons, Judas and Mattathias, were treacherously assassinated at an entertainment given by his own son-in-law, Ptolemy; who then sent a party to destroy John Hyrcanus also; but he

* A curious confirmation of this fact, is furnished by a genuine copper coin of Simon's, struck this very year; which was purchased by Dr. Kennicott, in the east, with the following inscription on the front, יאובא שָנַה יָעָדוּ "the fourth year;" and on the reverse, וְלָבָה יָעָדוּ שָנַה, "from the deliverance of Sion." The character is not Chaldee, (as here given,) but the ancient sacred character. An engraving of the coin, or medal, and of the inscription, is given in Kennicott's Observations on the first Book of Samuel, vi. 19. Oxford, 1786, p. 49. The letter Thau, which twice occurs, is represented by "the mark X, or sign of the cross:" excellently explaining the vision of Ezekiel, ix. 4—6.
escaped, and fled to Jerusalem; where the people elected him in his father's room, and shut their gates against the wicked and ambitious Ptolemy, who thought to have secured the crown for himself. Disappointed in this, he wrote to Antiochus for an army to assist him in reducing the country and cities again under the Syrian dominion, 1 Mac. xvi. 12—22. Joseph. Ant. XIII. 7, 4.

JOHN HYRCANUS.

As soon as Hyrcanus had performed the necessary sacrifices upon his appointment to the pontificate, he marched on an expedition against Ptolemy, and besieged him in a fortress near Jericho, to which he had fled; but the siege being protracted till the next year, B.C. 135, which was a sabbatical year*, it was broke up, probably for want of provisions; and Ptolemy fled to Zeno, tyrant of Philadelphia, and waited there till Antiochus should arrive. What became of him afterwards is uncertain, for no further mention of him is made by Josephus. Though Antiochus might have liked the treason, he must have hated and abhorred the traitor. And how could he trust an ungrateful viper, who had stung his best friend and benefactor to death? Ant. XIII. 8, 1.

Shortly after, Antiochus marched with a great army into Judea, and having ravaged the country, besieged Hyrcanus in Jerusalem, and reduced him to the last extremity, for want of provisions that year. On the approach of the feast of tabernacles, in the seventh month, about autumn, Hyrcanus applied to the king for a week's truce, during the celebration of the feast; which he not only granted, but supplied him with victims for sacrifice, and at length concluded a peace with the Jewish nation, when he had it in his power to have extirpated them, and was importuned so to do, but generously refused. However, he again reduced them under the Syrian dominion, dismantled

---

* The year B.C. 163, was proved in a former note to be sabbatical; consequently, B.C. 135, which was twenty-eight years after, (or 4 x 7,) was also sabbatical. This fixes the accession of Hyrcanus, to the year before, B.C. 136; and corrects a mistake now in Josephus, who dates the invasion of Judea by Antiochus, in the 162d Olympiad; whereas, the year B.C. 135, in which it happened, was the second year of the 161st Olympiad. And this, probably, was the correct reading, according to Petit's conjecture. See Hudson's Note (b), p. 582.
Jerusalem, and made them pay a tribute for Joppa and the other towns, which they held under the grants of his predecessors.

Four years after, B.C. 181, Antiochus Sidetes marched with a great army against Phraates, king of Parthia, under pretence of liberating his brother Demetrius Nicator from captivity, and was accompanied in the expedition by Hyrcanus, prince of the Jews; who returned home at the end of the year, leaving Antiochus victorious over the Parthians in three battles, which put him in possession of Babylonia, Media, and all the revolted provinces, and confined Phraates within the original limits of the Parthian kingdom. But while the Syrian army was dispersed in winter quarters, the Parthians, assisted by the natives, who had been grievously oppressed by the enemy, conspired against them, and massacred them all in one day, and slew Antiochus himself, so that scarcely a man escaped to carry back the news of the catastrophe to Syria.

Upon this signal success, Phraates sent to apprehend Demetrius, whom he had released and sent back to Syria, in order to create a diversion, after having been thrice vanquished in the former campaign; but Demetrius had made such haste, that he escaped the pursuit, and again recovered his crown, B.C. 130.

After the death of Antiochus, Hyrcanus took advantage of the divisions and disturbances that ensued through the whole Syrian empire, not only to enlarge his territories, by seizing Madeba, Samega, and several other places in Syria, Phœnicia, and Arabia, and annexing them to his dominions; but also to render himself totally independent. For after this, neither he nor his descendants, paid any more tribute, service, or homage, to the kings of Syria.

Hyrcanus next invaded Samaria, and took Shechem, the chief seat of the sect of the Samaritans, and destroyed their temple on Mount Gerizim, which had been built by Sanballat. However, they still continued to have an altar there, on which they offer sacrifices according to the Levitical law, even to this day. See Prideaux Connex. B.C. 130.

After this, B.C. 129, Hyrcanus subdued the Idumeans, and gave them the choice either to embrace the Jewish religion, or else to quit the country, and seek a settlement elsewhere. Chusing, therefore, to relinquish their idolatry rather than their country, they became proselytes to the Jewish religion, and were then afterward incorporated with the Jews, so as to be
reputed one and the same people; and at length, the name itself was lost, or absorbed in that of the Jews. The later Rabbis, indeed, speak of Edom and Edomites long after, but they mean thereby, not the Idumeans, but Rome, and the Christians of the Roman empire, under these feigned names of reproach, for fear of incurring the displeasure or punishment of the Christian states in which they live.

About B.C. 128, Hyrcanus sent an embassy to Rome, to renew the league made with the Romans by his father Simon; to which the senate readily consented, and decreed that the peace which they had been compelled to make with Antiochus Sidetes, should be null and void; that Hyrcanus should hold Gazara, Joppa, and the other places, free of tribute or homage to the Syrians; and that the Syrian kings in future should not presume to march their armies through the Jewish territories; and that ambassadors should be sent to see all this executed. The Jewish ambassadors were also furnished with money to bear their expenses home, and letters were written to all the Roman allies and confederates in their way, to give them a safe and honourable passage through their respective countries. In return for this, the Jews sent another embassy to Rome next year, with a present of a cup and shield of gold, valued at fifty thousand gold pieces of their money; when another decree was passed by the senate, confirming the former. Josephus, who recites this decree at large, Ant. xiv. 16, by mistake, supposes it was granted to Hyrcanus the second, the grandson of John Hyrcanus. But this cannot be, for the decree is dated in "the ninth year of Hyrcanus," and one of the ambassadors, "Numenius, the son of Antiochus," mentioned in the body of the decree, had been sent to Rome on the former embassy by Jonathan; but could not be alive in the reign of Hyrcanus the second. See Prideaux Connexions, B.C. 127.

Demetrius, after his restoration, having, by his tyranny, rendered himself odious to the Syrians, many of them revolted from him, and joined an impostor, supported by Physcon, king of Egypt, as the son of Alexander Balas, who called himself Alexander Zebina, but was in reality the son of a broker at Alexandria. A battle was fought, in which Demetrius was defeated, and soon after slain, B.C. 126. To secure his conquest, Zebina made a strict alliance with John Hyrcanus, who took all the advantages of these divisions, that might justly be expected
from a wise prince, attentive to the interests of his people, and his own security.

During the divisions and distractions that henceforth harassed and weakened the Syrian empire, John Hyrcanus increased in wealth and power; and about the year B.C. 110, undertook the entire reduction of Samaria, and sent his two sons, Aristobulus and Antigonus, to besiege the city, who took it next year, and totally demolished it. After this victory, Hyrcanus became master of all Judea, Galilee, and Samaria, and of several other places in the adjacent countries; and raised the glory of the Asamonean princes to its height; and spent the remainder of his reign respected by his neighbours, and free from foreign wars.

In the latter end of his reign, he discovered the symptoms of disaffection in the Pharisees, a proud and turbulent sect among the Jews, who boasted of superior sanctity, and derived their name from the Hebrew verb parash, to "separate or set apart" for sacred uses; and envied the prosperity of Hyrcanus. Upon which he quitted their sect, and attached himself to that of the Sadducees; who probably, at that time, went no further than to deny the authority of the oral or unwritten traditions, of which the Pharisees were too fond, and for which they were afterwards reproached by our Lord himself, as "rendering the law of no effect by their vain traditions," Matt. xv. 6. For it is not to be imagined, that so pious and good a prince could have denied the resurrection and a future judgment. To the Pharisees, who courted popularity, may justly be ascribed the declension, and at length, the downfall of the state, by their continual opposition to their own princes, and afterwards to the Romans.

After he had reigned thirty years, Hyrcanus died. In addition to the government and pontificate, according to Josephus, he was gifted with prophecy, and foretold that his two eldest sons would not long reign; which was verified by the event. Ant. XIII. 10, 7.

ARISTOBULUS,

his eldest son, succeeded him. He first assumed the ominous title of king, which by their law was appropriated to the Messiah; for whose rights a reservation was made by the people, as we have seen, when they elected Simon their ethnarch, or prince, 1 Mac. xiv. 41. He next imprisoned his mother, whom Hyrcanus had left in possession of the government, and starved
her to death; and then killed his next brother, Antigonus, who
reigned jointly with him, upon a false suspicion of seeking his
death. Finding his error, he fell sick and died, after a reign of
only one year. Ant. XIII. 11.

ALEXANDER JANNAEUS.

He was the third son of Hyrcanus, and succeeded his bro-
ther, B.C. 105. His first act was an attempt to recover the
important sea-port of Ptolemais, which he besieged. But the
inhabitants having applied for succour to Ptolemy Lathyrus,
then reigning in Cyprus, who came to their assistance with a
great army, he was forced to raise the siege; and Alexander
having endeavoured to circumvent Ptolemy in a treaty of peace,
while he was underhand treating with Cleopatra, queen of Egypt,
his mother and his rival, Ptolemy, provoked at this duplicity of
conduct, invaded the territories of Alexander, defeated him in a
pitched battle, in which he lost 30,000 men, overran the whole
country, ravaging and destroying it in a grievous manner, and
Alexander must have been undone, had not Cleopatra brought
an army to his relief next year; which compelled Ptolemy to
retreat from his territories, and at length, Ptolemy, being suc-
cessfully opposed by his mother, returned to Cyprus in B.C. 101,
foiled in all his attempts to recover the crown of Egypt out of
her wicked and ambitious hands.

Alexander availed himself of this riddance, to recover several
of the fortresses on his frontiers, which had been taken from him,
or had revolted. But at the siege of Amathus, beyond Jordan,
and the strongest in all those parts, he was surprized and de-
deated, with the loss of 10,000 men, by the prince of Philadel-
phia, whose treasures were deposited there, and sent back, with
loss and disgrace, to Jerusalem. This was highly gratifying to
the faction of the Pharisees, who alienated the affections of the
people, and stirred up a bloody intestine war against him during
the greater part of his turbulent reign.

This first broke out B.C. 95, in the eleventh year of his reign.
Having entered the temple at Jerusalem, to officiate as high
priest in the feast of tabernacles, he was insulted by the popu-
lace, and pelted with citrons while he was offering sacrifices
upon the great altar; to which they added opprobrious language,
intimating him to be unworthy of that sacred office. This so
enraged him, that he fell upon them with his guards, and slew six thousand of them. And to prevent the like insult, he enclosed the priest's court, which contained the altar and sanctuary, with a wooden partition, excluding the approach of the people; and for the safety of his person, he employed a guard of six thousand foreign mercenaries, and endeavoured by severity, and the terror of his executions, to allay the storm that had been raised against him by the adverse faction; but he could not quell it by such methods. And three years after, in consequence of a great defeat he received from Obodas, an Arabian king, in Gaulonitis, on the eastern side of the lake of Gennesaret, the Jews broke out into open rebellion for six years, in which, though he repeatedly defeated them, he could not subdue their refractory spirit. Wearied at length, with punishing and destroying his people, he sought an accommodation, and offered to grant them any reasonable conditions they chose. With one voice, they desired him to cut his throat, for they could be at peace with him on no other terms; and that considering the great mischiefs he had done them, it were well that they could be reconciled to him, even in his grave. They then sent for succours to Demetrius Euchares, king of Damascus, who brought a powerful army to their assistance, and overthrew Alexander, with the loss of all his Greek mercenaries to a man, B.C. 89; and he would have been utterly ruined, had not six thousand of the Jews themselves, compassionating his distress, revolted from the Syrians, and joined him. Being a man of most undaunted spirit, and possessing great resources in himself, he continued the war with his own people after the departure of the Syrians, and at length he defeated them with great slaughter, and shut up the remainder in Bethome, which he besieged and took the year after, B.C. 86. On this occasion he was guilty of a most barbarous act of cruelty, which got him the appellation of Thracidas, "the Thracian." He brought eight hundred of the prisoners to Jerusalem, and there crucified them all in one day, and put their wives and children to death before their faces, as they hung dying on the crosses; while he, his wives and concubines, were feasting in view of the horrid scene, to glut their eyes with the spectacle! After this, Alexander had no more disturbance; the rebels who survived flying the country; after he had destroyed above fifty thousand of them in the course of the war.

After this, he spent three years in recovering fortresses, which
had revolted during the civil war, and extended his conquests beyond Jordan. He returned to Jerusalem victorious in B.C. 82, and gave himself up to luxury and drunkenness, which brought on a quartan ague, under which he languished for three years, and at length died at the siege of Ragaba, beyond Jordan, in the country of the Gerasenes.

In his last moments he advised Alexandra his queen, to conceal his death, until the capture of the fortress, and then on their triumphant return to Jerusalem, he recommended her to convene the heads of the Pharisees, and offer to be guided by their counsels in the administration of the kingdom; and to lay his dead body before them, and resign it wholly to their discretion, whether to treat it with ignominy, in revenge for all the evils they had suffered from him, or otherwise; adding, that if she followed this advice, she would not only procure him an honourable funeral, but security for herself and her children. And the event justified the prediction: for his funeral obsequies were more splendid than those of any of his predecessors; and Alexandra, according to his will, was quietly established in the government, B.C. 78.

Q. ALEXANDRA.

And now the Pharisees, having gotten the upper hand in the state, released the prisoners, and recalled the exiles of their party, and being strengthened by this accession, they demanded justice against the advisers of the crucifixion of the eight hundred; which in fact involved all the adherents of the late king. They began with Diogenes, a chief confident of Alexander, and having cut him off, proceeded to the most obnoxious of the royalists. The queen, much against her will, acquiescing in their vindictive measures, for fear of involving the country again in a civil war; and submitting to a less evil, in order to avoid a greater.

Alexandra had two sons; the elder, Hyrcanus, who was of a quiet, indolent temper, she appointed high priest; but the younger, Aristobulus, inherited his father's spirit, and highly disapproved of his mother's proceedings. In the seventh year of her reign, B.C. 72, he came to her at the head of the royalists, seeing no end of the prosecutions, and proposed, either that they should go into voluntary exile; or else, that they might be
dispersed through the several garrisons of the kingdom, in order to avoid the fury of their enemies. The queen agreed to the latter proposal, and put them in possession of the fortresses, except Hyrcania, Alexandrium, and Machera, where she kept her treasures.

Next year she sent Aristobulus with an army to attack Ptolemy Meneus, at Damascus; but he returned without doing any thing memorable in the expedition; only making use of this opportunity to secure the army in his interest.

The following year, B.C. 70, she was threatened with a formidable invasion by Tigranes, king of Armenia; to whom the Syrians, harassed by the perpetual competitions of the different royal families for the crown, had voluntarily surrendered it, B.C. 84, and put themselves under his protection. From this danger she was relieved by the Roman invasion of Armenia, which took place shortly before her death, next year, B.C. 69.

HYRCANUS II.

After her death, Hyrcanus took possession of the throne. The year of his accession is doubly determined by Josephus, Ant. XIV. 1, 2, as the third year of the 177th Olympiad, which ended in the Julian year, B.C. 69; the same year in which Q. Hortensius and Q. Metellus Creticus, were consuls at Rome. This, therefore, is a useful character for adjusting the chronology of this period. But his reign was short, only three months; for his brother, Aristobulus, having got most of the fortresses of the kingdom into his hands, during his mother's sickness, and the people being weary of the tyranny of the Pharisees, and fearing their ascendancy over the weak Hyrcanus, joined Aristobulus, and the army of Hyrcanus deserting him, he was forced to surrender the crown and pontificate to his brother, and willingly agreed to lead a private life under his protection. "So Aristobulus went to the palace, and Hyrcanus to the house of Aristobulus," as Josephus relates.

ARISTOBULUS II.

Antipater, the father of Herod the Great, an Idumean, whose name originally was Antipas, was much in the confidence of
Alexander Janneus, and his wife Alexandra, and had been appointed by them governor of the province of Idumæa. He had amassed considerable wealth, and formed a connexion with the Arabs in the east, and the Gazites and Ascalonites in the west. Fearing Aristobulus, he instigated Hyrcanus, to whom he had attached himself, to fly for refuge to Aretas, king of the Arabs, for that his brother meant to put him to death; and with much solicitation prevailed on him at length to escape by night to Petra, the residence of Aretas. Espousing the interest of Hyrcanus, the Arabian prince brought him back to Judea, with an army of fifty thousand men; and being there joined by the Jews of his party, gave battle to Aristobulus, defeated him, and compelled him and his party to take refuge in the temple mount, and besieged him there.

While Pompey, who succeeded Lucullus in the command of the war against Tigranes, was employed in Armenia against him and Mithridates, he sent Scaurus into Syria; who finding that Lollius and Metellus had taken Damascus, marched directly to Judea. The two brothers having separately attempted to gain him to their side, by the offer of four hundred talents each; he preferred that of Aristobulus, not only because he was more solvent, being in possession of the royal treasures, while Hyrcanus was poor, but because it was easier to intimidate the fugitives with their Arabian auxiliaries, than to reduce a fortress of the greatest strength. He therefore commanded Aretas to withdraw his troops, threatening him with war from the Romans if he refused. After which Scaurus returned to Damascus. Meanwhile Aristobulus, having raised a powerful force, invaded Aretas and Hyrcanus in turn, and defeated them with great slaughter; among others of the Jews attached to Hyrcanus, who fell in that battle, was Caephalion, the brother of Antipater.

Not long after the conquest of Armenia and Iberia, Pompey having finished the war in the north, B.C. 65, came to Damascus, and went through Coele-Syria; and stripping Antiochus Asiaticus of all his dominions, (the last of the Seleucian family,) he reduced them to a Roman province, under the pretext that he was a weak prince, and unable to protect the country from the ravages and depredations of the Jews and Arabs; and that the Romans having taken this country, by conquest, from Tigranes, were not to lose the fruits of their victory. Here Pompey was met by ambassadors from all Syria, Egypt, and Judea; and
Aristobulus sent him a golden vine, of the value of 400 talents; which Strabo afterwards saw in the capitol at Rome with the inscription, Alexander the king of the Jews, which he had presented as an offering to the temple, and his son now sent to the Romans.

Pompey, on his return next year, B.C. 64, from the Mithridatic war in Pontus and Cappadocia, to Coele-Syria, was addressed by Antipater and Nicodemus, the deputies of the two brothers, Hyrcanus and Aristobulus, to settle the controversy between them; but he put them off till the ensuing spring, in order to finish the conquest of Syria, and repress Aretas, who had taken advantage of his absence in Pontus, to recover a good part of his dominions, and to make incursions into Syria. Accordingly, next year, B.C. 63, on his return to Damascus, the two brothers came in person to plead their cause before him; several of the Jews complaining of both, that they had changed the form of government to regal, instead of pontifical, contrary to the established usage, in order to enslave the people. Hyrcanus pleaded his prior claim to the crown, as the elder brother, and complained of the usurpation of Aristobulus; while Aristobulus alleged the imbecility of Hyrcanus. This last circumstance, probably, decided the artful Roman in favour of Hyrcanus; he did not, however, openly declare his sentiments, but left the matter undecided, till he should have leisure to come in person, and settle the matter at Jerusalem.

Disappointed in his expectations, Aristobulus prepared for war. Pompey, therefore, on his return from an expedition against the Nabathean Arabs, marched against Aristobulus, and summoned him into his presence from his strong fortress of Alexandrium. Aristobulus unwillingly complied, for fear of irritating the Roman general by a refusal, who, when he had got him into his power, compelled him to sign an order for the surrendering of all his fortresses to the Romans. But he grievously resented this imposition, and when he was dismissed, fled to Jerusalem, and there prepared for a siege. Pompey followed him with his army. On his approach, Aristobulus, wavering in his resolution, went again to Pompey, promising submission and a sum of money to prevent a war. His proposal was accepted, and Gabinius, one of Pompey's lieutenants, was sent with a body of troops to recover the city and the money. But when he came to Jerusalem, he was disappointed; the gates were
shut against him, and no money to be had, because the soldiers of Aristobulus would not agree thereto, indignant at his detention. Whereupon Pompey marched directly, with his whole army, to Jerusalem, keeping Aristobulus in custody, and being admitted into the city and palace by the faction of Hyrcanus, he besieged the adherents of his brother in the Temple Mount, and at length, after three months' siege, took it by assault, in the first year of the 179th Olympiad, ending B.C. 63, the same year in which C. Antonius and M. Tullius Cicero were consuls, which ascertains the year of its capture, and of the commencement of the Roman dynasty in Judea. Ant. XIV. 4, 3.

On this occasion Pompey was guilty of violating the sanctity of the Temple. For not content with viewing the outer court, he, with his principal officers, by a sacrilegious curiosity, entered into the inner Sanctuary, or Holy of Holies. And here, it has been remarked, his prosperity ended. He was ever after unsuccessful in all his undertakings, as if to punish him for this act of sacrilege against the Lord. And this the Jews resented more than their sufferings. However, he spared the sacred treasury, in which there were above 2000 talents, besides the sacred utensils, and other articles of great value, and left them for the sacred uses to which they had been devoted. The next day he restored Hyrcanus to the pontificate, and made him prince of the country, and tributary to the Romans, but forbade him to wear a crown, and dismantled the walls of Jerusalem. And he took with him Aristobulus and his two sons, Alexander and Antigonus, and two of his daughters, to grace his triumph at Rome.

HYRCANUS II. again.

From the first accession of Hyrcanus, B.C. 69, to his restoration, B.C. 63, was an interval of six years and nine months, being the amount of his first reign of three months, and his brother's of six years and six months *.

* This is the rectification of a double error in the present text of Josephus, dating the reign of Aristobulus "three years and six months," Ant. XIV. 6, 1; but "three years and as many months," Ant. XX. 9. That it must have been six years at least is demonstrated by Josephus himself, both from the Olympiads and Consuls above-mentioned; and as the "six months" are specified in the former passage, and in the latter are said to be "as many" as the years, the two passages correct each other, and furnish six, the true number of years.
The reign of this meek and quiet prince, who was unfit to guide the helm of the state in such tempestuous times, was disastrous throughout.

While Pompey was returning to Rome with his royal captives, Alexander, the eldest son of Aristobulus, contrived to escape on the way, and returning to Judea, created fresh disturbances. In the year B.C. 57, he collected an army of ten thousand foot and fifteen hundred horse, and seized Alexandrium, Machærus, Hyrcania, and several other strong fortresses, and garrisoned them, and from thence ravaged the whole country. Hyrcanus was not in a condition to suppress him, and wished to have rebuilt the walls of Jerusalem, but the Romans, in their jealousy, not permitting this, he was forced to call upon them for succour. Accordingly, Gabinius, president of Syria, sent Mark Anthony, his general of horse to his relief, who being joined by Antipater and Malichus, with the forces of Hyrcanus, defeated Alexander near Jerusalem, with the loss of three thousand men, and shut him up in Alexandrium, and besieged him there. But by the prudent mediation of his mother, Gabinius concluded a peace with him, on condition of his surrendering Alexandrium, and the other fortresses, which were demolished by the advice of this lady, that they might not give occasion to future revolts.

To please the Jews, Gabinius, at this time, made a change in the government of Judea, from regal to aristocratical. Hitherto the administration of public affairs had been managed under the prince, by the two sanhedrims, or councils, or courts of justice; the lesser, consisting of twenty-three persons, was instituted in every city; each of these lesser was subject to the jurisdiction and controul of the great sanhedrim of seventy-two members, sitting at Jerusalem. Gabinius suppressed both, and in their room appointed five independent tribunals, at Jerusalem, Jericho, Gadara, Amathus, and Sephoris, and invested each with power to administer summary justice to all the inhabitants within their respective districts. This threw the whole power into the hands of the nobles of the land, who presided in these courts, leaving Hyrcanus only the name.

But ten years after, Julius Caesar, on his passing through Syria, after the Alexandrian war, in gratitude for the effectual assistance he had received from Antipater, the general of Hyrcanus, reinstated Hyrcanus in the Principality, restored the an-
cient form of government, and appointed *Antipater* procurator of *Syria* and *Judea*.

*Gabinius* was succeeded in the government of *Syria* by *Crassus*, B.C. 54, who, to make preparation for the *Parthian* war, which he meditated, plundered the Temple at *Jerusalem* of all the treasures which *Pompey* had respected, and of every thing else worth taking, and carried off to the amount of ten thousand talents, or about two millions sterling. But this sacrilegious plunder proved the prelude to his ruin; for having invaded the *Parthian* territories without provocation, and when the *Parthians* were unprepared for war, he overran a great part of *Mesopotamia* without opposition. But the next year, B.C. 53, the *Parthians* encountered him, and by his own misconduct principally, in listening to traitors, and neglecting the advice of *Cassius* and his best friends, was defeated with great slaughter, and himself and his son killed, near *Charra*, the site of the ancient *Charran*, in the days of the *Patriarchs*, in the north-west quarter of *Mesopotamia*.

*Cassius*, having escaped to *Syria*, collected an army there, and defended that province successfully against the *Parthians*, who invaded it next year, B.C. 52. He then marched into *Judea*, and forced *Alexander*, the son of *Aristobulus*, who was raising fresh disturbances, on the news of the defeat of *Crassus*, to terms of peace.

*Aristobulus*, two years before, had found means to escape, with his younger son *Antigonus*, from captivity at *Rome*, and returning to *Judea*, excited a revolt; but by the activity of *Mark Anthony*, and the troops sent against him by *Gabinius*, was defeated, taken with his son, and sent back again to his former prison. *Gabinius*, however, having represented the services of his wife in suppressing *Alexander's* insurrection, his family was set at liberty, and he only kept in custody. But in the civil war which broke out between *Cæsar* and *Pompey*, *Cæsar*, thinking it would promote his interest, released *Aristobulus* out of prison, and sent him with two legions into his own country to reclaim the crown. But *Pompey's* party contrived to poison him on the way, B.C. 49. And *Alexander*, his son, in expectation of his arrival, having raised forces, *Pompey* sent orders to *Scipio*, his father-in-law, whom he had appointed president of *Syria* in the room of *Bibulus*, to put him to death, who had him taken, brought to *Antioch*, and, after a formal trial, beheaded.
Two years after, Antigonus, the surviving son, applied to Julius Caesar, on his return from the Alexandrian war, to be restored to his father's Principality, stating the calamities that had befallen his family for their adherence to his cause. But Caesar, from regard to Antipater, who then attended him, rejected his petition, and treated him as turbulent and seditious, B.C. 47.

Antipater had now great credit with the Romans, and influence at home, and in fact governed Hyrcanus. He appointed Phasaelis, his eldest son, to be governor of Jerusalem, and Herod, his second, governor of Galilee, when he was at least twenty-five years old*, and took a progress with Hyrcanus, through Judea, to settle the affairs of the kingdom. Bell. Jud. I. 10, 1—4.

Herod having exerted himself with great spirit and activity in clearing his province of robbers, or banditti, and put Hezekiah, their leader, and several of his associates, to death, by his own authority, without any formal trial, excited the envy and jealousy of several of the leading Jews; who forced Hyrcanus to summon him to appear before the sanhedrim, to answer for his conduct. Herod attended the summons, and came clothed in purple, and with a numerous retinue, and brought a letter from Sextus Caesar, then president of Syria, to Hyrcanus, with express orders to acquit him, under pain of incurring his highest displeasure, which Hyrcanus was sufficiently inclined to do without this mandate. All this, however, so intimidated his accusers and the sanhedrim, that they all sat silent; until Santeas, a man of great wisdom and integrity, had at length the courage to arraign him, not only for the crime imputed to him, but also for his arrogance and presumption in daring to appear before them, not as a criminal, but as their superior. And he predicted, that this Herod, whom they now iniquitously spared, would execute the just judgment of God upon them all, which afterward came to pass; for Herod afterwards put Hyrcanus and the whole sanhedrim to death, except Pollio and Sameas, whom he spared for recommending the surrender of the city to

* The present text of Josephus reckons Herod's age only fifteen years at this time, Ant. XIV. 9, 2. But he was seventy at his death, B.C. 4, and consequently was born B.C. 74, from which subtracting 15, we should have the date of this appointment B.C. 59, considerably too early. If it was B.C. 47, as we may collect from the history, he was rather 27 years old.
Herod and Sosius; because "the crimes of the people were such that they could not escape him." Ant. XIV. 9, 4.

On this occasion, however, Hyrcanus, seeing the sanhedrim provoked against Herod, adjourned the court till next day, and advised him to fly from the city that night, which he did, to Damascus; and was with difficulty dissuaded by his father and brother from marching with an army to Jerusalem, to avenge the insult he had received, in being summoned to clear himself before the sanhedrim.

After Julius Caesar's return from the African war, in which he subdued the remains of Pompey's party, B.C. 44, when he entered on his fifth and last consulship, Hyrcanus sent an embassy to him, for permission to repair the walls and fortifications of Jerusalem. Caesar not only granted this request, which Antipater immediately executed; but by a decree, confirmed Hyrcanus in his prerogatives of high-priest and ethnarch; and remitted the annual tribute to be paid to the Romans every seventh or sabbatical year; and granted such further privileges and immunities to the Jews, throughout the empire, that they could hardly be said to feel the weight of the Roman yoke.

But this happy state was of short continuance.

The assassination of Sextus Caesar in Syria, by Bassus, and of Caesar himself at Rome, by Brutus, Cassius, and their confederates, rekindled the flames of war. Cassius soon seized and secured the province of Syria, and was forced to levy heavy contributions there, for the support of an army of twelve legions, which he had raised. He assessed Judea in 700 talents; of which Antipater commissioned his sons, Phasaelus and Herod, to raise the one half, and Malichus, a Jew, (one of the principal supporters of Hyrcanus,) and some others, to raise the remainder. Herod ingratiated himself with Cassius, by the speedy payment of his quota; but Malichus, being dilatory, Cassius would have put him to death, had not Hyrcanus redeemed him at the expense of a hundred talents, which he sent him out of his own coffers.

Malichus, and the heads of the Jewish nation, jealous that an Idumæan, and a foreigner, as they accounted him, should govern the state, plotted to destroy him and his whole family. Soon after he poisoned Antipater with a glass of wine, which he prevailed on the high-priest's butler to give him at an entertainment in the palace. Phasael and Herod, in turn, revenged
this, by procuring the assassination of Malichus, by a party of the Roman garrison at Tyre, in obedience to the orders of Cassius, which Herod procured.

After the defeat and death of Cassius and Brutus at Philippi, B.C. 42, by Antony and Octavius, the troubles broke out afresh in Judea. The faction of Malichus gained Hyrcanus to their side, and Felix, the commander of the Roman forces at Jerusalem, by representing the overgrown power of the sons of Antipater. But Phasael and Herod soon mastered the faction, drove Felix out of Jerusalem, and recovered Massada, and all the fortresses that they had taken; and upbraided Hyrcanus with favouring the adverse faction, who had always strove to curb his power, while he owed his support to the wise and vigorous counsels of their father Antipater. Hyrcanus judged it imprudent to oppose "these sons of Zeruiah," who controlled him as much as David was controlled by Joab and Abishai. And a match was set on foot between Herod and Miriam, or Mariamne, the beautiful and accomplished grand-daughter of the high-priest, which for the present reconciled all differences between them.

But the adverse faction, though repressed, was not extinguished. It soon found another head in Antigonus, the younger son of Aristobulus, and under pretence of restoring him to his father's throne, raised new disturbances in the state. And his claim was supported by Marion, king of Tyre, Fabius, governor of Damascus, and Ptolemy, prince of Chalcis, who had married a sister of Antigonus.

The next year, B.C. 41, after the victory at Philippi, Antony passed over into Asia, to secure that important country in the interest of the conquerors. At Daphne, near Antioch, a deputation of a hundred of the principal Jews came to complain against the sons of Antipater. Antony gave them a hearing, and asked Hyrcanus, then present, whom he thought the fittest to conduct the administration of affairs under them? to which he replied, the two brothers; induced, probably, by the contract of marriage between Herod and his grand-daughter. Whereupon Antony, who was well disposed towards them before, made Herod and Phasael Tetrarchs, committed the affairs of Judea to their administration, imprisoned fifteen of the deputies, and would have put them to death, had not Herod saved them by his intercession. Still not baffled, they renewed their complaints to him against the two brothers at Tyre, in a body
of a thousand deputies. But Anthony, considering this as an insult, and a tumult, ordered his soldiers to disperse them, who slew several, and wounded more.

No sooner had Herod weathered this storm, than he assayed another, more dangerous to encounter. The following year, B.C. 40, the Parthian general, Pacorus, who had taken Sidon and Ptolemais, was induced to undertake to restore Antigonus to his father's kingdom, for the promise of a thousand talents, and five hundred Jewish women. Accordingly, he sent a part of his forces, under his cup-bearer, called also Pacorus, to see the contract put in execution. After frequent engagements with the two brothers, in which the Antigonians were rather worsted, finding they could not prevail by force, they had recourse to fraud. The cup-bearer proposed to Phasael to go on an embassy to Barzaphanes, who governed Syria under Pacorus, as the best mode of settling their differences. Contrary to Herod's advice, Phasael went, and took Hyrcanus with him; but the treacherous Parthian seized them both, and put them in chains, while the cup-bearer endeavoured to entrap Herod at Jerusalem. But he, having timely intelligence of the treachery, fled with his family and most valuable effects, to Massada, the strongest fortress in the country, built on the top of a very high mountain, near the Asphaltite lake. Finding that Herod had escaped, the Parthians first plundered the country, made Antigonus king, according to agreement, and delivered up Hyrcanus and Phasael to him, before they left the country. Phasael, knowing that his death was determined on, dashed out his brains against the walls of his prison. Antigonus spared his aged uncle's life, but barbarously cut off his ears, to incapacitate him from being any longer high-priest, and then sent him into exile to Seleucia in Babylonia.

ANTIGONUS.

In this emergency, Herod went to Egypt, took shipping at Alexandria, and sailed to Italy, intending to implore assistance of Anthony and the Romans, to place Aristobulus, the brother of his espoused Mariamne, on the throne of Judea; who was the son of Alexandra, the daughter of Hyrcanus, by Alexander, the eldest son of Aristobulus; so that he united the titles of both brothers to the crown: proposing nothing further for him-
self, than to govern the country under Aristobulus, in the same manner as under Hyrcanus. But Anthony chose to make Herod himself king, in reward of his past services, and for the promise of a great sum of money; and by his interest with Octavian, procured from the senate, contrary to their usual policy, a decree to that effect, in the course of that same year, B.C. 40. Herod made such dispatch, that he returned to Judea before the end of it, and raising forces of every kind, foreigners as well as Jews, relieved his friends at Massada, who had been closely besieged all the while by Antigonus. At one time they were reduced to the utmost distress for want of water, and must have surrendered next day, had not a providential rain fallen the night before, and filled all their cisterns, so as to enable them to hold out until Herod came to their succour.

Next year, B.C. 39, Herod carried on the war against Antigonus, with various success. The Roman generals sent to his assistance, by order of Anthony, namely, Silo and Machæras, doing him more hurt than good. And his brother Joseph, who had defended Massada so gallantly, being left to command in Judæa, while Herod attended Antony in Syria, contrary to his orders, went on an expedition against Jericho, in which he was slain, and most of his forces cut in pieces. This disaster encouraged a revolt of the disaffected in Galilee and Idumæa. Afterwards Herod himself was wounded and repulsed at Jericho, but near the end of the year obtained a signal victory over the army of Antigonus, commanded by Pappus, whom he slew.

The following year, B.C. 38, Herod besieged Jerusalem. During the siege, he consummated his marriage with Miriam, or Mariamne, whom he had espoused four years before. This affinity with the Asamonean family, he hoped would conciliate the people to his government. On his return to the siege, he was joined by Sosius, president of Syria, with a powerful force which Antony sent to his assistance. Their joint army, at the lowest computation, amounted to 60,000 men. At length, after they had vigorously besieged the city about half a year, they stormed it, the year following, B.C. 37. And the Roman soldiers, exasperated at the opposition they had experienced, plundered the city, and massacred the inhabitants without mercy, Sosius encouraging his men. Insomuch that Herod complained, that the Romans were going to make him king of a desert; and was forced to redeem the city from total destruction, by the present
of a considerable sum of money, to satisfy the rapacity of the Romans.

Antigonus surrendered himself to Sosius, and implored his clemency. But the Roman general, despising his pusillanimity, rejected him with scorn, calling him, in the feminine gender, Antigona, and sent him in chains to Anthony, at Antioch; who, not long after, was prevailed upon, by the solicitations of Herod, and a large sum of money, to execute him, like a common malefactor, by the rods and axe of the lictor: intending, by this ignominious death, to which the Romans never before had subjected any crowned head, to lessen the attachment of the Jews to the Asamonean family; who, during his lifetime, could not, in general, be prevailed on to acknowledge Herod as king, by any tortures; as we learn from Strabo, cited by Josephus. Ant. xv. 1, 2.

Such was the end of the Asamonean dynasty, after it had subsisted 126 years. "A noble and illustrious house," says Josephus, "distinguished by their descent, by the dignity of the pontificate, and by the great exploits of their ancestors for the nation."

The fortunes of this house seem to be referred to in the following obscure

SEQUEL OF MICAH'S PROPHECY.

V. 5. "When the Assyrian shall have come into our land,
Then shall be raised up against him *
Seven Shepherds, and eight princes of men.
6. And they shall waste with the sword
The land of Asher, and the land of Nimrod, in its coasts;
Thus shall HE deliver [us] from the Assyrian,
When he shall have come into our land,
And when he shall have trampled on our borders."

"The Assyrian" here, (according to the ingenious conjecture of Dr. Gregory Sharpe †,) aptly denotes Antiochus Epiphanes, and the succeeding kings of Syria, who ruled in Assyria and Babylonia, and greatly oppressed the Jews, as we have seen. The "seven shepherds" to be raised up by the Messiah for the deliverance of his people, represent the seven Maccabees,

* Instead of the Masoretic reading, יַדְלִים יִשְׂרָאֵל, "Then shall we raise against him," the Sept. read, יִדְלִים יִשְׂרָאֵל, καὶ εὐρήκετον τόν. "Then shall he be raised up against him."

† See his Second Argument in Defence of Christianity, &c. p. 162, &c.
old Mattathias, his five sons, and his grandson John Hyrcanus, who signalized themselves in the defence of their country, and carried the war into the enemies' land of "Asher and of Nimrod;" and the last, in particular, raised the glory of his house to the highest pitch, and derived his name, Hyrcanus, from his exploits in these countries. These are aptly termed "shepherds," because they were leaders of the people, acting under the great Shepherd of Israel, and the prime "leader," Christ, noticed in the foregoing part of the prophecy.

Their successors are distinguished from them by the title of "princes," because, not satisfied with the modest title of "Ethnarchs" and "High Priests," they assumed the crown as "kings," following the example of Aristobulus, the eldest son of Hyrcanus; who, with his two brothers, Antigonus and Janneaus, Alexandra, her two sons, Hyrcanus and Aristobulus II, and the two sons of the latter, Alexander and Antigonus, make up eight. Queen Alexandra may justly be reckoned in the number; for as Josephus observes, "she was a woman free from the weakness of her sex, and more practised in the arts of government than most men."

If this interpretation be admitted, (which certainly is less objectionable, and more exact and consistent throughout, than any other that has been proposed hitherto,) it fills up an important chasm in the prophetic series of the Asamonean dynasty, between the Macedo-Grecian dynasty and the nativity of Christ, at Bethlehem, under the Romans, with which the prophecy commences, perfectly corresponding therewith; and thus renders the whole the most comprehensive and important single prophecy in the Old Testament.

**HEROD THE GREAT.**

His accession is dated by Josephus, in the consulate of Marcus Agrippa and Caninius Gallus, B.C. 37, and in [the third year of] the 185th Olympiad.

To secure himself on the throne, he began his reign by cutting off the heads of the Asamonean party; and among them, all the members of the Sanhedrims, except Pollio and Sameas, who alone had recommended the surrender of the city to Herod; whereas the rest joined in the general cry, the temple of the Lord! the temple of the Lord! As if God would protect it;
though they had such dear-bought experience to the contrary, when the national sins drew down Divine chastisement upon the people; as before remarked in the second of Maccabees, v. 19, 20.

The Pollio and Sameas of Josephus were the Hillel and Shammai of the Rabbins; two of the most eminent among the ancient doctors of their nation. Hillel was of the royal line of David, being descended from Shephatiah, the son of Abital, David's wife, 1 Chron. iii. 3. He was born in Babylonia, and came to Jerusalem in the fortieth year of his age, and for his eminence in the study of the law, was appointed president of the great Sanhedrim, forty years after, in the eightieth of his age, and held that high station for forty years more; and it continued in his family till the tenth generation. For he was succeeded by Simeon, the same who is supposed to have taken Christ in his arms, when he was presented in the Temple, Luke ii. 25—35. His son, Gamaliel, was president of the Sanhedrim, when Peter and the Apostles were summoned before them, Acts v. 34; "At whose feet the Apostle Paul was bred up," or educated, in the sect and discipline of the Pharisees, Acts xxii. 3. He lived till within eighteen years of the destruction of Jerusalem, and in the Jewish writings is distinguished by the title of Gamaliel the Old. He was succeeded by Simeon II. who perished in the destruction of Jerusalem. His son was Gamaliel II. and his again Simeon III. He was succeeded by his son, the celebrated R. Judah Hakadosh, or "the holy," who composed the Mishna, or Traditional Law. His son and successor was Gamaliel III.; after him Judah Gemaricus; after him, Hillel II. the ingenious compiler of the present Jewish Calendar, or technical Chronology, about A.D. 358.

Shammai had been a disciple of Hillel, and approached the nearest to him in learning and eminence of all the Mishnical Doctors. He was vice-president of the Sanhedrim, and disagreed in several points with his master. Hillel was of a mild and peaceable temper, but Shammai of an angry and fiery spirit. Hence proceeded violent disputes and contests between the two schools, which at length ended in bloodshed. At last they were allayed by a fictitious Bath Col, or voice from heaven, deciding in favour of the school of Hillel, to which the school of Shammai submitted.
In the room of Antigonus, Herod appointed Ananelus high priest, B.C. 36. He was an obscure priest, of the pontifical family, residing among the Jews of Babylonia, whom Herod had formerly known, and now promoted, for his insignificance, to that high office, that he might not interfere with the royal authority. But this appointment produced great disturbances in his family. For Mariamne, his favourite wife, and her mother Alexandra, took umbrage at the exclusion of Aristobulus, her brother, the rightful successor to the pontificate. Mariamne was perpetually teasing him on the subject, and Alexandra, who was a woman of high spirit, and of great understanding, went further, for she complained to Cleopatra, queen of Egypt, by letter, and began to engage Anthony himself to interfere, by means of Dellius, a favourite of his. Herod therefore found it necessary, for his own quiet and safety, to depose Ananelus, and appoint Aristobulus, then a youth of only seventeen years, high priest in his stead, next year, B.C. 35.

Alexandra having thus extorted from Herod the pontificate for her son, pursued the same means for obtaining the crown also, which Herod had usurped; by intriguing with Cleopatra to gain over Anthony. But Herod detecting their intrigue, confined her to the palace, and set spies to watch her proceedings. Resenting this imprisonment, she formed a plot for escaping to Egypt with her son, but Herod seized them both on the road, when they attempted to put it into execution; and out of an affected clemency, pardoned both, because he dared not punish either; determined, however, to rid himself of such a dangerous competitor, whenever a convenient opportunity should offer. And the attachment of the multitude was soon publicly shewn to the young prince; for at the ensuing feast of Tabernacles, he discharged the functions of the high priest with so much grace and dignity, and the beauty of his person was so set off by the splendour of the pontifical robes, that he charmed the whole assembly, and every tongue was loud in his praises. This raised the tyrant's jealousy to such a pitch, that he could not brook any further delay, but immediately after the festival was over, took him down to an entertainment at Jericho; and after dinner, several of Herod's attendants, bathing in a pond, he was persuaded to bathe also, and was dipped, and held so long by them under water, that he was drowned. Herod expressed the greatest grief at this unfortunate accident, as he affected to consider it,
and interred him with great pomp. But every one saw through his hypocrisy, and none more clearly than Alexandra, who was inconsolable, and could not have survived her loss, but for the desire of revenge. Accordingly she acquainted Cleopatra with the treacherous murder of her son, and engaged her so effectually in her interest, that she never ceased importuning Anthony to call Herod to an account. Anthony therefore cited Herod to appear before him in Syria, next year, B.C. 34. But Herod, by fair words and large presents, so mollified Anthony, that nothing could be done against him; though Cleopatra, who attended the trial, prosecuted this cause to the utmost; not so much to gratify Alexandra, or to promote justice, as to gain Herod's kingdom for herself, if he should be put to death. Anthony satisfied her covetousness, by giving her Coele-Syria instead of Judea, and so she dropped the prosecution.

This prosecution, however, gave great rise to another tragedy in Herod's family. For when Herod was summoned to appear before Anthony, apprehensive of the event, he left directions with his uncle Joseph, who had married his sister Salome, to put Mariamne, his beloved wife, to death, if he should be condemned; fearing lest Anthony, who admired her even upon the fame of her beauty, might take her to himself, after his death. But Joseph imprudently divulged the secret to Mariamne, which exceedingly offended her and her mother Alexandra; and the latter plotted to fly for protection to a Roman legion, stationed near the city. Upon Herod's return, his sister Salome, the fire-brand of her family, disclosed to him all that had happened, and malignantly accused her own husband Joseph of too great familiarity with Mariamne, ready to sacrifice him to her hatred of the latter; who being a woman of high birth, and still higher spirit, looked down on Salome as her inferior, and treated her with contempt. An offence not to be forgiven by an haughty and revengeful woman. Herod, though struck with jealousy, restrained himself through love to Mariamne, and questioned her in private about the charge. But she vindicated herself so fully, with all the persuasiveness of conscious innocence, that the king was satisfied, and asked her pardon for listening to such injurious reports; and assuring her of his love, pressed her to return it; but she resentfully remarked, that his conduct did not correspond with his professions, for that if he loved her, how could he order her to be put to death, though innocent, in case
Anthony should determine against him? This imprudent declaration rekindled his jealousy, and convinced him that the charge was true; he flung her from his arms, ordered Joseph to be put to death, without admitting him into his presence; and though his love at this time restrained his rage against Mariamne, he put her mother Alexandra into custody, as the cause of all these mischiefs. Ant. XV. 3, 9.

In the year B.C. 32, the civil war between Anthony and Octavius broke out, and when Herod was raising forces to assist the former, his patron, he was commissioned by him, at the desire of Cleopatra, to invade Malchus, king of Arabia Petrea, who now withheld from her the tribute which he had paid for a part of his territory adjoining Egypt, that had been unjustly granted to her by Anthony. This wicked and rapacious queen, hoping that one or the other of these kings would be slain in the war, and that his kingdom would become a prey to her. Herod at first defeated Malchus, but in a second engagement, being treacherously deserted by Cleopatra's general, Athenion, who turned his arms against him, was overthrown with great slaughter, and hardly escaped himself with the remnant of his army.

To aggravate this disaster, the next year, B.C. 31, opened with a dreadful earthquake in Judea, which destroyed thirty thousand souls: this fresh calamity induced Herod to sue for peace to the Arabians; but they thinking this a favourable opportunity of reducing the whole country, haughtily refused it, put his ambassadors to death, and invaded Judea. Herod, whose army had not suffered by the earthquake, which only overthrew their tents, marched against them, and in two successive engagements, either killed or took prisoners the whole of their army, and compelled them, in turn, to sue for peace, which he granted on his own terms, and returned in triumph to Jerusalem, having reduced the Arabians under his dominion.

The battle of Actium, Sept. 2. B.C. 31, gave Octavius a decided victory over Anthony, who fled to Egypt, as his last retreat. There, Herod, by a special messenger, recommended him to put Cleopatra to death, who had been the cause of all his misfortunes, to seize her kingdom and treasure, raise a new army, and carry on the war; promising to support him to the utmost. But the infatuated Roman rejected this advice; and Herod thought it high time to look to himself, and make his
peace with *Augustus*, on the best terms he could. Apprehensive, however, that he might be deposed, and *Hyrcanus* restored to his throne, (which he had formerly held under the protection of the *Romans*, until he was dispossessed by the *Parthians,* he trumped up a sham plot against the poor old prince, as if he held a treasonable correspondence with *Malchus*, king of *Arabia*; and under this pretence caused him to be beheaded, after he had passed the eightieth year of his age.

Of all the atrocious cruelties of *Herod*, this was marked with the highest perfidy, ingratitude, and breach of hospitality. *Hyrcanus* had lived in exile, for some time, at Seleucia, where he was treated with the highest respect by the king of *Parthia*, and honoured as their king by the *Jews of Babylonia*, and of the *Parthian* empire, who composed a body altogether more numerous and wealthy than those of *Judea*, and supplied him with a maintenance suitable to his rank and dignity. But on hearing of the death of *Antigonus*, and advancement of *Herod* to the throne of *Judea*, his love of his country prompted him to return home, and put himself under the protection of *Herod*, who owed to him the rise of all his fortunes, his affinity with the royal family, and even his life, when arraigned before the *Sanhedrim*. *Herod* also was anxious for his coming, in order to have him in his power, that he might, by his death, prevent his restoration to the throne, in case of a reverse of fortune. And therefore not only importuned *Hyrcanus* to come, but sent an embassy to *Phraates*, king of *Parthia*, to solicit his permission. Contrary, therefore, to the advice of all his friends, *Hyrcanus* returned to *Jerusalem*, in the second year of *Herod’s* reign; who treated him with all seeming respect; until his wicked policy tempted him to cut off his king and his benefactor, six years after.

*Herod’s* next care, before he went to make his peace with *Octavius*, (who came to *Rhodes* in his way to *Egypt*, the ensuing year, B.C. 30, after he had settled matters in *Italy*, *Greece*, and *Asia Minor*, and secured those nearer countries in his interest,) was to secure his own family and his treasures, in case he should be unsuccessful, in consequence of his known attachment to *Anthony*. His mother, sister, wives, and children, he placed in the strong fortress of *Massada*, under the care of his brother *Pheroras*. But *Mariamne*, and her mother *Alexandra*, who disagreed with his mother and sister, he left in *Alexandrium*,
under the care of Sohemus, a trusty Idumean, with orders to put them both to death, if Octavius should treat him harshly, and then that he should endeavour to secure the crown for his children, in conjunction with Pheroras.

Octavius, however, gave him a most favourable reception, struck with the dignified frankness of his demeanour; openly avowing his attachment to Anthony, as long as he could serve him, and now offering his friendship to Augustus, promising to serve him with the like fidelity. That artful politician not only restored him his diadem, which, on entering, he had laid aside, but afterwards enlarged his dominions, by the restoration of a part which Anthony had taken from him to give to Cleopatra, and by further grants, and always treated Herod with more distinction and regard than any of the tributary kings of the Roman empire.

But however successful Herod was in his public proceedings, he was most unhappy at home. The affections of his wife Mariamne were still further alienated from him, by the discovery of his last directions to Sohemus, which, by her address, she extorted from him. And she received Herod, on his return home, after his good fortune, with coldness and sadness, so as to provoke him most highly; and presuming too much on her unbounded influence over him, she failed not to aggravate his displeasure, by her reserve and haughtiness. While he was fluctuating between love and resentment for a year, sometimes wishing to put her to death, but again fearing to punish himself still more severely, she brought matters to a crisis, by one day refusing his proffered love, and upbraiding him with the murder of her father, (or grandfather, Hyrcanus,) and of her brother. Enraged at this, and spurred on by the false accusations of Salome, he put her confidential chamberlain to the torture, who declared that her hatred towards him proceeded from what Sohemus had told her. This instantly excited his jealousy of Sohemus, who he concluded must have been too intimate with her, for that otherwise he would not have betrayed the secret. He ordered him to be immediately seized and put to death, and had Mariamne tried and condemned, by intimidated judges, and at the instigation of his sister Salome, fearing he might relent, executed immediately, under the alarming suggestion, that if her life was spared it might excite a public commotion.

While she was leading to execution, her unworthy mother,
Alexandra, fearing to be involved in her doom, met her on the way, reproaching her with ingratitude to her husband; adding that she was justly punished, and even dared to pull her by the hair; but Mariamne, without uttering a word, bore it with dignified composure, ashamed of her mother's baseness, and without changing colour, submitted to death, retaining her nobleness of mind even to the last.

Alexandra did not long escape, for when Herod fell sick next year, B.C. 28, oppressed with the most poignant grief and remorse for the injured Mariamne's death, she laid a plot for seizing the government, but it was disclosed to Herod by the officers whose fidelity she endeavoured to corrupt, and he instantly ordered her to be put to death.

The next year B.C. 27, Augustus got that name, instead of Octavius, and with it the whole power of the state, which was vested in him by the senate and Roman people, with the liberty to resign it every ten years, when he should find the burden too heavy for him; but he retained it till his death. That he might not seem, however, to assume the whole authority to himself, he divided the empire into two parts; the quiet and peaceable provinces he assigned to the senate, to be governed by consular and praetorian officers, according to former usage; these were called senatorial; but the turbulent and insecure, which lay on the outskirts of the empire, he reserved for himself; these were called imperial, and governed by his presidents and procurators.

By this profound political arrangement, under the appearance of leaving to the senate the most settled parts of the empire, and the easiest to be governed, and taking the most troublesome to himself, he secured the whole military power, which was necessarily stationed in the imperial provinces, to keep them in awe; such as Cilicia, Syria, Phœnicia, Cyprus, and Egypt in the east, and Spain in the west.

Herod was still harassed with domestic troubles. His turbulent sister, Salome, having fallen out with her second husband, Costobarus the Idumean, the year following, B.C. 25, sent him a bill of divorce, contrary to the law and usage, which confined that privilege to the husband, Deut. xxiv. 1, 2, &c. Matt. v. 31, xix. 7, and accused him to Herod of plotting with Lysimachus, Antipater, and others of the Asamonean party, and of having concealed the sons of Babus, whom Herod, at the taking of Jerusalem, had entrusted to him to be executed. Finding this last
information of Salome to be true, he believed the rest, and put them all to death. But he was still harassed with tumults and conspiracies during the remainder of his reign, which, though he punished with increasing severity and cruelty, as he advanced in years, he could never entirely subdue.

To secure himself the better against such tumults and conspiracies, he built several strong cities and fortresses in the land. He rebuilt Samaria, which John Hyrcanus had destroyed, and restored it to its former splendour, calling it, in Greek, Sebaste, "the city of Augustus." Having finished this, he began another city at Strato's tower, on the sea coast of Palestine, between Dora and Joppa, which, in honour of his other name, Caesar, he called Cesarea. Here he made the most convenient and safest port in all the coasts of Phoenicia, by running out a vast semi-circular mole, of great depth and extent, into the sea, so as to form a spacious and secure harbour against the stormy south and west winds leaving only an entrance into it from the north. Some of the stones employed in the work were fifty feet long, eighteen broad, and nine thick, and the foundation was sunk twenty fathom, or one hundred and twenty feet in the sea. When Judea became an imperial province, after the banishment of Archelaus, Herod's son, it was usually the residence of the Roman procurator, or governor, Acts xxiii. 23, 24.

He also built a strong and magnificent palace for himself on Mount Sion, the site of the original fortress of Jebus, which David took, 2 Sam. v. 7, and of the citadel which had so much annoyed the Maccabees in the Syrian wars. It was remarkable for two large and sumptuous apartments, the one called Cesareum, in honour of the emperor; the other Agrippaeum, in honour of his favourite Agrippa.

But his greatest and noblest work was the rebuilding of the temple, which had gone greatly out of repair, by length of time, and had also been materially injured in the civil wars. By this pious work, he probably thought to make atonement to God for all the blood that he had shed, as well as to conciliate the minds of his subjects, who were wonderfully attached to the forms of their religion, however they denied its power, and to erect a lasting monument to his own honour; and, perhaps, it was to disappoint him in this last expectation, that the Jews affected to call Herod's "the second temple" still, though the second, built by Zerubbabel, had been pulled down to the foundation
on this occasion; or rather, perhaps, because the daily sacrifices had never been intermitted while it was building.

*Herod* made this proposal to a general assembly of the people, in the eighteenth year of his reign, probably at the passover, B.C. 19, but they were startled thereat, apprehending that when he had pulled down the old temple, he might not be able nor willing to build the new; he therefore promised them that he would not attempt to demolish the present, until he had provided all the materials for immediately rebuilding it. And he kept his word; for he employed a thousand carts to draw stones and materials, ten thousand of the most skilful workmen, and a thousand priests, whom he had instructed to be masons and carpenters; and, after two years' preparation, pulled down the old temple, and began the new, in the twentieth year of his reign, B.C. 17. And such was their expedition, that the sanctuary (*σακροσταύρωμα*) was built in a year and a half, and the rest of the temple (*τέμενος*), containing the outer buildings and porticos, in eight years more, so as to be then fit for divine service, according to the king's intention. But the expense of adorning and finishing the whole was still carried on from the sacred treasury, and was not completed till the administration of *Gessius Florus*, A.D. 62, when eighteen thousand workmen were discharged at once.

To find further employment for these, king *Agrippa*, who then had the care of the temple, under *Claudius*, was recommended by the people to take down and rebuild the eastern outermost portico, which had been originally built by *Solomon*, not wishing that the sacred treasure should be laid up, for fear it might become a prey to the Romans, but *Agrippa* unwisely refused their request, on account of the length of time, and the greatness of expense the work would require. So these men, for want of support, began those robberies and seditions which ended in the destruction of the temple. *Joseph. Ant. XV. 11, 1—6; xx. 8, 7.*

This determines the date of our Lord's first passover, A.D. 28, which was *forty-five* years complete, or the *forty-sixth* current, from the foundation of the temple, B.C. 17. And leads us to an emendation of the English translation of John ii. 20. "*Forty and six years hath this temple been in building, [and is not finished yet,] and will thou erect it in three days?*" For such is the proper rendering of the Greek aorist, *φηκαδομηθην*. *Herod,* vol. ii.
indeed, only began the work, which the funds of no individual were competent to finish; especially his, which must have been considerably exhausted by his other public buildings, carrying on at the same time, the city and harbour of Caesarea, &c. The Temple, as Tacitus remarks, was a work of "immense opulence," on which a great many years, and all the sacred offerings sent from all parts of the world, for the use of the temple, were expended. The free will offerings and gifts to the sacred treasury are noticed as considerable in our Lord's days, Mark xii. 41—44; Luke xxi. 1—5. And were continued in those of Paul, Acts xxiv. 17.

The year after the foundation of the temple was laid, Herod went to Rome, to visit Augustus, and to see his two sons by Mariamne, Alexander, and Aristobulus, who had been educated there for three years past, under the immediate inspection of the emperor himself, who had them lodged in the royal palace. He was received with great honour and kindness by Augustus, and took back his sons, whose education was now complete, to Judea; and soon after married the elder to Glaphyra, the daughter of Archelaus, king of Cappadocia, and the younger to Berenice, the daughter of Salome, his sister. But the wicked Salome, notwithstanding her closer affinity, envied the young princes their merited popularity, fearing also that she might suffer for having advised their mother Mariamne's death; and she never ceased to calumniate them both to Herod, until at length his jealousy got the better of his paternal affection. For she was so base, as to alienate her own daughter's affections from her husband, and prevail on her to betray his confidential conversations, respecting the king's cruelty and ill-treatment; which she reported, with aggravations, to Herod.

To check the pride and insolence of Mariamne's sons, who certainly were not sufficiently guarded in their conversation respecting their father; three years after their return, Herod brought to Court, B.C. 13, his eldest son, Antipater, whom he had by his first wife, Doris, when he was in a private station, and whom he had divorced on his marriage with Mariamne. But this measure only provoked them to greater discontents, and more intemperate language than before. Of which, Antipater, who was no less artful than ambitious, failed not to avail himself; and took care to have them constantly reported to his father, by his own emissaries; while he openly espoused their cause; and
endeavoured to excuse them from the charges, so as to persuade the old king that he was no less attached to his brothers than to his father: and at length to recommend him to Augustus as his successor, and obtain the emperor's permission to leave the crown to him, in the first instance, and afterwards to the sons of Mariamne, two years after, B.C. 11.

Josephus gives a full detail of all the various plots that were laid by Antipater and his wicked associates, Salome, the sister, and Pheroras, the brother of Herod, to compass the destruction of the unfortunate princes, which they at length accomplished, by a false charge, that they intended to poison their father; and Herod, in his rage, at last ordered them both to be strangled, at Sebaste, after he had accused, and got them to be condemned to death, in a council held at Berytus, before Saturninus and Volumnius, governors of Syria, B.C. 6. By the death of these two unfortunate brothers, the noble family of the Asamoneans became utterly extinct; and this disastrous period, marked by civil wars, and domestic treasons and massacres, was brought to a conclusion, according to prophecy, about the birth of John the Baptist, Mal. iv. 5, 6.