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Dan. 12. Ver. 8 --
Then I said, 0 my Lord, what shall be the end of these things?
Ver. 9 And he said unto me, Go thy way Daniel, for the words
are closed up, and sealed till the time of the end.
Ver. 10 Many shall be purified and made white, and tried;
but the wicked shall do wickedly, and none of the wicked shall under-
stand, but the wise shall understand.

Chap. 7. 21. I beheld, and the same Horn made war with the
Saints, and prevailed against them.
Ver. 22. Until the Ancient of days came, and judgement was
given to the Saints of the most High, and the time came that the
Saints possessed the Kingdom.
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TO
The faithful Witnesses of CHRIST,
Within the Common-wealth of England, Scotland, and Ireland.

Dearly beloved in our Lord:

It was not doubtless without a special and most wonderful design of Heaven, in order to the making of Christ's Kingdom, and the Administrations thereof more welcome to the World, when the Fathers appointed time of setting the same up should be come, That the power of the Fourth Monarchy in its second state should be in all
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respect, but chiefly in its rise, worse, more odious, and abominable than ever was power in the world before it; for as for all the three first Monarchies, and the Fourth also (considered in its first state, before the Antichristian Beast was Mid-wived into the World) they did receive their power from God, upon which account the Apostles in the New Testament urge obedience to the ruling Powers of the World that then were, telling Believers to whom they wrote, that there was no power (i.e., then standing) but what originally, in respect of the derivation of the power, was of God, and ordained by God, Rom. 12. 1. 1 Pet. 2. 13, 14.

But now the power of the Roman Monarchy in its second State, as subjected to Antichrist (which Beast was not then risen, but to ascend to the Throne afterwards, Revel. 17. 8.) is (as in many other respects, so especially in this, viz. of the first rise or derivation of the power) made to differ vastly from all those preceding powers, which were parts of the Great Image, as well as it; for those, though their power was abused, yet had they it originally from God; but of the Antichristian Power the contrary is expressly declared, namely, That when the Ten-Horned blasphemous Beast should arise, he should receive
his power from the Dragon, or Devil, Revel. 13. 1, 2. And I saw a Beast rise up out of the Sea, having seven Heads, and ten Horns, and upon his Horns ten Crowns, and upon his Heads the name of Blasphemy. And the Beast that I saw was like unto a Leopard, and the Dragon gave him his power, and great authority. Hence, Revel. 11. 7. and again, Chap. 17. 8. where his rise is spoken of, he is said, not to have a descent from Heaven, as had the former powers, but an ascent out of the bottomless Pit, i.e. from Hell, noting (as before) that the derivation of this Power should not bee from God, but from the Devil.

Which Position is yet more clear, if we consider, how that Jesus Christ, all the time of the Beasts Kingdom, doth set up a two fold power, viz. a power Magisterial and Ministerial, (which he calls his two Witnesses, Revelation 11. 3.) For this very end, to oppose the Beast, by bearing constant witness against, and smiting so farre as in them lies, the Beast and his Powers. This witness-bearing Power set up in direct opposition to the Beast, though in respect of their outward condition they are at and under all the time of the Beasts Kingdom, he, till his day is out, ruling the rost, for which cause they wear Sackcloth; yet being declaredly
of Divine appointment, and ordination, I will give power to my two witnesses; hence it necessarily followeth, that the power of the Beast cannot be such too, unless we should suppose Divine appointments to be manifestly contradictory within themselves, and to fight the one with the other, which to say, would be rather a blasphemy than an absurdity. And it is for this reason, because the Beast receives his power from the Dragon, that the Worshippers of the Beast are said to worship the Dragon, Revelation 13.4. And they worshipped the Dragon that gave power to the Beast, and they worshipped the Beast. From all which it appears, That Power considered as Antichristian is not of divine institution, but Diabolical.

This Antichristian power is that which of all the Powers of the Four Monarchies takes the last place, closing up the World's day, and standing next to Christ's Kingdom in regard of time; God seeing it best in his infinite and unsearchable Wisdom, to suffer things, before he will erect his own Kingdom of righteousness, and holiness, to grow to such a height of unparalleled impiety in the World, as that the principal affairs thereof, which in all Ages and Generations formerly had ever been
been ordered and disposed by men, as his Substitutes, should in this last time (namely the time of Antichrist's Kingdom) be disposed of, and governed by men as Substitutes of the Dragon.

In the ruines of this Power Christ begins his own Kingdom; for as the Persian Monarchy had its beginning in the ruines of the Babylonian, and the Grecian in the ruines of the Persian, the Roman afterwards in the ruines of the Grecian; so the Kingdom of Christ, or the Fifth Monarchy, hath its first rise in the ruines of the Antichristian Kingdom, with which (the Antichristian Kingdom being the Fourth Monarchy in its second and last state) the Fourth Monarchy it self goes to ruine, and way is made for the rise of the Fifth, which succeeds it.

This thing is most evident in the two first of Daniels Prophecies, viz. That of the Great Image, Chap. 2. and that of the four Beasts, Chap. 7. for the one tells us, that Christ's Kingdom ariseth by smiting and breaking the feet of the Great Image; the other, that it ariseth by judging, casting down the Throne, taking away the Dominion of the Little Horn, either of which are the same, both
both pointing (as the future Discourse proveth at large) at the Kingdom of Antichrist, and Christ's judging thereof.

Now, that this Kingdom of Christ, which Daniel speaks of, as succeeding the Kingdom of Antichrist, taking its beginning in the others ruines, cannot be a meer Spiritual Kingdom (as many would have it) but must bee an outward and visible Kingdom, is manifest enough, though wee had no other proof thereof, but what is couched in these two Prophecies; though yet I might say it, and speak truth, that this Doctrine of Christ's visible Kingdom, is that great Truth of which all the Prophets of the Old Testament, more plentifully than of any one besides it, have spoken, and Christ himself, with the Apostles, and Evangelists, of the New likewise.

But (not to enter into so large a field, which requires a Book, not an Epistle) let us (because the Rulers of this World begin at this day to be jealous of this Notion, and to look bigge upon Christ's outward Kingdom) consult with Daniel upon this Question, Whether the Kingdom hee speaks of in his two first Prophecies be meerly Spiritual, or whether it
it been not, as Spiritual, so outward too. And although some Arguments urged from Daniels first Prophecy, to prove this Kingdom to be not Spiritual only, but outward also, are laid down in our following Discourse; yet do I not here judge it amisse to enlarge some of them, and also add something new, to vindicate thereby a most blessed, but suffering truth, hoping my labour in so doing may not be altogether lost. Let us therefore ( I say ) ask Daniels minde upon our Question.

First, As for his Prophecy of the Great Image, Chapter two, the Stone, verse thirty fourth, which is interpreted Christs Kingdom, verse forty fourth, cannot be meant of Christs Spiritual Kingdom, but must necessarily point at an outward.

The Reasons are,

1. Because the rise of this Kingdom is not till after that the feet of the great Image, i.e. the Roman Monarchy in its Antichristian state, is risen and in being, which is clear;

1. Because Daniel, to whom things in the Vision were represented ( as his interpretation, verse thirty sixt to forty fixt, doth
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doth evidently manifest) in that order of succession that they were to come forth in afterwards, beholds the Feet before yet hee sees the Stone; as verse thirty fourth, Thou sawest till that a stone was cut out without hands, which smote the Image upon his feet; the seeing of the Stone cut out, and imiting, was after that the whole Image in its several parts had been presented to him; therefore I say, as all the other parts, so likewise the Feet of the Image were in being before the Stone.

2 Because Daniel beholds the Stone, so soon as formed, to imite the Feet, verse thirty fourth, therefore must the Feet bee in being before the Stone was formed.

3 Because the Kingdom signified by the Stone is not set up till in the days of the ten Antichristian Kings, verse forty fourth, And in the days of these Kings shall the God of Heaven set up a Kingdom. That these Kings can point at no other but the ten Antichristian Kings John speaks of, Revelations 17. 18, 13, 14. See our future discourse, page three hundred and eighteen, and three hundred
dred and nineteen. Now the Kingdom of the Stone being to be set up in the days of the ten Antichristian Kings, therefore must the Antichristian State be before the Kingdom of the Stone. If so, then cannot Christ's Spiritual Kingdom be the thing signified by the Stone, for that was set up when Christ first gave forth his Spirit, immediately upon his Ascension, which was within the time that the Iron Legs of the Image, verse fortieth, i.e. the Roman Monarchy in its first, and as yet Pagan State, did bear rule, being three hundred years and upwards before the Feet, viz. the Antichristian State, had existence or being in the World. Christ's Spiritual Kingdom therefore being long before Antichrist's Kingdom was begun, but the Kingdom of the Stone having not being till afterwards, it follows, that the Kingdom of the Stone cannot be Christ's Spiritual Kingdom, but must be an outward.

Second Reason, Because it is the Stones proper and peculiar work to break in pieces the Great Image, i.e. outward Powers.
First, That it is its proper work, is clear, because it doth the thing not accidentally, but intentionally, and therefore it is laid to do it by imitating, verse thirty four, thirty five, & forty five; which Phrase notes the intention of the Agent, it imites the Great Image, with full purpose and resolution to break it, and therefore observe, it never leaves imitating, after once it hath begun, till it hath beaten the Great Image to very chaff and dust, ver. 35.

Secondly, That it is its principal work, is clear, because no other work is attributed to the Stone but this only, which sheweth, that the Kingdom of the Stone is a Kingdom set up by God to perform this work, which in case it doth it not, it doth nothing. But now the proper and principal work of Christ's Spiritual Kingdom is another thing, viz. The increasing and edifying it self in love; and it doth not at all intermeddle, much less undertake it as its proper and principal work, with the routing and breaking of Worldly Powers, which if indeed it should, then Christ's Spiritual Kingdom (the proper and principal work thereof...
hereof being once rightly apprehended by the Saints, the Children of this Kingdom, would soon prove a thing of as dangerous consequence to the Rulers of this World, as the Doctrine of the Fifth Monarchy either is, or can be. But this I say is not the work of Christ's Spiritual Kingdom, therefore cannot the Kingdom of the Stone be. Christ's Spiritual Kingdom, but must be an outward.

Third Reason, Because the Kingdom of the Stone is such a Kingdom, as that the standing and continuance of the Great Image is altogether inconsistent with the growth and prosperity thereof; which is clear, because it neither doth, nor can grow up to be a great Mountain, filling the whole Earth, till the total removal of the Great Image, verse thirty five. But now the standing and continuance of the Great Image is no way inconsistent with the growth and prosperity of Christ's Spiritual Kingdom, but rather is indeed advantageous unto it, as the Persecutions that Christ's Spiritual Kingdom hath met with, and that in all Ages, from the Great Image, which have always been the
the greatest and most effectual means of its growth, and fruitfulnes, do bear witness; therefore cannot the Spiritual Kingdom of Christ bee the Kingdom here meant.

Fourthly, Because the Kingdom of the Stone is a Kingdom in respect of Nature, the same with the Kingdoms represented by the Great Image, i.e. it is outward as they are outward; which appears,

1. From the general scope and drift of the Prophecy which runs upon outward Kingdoms, all the first four Kingdoms, or Monarchies are outward, as none can deny; why then the Holy Ghost in speaking of the Fifth and last should so farre vary his scope, as presently to glide from the outward Kingdom to the inward, ought (besides the bare say lo) to have some solid and substantial reason brought for it, by thole, whosoever they are, that either do or shall assert it.

2. Because it is not proper to say, that a bare Spiritual Kingdom, considered only as Spiritual, should break in pieces, beat to very chaffe, grind to Powder, the Great Image, i.e. destroy the very be-
ing of worldly Kingdoms, which work is yet notwithstanding done by the Stone, as Vers. 35. 44, 45. Indeed Christ's Spiritual Kingdom may by that light and life it gives forth, much refine, and reform outward Kingdoms, but when once the work comes to breaking and beating to pieces, i.e. subverting Kingdoms, razing their very foundations, and destroying their being, as they are the Kingdoms of this World; here (unless we conceive God to do it by a Miracle) must we also conceive some other hand, besides a Spiritual, to bee put to the work.

3 Because the Stone, to the end there might not be a vacancy in the world, comes straightway in the place and room of the Great Image, so soon as ever the same is totally broken, verse thirty-five; for as the Great Image, while standing, bears rule over all the earth, verse thirty-nine, so the same being broken, the Stone becomes a Mountain, and fills the whole Earth, verse thirty-five, therefore must the Kingdom of the Stone be such a Kingdom as was that of the Great Image, viz. outward, or otherwise the coming of that in the place of the other now taken away, could not supply the want
want of the other. From all which reasons (and some others also that are laid down in the following Discourse, page one hundred and five, one hundred and six.) It is clear, That the Kingdom of the Stone, mentioned Daniel 2, cannot be a Spiritual Kingdom, but must be an outward. Thus much from Daniel's first Prophecy.

Secondly, As for that Kingdom Daniel speaks of in his Second Prophecy, Chapter seven, which is there said to be given to the Saints, and to succeed (in respect of the greatness and glory of it, though not in respect of the beginnings) the Kingdom of the Little Horn, that it cannot be a Spiritual Kingdom, but must also be an outward and visible, is clear, for these reasons.

First Reason, Because it is a Kingdom in which outward judgement is given to the Saints, verse twenty two, Judgement was given to the Saints of the most High. This Judgement must be outward, because the effect of it is such, viz. a casting down the Thrones of the Fourth Beast, verse nine, by consequence therefore the Kingdom it self must be such.

Second Reason, Because it is a Kingdom the Saints are said to possess, verse twenty two
two, The time came that the Saints possessed the Kingdom, but it is more proper to lay of the Spiritual Kingdom that it pos sesseth them, than they it.

Third Reason, Because it is the very same Kingdom which was before governed by the Little Horn, that is given to the Saints; now that being an outward Kingdom, such must the Kingdom given to the Saints be also.

That the Kingdom given to the Saints is the very same Kingdom that the Little Horn did before possess, is clear, from the plain words and expressions used by the Holy Ghost, verse twenty one, twenty two, I beheld, and the same Horn made war with the Saints, and prevailed against them; until the Ancient of days came, and judgement was given to the Saints of the most High, and the time came that the Saints possessed the Kingdom. Note, we do not read it, That the Saints possessed a Kingdom upon this their judging of the Little Horn, but the Kingdom, teaching us thus much, That that very Kingdom which the Saints by judging the Little Horn do take from him, they themselves do afterwards possess. So verse seventeen and eighteen, These great Beasts which are four, are four Kings which...
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shall arise out of the earth; but the Saints of the most High shall take the Kingdom, and possess the Kingdom for ever, even for ever, and ever. Observe, the Kingdom, or that very Kingdom which was before governed by the four great Beasts, and by the Little Horn, as the last Limb of the Fourth Beast, is the Kingdom that the Saints take i.e. from this Little Horn, and so consequently from all the Beasts, or Powers, his Predecessors, and having taken it, do possess it for ever and ever, i.e. it shall never be taken from them again, as they took it from all the other. So verse twenty six

But the Judgement shall sit, and they shall take away his Dominion, to consume, and to destroy it unto the end. And the Kingdom, and Dominion, and the greatness of the Kingdom under the whole Heaven, shall be given to the people of the Saints of the most High, whose Kingdom is an everlasting Kingdom, and all Dominions shall serve and obey him.

Observe, The Saints, in the Evening of the Little Horns Kingdom, are by the Decree of Heaven constituted a High Court of Justice; hereupon they sit in Judgement, by sitting in Judgement the
they take away his Dominion; Whose? Why, the Little Horns, upon whom the Discourse runs; but what becomes of it when they have taken it away, & despoiled him of it? why, it is by God given to them, the Kingdom, and Dominion, and greatness of the Kingdom under the whole Heaven shall be given to the people of the Saints of the most High. Which yet further (besides the general scope which shews this to bee the same Kingdom with that of the Little Horn) that this Kingdom should bee an outward Kingdom, the use of that Phrase, the greatness of the kingdom under the whole Heaven, which cannot without forcing the words be restrained to a Spiritual Kingdom only, doth necessarily import. The Kingdom of the Saints therefore, which Daniel in his second Prophecy makes mention of, cannot bee a meer Spiritual Kingdom, but is, and must be an outward.

But now as it was the great Master-piece of Satan's policy at the time of Christ's first coming, when hee set up his Spiritual Kingdom, to put that Generation of men altogether upon looking after the outward king-
dom, drawing them thereby to a neglect of that Kingdom, which they in that day ought specially to have attended to: So is it his great engine of Policy in the days a little before Christ's second coming, when now Christ is indeed, and in truth, entering into the World to set up his outward Kingdom, to turn the eyes of this Generation altogether upon the Spiritual Kingdom, drawing them thereby off from the outward, thereby cunningly holding forth one truth as a bait to allure from another, and endeavouring to draw the hearts of men from the great truth of the Generation, by presenting them with some other truth, every way as glorious, considered in itself (the time and season only, which is still the thing that adds beauty to Generation-truth, let aside) as the truth itself of the Generation.

Upon the foregoing Principle, That Christ is to have an outward visible Kingdom, and the scope of the following Discourse, which proves that the time of setting up this Kingdom is now approaching, and upon us, doth it not necessarily follow, that all
faithful Witnesses of Christ, &c.

those who in this day, shall by their sayings or
actings be found to have any hand in keeping
Christ from his Throne, are by so doing become
guilty of High Treason against this King of
Kings; and though they may and should e-
scape the judgement of man, may they not ex-
pect (in case they remember not from
whence they are fallen, and repent) to be
arraigned as such before his Throne another day,
who will then passe a Judgement of persons and
things, not as they are in mens interpretations,
but according as he hath left them in his Word
yea, let it be seriously considered, and laid
to heart, whether or no the condemning
this blessed Doctrine, the glorious truth of
the Age, viz. of the Fifth Monarchy, or
Christ's visible Kingdom (considering that
no five Parties this day in England have so
much to say from the Word for their par-
ticular opinions, though all they have to
say be put together, as may be said for this)
be a thing justifiable before Gods people,
or rather in the sight of God and our Fa-
ther, especially too when as the persons
condemning, have never to this day given
the truth a fair hearing, by using such en-
deavours for the finding out the minde
of God in this thing, as they might, and
as lies in their power to do, and which, were there nothing else but the dis-satisfac-
tion of God's people, God declares from Heaven that he calls upon them to do; yea whether or no is not this very act of theirs a dealing more injuriously with the blessed Truth of Christ, the least iota of which is of far greater worth than Men and Angels, than ever did the Pagan Powers of the Roman Empire in the Apostles' days, with the persons of particular men (though Malesfactors) who always refused to pass a Sentence till they had heard what the accused could speak? Acts 25. 16. yea whether or no such persons whose words and actions are Patterns unto Multitudes, will not have much to answer for (unless they repent) if so be Christ shall one day finde it, that by their flight speeches, or frowning car-
riages towards the truth of the Generati-
on, the generality of poor souls that know nothing, but are meerly led by example, shall be emboldned, encouraged to flight, revile, opposte, persecute that truth in which his honour is more nearly and im-
mediatly concerned, than in any other truth besides it? And is it not possoble that
a man with a faithful and upright heart, (but considered as mistaken, or darkened in his Principles) may do all this? Did not Paul act with an upright heart, considering he acted zealously according to his light, whilst yet he persecuted the Church, and the true way of the Lord? And in such Cases, is it not the better and safer way for a man to fear his own heart, and to be jealous that it acts under some dis-temper, and so makes not a judgement of itself in the light of the Lord's Spirit, but in the darkness of temptation, than to be confident of it, especially too when a general fear of such a thing dwells upon the hearts of God's people? David concluded himself then for certain to be under a temp-tation, when he saw that otherwise he must condemn the generation of the right-eous, Psal. 73. 15. Much more I could say, but that it is no delight to dig into a Wound.

To conclude therefore, seeing the visage of our times (both in respect of the great opposition this day made to the truth of the age, and in many other respects) is grown pale and black, and that blessed Cause of Christ, that of late looked with a fresh
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fresh and amiable countenance, begins now to appear wan with Death in the face of it, is it not high time for the Saints, and all those who wish well to Sion, to cry mightily to the Lord, and to give him no rest, to humble themselves greatly before him, for those manifold abominations committed in the Land, especially that Pride, Luke-warmness, Wantonness, unthankfulness for Mercies past, love of this present World, open licentiousness, gross Apostasy, that superabounds even among those that bear upon them the Name of the Lord, which things have given our Father just cause, not only thus to frown, but to depart from us for ever? Yea, is it not high time, if we have a tongue for Christ, now to speak for him? if bowels, now to sympathize with him? if tears in our eyes, now to pour them forth before the Lord? if groans in our hearts, now to send them up into Heaven? if faith in the Word and promise of God, now to act it? if exhortations in our Breasts, now to bring them forth, and speak often one to another? and will not the Lord hearken, and hear? and shall not a Book of remembrance be written before him, for them
faithfull Witnessses of Chrifi, &c.

them that now fear the Lord, and call upon his Name? Yea, will not God say concerning them, and they shall bee mine in the day when I make up my Jewels, and though they are Children full of failings, yet for this service sake I will spare them, as a man spareth his own Son that serveth him; surely he will.

And should not this consideration added to all the rest, that the set time of our Redemption is at hand (which dwelling every day more and more upon my heart, hath caused mee to speak) work up our hearts to all these things, and beget in us noble resolutions to hazard whatever is precious to us in the World, for the sake of Christ, and his now despized Cause? which though trampled upon at present, yet shall it suddenly arise with Power and great Glory, and then shall all its enemies melt away before it, as the Snow before the Sun; then shall the Armies of Heaven march forth with the Lord in the Head of them, and the Princes shall bee afraid of his Ensigne, whose fire is in Sion, and his
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his furnace in Jerusalem. The zeal of the Lord of Hosts will perform this. So believes he, and so he prays, who is,

From my Study in Trunch, this 4th. day of the 9th. Month, 1654.

A poor sinful Creature, unworthy to make mention of the name of the Lord,

John Tillinghast.
Errata.

Page 2. line 10. for so even this also, read so even in this also. p. 3. l. 26, 27. for such knowledge also is the root of grace. such knowledge also is the root of grace. p. 4. l. 14. for, apace, this way, apace this way. p. 6. l. last, for, be with Jew and Gentile, between Jew and Gentile. p. 17. l. 18. for are the same, both which are the same. p. 22. l. 15. for at, r. as, l. 16. blot our which. p. 37. l. 20. for current, concurrent. p. 43. l. 19 r. Bishop of Rome, Purgatory, p. 45. l. 25. r. they are to be, p. 77 l. 27. for confine, insists, p. 82. l. 31, 32. for terrible to the Saints, terrible to the Nations, p. 85. l. last. r. Crowns, p. 87. l. 11. for into p. 89. l. 13. for the beginning, our beginning, l. 21, 22. for the aforesaid ending of the 1260 days, the ending of the 1260 days from the aforesaid beginning p. 109. l. 24. for eleven, the eleventh, p. 139. l. last, for 1230, r. 1150. p. 137. l. last. forth, and, buts, p. 141. l. 29. for also, v. 3. v. 2. also l. p. 183. l. 24. for forth came, p. 160 l. 9. for who are, r. which is, p. 218. l. 3. for mollifies, mollifies, p. 232. l. 26. for four, r. fourth, p. 239. l. 23. for one, r. once, p. 265. l. 11. for Hester ten, r. Hester the 10th, p. 291. l. 29. for account, r. accounts E-pist. p. 2. l. 85, obedience, p. 3. l. 25. r. are at an under.
Let the words which are printed greatly out of place be read thus:

Yea by consequence many hundred years should here be leaped over, which is not in any of the other Prophecies.

2 Because the rise of this Little Horn is in the latter time of the Grecian Monarchy, verse twenty three, and in the latter time, &c.
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Knowledge of the Times:
OR,
The Resolution of the Question,
How long it shall be unto the end of Wonders.
Divided into three Parts.

PART I.
Handling some things of more General concernment as to our whole Discourse.

CHAP. 1.
Of the Justifiableness of this Enquiry.

Amongst the many Questions that this Age abounds with, The Great Question that we find in Daniel Cha. 12.6. How long shall it be to the end of Wonders? is neither of the least of those Gods people at this day are seeking resolution in; Nor may it be ranked among
among those we call unnecessary, seeing the Age itself we live in, hath been, and is an age of Wonders.

And truly, that I, once, and now again have affirmed it, doth not arise I hope from any confidence I have of my self, that there is in me above others an ability to resolve it (the thought of which thing I desire to abandon) but having been moved of late to wait upon the Lord for light, as in other things, so even this also; and hoping that a door of light as to the question propounded, hath through the Lords merciful guidance of a sinful unworthy creature, been set open to me, I have judged it a duty, and indeed the greatest piece of service that I find my self in a capacity to do for Christ in my generation, to set this light on a Candlestick, that Gods people may see it.

Yet in regard the Enquiry itself is such as lieth under the censures of some, the reproaches of others, and the general neglect almost of all, it will be necessary that something be spoken in the first place, by way of Justification of the thing itself, which I shall do in two or three Conclusions laid down and proved.

1. CONCLUSION.

That this Enquiry is no enemy to a mans own grace, or the grace of God in others; but rather a special help and advantage to the increase and quickening of grace, both in the person enquiring, and the person reading and hearing.

1. Because it is included within that general Command, John 5.39. Search the Scriptures; now God doth not command that which is prejudicial to our grace.

2. Be-
2. Because the word of blessing goes along with sincere and faithful endeavours of this nature, 
Rev. 1:3. Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this Prophecy, and keep those things which are written therein, Rev. 22:7. Blessed is he that keepeth the sayings of the Prophecy of this Book. The original word in either place translated keep, comes from a verb that signifies to reserve, or to observe; noting, That this keeping which hath a blessing twice annexed to it, first in the beginning, then in the end of the Apocalypse, is such a keeping whereby a man layes up the things here written in his heart, observes how they are fulfilled, and acts towards God and man accordingly; and therefore (I take it) is this Book fenced in with Gods blessing, so as no other besides it, to deliver us from such a conceit as this, viz. That by studying of it, our grace would either suffer decay, or be lost.

3. Because we have a particular promise of fruit and success annexed to such an Enquiry, Dan. 12:4. Many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased; This knowledge here mentioned being a fruit of the Promise, is not to be looked upon as head-knowledge only, but heart-knowledge also, and such knowledge also, is the very root and watering of grace, and therefore can be no enemy to it.

4. Not to multiply Reasons, which of the two, whether to be ignorant of the times of Christs glorious appearances, and his coming, or to know them, if this knowledge be a thing attainable, especially for persons living in the last dayes, who are need.
near the times, and in a manner bordering upon them, be the most likely thing to make a heart secure, lull it asleep in sin, love of this present world, forgetfulness of God, make it negligent in the holy Christian duties of faith, patience, watchfulness, prayer, &c. I call not Reason only, but such Christians also, who knew their own hearts fifteen or twenty yeers ago with a principle then that Christ's coming was at hand, and who know them now, but it may be with a contrary principle, to be Judges. And truly (to say no more) how Christians, though they may rub and chafe their hearts, will yet be able, seeing that the Sun is coming up with the beams of his light and vigor apace, this way to keep them alive, or warm long, if they too come not up to truths of this nature, I do not know.

2. CONCLUSION.

That the Holy Ghost hath expressly foretold that Saints at the time of the end, shall make diligent enquiry into these things. This I take to be the thing noted in those words, Dan. 8. 13. Daniel in the foregoing Vision had had the three last Monarchies, viz. 1 Medes and Persians, 2 Grecians, 3 Romans, represented to him. The Roman Monarchy (which is the last) is represented in its twofold state; 1 In its pure civil state; 2 In its mixt Antichristian state. All which things occasion will be offered to handle more fully in the following Discourse. Now observe, after all these things had passed before Daniel in the Vision, then as the very last thing of all, Daniel hears a discourse of Saints upon our Question; Then I heard one Saint speaking,
and another Saint said unto that certain Saint which spake, How long shall be the Vision concerning the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the Sanctuary and the Host to be trodden under foot? The particle [then] denotes the thing to be successive in time, as well as in place; that is, after Daniel had seen the whole Vision, first the Medes and Persians come forth, and for a while make a great noise in the world, but in the end vanish; Then the Grecians, who also for a time make some stir, and then vanish: After them the Romans, who first conquer Nations as they were a civil State; then secondly, rage against the true worship of God, the holy City, and the inhabitants thereof, as they are an Antichristian State. Now in the conclusion of all, after all these things had passed before Daniel, and he saw this last Monarchy, in its last state upon the nick of vanishing away, as were already the former, then Daniel specially observes another thing, of which he had not seen the like all the time and way before, viz. He beholds many Saints, and they are in very deep serious discourse, and the subject of all their discourse is this Question, HOW LONG SHALL IT BE TO THE END OF WONDERS? or How long shall the Vision be? To which Question of theirs, Daniel hears answer given, and immediately thereof upon the whole Vision is at an end; only the interpretation of it comes in afterwards; so that it is evident these words are properly the last in place and time both, of the whole Vision, which clearly affords us this Observation:

That Saints in the time of the end, shall be much...
upon this Enquiry, How long it shall be unto the end of Wonders?

This is farther clear from Daniel's great Prophecy, Chap. 11. & 12. in which two Chapters Daniel hath the very same thing, viz., the three last Monarchies declared to him by way of Voice, which in the former he saw by way of Vision. Now after the declaration of the whole, Daniel Chap. 12. vers. 5, 6. seeth two men standing, betwixt which is a River, and one is on the one side, and the other on the other. A fit resemblance of Jew and Gentile, ready to unite, yet not fully united: for still there is a River betwixt them, which argues that these words relate to the time a little before the coming in of the Jews, when Jew and Gentile shall be upon the very bank of union, yet not united. Of these two, one propounds a Question to the man cloathed in linnen upon the waters of the River, How long shall it be unto the end of these Wonders? This Querist I conceive to be no other then the Gentile Saints; and my reason is, because vers. 7. answer to him is made in the Gentile Dialect of a time, times, and a half, which is a time proper to the Gentile Churches, Rev. 12. 14. and not to the Jews. And further I look upon the Enquirer here to be the very same for time and persons both, with that Chap. 8. 13. Only with this difference, the Enquirers, though many, are here called but one, because in opposition to the Jews we have one here put for the whole body of the Gentile Saints, there they are spoken of as many, because in that Text is no such opposition between Jew and Gentile.
Now from the whole I make up this Conclusion. That in the time of the end, a little before the Jews coming in, and Antichrist's fall, shall be great Enquiries made among the Gentile Saints concerning the end of Wonders. And if so, then in case we are fallen into that time (as what I have said already in my Key, and have farther to say, will manifest that we are) this Enquiry is not only justifiable, but necessary, it being the great truth of this Age.

3. CONCLUSION.

That the Holy Ghost hath left particular and certain ground for the faith of God's people in the last days to go to God upon for light and knowledge in this thing. I say not only, that the promise made to runners to and fro, Dan. 12.4. that knowledge shall be increased, is, yea ought to be (for why is it else left upon Record?) a ground for our faith to build upon in making this Enquiry; nor only, that the particular answers given to the Querists, Dan. 8. and Chap. 12. is, yea should be another; for why is particular answer given to the Enquirers, but to shew that upon a sober humble and believing Enquiry a knowledge of the thing sought after should be given forth? But that which I chiefly aim at, is, the particular assurance left us in the word that the sealed Book of Prophecies should be unsealed, the words opened, the understanding of the Vision made manifest to the Saints at, or in time of the end; For this see Dan. 12.4. But thou, O Daniel, shut up the words and seal the Book, even to the time of the end. The Book is to be sealed, the words therein shut up;
But how long? Why, but till the time of the end then Book and Words both are to be opened and read.

So ver 9. Go thy way Daniel, for the words are closed up till the time of the end. Daniel heard the answer given by the man that was clothed in Linnen, ver 7. to the Enquirer, ver 6. but faith he, I understood not; therefore from a desire to know, Daniel himself puts the Question, ver 8. to whom answer is given, ver 11.12. but withall observe, Daniel hath first a kind of gracious check, Go thy way Daniel, for the words are closed up untill the time of the end; as to say, Daniel, thou wouldest fain have the knowledge of these things presently, but go thy way Daniel; for the time of Revelation is the time of the end; though I will give thee the words now, yet the unlealing of them shall not be till the time of the end, when (and not before) my mind in these sealed mysteries shall be made known to my children.

Suitable hereunto are the words, Dan.8.17. which words I have shewed in my Key, these are not to bee understood of the time of the Vision, nor the subject matter thereof, but of the understanding of the Vision, which though revealed in part to Daniel then, yet was not to be fully and clearly opened untill the time of the end.

The Conclusion is, That at the time of the end, the Book is to be unsealed, the understanding of the Vision to be made known; and if so, then surely this our practice, we being fallen into the lap of the last times, is justifiable; for why hath God
God so long before given assurance that then he will unfold the Book, open the words, but only to this end, that our faith, when this time comes, might as in other things, so in this, wait upon him for light and knowledge.

CHAP. II.

Shewing, That the Mystical Numbers of Daniel and the Revelations do hold forth a certain definite and determined time.

Having in the foregoing Chapter shewed the justifiableness of our Enquiry, and what comfortable hope the inquiring Soul may have of God's presence and assistance to accompany him in this work. In the next place it is requisite, because we have no ground in Scripture to go upon for an answer to this Question, but only the mystical Numbers of Daniel, and the Revelations, that I proceed to shew that there is a certain definite and determined time held forth in those numbers; only in order to the thing, to the end some of the following Arguments may not want their weight, nor we be put in our proof to insist upon each particular number by itself; I premise, That look what is truly affirmed of anyone, or more mystical Numbers, the same may be as truly affirmed of all except such, where some substantial reason appears to the contrary. If therefore it may be truly affirmed of someone or more, that a definite time is held forth
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forth in them, then by the same rule of all, when (I say) appears not some solid reason to the contrary. This premised, my Reasons that a definite time is held forth in the mystical Numbers of Daniel, and the Revelations, are these.

1 Because They are all broken Numbers; the two thousand and three hundred days, Dan. 8.14 is a broken Number; for although the three hundred is a round Number in respect of Hundreds, yet it is a broken Number in respect of Thousands, which is the way of numbering here. Upon the same account, but more evident, the one thousand two hundred and ninety, the one thousand three hundred thirty-five days, Chap. 12. John's one thousand two hundred and sixty days, his two and forty months are all broken Numbers.

Now it is a Maxime among Interpreters, that notwithstanding round numbers do sometimes signify an indefinite time, yet broken numbers ever a definite.

2 Because If they signify not a definite time, no account can be made up from them; for who can define what is indefinite, or make up an account from uncertain numbers? But now the intentment of the Holy Ghost in laying them down, is, that from them an account might be made up, as is clear.

1 Because the scope of the Questions proposed, Dan. 8. and Dan. 12. to which the mystical Numbers there mentioned, are given in as answers, doth look at such a determined time as known; some certain conclusion concerning the time, How long the things revealed should be in
accomplishing, might from thence be drawn up; therefore the Questions do not run thus, Shall these things be long, O Lord in doing? but thus, How long shall the Vision be? Dan.8.13. How long shall it be to the end of these Wonders? Chap.12.6. the thing enquired after in both, is a certain determined time.

2 Because the Holy Ghost doth lay down a particular head of account, Chap.12.11. Now this is never used but only there where some account is to be made up. But were the time indefinite, there could (as before I have said) be no making up of any account.

3 Reaf. Because should we look upon them as holding forth only an indefinite time, signifying no more but a long time, there would be manifest Tautology in laying them down. For in Daniel’s Vision, Chap.8. where is recorded his two thousand three hundred dayes, vers.14. it is said over and above, vers.last. The Vision shall be for many dayes: If now the two thousand three hundred dayes signify only a long time, it is the same with the other. So in Daniel’s Vision Chap.10, ch.11, and ch.12. where the one thousand two hundred and ninety, the one thousand three hundred thirty five dayes are spoken of, it is said moreover, Chap.10.1. The time appointed was long: The very same with the other, if not a certain time but a long time only be intended.

4 Because For this very reason Daniel 8, vers. last, it is said the Vision of the evening and morning is true. The Vision of the morning and evening hath a particular and peculiar reference to the
two thousand three hundred dayes, ver. 14. (or as the Hebrew reads it, two thousand three hundred mornings and evenings.) Now Daniel in the foregoing verses, from ver. 20, having had the whole Vision in an orderly manner interpreted to him, in the conclusion of all, left Daniel should doubt of the time assigned of two thousand three hundred mornings and evenings (which was the very last thing of the Vision, and is here of the Interpretation) it is added, The Vision of the evening and morning is true, that is, the two thousand three hundred dayes, which thou heardest mention made of in the close of the Vision, are a certain and determined time, and therefore ver. 19. the time is said to be a set time, or an appointed time; At the time appointed the end shall be.

Because God in former times under the Old Testament, hath ever measured out the Bondage and Captivity of his Church by set and determined times. Four hundred and thirty years was the time in Egypt, and this time set to a very day, Exod. 12. 41, 51. Seventy yeers the set time in Babylon. Now is New Testament grace lesse than Old Testament? Nay consider the Egyptian and Babylonian Captivity were both Types of the great Captivity of Gods Church in the latter dayes. Now is it likely that in both the Types the time should be determined, and yet undetermined in the Antitype? Is the Type more cleer, and the Antitype more dark? yet this will follow.

If any should say so, let them say the same also for Daniels Seventy weeks, Chap. 9. 24. for the reason is the same. Nay the Seventy weeks are a round
round number; so is none of the other; yet who doth, or will affirm an indefinite time to be there signified? or if any should, let them when they have done, shew any ground at all (unless bare humane authority) for above four hundred of the worlds yeers, and that too within such a period, in which (without censure) less credit is to be given to the Historians, then almost in any one period from the Flood to this day.

7 Because such a Principle would be very prejudicial to the faith, comfort, and prayers of the Saints; for the more certain ground any of these are built upon, the more strongly do they act. Daniel's assurance that Seventy yeers was the utmost terme of the Babylonian Captivity, raiseth mightily his faith and prayer. But now were the time held forth in these mystical Numbers an indefinite time onely, there should be no certain ground for any of these: And hence it would follow that the people of God in the last dayes should instead of having a more clear word of Prophefie, have a more doubtful ground for their faith and prayer in this respect, than had Gods people in times of old.

The Conclusion is, That the mystical Numbers of Daniel and the Revelations, do hold forth to us a certain definite and determined time.
CHAP. III.

Clearing and confirming our general Distinction, viz. That the end of the Beasts Tyranny, relates to one time; the end of the fourth Monarchy to another.

It is a truth, Nothing can be rightly defined, which is not first rightly divided. The very reason (as to the creature) why mens conceptions have been so dark as to the mind of the Holy Ghost in the mystical Numbers of Daniel and the Apocalypse, hath seemed to me to be this, because they who have undertaken the work, have not applied distinct numbers to their distinct times, but either carried them all in a heap, or handled them all severally, i.e. made all to end at one and the same ending point, or made as many ending points as there are divers numbers. Now of these two, the first inevitably breeds confusion throughout all the Prophecies of the Old and New Testament; the last leaves in the Enquirer after the most diligent search a seed and a ground of doubting, because the light he hath attained, is a word established only by the mouth of one witness, and that witness too (which makes the suspicion greater) must of necessity be, where first numbers are not rightly distinguished; for a principal part of its testimony, as namely, where I am to begin, or how to carry on the account having begun, onely humane; it being impossible for that man who would carry up each
each number severally, to find divine Testimony either for the beginning, or carrying on of any one number; for of this kind of testimony, though there is sufficient left us in the word for each number, both where to begin it, and how to carry it on, yet all is couched in the Harmony; and the Harmony itself depends upon a right division; so that consequently, this wanting, we have nothing left us but humane testimony (which is a thing fallible, and no ground of faith) to warrant the beginning, or carrying on of any particular number that we have either in Daniel, or the Revela-

That therefore we might have firm ground and sure footing here, I have in my Key, Thef. 15. laid down (as the foundation of all) this Distinction, namely to distinguish betwixt the time of the Jews first stirring, and their compleat deliver-

ance; betwixt the time where an end is put to the Beasts Reign and Tyranny, and his final destru-

tion; or (which is all one in respect of time with the other) betwixt Christ standing up in his Witnes-

es, and his standing up in his Person.

Now although the Harmony that by vertue of this distinction is brought forth betwixt all the mystical Numbers (of which in my Key, Thes. 63.) be Argument sufficient to make the dis-


inction valid, yet that it may appear that all our ground for it lies not here, I shall briefly shew what particular ground and warrant besides it, we have in the word for this Distinction.

For the first branch, which concerns the Jews delivery, our ground is so clear from Daniel's
distinguishing of times, Chap. 12. ver. 11, 12. (where he treats of his own Nation more especially) first one thousand two hundred and ninety days, then one thousand three hundred thirty five, that the truth needs no explication.

And although that Division of times made by Daniel is foundation sufficient for our whole distinction, considering that the end of the Beasts Reign, and the Witnesses Resurrection, are things contemporary with the Jews first stirring, as is proved Key, The 17. and also Christ's Personal appearance, and the final destruction of the Beast or fourth Monarchy, contemporary with their compleat deliverance, as also see our Key, The 34. yet because I will not lay the weight of so material a distinction upon that single Text only, I shall produce other Scripture grounds which warrant this distinction.

Dan. 7. 26, 27. A manifest distinction is made betwixt the end (i.e. the final destruction) of the little Horn, (i.e. Antichrist) and the taking away his Dominion.

His Dominion is taken away at the end of the time, times, and a half, which is the very day of the Witnesses Resurrection; i.e. the Beasts Reign and Tyranny shall expire with the time of the Witnesses rife; but observe, his final destruction is not as yet; for after his Dominion is taken away, there is betwixt that, and his end, a time of consuming and destroying him by degrees, till at last upon Christ's Personal appearance, a total destruction comes upon him, and thereby a translation of the fourth Monarchy to the Saints.
Part 1. as to our whole Discourse.

ver. 26. He shall speak great words against the most High, and shall wear out the Saints of the most High, and think to change Times and Laws, and they shall be given into his hand, until a time, times, and the dividing of time, ver. 26. But the judgement shall sit, and they shall take away his Dominion to consume and destroy it unto the end. ver. 27. And the Kingdom and Dominion, and the greatness of the Kingdom under the whole Heaven, shall be given to the people of the Saints of the most High, whose Kingdom is an everlasting Kingdom, and all Dominions shall serve and obey him.

So Rev. 11. It is evident that so soon as the Witnesses rise, the treading under foot the holy City by the Beast is at an end; for as the two and forty months of the Beasts continuance, Rev. 13.5. are interpreted, Chap. 11.2. by another phrase of treading under foot the holy City, are the same, and therefore both end together; no longer, according to the mind of the Holy Ghost, Cha. 13.5. may he be said to continue, then he treads under foot the holy City. So it is most evident that the two and forty months of treading under foot the holy City, ends with the end of the one thousand two hundred and sixty days of the Witnesses wearing Sackcloth; for what causeth the Witnesses to wear Sackcloth, but this, because the holy City is trodden under foot? therefore with the end of the one, the other ends. But now observe upon the Witnesses rise, and putting off their Sackcloth, where ends the Beasts Tyranny, not the whole Kingdom of the Beast is destroyed, but a tenth part only, Rev. 11.13. And the
same hour the tenth part of the City fell. Yea far-
ther observe, after the Witnesses' rise, we read of a
third wo to come quickly; therefore not come yet,
ver. 14. The second wo is past, and behold the third
woe cometh quickly. And of this wo, the Beast
bears a part, as well as Christ's other enemies, and
therefore not yet finally destroyed. Yea farther,
(which serves us as a clear demonstration of the
thing in hand) we read of the Beast as one of the
grand Leaders in the battle of Armageddon; Now
as this battle succeeds the ruine of Rome (as for-
merly I have proved) so doth the ruine of Rome
succeed the rise of the Witnesses, whose punish-
ment comes in a way of revenge of their quarrel
Rev. 18, 6, of necessity therefore the rise of the
Witnesses, and consequently the end of the Beast's
Reign, which expires with the other, must be, yea
and that some time, before the last and final de-
struction of the Beast.

To say, we finde the Beast raging even at the
battle of Armageddon, as appears, Rev. 19, 19.
therefore the two and forty months of the Beast
must be extended as far as that day; and if so, then
our distinction is invalid.

I answer, True, the Beast shall then rage, and
his rage at that day shall make him stark mad; but
with what rage? not with the proud insulting rage
of a Conqueror, as he did all the time of the two
and forty months, but with the mad and distract-
ed rage of a loser; before he overcame the Saints,
and in his pride raged, and trampled the Holy
City under his feet; now himself is overcome,
and for madnesse rageth, because himself is trod-
den underfoot; before he was a raging spoyler, now a rager because spoyled; and in this latter sense he may be a rager, and yet the time of his Reign out; nay, that he who before trod underfoot, is now trodden underfoot; who led into Captivity, is led into Captivity; who killed with the sword, is killed with the sword, is an evident demonstration (though his end be not presently; yet) that the time of his Reign and treading underfoot the Holy City is over; the Woman is got out of the Wildernesse; for she seeks not any longer holes to hide her self in from the rage of her Enemy, but dares appear in his very face, and can drive her Enemy before her. Add also hereunto, that although the Beast rage after the two and forty months are expired, yet doth not he then rage alone as he did all the two and forty months. All the two and forty months he was able to tread underfoot the Holy City, and put the Woman to flight without help; but now he is glad to call in help, send Ambassadors to the Kings of the Earth, and the whole world to stand by him, Rev. 16.13,14. as being not able alone, though a mad raging Beast, to deal with a Potent Woman, which is a manifest Argument that the time of his Reign is over, though yet his end be not presently; and indeed the following time is not (to speak properly) the Beasts time, so much as the time of Gods enemies in general, in which they all hand in hand shall endeavour to destroy the Holy City, but the end shall be their own destruction, which they shall come to, and none shall help them.
And here methinks it doth wonderously affect my heart whilst I ponder upon it, to think how that within these few dayes the poor Woman will come creeping out of the Wilderness, armed with such courage and divine power, as that she, though but a weak Woman, shall yet with manlike resolution flye in the very face of this monstrous Beast, though all the Kings of the earth stand by him to help him; un-horse the Scarlet Whore that sits upon him, drive the Whore, and the Beast that carrieth her (Antichrists Civil and Ecclesiastical power) both before her, making them cry, *Come help, come help, deliver us from the fury of the Woman.*

From the whole it appears what footing we have in Scripture for this distinction, which is a fundamental thing, as to the Enquiry in hand; Yea where it is not made, and diligently observed, a cloud will of necessity be upon all the Prophesies of the Old and New Testament both.

*The end of the First Part.*
PART II.

Computing the Time of the Beast, and shewing where the limited time of his Tyranny ends.

CHAP. I.

Discussing some things of more General Concernment as to the particular Question.

SECT. 1.

That distinction of Times (which we have noted before) namely to distinguish betwixt the time of the Beast's Tyranny, and the time of the fourth Monarchy, being the foundation of this Enquiry, and that only which can produce a Scripture Harmony of all those mystical Numbers that bear any relation to the Question in hand, it is necessary that we should here make it our rule to walk by.

Now of these two, as the time of the Beasts Reign is to expire first, the time of the fourth Monarchy some years after; So shall I in this
Enquiry first, begin with the first, viz. the time of the Beasts Tyranny.

And so the Grand Question is:

**Quest. When, or with what time are we to put a period to Antichrist's Tyranny.**

The onely ground we have to go upon to resolve this great Question, is, Daniel's one thousand two hundred and ninety days, John's two and forty months, his one thousand two hundred and sixty days.

The first, viz. Daniel's one thousand two hundred and ninety days prove not this directly; for their aima is at another thing, viz. the beginning of the Jews delivery, but by consequence onely at the end of Antichrists Reign, and the beginning of the Jews delivery, which fall out at a point; I shall therefore (having also spoken sufficiently to that number. Key, Theb 20.) wave it here, and wholly insist upon John's numbers of two and forty months, one thousand two hundred and sixty days, both which tend directly to prove the thing in hand; only with this difference; the one, viz. the one thousand two hundred and sixty days, sets forth the time in reference to the Churches suffering state within this time; the other, viz. the two and forty months in reference to Antichrists rage and tyranny throughout this time: yet both (I say) have a direct tendency to prove the thing, and answer our Question. And (as Mr. Mede hath excellently observed) Antichrists time is set forth by months, which are governed by the Moon, because the worshipping of Idols, and every sin and error is of the power.
of darkness and night, wherein the Moon ruleth; but the Churches time by days, because true Religion is compared to the light, and to the day, of which the Sun is the Ruler.

SECT. 2.

That both Days and Months are Prophetical, is clear, because (as Mr. Mede in his Comment upon Rev. xii. vers. 3. well reasons) if ( faith he) the one thousand two hundred and sixty dayes be to be understood of natural dayes, then are the three days and a half, assigned afterwards to the death of the Witnesses, to be so understood also, they being part of the one thousand two hundred and sixty; but they cannot be so taken, because the things foretold to be done within the three days and a half, will no way agree to three days and a half of natural dayes; the one therefore being Prophetical, the other must also. Withall the very things spoken of the Beast, and the Witnesses, have already taken up neer as much time as two and forty Prophetical months, one thousand two hundred and sixty Prophetical dayes, amounts to. I conclude, therefore the one thousand two hundred and sixty days, the two and forty months, are Prophetical Days and Months.

SECT. 3.

The Days and Months being Prophetical, the Question now would be, Where are we to begin these numbers? Before I can take this Question in hand,
hand, there is yet something of more general concernment to be noted by the way, as,

First, Let it be observed, that the two and forty months are twice spoken of. 1 Forty two months of the Beasts continuance, Rev. 13.5. 2 Forty two months of treading underfoot the holy City, Chap. 11.2. Each two and forty months are one and the same in respect of beginning and ending. The difference between them is onely this, the first chiefly mentions the time allowed to the Beast to reign and domineer; the second the work that he shall do within this time, viz., Tread down the Holy City. And indeed that these two must begin and end together, is clear; for were the treading underfoot the Holy City to have its beginning either some time before the rise of the Beast, or some time after, and that as a distinct two and forty months from the other, then considering that the Beast must rage, and tyrannize two and forty months, in all which time the Holy City is trampled underfoot, the time (though ever so little) that we adde either before or after, will make the time of treading underfoot the Holy City to amount to more then two and forty months, which is the very time, and no longer, that the Holy City is to be trodden underfoot.

The one thousand two hundred and sixty days, we have likewise twice spoken of. First one thousand two hundred and sixty days, of the Womans flight into the Wildernessse, Chap. 12.6. Secondly, one thousand two hundred and sixty dayes of the Witnesses prophesying in Sackcloth, Chap. 11.3. These two (as the other) are likewise one and
the same, both for beginning and ending, the one (making mention of the state of the Church more in general) setteth forth the place where the Church of God all the one thousand two hundred and sixty days should abide, viz. in some obscure corners of the world, as in a Wilderness; the other (pointing at the state of the Witnesses in particular, which are not the whole Church, but a part only, and this I take to be the main difference betwixt the eleven and twelve Chapters of the Revelations) tells us, the work Christ's Witnesses should be employed in, notwithstanding this their retirement, together with the Church into blind and obscure holes and corners, in this time of the one thousand two hundred and sixty days, which is, they Prophesie, though in Sackcloth, i.e. in a poor oppressed sorrowful condition, through grief, to see all this time the Holy City trampled underfoot by the Beast.

And indeed that these two also must be one and the same: both for beginning and ending, is evident for the very same reason, as the former, because if the one thousand two hundred and sixty days of the Woman's flight into the Wilderness were to begin sooner or later than the one thousand two hundred and sixty days of the Witnesses prophesying in Sackcloth, then (as I said of the other) seeing the Witnesses wear their sackcloth all the time the Church abides in the wilderness, the added time whether before or after, would make the time of the Witnesses prophesying in sackcloth to surmount the number of one thousand two hundred and sixty days.
Now in the next place it would be farther enquired into, First whether the two and forty months, and the one thousand two hundred and sixty days, are a different time? or whether both make up but one and the same number of years? Secondly, whether in case the same number of years be found in both, are we to conceive of either as beginning and ending together? or whether is any one to begin before the other?

To the first, I answer, That we are to conceive the time to be one and the same in both; the two and forty months, the one thousand two hundred and sixty days, making both up but one and the same number of years. Not to insist upon what Expositors generally say, that two and forty months, reckoning thirty days to a month, which is the Grecian account, make up the just summe of one thousand two hundred and sixty days; to me it appears that the thing I am speaking of must be so, and cannot be otherwise, and that upon the former account still; because were the two and forty months a time longer than the other, then the Beasts reign and treading underfoot the Holy City, being to continue two and forty months (which two things are the main cause why the Woman betakes her self to the Wildernesse, and the Witnesses continue there with her in a mournful postture prophesying in sackcloth) the Woman's continuance in the wildernesse, and the Witnesses prophesying in sackcloth shou'd (the cause still remaining) be above one thousand two hundred and sixty days. Or were the two and forty months a shorter time, then should the flight
flight of the Woman into the wildernesse, and the Witnesses prophesying in sackcloth, which
continues no longer then the time of the Beasts rage, and trampling the Holy City ( that being
(as I have said) the cause of the other, which taken away, the effect ceaseth ) not be so long as
one thousand two hundred and sixty dayes. Seeing therefore it cannot be either a longer time, or
a shorter, we must conclude one and the same number of years to be included in both.

To the second I answer, That we are without
doubt to conceive of it, that the two and forty months,
the one thousand two hundred and sixty dayes (making
up but one and the same number of years) are to be
begin and end together. My reason is still what I
have urged; because should we suppose the two
and forty months to begin either sooner or later
then the one thousand two hundred and sixty
dayes, as a time distinct, and to be considered by
it self; it will then necessarily follow, seeing all
the time of the Beasts tyranny, and treading un-
derfoot the Holy City, the Woman is to be in the
wildernesse, and the Witnesses to prophesie in
sackcloth, that by reason of the time which must
be added either before or after, to make up the two
and forty months compleat, the Womans con-
tinuance in the wildernesse, and the Witnesses
prophesying in sackcloth should be above one
thousand two hundred and sixty dayes.

The conclusion is, That the two and forty months,
and the one thousand two hundred and sixty days,
are one and the same, and also begin and end to-
gether.
CHAP. II.

Disproving the sundry false beginnings.

SECT. 1.

It being cleared in the former Chapter that both Months and days are Prophetic; and also that the two and forty months of the Beasts continuance, the two and forty months of treading underfoot the Holy City; the one thousand two hundred and sixty days of the Woman's abode in the wilderness, the one thousand two hundred and sixty days of the Witnesses prophesying in sackcloth, do all make up but one and the same number of years; and also are one and the same both for beginning and ending; it comes next to be considered, where we are to begin this Epoch of two and forty months, one thousand two hundred and sixty days.

Amongst the variety of opinions which are extant of Writers ancient and modern, there are but three, save the opinion of our worthy German Author, from whom, though I judge, by comparing mystical numbers together, that I see reason to vary somewhat, yet is not the variance such as deserves a contest; I say besides him, there are but three that have so much colour of reason for their opinions, as that there will be any need of bringing them to the Touchstone. And these are,

1. Those who begin the Epoch with the time of Constantine the Great,
A late Writer who begins with the time of Pope Leo the first.

3 Others who begin with the time when Boniface was created universal Bishop by Phocas.

As for the first, viz. the opinion of those who begin from the time of Constantine the Great (some of that opinion fixing upon the year 304. others differ as to a few years, yet keep within the compass of 300. and 316.) I say not (in answer to it) that the very foundation of this opinion is a mistake, viz. That the two Witnesses are the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament.

But my reasons against it are:

1 Because by this opinion, the Harmony of the mystical numbers is destroyed; for if the one thousand two hundred and sixty days, and the two and forty months begin with Constantine's time, then is it not possible to bring the one thousand two hundred and sixty days, the two and forty months to concur in their end with Daniel's one thousand two hundred and ninety (which must be upon the grounds laid down in our Key, Thesis 17.) unless we shall finde some action which may be accounted a fit Head for the one thousand two hundred and ninety days, thirty years above Constantine; and in case this should be found, yet then will not the one thousand three hundred thirty five (which begins from the same Head with the one thousand two hundred and ninety) concur in their end with the two thousand three hundred (which also must be for our reasons, Key, Thesis 34.) unless some other beginning and carrying on of that great number, may upon approved grounds be found, which will
notwithstanding bring the two thousand three hundred dayes to end at the same point with the one thousand three hundred thirty five.

2. Because (setting the Harmony wholly aside) by this computation the seventh Government in the Roman Empire, viz. by Christian Emperors, which is that John calls a Government yet to come (Rev. 17.10. There are seven Kings (i.e. distinct kinds of Government) five are fallen, one is, and the other is not yet come) is either wholly cut off, or else confounded with the Beasts: For this Government did not begin till Constantine's time; now if we thence also begin the two and forty months of the Beast, then do we (I say) leave no room for the seventh kind of Government; so that either it must be cut off, or confounded with the Beasts. That it should be cut off, cannot be; for the Text faith expressly, is to come, i.e. as really to have a being as the five fallen had had, and the sixth then in being had. That we should confound it with the Beasts, may not be.

First, because this Government is to continue a space before the rise of the Beast. And when it cometh, it must continue a short space. This short space must either be meant of the time before the Beasts Kingdome, or the time of his Reign. If the time of his Reign be meant, and so the seventh Government, and his Reign be made one; how then is it called a short space? Seeing the time allotted to the Beast is a long time, two and forty months; one thousand two hundred and sixty years; yea how is it called a short space comparatively with the sixth or former Government, which continued
not half, nay not one third part of this time? this Government therefore must be distinct from the Beasts.

Secondly, because the Beasts Government as relating to this, is called the eighth, ver. 11. And the Beast that was, and is not, even he is the eighth. Though the Beast in respect of his Seat and the Civil power he exerciseth, which power did reside in all the former Governments, is laid to be of the seven; and accordingly hath seven Heads, i.e. Rome the Seat of, and the Civil power of all the former Governments, yet is he not called the Seventh, but of the seven, because successively, and in order he followeth the seventh, and his Government comes in as the eighth, being a Government distinct from the seventh, and all the several Governments before him; For which reason we may not confound the Beasts Government with the seventh, which yet this opinion either doth, or shuts wholly out, neither of which can stand with truth.

3 Because according to this supposition, the time is expired above a hundred years since. And being so;

1 How comes it to passe that yet of late yeers the Holy City hath been so trodden underfoot? Saints for Religion sake driven to flight, as it hath been with us here in England; yea so many killed, and put to death, as have been in Germany, the Low-Countries, France, and all this within much less time then one hundred yeers, yea the greatest part of it not half the time? Certainly whilst the Woman is driven from one corner of the world to
the other to hide herself, and her children are cruelly killed & massacred, we cannot look upon her as come out of the wilderness; whilst Antichristian injunctions and superstitions are set up, and imposed instead of the pure worship of Christ, who will say the treading underfoot of the Holy City is at an end? and have not these things been more or less, within less than twenty, I may say within less than half this twenty years? I would I could not say at this present.

2. How also comes it to pass that so many years since the expiring of this time, the Beast hath escaped, and neither been killed with the sword, nor led into captivity, seeing it is said of him that at the end of his Reign his two and forty months expired, He that leadeth into Captivity shall be led into Captivity, he that killeth with the sword, shall be killed with the sword, Rev. 13.10. If it be said, Christ hath these many yeers ever since Luther's time in a spiritual manner with the sword of his mouth been killing and captiving the Beast; I answer, true; But what hath been done against him by a Civil sword, or towards a Civil captivating of him, which is the Sword and Captivity here spoken of? For observe such a Sword as he hath killed the Saints with, and such a Captivity as he hath exposed them unto, such a Sword, and such a Captivity (it being brought upon him by God in a way of retaliation) shall himself suffer by, and be exposed unto; but the one hath been Civil, therefore shall the other also. If it be replied, was not this done some years since in Germany by Gustavus Adolphus? Answ. Grant it so to be; yet...
doth that fall many years too late; the one thousand
two hundred and sixty (according to this opinion) being expired long before his time; but now
no sooner is the time expired, but instantly, *Hee 
that leadeth into Captivity is led into Captivity, Hee 
that killeth with the Sword is killed with the Sword.*
Neither the German War therefore, nor any that
hath been since will at all help this opinion. 2. If
the War of the Swedish King in Germany were a
killing the Beast with the Sword, a leading him
into Captivity, then most certainly, since, he is risen,
and come out of Captivity again; but let us assure
our selves, that when Christ kills the Beast with
the Sword, he shall have no resurrection; when
he leads him into captivity, no return.

Obj. But it may be objected, That we must of
necessity begin this Epoch of one thousand two
hundred and sixty years as high as Constantine, if
not higher; for (Revel. 12.) it is the Dragon
with seven Heads, and ten Horns, and seven
Crowns on his heads; (which is the embleme of
the old Roman Empire, and not the Empire of the
Beast, who hath ten Crowns, and those upon his
Horns, (Revel. 13. 1.) that drives the Woman
into the Wilderness.

I answer; This cannot be for what hath been
proved already, viz. That the forty two months,
and the one thousand two hundred and sixty days, are
one and the same time, which begin and end together;
and how could this be, in case the one thousand
two hundred and sixty days were to begin before
the rise of the Beast, whilst yet the Roman Empire
was ruled by the Dragon?

2. Observe the Text it self, and it will appear:

That the act of the Dragon there mentioned, is not the driving of the Woman into the Wilderness, but another thing, viz. a lying in wait to devour her child so soon as born, v. 4. And the Dragon stood before the woman which was ready to be delivered, for to devour her child so soon as it was born. The meaning whereof is, That the faithful, the true members and children of the Church, (which because one Body, are here represented by one Childe; and for dignity sake, or else to represent their strength in their head, Christ, a Man-childe) that in the time of Paganism had been oppressed by the Dragon; the Devil perceiving them now through Constantines means to be in a rising way, and ready as with a Rod of Iron to crush in pieces his Heathenish Worship; he therefore labours by stirring up the power of the old Pagan Empire to oppose Constantine, to stifle this work in the beginning; but this he cannot do; Constantine prevails, and the faithful in despiught of him are caught up to God, and to his Throne, i.e. set out of the reach of the Dragon through Constantines prevailing. The Church now after her sharp fiery Trial under the Pagan Emperours coming to enjoy great peace and prosperity under Constantine, it comes to passe that shee abusing her prosperity, and Jesu-ron-like now waxing fat, beginning to kick and grow wanton, her good is turned into evil, and within a short time afterwards shee begins to Apostatize from her first Principles, and instead of being cloathed with the Sun (as was the Primitive Church, ver. 1.) and having the Moon under her feet, she neglects the Sun, i.e. Christ crucified for Justification, and true Holinesse through his
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Death and Sufferings, and arrayes her self with the Moon, i.e. worldly ornaments, as Dignities, Preferments, outward Riches, &c. which things a while after Constantine began to bee mightily tickled for by the Clergy generally, yea in Coun-
cels also. Now when it came to be thus, the wo-
man, i.e. the true Church vanisheth away, and re-
tires her self into the Wilderness; and as shee re-
tires, so in her room stands up the Beast, i.e. the false Antichristian Church. But this is not done
instantly, but after the Church had had prospe-
ritv some time, and abused it, and thereby pro-
voked Christ to with-draw his presence and Spi-
rit; which gone, the Church straightway dege-
gerates, and shee that was before the Spouse of
Christ, becomes an Antichristian Harlot.

Hence the Womans flight into the Wilderness
is noted in the Text, as the very next thing after
the childes being caught up to God and his
Throne, ver. 5. And her child was caught up to God,
and to his Throne, ver. 6. And the woman fled into the
Wilderness. Now observe, as the childes being
caught up to God, and his Throne, was successi-
to the Dragons gaping to devour the child, which
was whilst yet the child was but in the birth; So the
womans flight into the Wilderness (whence begins
the one thousand two hundred and sixty days) is to
be looked upon as a thing successive, as well in
time as place to the childes being caught up to
God and to his Throne; And so the Objection
is indeed a reason for us, that we may not begin
the one thousand two hundred and sixty days, ei-
ther before Constantine, or with him, but must
some time afterwards.
The Arguments brought from History Civil, or Ecclesiastical, to prove this fall to the ground upon the account of these two reasons.

1. Because History is only a Human testimony, and therefore to be tried by the Divine; but the Divine testimony (or testimony of Scripture) cannot be made to agree to this beginning, as our two first Reasons prove.

2. Because all that is said from History, as viz., the Story of Constantine's donation of Rome, Italy, &c. to Pope Silvester, the story of Queen Helen's Cross, &c. have only the authority of Popish Writers, and not any of the Ancients to countenance them; yea, are exploded by Protestant Writers as Fables; as see Melanthon in his review of Carions Chronicle, lib. 3. Johan. Wolf. cent. 4. Simpsons History of the Church, lib. 2. cent. 4.

The Argument urged by some from the Indictions (which of all Arguments from meer History is the most plausible) tends only to prove that the Papists reckon the beginning of their Kingdom from about this time. But doth it follow that therefore we are so to do? What Scripture warrant is there for such a thing, that there we should begin the time of the Beast's reign, where the Beast's own followers begin their Kingdom? Certainly, were this a rule to walk by, there would be no difficulty at all in making up our account of the forty two Moneths, & the one thousand two hundred and sixty days; yea, take it at best, it is but an uncertain Argument; for some end the Olympiads, and begin the Indictions sooner, some later; and what strength this Argument hath in it (which in my account is but feeble) will as well agree.
agree (according to some) to a more likely time, as to this; for Rosse in his History of the World faith, Lib. 3. Chap. 3. that about the year three hundred ninety five the Olympiads ceased, and the Indictions were instituted.

The conclusion of all is, That that opinion which begins the forty two Months, and the one thousand two hundred and sixty days, with Constantine, is not that we are to cleave unto, as truth in this thing.

S E C T. 2.

The opinion of a late Writer (who hath bestowed much labour upon our Question) is, that we are to begin this Epocha with the time of Pope Leo the first; and the particular year pitch-ed upon by our Author is the year four hundred forty two.

But though I honour the Author, yet cannot I receive his opinion.

1 Because according to it the one thousand two hundred and sixty days cannot be made current in their end with the one thousand two hundred and ninety, unless thirty years upwards of the year four hundred forty two, a Head be found for that number; which could it bee, yet cannot then the one thousand three hundred thirty five be made concurrent in their end (no not according to our Authors own Principles, and calculation) with the two thousand three hundred.

2 Because its evident the Beast was risen above forty years before this time; therefore not now to rise.

The account of the wonderful Numberer,
Dan. 8. 14. doth not (as faith our Author, but without giving any substantial reason for the thing) enforce this beginning, but indeed strongly, it rightly computed, another, as appears from our Key.

His Human testimonies are wonderously misapplied in point of time; for indeed not any one of those Human Rites, Superstitions, and Idolatries, which our Author makes mention of, as crept in at this time, but had their rise, yea approbation too even in Councels some years higher, as is proved in my Key, Tbes. 23.

The Author's calculation of the time when the Beast shall begin to go to wrack, and that from the number of his Name, six hundred sixty six, carries not weight with me, because I finde the number of the Beast's name, put for a part or peice of the Beast's Idolatry, which the true worshippers of Jesus are to shun, and get victory over, Chap. 15. 2. And I saw them that had gotten the victory over the Beast, and over his Image, and over his Mark, and over the number of his Name. But now did the number of his Name hold forth the time of his continuance, it would contrariwise bee a great part of a Saints comfort and joy to know it.

Nay further, I finde the Papals severely punished by God for having to do with this Name, Chap. 14. 11. And the smack of their torment ascended up for ever and ever. And they have no rest day nor night, who worship the Beast, and his Image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name. The least that can be inferred from these words, is, that
the mark of the Beast and his name are things of near kin the one to the other; therefore his mark, and the number of his name are both included in these words, The mark of his name. But were there any such thing intended in the number of the Beasts name, as the time of his continuance, this could not be, but contrariwise, the Beasts mark, and the number of his name should be things vastly different. To say the one and the other may be intended, cannot be, unless we should suppose contraries, viz. Sin and Comfort, a Curse and a Blessing may be reconciled.

The conclusion is, That that opinion, which makes the two and forty months, the one thousand two hundred and sixty days to begin A. D. 442, cannot be the mind of the Holy Ghost in this thing.

**S E C T. 3.**

There is yet another opinion, which begins the one thousand two hundred and sixty days with the time when Boniface was by Phocas made universal Bishop. The Authors and Assertors of this opinion most of them begin about the year 600.

But this cannot be:

1. Because all the wit of man can never according to this opinion bring forth a Harmony of the mystical Numbers, i.e. make the one thousand two hundred and sixty days to end at the same point with the one thousand two hundred and ninety, and the one thousand three hundred thirty and five with the two thousand three hundred, both which must be,
2 Because it is said of the seventh kind of Government in the Roman Empire that the same was to continue but a little space, Rev. 17.10. And there are seven Kings, five are fallen, and one is, and the other is not yet come; and when he cometh, he must continue a short space. Now when the Angel saith, It should continue but a little space, he speaks undoubtedly with a reference to that Government that then was in being, viz. by Pagan Emperours, comparatively with which the continuance of the seventh or following Government should be but a short space. But now if the Beast who by coming in as the Eighth, puts an end to the seventh or following Government, did not rise till about this time, then comparatively with the sixth, could not the seventh be said to continue a little space; for its continuance should be well nigh as long as the other.

3 Because according to this account, all the Horns of the Beast should be in being, and that above one hundred and forty years before yet there was any Beast; For the Beast had all his Horns (as shall appear by and by) before the year four hundred and sixty; but how monstrous and irrational a thing is it to affirm that Horns should be before, or without a Beast?

The Conclusion is, That we are not to begin the two and forty months, or the one thousand two hundred and sixty days, with the time when Boniface was created universal Bishop by Phocas,
It will now be said, seeing I disallow all the precedent accounts, *what year do I myself pitch upon for the beginning of this Epoch?*

I answer, *The year I fix upon, I have already stated in my Key, to be A.D. 396.*

The Reasons of this fixation are,

1. **Reason,** *Because that year, and no other can make the one thousand two hundred and sixty days concur in their end with the one thousand two hundred and ninety; And also the one thousand three hundred thirty-five with the two thousand and three hundred.*

2. **Reason,** *Taken from the words of the Apostle, 2 Thes. 2.3. Let no man deceive you by any means; for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the Son of perdition.*

Out of which words I draw this Conclusion;

*That the Revelation of the man of Sin was then to be, when as there should appear some eminent defection in the Church from its primitive purity. For the Apostle makes the falling away, to be the Revelation of the man of Sin; as to say, the man of Sin shall then thrust himself into the world, in, or with this falling away.*

Now
Now let us enquire when this eminent Apostacy from Primitive purity began, and therein undoubtedly are we to state the rise of the Anti-Christian Beast.

Much as to this I have written already, Key, Thes 23, so as that it may seem superfluous to add any thing more. All therefore that I shall do farther, shall be only to translate some few things of many, which I finde gathered together out of the Ancients by Joan. Wolfs in his Centenaries, who applyes things to the particular year or time of their rise, i.e. when a discovery was first made of these corruptions, and witnesses born against them, by good men living in those first ages.

And first as for what is by him laid down in his Epistle Dedicatory,

Out of Jerome he hath these sayings, which he applies to the year 390.

Concerning the Avarice and corruption of the Clergy, Jerome thus;

Where is this Avarice crept into the Church? the Law now perisheth from the Priest, the Vision from the Prophet.

And again, searching (faith he) former Histories, I have not been able to find any who have so rent the Church, and seduced those of Gods Family, as those do who now go under the name of Priests; they are become a crooked snare, giving occasion to scandal in all places.

Farther, He calls the then Roman Presbytery, Scribes, Pharisees, a Synod of Pharisees; and adds, that from the Apostles days until that time the Church
Church grew under Persecutions, and was crowned with Martyrdom; But (faith he) at this day the same is greater in riches, and power, but lesser in virtue.

Concerning the Prohibition of Marriage, Meats, &c. the said Jerome, thus;

IN HYPOCRYSIE they speak, who when they cannot contain, will seem so chaste as even to condemn Marriage, so abstemious that they judge those that use the creatures of God sparingly, when as they give up themselves to follow luxurious Banquets.

Our aforesaid Author alledge also a saying out of Augustine, applying it to the year 399, tending to shew how greatly the Church about this time was fallen from her first purity. The testimony speaks thus, That Religion about this time was so corrupted with Traditions and humane Rites, that the very condition of the Jews under the Law was more easie then that of Christians under the Gospel.

Also under the very same year (as the next thing) he brings a testimony of Dionysius Bishop of Corinth, who by an Epistle admonisith another Bishop, that he shoule not load Christians with heavy Burdens, Ceremonies and Traditions, nor obtrude upon his Brethren single life.

After this he quotes Chrysostome declaming against the Bishop of Rome's Purgatory, &c. which things he applies to the year 410. the recital whereof I forbear to mention,

Hitherto of what I find in our Authors Epistle. The Book it self affords variety of the like,
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Betwixt the years 390 and 400, whereof I shall only glean up some things.

Cent. 4. A.D. 391.

Of the Clergies enriching themselves by Auricular Confession, he faith thus,

That when any Prince or great man confessed himself guilty of any crime by him committed, presently by threats and persuasions he was made to believe that he could not be saved, unless he did confer on the Church a good part of his estate; or else bidding farewell to all earthly things, devolving them upon the Clergy, should betake himself to a private Monkish life; which done, he should thereby not only be freed from Hell, but also obtain a sure certain and plentiful hope of life eternal.

A.D. 393. He faith thus, That in that very year was seen hanging in the Heavens, a burning Pillar by the space of thirty days. And (faith he) about this very time began humane Traditions, Monkish life, &c.

A.D. 395. He makes mention of one Amphilo- chius Bishop of Iconium, reprehending the worshipping of Images; An Argument Image worship was up so early.

A.D. 396. He collects many things out of Epiphanius third Book, Contra Haereses, shewing how great the defection was at this time.

Concerning Image worship, Epiphanius thus.

Where is this Image worship, and design of the Devil?

And a little after, The Images of such as never lived, do men introduce to be worshipped, having the mind adulterated from the one, and only God.
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And a little after that, Be mindful my beloved children, that ye bring not Images into the Church, but bear about God always in your hearts; for it is not meet that a Christian should be held by his eyes, but by the occupation of his mind.

Concerning the Virgin Mary, Epiphanius thus;

The body of Mary was truly holy, but not God. The Virgin herself was indeed a Virgin, and to be honoured, but not given us that we should worship her, she her self worshipping him who was born of her flesh.

Much more is by the aforesaid Author quoted from Epiphanius, which speaks the very lame language with these, all which he applyes to the year 396. the recital whereof I forbear.

A.D. 399. To this year Wolfius makes application of many sayings of Augustine, who was made (faith Helvicius) Presb. Hyponensis, A.D. 391.

Concerning Purgatory, Augustine thus;

The Catholick faith believes Heaven to be the first place, the second Hell; as for a third, we are wholly ignorant, nor is it found in the Scripture.

Concerning worshipping Saints thus,

It is not our Religion to worship dead men; they are honored for our imitation sake, not to be worshipped for the sake of Religion, nor are we to consecrate Temples to them, for they will not so be honoured of us.

Concerning Faith and Works.

Good Works do not precede Justification, but follow the justified.

Concerning Peter, and the Power of the Keyes thus,
We who are called Christians do not believe in Peter, but in whom Peter did believe. And again, The Keys of the Church are delivered to the whole Church, not to one Peter.

A little after, Augustine reprehending (faith our Author) the arrogancy of the Popes who suffered themselves to be called Gods, faith, He that would seem to be God, when as he is man, doth not imitate him, who when he was God, was for our sakes made man.

The aforesaid Author quoteth a saying of Gregory Nazianzen concerning Councils about this time, Cent. 4. p. 127. If truth (faith he) be spoken, I judge it best that all Councils be avoided; for I never saw good end of any Council, nor the abrogation of any evil thereby, but only ambition, contention, and strifes about Prerogative and Dignity.

This cloud of witnesses standing up for the truth, and that about this time is a manifest demonstration of that great Apostacy from primitive principles and purity, which we are speaking of, to be about this very time.

If any doubt of the Testimonies themselves, or conceive I may in translating them have corrupted them, they may satisfy themselves by having recourse to my Author; where likewise they shall find in most things, two for one of what I have translated.

Add here to as a Celestial sign of this defection, and of the rise of the Antichristian Lucifer about this very time, what is by Alsted recorded, viz. That a little before this time, as namely, A. D. 383. And again, A. D. 389, were seen two Comets.
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one following the other like unto Lucifer, the like to which were never seen in any other Age. In Chronologia Cometarum.

Yet as concerning the defection I am speaking of, I grant that the same was in part more early. The reason whereof is this, because the mystery of iniquity from the Apostles' days did begin to work, and endeavour to thrust itself in, 2 Thes. 2.7.

Hence in the year 198, when Victor was Bishop of Rome, a great stir was made by him about the Celebration of Easter; but the same was opposed by some Councils at that time. Alst ed in Chronologia Conciliorum.

So also in the year 316. It was endeavoured in the Council of Nice, That Bishops and Elders should refrain from their wives: But Paphnutius opposed himself to the whole Council, urging that of the Apostle, Marriage is honourable among all men, and so far prevailed as to bring forth a decree of liberty, that for chastity such might accompany with their wives. Alst ed in Chronologia Testium veritatis.

But now though Antichrist was more early thrusting himself forth, yet are we not thence to reckon his rise, but from that time when the Apostacy grew eminent, the Councils, and Ministry being more generally corrupted, which was about the aforesaid year, 396.

And certainly if at this time after all these things before mentioned were come forth, we cannot yet see the Beast in the world, but must come down lower to find him, it argues that we either shut out eyes, or are blind whilst we look for him.
The Argument then lies thus, If that falling away which is foretold should be at the time of Antichrist's Revelation, were A.D. 396, then we are there to place the Beasts rise, and accordingly thence to reckon the two and forty months, and the one thousand two hundred and sixty days; but the Antecedent is true; therefore the consequent.

SECT. 2.

3. Reason. A third Reason of the foregoing Position may be taken from the following words of the Apostle, ver. 6, 7, 8. And now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time: For the mystery of Iniquity doth already work; onely he who now letteth, will let until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that wicked be revealed. Out of which words I draw this conclusion, viz. That the man of sin, or the Antichrist, was to be revealed, when that which then did withhold and let (viz. the Civil power of the Roman Empire, which would not admit of any Competitor, or the setting up of any other power equal or above it) should be taken away, i.e., removed from the seventh Head (which is the last Head of the ancient Roman Beast, i.e. of Rome as it was a pure Civil state) and placed somewhere else.

Now before we can frame any Argument that shall have in it a concluding force, here are two things to be cleared, viz.

1. Whether this taking away be to be reckoned from the time that the Civil power of the Roman
Roman Empire was wholly taken off the seventh Head, and fixed somewhere else, or whether from the time when this began to be?

2 In case we incline to the one, or the other, what time are we to pitch upon, in which this was done?

Concerning the first, we are (as I conceive) to account from that time when this began to be done. My Reasons are,

1. Because it is proper and agreeable to the phrase of taking away, to say a thing is then taken away when such a beginning is made as irresistibly causeth a total removing or taking away.

It is said, Dan. 9.2. That seventy years were to be accomplished in the desolations of Jerusalem. These seventy years are to be reckoned from the first Captivity, which was in the third year of Jehoiakim, Dan. 1.1, 12. 2 Chon. 36. 6, 7. as is clear,

1. Because the Scriptures speaking of the seventy years Captivity point us to Jehoiakim's reign, as the time from whence we are to begin our account, Jerem. 25. vers. 1, compared with vers. 11, 12. Chap. 29. vers. 1, 3, compared with vers. 10.

2. Because Israel was to serve the King of Babylon but seventy years, Jer. 25.11, 12. These Nations shall serve the King of Babylon seventy years. And after seventy years are accomplished, I will punish the King of Babylon. Now Israel's servitude to the King of Babylon beginning in the
dayes of Jehoiakim, in case the seventy years were not to be begun till afterwards, then should they serve the King of Babylon above seventy years.

3 Because Israel was to be in Babylon but the terme of seventy years, Jer.29.10. For thus saith the Lord, that after seventy years be accomplished, I will visit you, and perform my good word towards you, in causing you to return to this place. But Israel for a considerable part of them were carried into Babylon in the dayes of Jehoiakim; if therefore we begin the seventy years afterwards, then seeing that untill the seventy years were expired, they came not out of Babylon, their being in Babylon should be upwards of seventy yeers; therefore I say that the seventy yeers of Jerusalem's desolations are to reckoned from the first Captivity; yet observe, their desolations then were onely begun, not perfected till nineteen years after, in the eleventh of Zedekiah, when City and Temple were destroyed, 2 Chron. 36.19. yet notwithstanding both the Holy Ghost reckon their desolations and captivity from the time the same was begun, though the compleating of it was not till some yeers after.

So Dan.7.26. Its said concerning the little Horn, the judgement shall sit, and they shall take away his Dominion: And when is this taking away? Ans. When the Ancient of dayes begins to sit, and the Thrones of the Beast begin to be cast down, though yet the final destruction of this little Horn is not till afterwards, ver.11. And observe, if the ruine of the Roman Empire in its second state under Antichrist be to be reckoned from the time
time when this begins, why not in its first likewise?

In Scripture Phrase therefore a thing is said, to be taken away, when the desolating and removing time is come, and the work begun, though yet the compleating of it be not till some time after.

2. Because the Beast, did not take up and exercise all the Civil power of the Roman Empire together, or at once, but did by little and little ingross the same into his own hands, as the same by degrees fell off the seventh Head. And if so, then of necessity must the Beast, who pills the seventh Head, and robs him of his power, have a being before as yet the seventh Head had lost all his power, or was totally destroyed.

3. Because if we begin not till this work was compleated, then of necessity must we extend the forty months, the one thousand two hundred and sixty dayes, beyond Daniels two thousand three hundred, and his one thousand three hundred thirty-five, both which expire A.D. 1701, but so will not the one thousand two hundred and sixty dayes, if we find not a beginning for them till the compleas devastation of the ancient Roman Empire.

To say some middle beginning may be found, must be grounded upon some such substantial reason as may enervate the force of ours; and withall be so carried on, as that the admirable Harmony betwixt Daniels numbers and Johns may be preserved.

The conclusion therefore is, That we are not to reckon this taking away from the time that
the Civil power of the Roman Empire was fully removed from the seventh Head, but rather from the time when this began.

Our next Question is, What time are we to pitch upon when this was done?

Ans. The year before fixed 396.

1 Because at this time the Roman Empire (upon Theodosius death) became divided betwixt Arcadius and Honorius his two sons, of which see my Key, Thes. 22. This division was such that Carion treating upon the fourth Monarchy, doth here-upon prefix to the reign of Arcadius and Honorius this title, The spoiling of the fourth Monarchy.

2 Because about this very time did the Goths and Vandals invade the Roman Empire, coming in as an overflowing deluge upon divers parts of the Roman Empire. A better testimony hereof I cannot produce, then by transferring hither what by the learned Mede is gathered together out of the Ancients relating to this time and thing, in his Comment upon the Apocalyps, Chap. 8. upon the first Trumpet.

He begins from the time of Theodosius death, which was A.D. 395. (which because the current year, we are in our account to let fall, and begin with the year following 396.) and saith thus, In this very year Alaricus with a huge host of Goths, and other Barbarians, did first break in out of Thracia upon Macedonia, sparing neither Towns, nor men. Thence marching forward through Theflaly, and possessing himself of the Straits of Thermipolæ, he enters Greece, i.e. Achaia, the Cities whereof, besides Thebes and Athens, he razeth to the ground.
Herusheth into Peloponnesus, wasteth Corinth, Argos, and Sparta. Thence he marcheth into Epirus where he proceeds to make the same devastations and destructions. In the following year quitting Epirus, he invadeth Achaia, and it together with Epirus, and the adjacent Provinces, he laboureth four full years cruelly to destroy with fire and ransackings; when thus for five years he had afflicted the East with merciless ransackings, he set his mind to invade the West; he passeth into Dalmatia, and Pannonia, those Regions he wasteth far and near. Hear (faith he) Jerome, who then lived, bewailing the state of this deplorable time, the tempest hitherto raging. In his third Epistle, the Roman blood is daily poured out between Constantinople; and the Julian Alps: The Goth, the Sarmatian, Quaudus, Alanus, the Huns, the Vandals, the Marcomanny, do force and take by violence Scythia, Thracia, Macedonia, Dardania, Dacia, Theffaly, Achaia, Epirus, Dalmatia, and all Pannonia. How many Matrons, how many godly Virgins, and beautiful noble bodies were mocking stocks to these Monsters? The Bishops taken, the Presbyters slain. The Roman Empire goeth to ruine. What heart thinkest thou have the Corinthians now, the Athenians, Lacedemonians, Arcadians, and all Greece, whom these Barbarians command?

But in the year following, viz. Anno Dom. four hundred and one, the same Alaricus, followed by the Goths, Alans, and Huns, about to wage Warre in Italy also, brake through Noricum, and came through the Forrest of Trent into Venice, those Cities in a short time he subdued, the Emperor Honorius.
He end of the Beasts Tyranny. Part 2

Stilicho, the General of Honorius, having gathered a great Army, stopped his fury, and compelled him being once and again vanquished, and wearied with adverse Battels, to retire into Pannonia, whence he came; out of which a while after, a League being made, and he honoured with a Military government by Honorius, he departed into Illyricum, a Province of the East.

Alaricus being quiet a little while, left hence forward for any time the West should bee vacant of troubles, presently in the year four hundred and four, another memorable breaking in of the Barbarians upon Italy is attempted, Radagiso a Scythian being Captain, who with an Army of Goths, Sarmatians, and Germans, to the number of two hundred thousand, the Forts in the Alps being beaten down, hee paseth into the Region of Venice, Æmilia, and Hetruria; he besiegeth Florence, where being by Stilicho vanquished with a great slaughter, is taken and beheaded.

This enemy howssoever terrible, in a little time, and with little losse being taken away, forthwith Anno Dom. four hundred and six, the third, and that the most grievous and deadly inrode of the Vandals and Alans, taking with them the Marcomanni, Heruli, Swedes, Alemans, Burgundians, with a rabble of other Barbarians, is made upon the West, whereby first France, then Spain, lastly Africa are taken, and afflicted with all kind of calamities; Which destructions Hierom in his eleventh Epistle hath thus partly expressed, partly implied.
Innumerable (saith he) and most fierce Nations have taken all France, whatsoever is betwixt the Alps and the Pyrenean Mountains, which is inclosed with the Ocean and the Rhone; the Vandals, the Sarmatians, the Alans, the Gepides, Heruli, Saxons, Burgundians, Alemans, and Pannonian enemies have destroyed; Mentz is taken, and plundered, and many thousand slain in the Church; the Vangions with strong siege destroyed the strong City of Rheames, the Ambians, Atrebates, Motini, Tournacus, Nemece, Argentoratus translated into Germany, Aquitane, and the Provinces of Novem Populorum, Lions, and Narbone, a few Cities excepted, all are ruined. I cannot make mention of Tolose without tears, which that it is not yet ruined, is for the sake of that holy Bishop Exuperius; Spain itself now ready to perish trembles, Rome buys her life with gold. Hitherto Master Mede, p. 71, 72, 73, 74.

Now upon the whole, observe, it being a thing expressly fore-told, Rev. 13, 1, that the Anti-Christian Beast should have his rise out of the Sea, i.e. from a confluence of People and Nations, the rise of Antichrist cannot more aptly be applied to any time then this, of these barbarous Nations over-flowing in this wonderfull manner the Roman Empire.

3. Because suddenly after the year three hundred ninety-six (as the issue of this invasion) the Civil power of the Empire began by little and little to be transplanted from the seventh Head, and to be seated in the Horns. Now, as it is an evident Argument that the Empire was going to decay, when there began.

began to be a removal of the Civil power and authority from the Head to the Horns; so is it also as clear an Argument that the Beast was now rising; for it is the Beasts Horns that have Crowns upon them, the Dragons have none. But of this more in my next.

From the whole I frame this Argument; The forty two Months, and the one thousand two hundred and sixty days are there to begin where the Civil power of the Roman Empire began to go to decay, or to be taken away. But this was Anno Dom, three hundred ninety six. Ergo.

---

CHAP. IV,

Proving and confirming yet farther our Position, laid down in the former.

SECT. 1,

A Fourth Argument, to prove that wee are to begin the time of the Beast in all likelihood with the year before stated, may be taken from the time of the rise of the Horns; some of the Horns did suddenly after this year appear. For this see Alsted in Chronologia regnorum veterum, Rosses History of the world, Lib. 3. Cap. 3. Sigonius (as I finde him quoted by Mr. Mede, cl. p. 79.) of the Western Empire, Lib. 10. & 11.

To these let me adde; Our German Author in his Cla. p. 127, testifieth, that Anno Dom, four hundred
dred and three, some Horns did appear. Mr. Archer in his Personal Reign, p. 44. faith, That about the year four hundred, or four hundred and six, some of the ten Kingdoms in Europe began to rise. Mr. Woodcock, of the two Witnesses, p. 81. faith. That Anno Dom. four hundred and ten, when Alaricus took Roma, several of the ten Horns even in that very year began to appear.

Mr. Medes own opinion is, That all the ten Horns were in being in the year four hundred fifty six, the Empire in that year appearing divided into ten Kingdoms, which together with the names of the People, and of the Kings, and Provinces over which they reigned, are by him laid down in this following Table, Cl. p. 80.

A Type of the ending of the Empire, or Roman Dominion, in the year of Christ four hundred fifty six, and thence forward.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Kingdoms.</th>
<th>The Provinces wherein they reigned.</th>
<th>The names of the Kings reigning in this year.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Of the Britains.</td>
<td>In Britain.</td>
<td>Vortimer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Of the Saxons.</td>
<td>First, In Gallia Belg. suddenly after, In Celtica also.</td>
<td>Hengift.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Burgundians.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gunderic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Wisi-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Visigoths</td>
<td>In Aquitania &amp;c part of Spain.</td>
<td>Theodoric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Swedes and Alans</td>
<td>In that Tract of Spain which is contained in Galicia and Lusitania.</td>
<td>Ricarius.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Alemanes</td>
<td>In that Tract of Germany, which was called Rhetia.</td>
<td>Suanicas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Ostrogoths</td>
<td>In Pannonia the Huns being subdued, neither was that age run out when they did enlarse their Kingdome into Italy also.</td>
<td>Theodemirus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Grecians</td>
<td>In the residue of the Dominions of the Empire; for the Empire of ancient Rome being dissolved, the Kingdome of the Grecians is to bee reckoned among those Kingdoms.</td>
<td>Marcianus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
into which the Dominion of the City reigning, sometimes farre and near was divided.

Some things by way of explication of the Table are added by Mr. Mede, which I omit, referring the Reader where any doubt ariseth to the Author himself for satisfaction.

Now to make our Argument the more firm, let it be observed, That we are to place the rise of the Beast before the rise of the Horns; the Horns therefore having being, some so early as the years four hundred, four hundred and three, four hundred and six, see, yea being compleat, having their perfect number, Anno Dom. four hundred fifty six, the rise of the Beast must be placed somewhat more early; and therefore it is not amisse that I have pitched upon the year three hundred ninety six.

Now that the rise of the Beast must be before the rise of the Horns, is evident;

1. Because the ten Horns with Crowns upon them are the Horns of the Antichristian Beast, and no other. This being so, the Antichristian Beast must necessarily be before his Horns; for how improper, yea absurd would it bee to say, That Horns should grow before, or without a Beast? To say, The Horns are the same which were grown before, only the Beast puts Crowns upon them, which before they had not, helps not the thing,
thing, for if the Beast crown the Horns, then is
he before any of the Horns are crowned; that
which is not, cannot adde to another thing.

2. Because the rise of the Beast is to bee reckoned
from that point of time, in which the Civil power of
the Roman Empire began to be taken away, as hath
been proved already; but now none of the Crow-
neted Horn's arise till a while after, the Horns get-
ting Crowns, i.e. a Civil power to themselves,
by the devallation of the seventh Head, i.e. pil-
ling the Empire of its Civil power.

3. Because the words of the Holy Ghost, Rev. 17. 12.
import as much; for speaking of the Beast and his Horns,
it's said, These receive power as Kings one hour, (or in
one hour; so Pares in his Comment upon the Re-
velation reads it) with the Beast. Observe, not the
Beast receives power with them, but they with the
Beast; intimating clearly, that notwithstanding
the Beasts rise is not long before the Horns, there-
fore both rise as it were in one hour, that is, with-
in a little time of each other, yet the Beast hath
being first, and is instrumentally the cause of help-
ing the Horns to their Diadems or Kingly power,
to whom therefore as ingaged they adhere, giving
their power and strength to him again, ver. 13.
i.e. laying it out for him, who was a special
means of helping them to it.

S E C T. 2.

Obi. But it may be objected, That Daniel saw
the rise of this little Horn (namely Antichrist) after the rise of the other Horns, Dan. 7. 8. I con-
dered
dered the Horns, and behold there came up among them another little Horn, ver. 24. And the ten Horns out of this Kingdom are ten Kings that shall arise, and another shall arise after them.

Ans. Three opinions there are of this little Horn, which if either of them might be admitted, would easily quit our hands of this Objection.

The first is that which interprets it of *Antiochus Epiphanes*; but as touching this I shall say nothing till I come to my Third part.

Two other opinions there are embraced at this day by men of great light, learning, and worth, whom I would not thwart, were it not but that this Prophecy of Daniel's little Horn is so material, that an error here turns the streams of all Daniel's Prophecies out of their proper channel; and because the best men, and men of greatest Light may have their particular mistakes, I hope it will not be grievous or offensive to any, if for truths sake I bring the principles of those, whose light in other things I esteem above my own, as to this particular thing, to the touch-stone.

Yet ere I come to examine either opinion, I shall in order thereunto premise these few things.

1. That all Daniel's Prophecies, viz. That of the great Image, chap. 2. Of the four Beasts and little Horn, chap. 7. Of the Ram, Hee-Goat and little Horn, chap. 8. Of the Kings of the North, and Kings of the South, chap. 11. have but one and the same end.

2. That the last thing in each of these is the
description of the Fourth or Roman Monarchy.

These two Principles are so clear and unquestionable upon the grounds, that not my self only, but also those good men go, from whom yet (as to their opinions of the little Horn) I vary, yea from the plain scope and expressions of each Prophecy, that to insist upon particular proof, were but to multiply words.

3 That the Fourth or Roman Monarchy consisting of two States; 1 A pure Civil State; 2 A mixt State, partly Civil, partly Ecclesiastical; hath therefore in each of Daniels Visions and Prophecies a two-fold representation suitable to its two-fold state. In that of the Great Image, the Roman Monarchy (which is signified by the legs and feet of that Image) is first represented as a pure Civil State, by the legs of Iron, breaking in pieces and subduing all things, vers. 40. as a mixt State, by the feet and toes of the Image, which are part of Iron, part of Potter's clay, vers. 41.

In the second Vision of the fourth Beast, the Roman Monarchy, signified by the fourth Beast, is represented in two States. 1 As a Civil State, and so it is a Beast dreadfully terrible, strong exceedingly, having great Iron teeth, devouring and breaking in pieces, vers. 7. 2 As a mixt State, and so a raging blasphemous little Horn, vers. 8. 21. 25.

In the third, chap 8. the Roman Monarchy (represented by the little Horn, vers. 9.) hath two States; 1 A Civil State, and so it is a little Horn waxing great in a way of conquest, subduing Nations to it self, vers. 9. 2 A mixt State,
and so it is a little Horn, waxing great in a way of opposition to the truths, people, and worship of God, ver. 10, 11, 12, 24, 25.

In the fourth and last Prophecy, the Roman Monarchy hath two States; 1 A Civil State, and so it is that terrible potent King of the North, chap. 11. vers. 14. to 21. 2 A mixt State, and so it is that vile Person, vers. 21. whose description and acts are continued to ver. 40.

This I take to be (and I doubt not but he who thorowly weighs each Prophecy will, yea must in this be of my minde.) the true state of the Roman Monarchy, as the same is set forth in all the Prophecies of Daniel.

Hence fourthly, It follows upon the former, That the little Horn, chap. 7. signifying the mixt State of the Roman Monarchy, and the mixt State of the Roman Monarchy being also the thing signified chap. 2. by the feet and toes of the great Image, chap. 8. by the little Horn there mentioned in his second waxing great, chap. 11. by the vile Person; Hence I say, it follows, That the feet and toes of the great Image, chap. 2. the little Horn, ch. 7. the little Horn in its second waxing great, chap. 8. and the vile Person chap. 11. are all one and the same thing. What therefore is affirmed of the little Horn, chap. 7. must bee of all the rest.

This premised, I come now to the opinions themselves.

The first opinion is that which interprets this little Horn of Mahomet, at least-wise as to the special accommodation. The rage of this little Horn against the Saints to be specially meant of the
the Turks Tyranny over, and oppression of the Jews.

But this opinion cannot I receive, because it seems to me to be inconsistent with all the four foregoing Prophecies.

1. For the Prophecy of the great Image, its inconsistent with that; for the feet of the great Image (the same with the little Horn) are to be understood of such a power, as First, is made up of a mixture, and that of things contrary, as iron and clay. Secondly, it is such a power as consists of ten parts, which ten parts are represented by the ten Toes, ver. 42. Now neither of these Characters either do, or will agree to the Empire of the Great Turk, but both are punctually fulfilled in the Kingdome of Antichrist, which first is made up of a Civil and Ecclesiastical power moulded together; secondly, consists of ten Horns i.e. so many Kingdomes, Rev. 17. 12. 16.

2. For the Prophecy Chap. 8. The proud He, there spoken of (who is the same with this little Horn) is said to cast down some of the host of heaven, and of the stars to the ground, and to stamp upon them, ver. 10. to take away the daily sacrifice, throw down the place of his Sanctuary, cast down the truth to the ground, ver. 11. 12. Yea, he is also said to understand dark sentences, ver. 23. to be mighty, but not by his own power, to destroy wonderfully, to destroy the mighty and holy people, ver. 24.

None of these Characters (which are all the Characters of the little Horn) either will, or can agree to any act of the Turk put forth towards the Jews, for;
The Jews, in the state they are in, and have been in these many years, cannot be called The Host of Heaven, i.e. The true worshippers of God, as the phrase signifies.

Neither secondly, can the casting down and trampling the Jews be called A casting down of stars; and trampling upon them. The Officers of the Christian Churches are called Stars, &c. The seven Stars are the Angels of the seven Churches; but where in any Prophecy relating to the Church of the New Testament, from the day the Jews were broken off, till this day, are the Jewish Doctors and Rabbins called Stars?

Neither thirdly, can the Turks sitting over the material Temple, viz. the place of it at Jerusalem, be in a true sense called the taking away of the daily sacrifice, and a throwing down the place of his Sanctuary. If it be said, by sitting there, he hinders men from embracing the Messiah, so he doth by sitting in Constantinople, and therefore his sitting there may as properly in that sense (though Jerusalem were not under his power) be called a taking away of the daily sacrifice, and casting down the place of God's Sanctuary.

Neither fourthly, can his opposing the Mosaical worship be termed a casting down the truth to the ground, seeing God hath cast down that already, and owns it for his truth no longer.

Neither fifthly, will it agree to Mahomet to entitle him a King, understanding dark sentences, whose birth and education was poor and mean, and so far was he from learning and high speculations (which Antichrist not only pretends to, but
but is also furnished with) as that indeed he had nothing less.

Neither sixthly, doth it agree to the Turk to term him mighty, but not by his own power; seeing his might lies in no other power but his own; but it is an excellent description of the Romish Antichrist, who whilst he would make the world believe that he is Christ's Vicar, and a spiritual creature, doth yet lift up and exercise, and becomes mighty thereby, a Civil sword, which indeed he hath nothing to do with.

Neither seventhly, can it be said of the Turk that he hath destroyed wonderfully, i.e. more than any before him; and this wonderful destruction, to be a destruction of the mighty and holy people; seeing it is a thing rare with the Turk upon a meer account of Religion (what to increase his Empire he hath done, is but what others have done) to destroy men. But now what the Romish Antichrist in this kind hath done, is notoriously known. If it be said, he hath destroyed by the poison of his Religion more than ever any before him,

It is answered, but not the holy people, the holy people are kept by God, and therefore safe from the enchantments of Satan. To understand it of the Jews, will neither agree to them, either in the state they were in, when Daniel saw this Vision, nor the state they are in at present. Not the former, because then they were not the mighty people; for they were a people in Captivity; nor the latter, because now they are not the holy people, being a people as yet rejected of God.
For the Prophets Chap. xi. The vile person (the same with the little Horn) is said to have indignation against the holy Covenant, ver. 30. to cause the understanding people, who shall instruct many, to fall by the sword, the flame, captivity and spoil many days, ver. 33. The following Characters of this King, I shall take up, and shew whose they are, in answering the other opinion of this little Horn.

As for these two we have named, how will they, or can they agree to the Turk.

1. What holy Covenant is that which he hath indignation against? If the Levitical Covenant, God owns not that for the Holy Covenant any longer; but put case he did, what particular indignation doth the Turk express against that Covenant, when as a great part of his Religion is founded upon it? If the Gospel-Covenant, then must this indignation of his be not against Jews, but Christians; for they are the children of this Covenant, and if so, then are we off of our Argument, and we must rather of the two conclude the Romish Antichrist to be this vile person, then the Turk; for he, and not the Turk, is the great and principal oppressor of these.

As for the second, what understanding people are they who are said to instruct many, that through sword, flame, captivity, and spoil, fall by the hand of the Turk? Can they be the Jews as such? None will say so. Are they Christians? then are these things in a more especial manner to be applied to the Romish Antichrist than the Turk; for the understanding people...
people who have been the instructors of many, have fallen ten to one, I might say a hundred to one, more by his hand then ever have fallen by the hand of the Turk. Nay when did ever yet the Turk make a war upon, raise a persecution against the understanding people meerly upon this account because they were such? But this hath been the practice of the Romish Antichrist throughout all ages.

4 For the Prophesie itself, Chap.7. This interpretation of the little Horn agrees not to it, neither to the Characters of the little Horn mentioned in it, nor to the time of his continuance.

1 Not to the Characters, the little Horn is said, to make war with the Saints of the most High, ver.21. to wear out the Saints of the most High, ver.25. How doth he wear them out?

Answer. Partly by inward grief to hear his blasphemies, partly by outward sufferings, persecutions, martyrdomes.

But now as to the first, The Turkish oppression of the Jews by detaining their land from them (which he hath done divers hundred years) cannot be called a making war with the Saints of the most High; for the Jews from the day he first had their land to this, have been a people rejected by God; and therefore cannot in the condition they are in, and have stood in a long time, be considered as the Saints of the most High.

As for the second, The Turk cannot be said in either of the forementioned respects, to wear out the Jews; For first, They grieve not, nor (as yet) are their souls worn out to hear his blasphemies. Secondly, They have not been by him persecuted...
and martyred for Religion sake meerly, but are owned and countenanced in his Dominions.

2. Not to the expressions used by the Holy Ghost to set forth the time of his continuance; For the time of his continuance is expressed by a time, times, and dividing of time, ver. 25. which words being spoken in the Gentile Dialect, and signifying the very time of the black day of the Gentile Churches, Revel. 12. 14. seems to me clearly to argue, that this little Horn is such a one as should tyrannize over the Gentile Churches, not the Jews; and this agrees not to the Turk, but the Roman Antichrist.

So that we see that this interpretation will not agree to any one of all Daniels Prophecies.

Yet here let me say, that thus far I go up with the Assertors of this opinion, as to believe, that the Prophecies of the Old Testament, as touching the glorious restitution of the Church, do more directly and immediately, look towards the Jews; yet with this Proviso, that this rule is applicable to such Prophecies only as relate to the time of the Jews coming in: But now this Prophecy of Daniels little Horn, and his blasphemies, his rage against the Saints, relate to another time, namely that time in which the Jews are rejected; for the coming in of the Jews is not till the end of the time, times, and a half, which is the time where the little Horns dominion ceaseth. It therefore follows, that all the time of the little Horns blasphemy and tyranny, the Jews are a people rejected, and are not received till the day where a period is put to his reign; therefore al-
though Prophecies that relate to the time of their restitution have a look firstly to that people, yet not this Prophecy, which relates to the time of their rejection.

But indeed our Rule in Daniel's Prophecies must be this; viz. That the scope of the Holy Ghost in Daniel is to represent the state of things in the world from Daniel's time to the end, with a special reference still to God's Church and people in it. This being so, it follows that so long as the Jews remained a Church, so long did the things foretold primarily respect them; when they are broken off, and the Gentiles, God's chosen people, throughout that period, do the things foretold primarily respect the Gentiles; when the Jews are grafted in again, then shall the things, as at first, so now again, be primarily fulfilled to them. So that (I say) although Prophecies which relate to the time of the Jews coming in do primarily look to that people, yet is the case otherwise as to those Prophecies which relate to the times betwixt their breaking off, and their receiving again.

And although the name Antichrist is appliable all the time of the Jews' rejection to none but the Roman Antichrist, the only Persecutor of the Gentile Saints; yet this I readily grant, if we speak of the time after the Jews come in, that the name Antichrist shall be as well, and as properly appliable at that time to the Turk, as to the Roman Antichrist (which consideration affords answer as to all those agreements (some make) betwixt Pope and Turk) and this seems to me to be the great
and only thing intended, Dan. xi. ver. 40. to the end, which place I shall a little open, chiefly to let light into that Prophesie, which (in my apprehension) is generally mistaken.

The great knot of that Prophesie, is; whom we are to understand by the King of the North, and who by the King of the South. Now for the untying hereof, we are to consider, that these titles, the King of the North, and the King of the South, are not appliable to two parties or people only, but to divers parties and people; For this Chapter carries us through the second, third, and fourth Monarchies, and takes in the beginning of the fifth; so that there is very frequently a change of persons, though the old names are still retained, King of the North, and King of the South.

Now the reason of the names, in understanding which lies the chief mystery, and the very Key of the Prophesie, is taken from the situation of parties, that party in every change, contest, skirmish here mentioned, whose situation was more Northerly, goes ever under the title of the King of the North; that party whose situation was more Southerly, under the title of the King of the South.

So in the very first contest, where these names are used, which was betwixt Alexander's two chief Captains after his death, and the division of the Grecian Monarchy; the Race of the Lagida, so called from Ptolemeus the son of Lagus, the first of that Race, is called the King of the South, ver. 5. because their situation was in Egypt and Africa, which lay more towards the South. The
Race of the Seleucidae, so called from Seleucus Nicator, the first of them, are called the King of the North, ver. 6, 7, because they were situated in Assyria, Babylon, and other parts of Asia, which did border somewhat more upon the North, then the other.

So in the next contest which begins with the beginning of the Roman Monarchy, the parts first assaulted and invaded by the Romans when they were reaching after the Monarchy, as Macedon, Egypt, Judea, &c., are called the King of the South, ver. 14, because these Countries were situated Southward from Italy and Rome, and the Romans invading are called King of the North, ver. 15, because of their Northern situation.

And here by the way, give me leave to observe what a notable mark the Holy Ghost hath left us in this close transition from the Grecian Monarchy to the Roman, to give us light where in this Prophecy we are to begin the Roman Monarchy, which otherwise, considering how things all along hang as it were in a chain, were a thing most difficult to find; ver. 14. And in those days many shall stand up against the King of the South, which is a most proper description of the Roman Monarchy in its first rise, and seems to point them out from all the people in the world; for it is observable of them, that at the time they were growing into a Monarchy, they were governed by a Senate, consisting of many persons, which many also, tolew us that they are to be understood of such a many as do yet make up but one Representative body.
therefore in the next Verse called the **King of the North**. The words in the close of the fourteenth Verse, They shall fall, which may seem to make this Exposition doubtful, do not relate to the many standing up against the King of the South in the beginning of the Verse, but to the robbers of thy people in the end, which are not the Romans, but another people opposing the Romans in the beginning of their Monarchy, and falling before them.

So likewise in the controversy afterwards betwixt the vile Person Antichrist, and the Turks and Saracens, which began about the year one thousand ninety-six, the Turks upon whom the vile person makes War, are called the **King of the South**, ver. 25, because their situation lay Southernly from Rome; and Antichrist is **King of the North**, because his Seat was situated most Northernly.

This Light gained, sets open a window to that which follows, from verse forty to the end of the Chapter. For the better understanding whereof, let it be noted, That these six last verses do set forth the very last part of that Tragedy that now for a long time together had been acting upon the Stage of the World; and they are not (as is most generally thought) a repetition of things before delivered, but indeed a continuation of the Prophecy, and that from that very point of time where Antichrist's Tyranny, which is the thing described in the foregoing verses, ends. The description of Antichrists rage in the foregoing verses brings us down to the very end of the forty-two months, the one thousand two hundred
hundred and sixty days, now with the end of that time begins this Prophecy, which carries things on, but with a special respect to the Jews until Christ's coming.

Hence the time is particularly noted to be the time of the end, ver. 40. At the time of the end shall the King of the South push at him; and in this sense, viz. for the very concluding time, and shutting up of the things here fore-told, is this phrase used throughout this Prophecy, ver. 27. The end shall be at the time appointed, ver. 35. even to the time of the end, because it is yet for a time appointed, ch. 12. v. 4. Seal the Book even to the time of the end, ver. 6. How long shall it be to the end of these Wonders? ver. 8. What shall be the end of these things? So ver. 9, 13. all verifying our sense.

Now we are here to remember what I have proved in my Key, That the one thousand two hundred and ninety days (the time of the Jews first stirring) concur in their end with the forty two months, the one thousand two hundred and sixty days. This noted, things lie thus. The foregoing verses brings us down to the end of the forty two months, with which time ending, ends likewise the one thousand two hundred and ninety days, Now do the Jews stir, and get their own Land, which Land of theirs, because it lies Southward from Rome, the Seat of the Beast, and Constantinople likewise the Seat of the Turk, the new-stirring Jews in opposition to these take this name, King of the South. The Jews, this new King of the South, being gotten into their Land, push at the Turk and Pope both; at the one upon
Two Civil accounts; at the other upon a Christian, or at leastwise as favourers of the Gentile Saints. This makes Pope and Turk (though sometimes before they had been quarrelling with each other, not herein serving any design of Christ so much as their own Lusts; for though they quarrelled, yet it is said of them, vers. 27. That both their hearts were set to do mischief) now at last gaspe to join hands; and as Herod and Pilate, the one a counterfeit Jew, the other a professed Heathen, dually enemies to each other before, became friends in opposing Christ; so shall Antichrist and the Turk, the one a counterfeit Christian, the other an open Pagan, who till this day lived by one another as enemies, be now reconciled and made friends, yea become one in opposing Christ's Cause, in doing which they shall fall together. This combination of these two grand Enemies as chief, goes under the name of the King of the North, because either of them (as I have laid) are Northerly situated from Jerusalem. These combined shall come with great fury into the Land of Judah, and the Countries adjacent, as Egypt and Ethiopia, who shall at this day favour the Jews. Isa. 19. 23, 24, 25. Here shall begin the Jews black and terrible day of trouble; for this raging King of the North, filled with outrage to see a new Enemy risen up against him, and the more because of tidings he hears from the East and the North, vers. 44, which tidings in likelihood is news brought to him of those Gentile Saints (who having been instruments of setting the Jews at first in their own Land, and upon that,
that, having done their work, being returned home.) now hearing this, march up again from the Northern parts to afflict the Jews, and together therewith also tidings of other Jews coming up to their Land from the Eastern Countries. This news sets him in a great rage, and to the end that he may dispatch one party first, before the other can get up, he marcheth with wonderful fury, resolving to destroy all, into Judea, and up to Jerusalem, pitching his Tents in the holy Mountain, i.e. laying close siege to Jerusalem, as Joel 3. 1, 2, Zach. 12. 2, 3. by which the Jews shall be brought into such straits as never was any people in the world. Now in the day of their greatest straits, when the Enemies rage, and their straits shall be at the highest, shall Michael stand up, i.e. Christ appear, as Chap. 12. 1. Zach. 14. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. who instantly upon his appearing pours out the seventh Vial upon all these his enemies, now gathering and gathered together, by which they shall come to their end, and none shall help them, verse last.

Thus this last verse brings us to the point of Christ's Personal appearance, which more fully is opened in the following Chapter, ver. 1. all that follows afterwards to the end of the twelfth Chapter, is not of things succeeding, but only, first a rehearsal of the state of the Jews in the time of their first stirring, (the handling whereof, that no interruption might be caused in the Story, is omitted till the discourse was come to an end) which is set forth by a resurrection, ver. 2, 3. the same with Ezechiel's resurrection of the dry bones, Chapter. 37.
And afterwards a revealing to Daniel the time of these things, (viz. their first stirring, and their compleat deliverance by the appearance of Christ;) which is set forth by two mysticall numbers, of which I have discoursed at large in Generation work, Part 3. Chap. 2. Sect. 5. and in my Key, Thef. 17. Thef. 34.

Thus much by way of answer to the first opinion concerning the little Horn, in answering which I have been led into some things a little out of the way, but not unprofitable.

S E C T. 3.

Here is likewise another opinion of this little Horn, viz. That this little Horn signifies the late King Charls, as some; or the whole Norman race, as others; of these two, as touching the first, I must confess, I have wondered with myself, how any should once imagine that the Holy Ghost being now giving Daniel information how things should be agitated in the World from that time untill the time of the end, should at once leap over all the time from the beginning of the Roman Monarchy, which was long before Christ, untill the time of King Charls, the whole amounting to well nigh two thousand years; considering too, that the whole Prophecy of the Revelations in a manner consists upon things to be fulfilled within this time; and it is wonderfull that throughout this time, a time so remarkable for observation as never any before it, the Holy Ghost, when too (as I say) he was in a way of informing Daniel, should
should shut up all in silence, as if nothing from the time the Roman Monarchy began, were transacted or done in the world worthy to be noted, till King Charles arose.

And as to the second, Though the leap in regard of time will be too great to leap from the beginning of the Roman Monarchy until the time of William the Conqueror, as if the Holy Ghost should in this Prophecy leap over the wonderful revolutions attending Antichrists coming into the World, and all his rage when come in (which are things particularly noted in Daniel's other Prophecies) and observe nothing till William the Conqueror arose; yet is the mistake greater in limiting the Holy Ghost, so much as this opinion doth in regard of place; for it ryes up all done within these last six hundred years to England only; so that although it allow more time then the other, yet is it as strict in respect of place, both confining Daniel's Prophecy of the little Horn, to things done in England only, which no way agrees to the scope of the Prophecy, which is to let forth the state of the whole Roman Monarchy. And why we should not as well restrain the Apocalyptical Visions, as the Visions of Daniel, to England only, I see no reason to the contrary. This I am sure, If Daniel's Prophecies run upon things done only in England, in case John's doe not so too, we cannot make the one Expository of the other.

But to passe these Generals, I shall here lay down some particular Reasons to prove that this opinion, take it in either dresse, will no way agree
agree to the minde of the Holy Ghost in Daniel.

Real. 1. Because this little Horn after his rise is equivalent to the fourth Beast, or Monarchy, swaying the same Scepter, having the same Seat, or Civil Power; (which cannot agree to the late King Charles, or the Norman Race) as is clear.

1 Because for this Reason is the Fourth Monarchy itself called by the name of the little Horn, Dan. 8. 9.

2 Because the fatal destruction of the fourth Beast, or Monarchy, is for the blasphemies of the little Horn, Dan. 7. 11. an Argument the little Horn's power did extend itself to the whole Monarchy, having a special influence upon the whole, both to cause it to sin, and to bring the Wrath of God upon it.

3 Because the feet and toes of the great Image, chap. 2. (the same with the little Horn) are not a particular Nation, but the fourth Kingdom or Monarchy, Dan. 2. the forty and forty one verses compared.

Real. 2 Because the Prophecy of this little Horn being the same with the Prophecy of the vile Person, chap. 11. Let it be nakedly considered, whether the whole story of King Charles his Life, or of the whole Norman Race will, or doth afford matter fit for a Comment upon Chapter 11. ver. 24 to 32.

Real. 3 Because this opinion doth not agree to the Characters of Daniel's little Horn, in any of Daniel's four Prophecies.

1 For the Prophecy of the Great Image, the feet and
and toes of that Image (the same with the little Horn.) denote such a power as consists principally of ten Parts, set forth by the ten toes. This cannot be said of the Norman power, take it either as in the last King, or any of his Predecessors.

2 For the Prophecy, Chap. 8. it's said of the Tyrannical King, That his power should be mighty, but this power none of his own; that he should destroy wonderfully, i.e. above all that ever were before him, ver. 24. That he should stand up also against the Prince of Princes, i.e. Christ Personally appearing; That he should be broken without band, ver. 25.

Now apply these to King Charles that was, or the Norman Race in general, and see how unsuitable they are.

1 What power did he or they (I mean consider them as they were Kings) exercise, and become mighty thereby, which was none of their own?

2 How did he or they, destroy wonderfully above all before them? If we take it for a destruction of Nations, were not others before, as Nebuchadnezzar, Cyrus, Alexander the Great, the Romans after them, farre greater destroyers of Nations than ever any of the Norman Race? but take it for a destruction of Saints, because that the following words import, He shall destroy the mighty and the holy people; and consider, whether the Pagan Emperours of Rome in the first three hundred years, and Antichrist since, who each of them have put Millions of Saints to death,
death, were not greater destroyers of Saints, then the Norman Race.

3 Did ever the Norman Race oppose Christ Personally appearing? but so shall this little Horn in the end; for after all his opposition to the holy people, he stands up with an also against the the Prince of Princes.

4 Can it be said of the Norman Race their breaking was without hand, who were plucked up by the roots by a Civil power?

As for the rest of the Characters, which also belong to this little Horn, vers. 10, 11, 12. Let it be considered, whether they do in a more eminent manner (for that must be said, or nothing) agree to King Charles; or the Norman Race in general, then to any other person, state, or power that ever was in the world since Daniel's time.

3 For the Prophesie Chap. 11. It is said of the vile person, vers. 21. he shal come in peaceably, so did not William the Conqueror. Obtain the Kingdom by flatteries, so did not Charles Stuart, who had it by succession.

Vers. 33. That Saints under h'm shall fall by sword, by flame, captivity, and spoil many days; but in Scripture-phrase King Charles continuance cannot be called many daies, 10 nor the continuance of the Norman Race; for 600. years is but a short time, and not many daies, in the account of Scripture.

It is said of him, v. 36. That he shall exalt himself and magnifie himself above every god, which is the express character of the man of sin, 2 Thes. 2, 4. Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God. That he shall prosper till the indignation be accomplished, which
which Chap. 8.19. is called the *last end of indignation*, i.e. he shall persit in his pride and blasphemies till the pouring forth of the last Vial, for that is properly the last end of indignation, which Antichrist shall do; but the Norman Race is plucked up by the roots already.

Furthermore it's said of the vile person, vers. 37. That he shall *not regard the desire of women*, which agreeth exactly to Antichrist, who professeth and voweth chastity, forbiddeth and vilifieth marriage. But if things recorded be true, and in this we have little cause to be suspicious, this Character will agree to few of the Norman Race.

Again it's said of him, that he shall *honour a God whom his Fathers knew not*, vers. 38. called therefore a *strange God*, vers. 39. which most punctually is fulfilled in the Grand Popish Idol the Maffe, an Idol never heard of in the world till Antichrist devised it, and set it up. But let it be shewn what strange God, unknown to his or their Fathers, did King Charles or any of his Predecessors set up, and worship?

4 For the Prophecy itself, Chap. 7. It is said of this little Horn, vers. 20. That his *look was more stout then his fellows*, i.e. more dreadful, amazing to those that beheld him, than the look of any of the other Horns. But now let it be impartially considered, whether the look of King Charles that was, or his Predecessors in the Norman Race, were ever more dreadful and terrible to the Saints, or in particular to the Saints under their power, then the look of any of the other Horns!
Horns! I do believe, yea know, Histories will make the contrary appear.

To all the rest I may add, as none of the least, the Argument urged in my Key, The 39.

The head of all the Arguments brought for this opinion, take it in its first or second dress, are cut off at one blow, or with saying one word, viz. That as what is spoken of Tyrants in general, may in most things agree to every particular Tyrant; what is spoken of the whole body, in many things to every part, so what is here by Daniel spoken of Antichrist, the Grand Tyrant, and the whole body, may in many things very fitly agree to the Norman Race in general, or King Charles that was in particular, they being Tyrants, and also a part of this body; yet doth it not therefore follow that the one or the other are here solely intended.

The Conclusion is, That Daniels little Horn is neither the Norman Race in general, nor King Charles in particular; But is indeed the Romish Antichrist, to whom (had I leisure, or opportunity here to undertake the work) I doubt not through the Lords assistance, but to make it appear, that there is not a title in any of the Prophecies of Daniel, but will naturally, without forcing the Text agree, which will not to any other opinion whatsoever.

S E C T. 4.

But it will be said, how will we solve the Grand Objection we started at first, viz. That Daniel saw the rise of this little Horn, after the rise of the other Horns?
Answ. My answer is this, viz. That the ten Horns Daniel speaks of, among which, or after which came up the little Horn, are not the ten Horns of the Beast Antichrist, but of the Beast the fourth Monarchy. Now Antichrist's Kingdom, and the fourth Monarchy differ as the part, and the whole; Antichrist's Kingdom being not the fourth Monarchy, but a part or limb thereof only.

That the fourth Beast in Daniel, is not Antichrist's Kingdom, but the fourth Monarchy in general, is clear;

1. Because the fourth Beast succeeds straightway in the room of the other three Beasts, i.e. takes the place of the three former Monarchies, so soon as the third Monarchy was dissolved. But this did not Antichrist's Kingdom, whose rise was not till some hundreds of years after the dissolution of the third Monarchy; yet it excellently agrees to the Roman Monarchy in general.

2. Because Daniel's fourth Beast is exceedingly terrible, breaks in pieces, and stamps all the other Beasts, Dan.7.7. which thing will not agree to Antichrist's Kingdom, but to the Roman Monarchy in general.

3. Because the fourth Beast in Daniel is diverse from all the Beasts before it, Dan.7.3,7. but now the description of the Beast Antichrist, Rev. 13.2. argues him to be in some things like them all; for first he is like a Leopard; And the Beast which I saw was like unto a Leopard, which is the similitude of Daniel's third Beast, or the Grecian Monarchy, Dan.7.6. Secondly, He hath feet as the feet of a Bear, And his feet were as the feet of a Bear, which is the similitude of Daniel's second Beast.
Beast, or the Persian Monarchy, vers. 5. Thirdly, His mouth is as the mouth of a Lyon, which resembles Daniel's first Beast, or the Babylonian Monarchy; so that Antichrist hath the similitude of all the former Beasts; but Daniel's fourth Beast is diverse from them all.

Because there should be no distinction betwixt the fourth Beast, and the little Horn, in case the fourth Beast be to be understood of Antichrist's Kingdom, for that is the thing set forth by the little Horn.

Because the rise of Daniel's fourth Beast is clearly and plainly noted to be before the rise of Antichrist's Kingdom; for the rise of Antichrist's Kingdom begun in the rise of the little Horn; but the fourth Beast with all his Horns was risen before that; how else is the little Horn said to rise among, and after the other Horns? I conclude therefore that Daniel's fourth Beast is the Roman Monarchy in general, as John's Beast, Rev. 13.1,2, is the same only as under Antichrist.

Now this being so, it is to be noted, that the Roman Monarchy from its beginning, take it either as it was in its pure Civil state, or as it now is in its mixt Antichristian state, had ever ten Horns. As it was a pure Civil state, so was it exactly divided into ten parts in the days of Augustus Caesar, as Strabo witnesseth. And for this reason, the Dragon, which represents the old Empire, hath as well ten Horns, Rev. 12,3, as the Beast, Chap. 13.1, yet with this difference, the ten Horns of the Roman Monarchy in its first state had no Crown, i.e., the Kingdoms subjected to the
the Roman Empire whilst it remained a pure Civil state, had not Legislative power within themselves, but rather were kept in the nature of Provinces, over whom the Roman state did set titular Kings (as Herod in Christ's time was the titular King of Judea, and for this reason, because so in title, they are called Kings, Dan. 7. 24.) but yet did still reserve to itself the power of making and giving laws; as in Christ's time, besides Herod the titular King, there was Pilate the Roman Governor set over the Land to execute Laws, which Laws executed were only the Laws of Rome; and hence Christ is said to be crucified in Rome, because he suffered by the Law and Power of Rome, Rev. 11. 8.

And also it is for this reason, that the Dragon representing the old Empire is said to have his Crowns, not upon his Horns as the Beast, Chap. 13. 1, but upon his seven Heads; that is, the Legislative power all the time of the old Empire is continued at Rome, built upon seven Mountains, which are these seven Heads, Rev. 17. 9. Yea farther, it is for this reason, that John speaking of the ten Kings, as having a being even then when he wrote, faith, Chap. 17. 12. that as yet they had received no Kingdom, but were afterwards to receive power as Kings, namely with the Beast, i.e. though all the ten Horns were then in being, yet were they then only titular Kings, who had no power of making or giving Laws, this power as yet abiding upon the Heads, i.e. at Rome it self. But now the Horns of the Bealt Antichrist, i.e. the Roman Monarchy as under Antichrist, have Crowns.
Crowns upon them, i.e. that Legislative power which was before upon the Heads, is now translated to the Horns; every particular Kingdom, which before were but as Provinces, governed by no other Laws but such as came from Rome, hath now a power within it self to rule, and to make Laws; therefore faith John, Rev. 17. 12. the ten Horns receive power as Kings with the Beast, that is, when the Roman Monarchy which then was in the hands of Emperors, and the whole governed by the Laws of Rome, shall fall in the hands of the Beast, then shall those several Kings which before were titular, only receive Kingly power, or power as Kings to make and give Laws within their own Dominions, without receiving their Laws from any foreign place or power.

Now consider the ten Horns in the first respect as they are the Horns of the Roman Empire in general (which is clearly Daniel's sense, the ten Horns he speaks of being the Horns of the fourth Beast, i.e. the Empire in general; for faith he, ver. 7. It (that is the fourth Beast) had ten Horns) and it is most clear the rise of Antichrist, the little Horn, was among and after these Horns. And therefore observe the words narrowly, it is said, that "at the time of the little Horns rise, three of the first are plucked up by the roots, ver. 8." what is the meaning? why this; the Roman Monarchy in either state (as I have said) had ten Horns; now upon the little Horns rise, three of the first, i.e. Three of the Horns of the Roman Monarchy as considered in its first state were plucked up. And hence ver. 24. The little Horn is said to be diverse from

The first, that is, from all the Horns of this Monarchy in its first state; for of the Horns of the Monarchy in its second state, how is the little Horn diverse, when as the ten Horns in this state are but a part of this little Horn, i.e., of the Roman Monarchy as governed by Antichrist?

And thus interpreted, this place in Daniel doth excellently point out the time of the Beast's rise; and I take it, that it is left us by the holy Ghost as a divine Character to guide us where we should end the first state of the Roman Monarchy, and begin its second; where we should put a period to the Roman Monarchy, as a pure Civil state, and begin it as an Antichristian; namely with the time when a remarkable breach or rupture should be made among the first ten horns, or the ten horns of the Monarchy, as in its first state; with this time, and among the horns thus broken should the
little Horn creep up, i.e. from thence should the translation of the Monarchy be, or from thence should Antichrist's Kingdom begin; so that indeed these words are so farre from weakening what we have asserted, that they are a strong confirmation of our beginning, that we have stated it a-right, in stating the rise of the Beast, Antichrist, to be with the time of the invasion of the Goths and Vandals.

Thus notwithstanding the Objection, our Argument stands firm, viz. That the rise of the Antichristian Beast is a little before the rise of his Horns; and therefore his Horns rising suddenly after the beginning of the one thousand two hundred and sixty days, the forty two months, the rise of the Beast himself was stated rightly with the year three hundred ninety six.

**SECT. 5.**

To the Arguments already laid down, I shall adde an Argument or two more.

Arg. 1. The aforesaid ending of the one thousand two hundred and sixty days agrees most fitly to the time of killing the Witnessses; The time of the Witnessses killing (which is to be reckoned the last three days & a half of the one thousand two hundred and sixty, as see Generation Work, Part 3. Chap. 1. Sect. 4.) falls under the third Vial, and a little before the first stirring of the Jews (as is also there proved, Sect. 5. in the first and third conclusions) now as the third Vial is the Vial wee at present stand under, as my discourse upon that
Vial manifests; so the first stirring of the Jews fails to be in the year one thousand six hundred fifty six, as is proved, Key, Thes. 20, therefore it agrees well to the one and the other, to end the one thousand two hundred and sixty days with the year one thousand six hundred fifty six.

Arg. 2. Taken from the visibility of those very things at this day, which the Scripture hath fore-sold us shall occur within the last three days and a half of the one thousand two hundred and sixty.

To give some instances.

First, The Scripture fore-tells, that within this time the Witnesses shall lie dead; Their death shall be civil, and Spiritual; Civil in being stripped of Religion, and Liberty; Spiritual, in subjecting themselves (through a spirit of cowardise upon them) to this Tyranny of the Beast, rather then to run the hazard of life in opposing him. The place of their lying dead shall be Germany; the one to be their death, the other the place, I have proved, Generation Work, Part 3. Chap. 1. Sect. 7, 8. whether (considering the thing, time, and place) have we not more then a little ground to conjecture, that the present day is the day of the Witnesses killing? and if so, then considering that this time is the last three days and a half of the one thousand two hundred and sixty, doth it not speak that the year we have stated as the end of the one thousand two hundred and sixty is the right, viz. Anno Dom., one thousand six hundred fifty six.

Secondly, The Scripture fore-tells, That within the last three days and a half of the one thousand two
two hundred and sixty, A war shall bee attempted; First, by the invisible Dragon, then by the visible, (of which read Generation Work, Part 3. Chap. 2. Sect. last) against a remnant of the Womans Seed, that shall stand up for Christ in the World, within the day that their Brethren the Witnesses lie dead, which shall be known by these two Characters; 1. They shall walk in Gospel institutions. 2. Have amongst them a Spirit of Prophecy. Now whether the beginnings of the first War, and probabilities of the second, be not at this day more visible upon a people having the aforesaid Characters then ever heretofore, I propound as a Quære?

Thirdly, The Scripture fore-tels that there shall be within this time a people in the World that shall favour the Witnesses, and withall be so potent as to awe the Beast (of whom mention is made, Gererat. Work, Part 3. Chap. 2. Sect. 9.) who yet setting themselves upon a worldly interest as their highest aims, shall neither openly declare for the Witnesses Cause, nor against the Beast; These are called, They of the People, and Nations, and Kindreds, and Tongues, Revel. 11. 9. which cannot be interpreted the Popish party, though Rev. 17. 15. they are so described, because in this place they are distinguished from the Popish party, which in the following verse are set forth by another name, viz. The dwellers on the earth. Whether or no such a people be not now to be found, I also put the question?

Fourthly, The Scripture fore-tels, That within this time there shall be a great League and combination

nation of Nations (the Beast now gathering together his Powers to defend himself, the time being come that his Dominion is to be taken away; as the Fourth Monarchy afterwards, at the end of the one thousand three hundred thirty-five dayes, (when it is to go to ruine) gathers together all its power to that dreadful Battle of Armageddon to uphold itself.) Whether a Work like this be not now on foot likewise, I propound as another Quere?

Fifthly, The Scripture fore-tells, That within this time there shall be in the World a wonderful triumph over the dead and suppressed Witnesses, as supposing they and their Cause likewise to be now dead and sunk for ever, Revel. 11. 10. Chap. 18. 7. Whether doth the present time afford nothing that hath a look like this? If all these things bee found true at this day, have they not in them the weight of an Argument to prove, That wee are upon the very ending time of the one thousand two hundred and sixty days?

Arg. 3. The forty two months, the one thousand two hundred and sixty days may not be begun either higher or lower; therefore they must bee begun with the aforesaid year. That they may not bee begun any time higher, is clear, because from such beginnings the time is expired; but this cannot be, because the Witnesses to this very day (my opinion is throughout all Europe, but all must confess in most places, as Germany, France, &c.) do yet wear their Sackcloth; the Woman as to this day abides in the Wilderness, the Beast as to this day, (I really think in all the ten Horns, but as to the greater
Greater part of them it is undeniable) doth yet continue to rage against the Saints, by persecuting them under the Notion of Hereticks, or Schismatics, or Enemies to Civil Government (because they cannot but declare, That the day is come, in which God will destroy, as well his Monarchical Power, as his Spiritual, and Ecclesiastical) to tread under foot the holy City, by establishing Powers not of Christ, but his own creating, to be Lords over God's heritage; to blaspheme God, by blaspheming (as did the wicked Pharisees) those very Works and Truths of God, counting them Erroneous, Diabolical, which yet take him at sometimes, when he is in his best mood, hee is convinced in his Conscience are of God; yea and fears (maugre all his opposition) that these things will prove his undoing, to tyrannize over the Nations, by continuing those unrighteous Laws, Customs, &c. which were at first imposed by the Beast, that by these he might like an imperious Whore sit domineering upon the waters, 

Revel. 17. 1. 15. that is, beea Tyrant over the People. Now I say, considering that all these things are in being unto this very day (yea and that in all the ten Horns, to him that hath but half an eye to see) it cannot be that the forty two months, the one thousand two hundred and sixty days; (which are the limited time of the Witnesses wearing Sackcloth, the Woman being in the Wilderness; the Beasts rage against the Saints, treading under foot the Holy City, his blaspheming God, and his Truth, his Tyranny over the Nations) should be begun higher, then our aforesaid beginning,
for then should we see a perfect end of those things (in part, i.e.) in some of the ten Horns at least, which yet wee see to have being and exsit, yea to be maintained in every one of them; I therefore conclude, That the forty two months, the one thousand two hundred and sixty days, cannot be begun higher then the year I have stated.

That they cannot be begun lower, is clear and manifest, because it is a monstrous absurdity to say, That all the Beasts Horns should spring up, before yet the Beast was brought forth; but (as I have proved at large in the fore-going discourse) all the Horns were come forth, but a few years lower then the stated year; therefore must the time of the Beasts rise (who naturally hath being before his Horns) be, as I have stated it, and cannot without that grosse absurdity of placing the Beast after his Horns, bee placed lower. Again, All that begin lower, do not begin from the time of Antichrists Infancy, or from the time of his first rise; (which none can or do deny, but it was as early as we have stated it; the testimonies of all the Ancients being so full, as touching the wonderful defection that was in the Church about that time;) but rather they begin from the time of his growth, either his full growth, his perfect maturity, or his growth in part only; but now this beginning is expressly against the Prophecy of the Beast, which points us to the time of the Beasts first rise, as the time whence we are to reckon his forty two months.

This we may see, Revel. 13. in vers 5. It is said, *Power was given to him to continue forty two months.*
Whence are we to reckon these forty two months? Answ. From the day he first received his power and authority from the Dragon, ver. 2. The Dragon gave him his power, and his seat, and great authority. And when was that? Answ. At the time of his first rise, ver. 1. I saw a Beast rise up out of the Sea, having seven Heads, and ten Horns, and the Dragon gave him his power, &c. Further, Let it be considered, that the second Beast, or the Ecclesiastical state of Antichrist is set forth under a three-fold representation in the Book of the Revelation, suitable to his three-fold State, viz. of Infancy, Maturity, Old Age.

1. In his Infant state, He is a poor despicable Beast, creeping out of the earth, but not able as yet to make the Nations crouch to him, and therefore he borrows the power of the first Beast, i.e. of the Civil Magistrate, thereby to carry on his own designs, Rev. 13. 11, 12.

2. In his Mature state the Beast sits as a rich proud imperious Whore upon the Nations, Rev. 17. 1. compared with 15. and rides upon the back of the first Beast, or the Magistratical power of Nations, ver. 3. ruling them, and the Nations under them, making them do even what this Beast lists.

3. In his declining state, or Old Age; he is a false Prophet, i.e. he counterfeits abundance of Holiness, more then indeed he hath, or ever before professed; the reason whereof I take to be the first Beast through his long riding and galling of him, now begins to kick, and will by no means endure his Rider any longer; the Nations begin
to see, that this Beast is not indeed (as they have been all along held in hand, and made believe) the Woman, the true Church, but a very Strumpet, that by Whoring and Juggling hath in all Ages made her self rich, persecuted the Saints, enslaved them; this makes the Nations begin to spurn likewise at this Beast. This Beast now fearing a downfall, and knowing full well that if there be not some way found out to keep up his esteem with the first Beast, and the Nations, he is undone; he Proteus-like (for indeed he is a Monster, never heard of in the world till Antichrists Kingdom began) changeth shapes, and as at first of a poor ragged Beast became (opportunity serving him) a proud Whore; so now the Beast when he can be a ruling, commanding Whore no longer, transforms himself into a false Prophet, pretending abundance of Holiness, that hereby he may keep up that esteem still with the first Beast, and the Nations, which once he had, but hath well-nigh lost, through his domineering pride and imperiousness. This is the true state of the second Beast (or of Antichrist, as considered in his Ecclesiastical state) throughout the Book of the Revelations. And of this I have more fully treated, in my discourse upon the Vials, p. 101. to the 112. Now observe those who begin the Kingdom of Antichrist from the time of Antichrists growth, or maturity, leave out the first state of the second Beast, and begin their account with his second; which certainly we must not do, but must carry our beginning so high, as to take in all the three, as the Holy Ghost hath laid them down;
Part a. The end of the Beasts Tyranny.

down; I therefore conclude, that we may not begin lower than the aforesaid year, three hundred ninety six.

Seeing therefore that we may not begin either higher or lower, it necessarily follows that we must begin with the year we have fixed upon, viz. three hundred ninety six; to which number adding one thousand two hundred and sixty, the whole makes up one thousand six hundred fifty six.

The result of my whole discourse in this Second Part is, That the utmost period of the Beasts conti-
mance, the treading under foot the Holy City, the Womans being in the Wilderness, the Witnesses Pro-
phecying in Sackcloth, all which things are concur-
rent, will in greatest probability be, Anno Dom. one thousand six hundred fifty six.

Thus Joohns one thousand two hundred and sixty days expire in the same year with Daniels one thousand two hundred and ninety. Thus likewise in that very year in which from the Creation the Flood came upon the corrupted old World, in that very year from our Redemption, cometh the flood of Gods wrath upon the Idolatrous Antichristian world.

The end of the Second Part.
PART III.

Computing the time of the Fourth Monarchy, and shewing where the date of all worldly Kingdoms expires; and when the Fifth Monarchy, or that glorious Kingdom of Christ and the Saints, which is to bear rule over all the Earth, shall be set up.

CHAPTER I.

Of Daniel's two thousand and three hundred days.

The times that the Prophetical and Apocalyptical Numbers are conversant about, are either the time of the Beasts Tyranny, or the time of the fourth Monarchy.

The time of the Beasts Tyranny, we have treated of in our Second Part, and shewed where the date of his Commission ends. It now remains that we enquire into the time of the fourth Monarchy, to the end we may know how long that is to continue; and when, or by what time we may expect the total and final dissolution thereof.
Part 3. The end of the Fourth Monarchy.

Two mystical Numbers, ending at one and the same point, afford us light into this Question: the one is Daniel's one thousand three hundred thirty-five days, Chap. 12. v. 2, the other his two thousand three hundred, Chap. 8. v. 14. I shall say no more as touching the first then what I have already written in my Key, judging what I have there laid down, The 20. and The 37. to be sufficient as to it. My present Discourse shall therefore proceed upon the latter, viz. of the two thousand and three hundred days.

SECT. 1.

The common-road opinion is that the little Horn mentioned in this eighth of Daniel, is to be understood of Antiochus Epiphanes; the two thousand and three hundred days to be natural days, a day consisting of four and twenty hours, the whole making up six years, three months, and twenty days, which the Authors & Favourers of this opinion apply to the time of Antiochus rage against the Jews.

Now in order to put our answer hereunto, let us premise, That the Feet and Legs of the Great Image, Chap. 2. The little Horn, Chap. 7. The vile person, Chap. 11. who is described from ver. 21. to ver. 40, and the little Horn in his second state, or second waxing great, in this eighth Chapter, are one and the same, the very same state of person, (if a particular person be here meant:) is signified by all these.

And this needs no proof, because the common opinion hath granted it, by making application of
of all that the Holy Ghost hath spoken, as touching either of these, to that horrible Monster Antiochus Epiphanes; thereby plainly confessing that one and the same thing is signified in the aforesaid parts of each Prophesie.

This premised, let us examine what truth there is in this principle so much hugged and contended for by many, as the onely door of light into Daniel.

And although more can hardly be said in answer hereunto then what hath been already by some worthy men of later times, who have opposed themselves to this opinion, as Mr. Archer in his Personal Reign, The Author of Clavis Apocalyptica ad incendem revocata, but above all, the learned Parker in his Daniels Visions and Prophebies expounded; yet because in principles that men are wedded too (as ordinarily they are to all, be they right or wrong, that have but a crowd of learned men to Patronize them) they had rather (to use the Popish Proverb) believe as the Church believes, then look out for an Author that is contrary to their mind. I think it worth my pains in opposition to this opinion, to present here (though I shall but multiply whilst I to do things already published) some of those Arguments that are and may be brought against it; not doubting but that those who sincerely love truth, will see reason enough to be of my mind; as for others, who following the genius of this age, which is to be sick, sullen, and humorsome, when any truth crosseth those principles they have received by tradition from their Fore-fathers, have a principle or a will
will (I know not which I may call it) that they will not see any thing but with the eyes of their Fore-fathers, or the multitude of the learned Do-
ctors of the time, let Scripture or right reason speak ever so clear or punctual; I leave such to the judgement of being yet farther blinded.

But to come to the opinion it self, the Question is, Whether doth this Prophefie, Chap. 8. run upon Antiochus Epiphanes or no? This resolved, it will be easily determined whether the days are Na-
tural or Prophetical.

To this I answer, That Antiochus Epiphanes, notwithstanding Commentators have fearfully and shamefully stretched the Text, Reason, and the very sinews of the ancient Histories to gather up something that might colourably make the whole to agree to him, cannot be the person here meant, unless we look upon him as a common Tyrant and Persecutor, and so I deny not but that many things spoken of Antichrist that Grand Ty-
rant and Persecutor of the Saints, may very fitly be applied to him. Yea I think withall that there might be a special design of God in it, that many of the things here mentioned should be fairly ap-
pliable to him and others, that so thereby doors of mistake might be left open, and by it the Prophefie kept sealed (which otherwise in an ordinary way could not have been) untill the appointed time. And the same design seems to me to run also through the Book of the Revelations, in opening which it is very easy to mistake, if every thing which hath a plausible look, and fair colour out-
wardly, may presently be taken up as an Inter-
pretation.

But
But to passe this, and come to the thing, That
this Prophesie (as holds the common opinion)
should terminate in Antiochus Epiphanes, and to
have its fulfilling before the first coming of Christ,
cannot be.

My Reason is. Because it will not agree to the
sound of the Holy Ghost in any one of Daniels four
Prophesies before mentioned.

1. To begin with that of the Great Image,
Chap. 2. This opinion doth no way correspond
with the truth of that Prophesie.

2. Because that Prophesie runs down into the lat-
ter dayes (or the end of dayes, as our new Anno-
tationists upon the Bible render it) vers. 28. But
there is a God in Heaven that revealeth secrets, and
maketh known to the King Nebuchadnezzar what
shall be in the latter dayes. But this cannot be,
should the whole have its accomplishment two
hundred years before Christs birth, as this opinion
doeth, and must necessarily maintain; for Antio-
chus Epiphanes whose Kingdome they will have to
belong to the Feet and Toes (which are the ex-
treme and utmost parts of the Image, and there-
fore the close of the Prophesie) reigned two
hundred years before the birth of Christ.

3. Because the Iron legs are called the fourth
Kingdome or Monarchy, vers. 40. And the fourth
Kingdome shall be strong as Iron; but this opinion
which applies the legs and feet to the Race of
the Seleucida, and Antiochus Epiphanes one of
that Race, makes the Iron legs and feet a part of
the third Kingdome of Monarchy; for the house
of the Seleucida and Antiochus Epiphanes, are
by
by Chronologers generally reckoned as a part of the third or Grecian Monarchy,

3 Because the fourth Kingdom is that which breaks in pieces all the foregoing Kingdoms and Monarchies, i.e. it subdues to it self whatsoever was before subject to any of the other Monarchies, ver. 49. for as much as Iron breaketh in pieces and subdueth all things, and as Iron that breaketh all these, shall it break in pieces and bruise.

This also appears from ver. 35. because the stone that smites, upon its smiting, breaks the Brass, the Silver, the Gold, as well as the Iron and Clay, though yet it smites no other but the feet of Iron and Clay, which shews that whatsoever was in the three first parts of Gold, Silver, Brass, was now by succession come to the Iron and Clay, which smitten, the whole is broken. But this was never done by the Seleucidae in general, nor Antiochus Epiphanes in special, therefore cannot relate to him or them, but had a punctual fulfilling in the Roman Monarchy, which succeeded the Grecian, and swallowed up whatsoever the foregoing Monarchies possessed.

4 Because in the days of these Kings, the God of Heaven sets up his own Kingdom, ver. 44. But this Kingdom (according to the principle of those who are our Opponents, who begin it not till Christ's Birth) was not set up in the days of the Seleucidae, nor of Antiochus Epiphanes, for the whole Kingdom of the Seleucidae, yet the whole Greek Empire (lower then which this
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opinion looks not) was utterly dissolved many years before Christ's Birth.

5. Because it is Christ's Kingdom, represented by the Stone, which by smiting breaks in pieces that Kingdom, which by the Feet and Toes of the Great Image is set forth, ver. 34. Thou sawest till that a Stone was cut out without hands, which smote the Image upon his feet that were of Iron and Clay, and brake them to pieces; But it was not Christ's Kingdom, but the Pagan power of the Roman Empire that destroyed and brake in pieces the Kingdom of the Seleucida, of which Antiochus Epiphanes was a limb; therefore cannot the Seleucida or Antiochus Epiphanes be understood by the Feet and Toes of the Great Image.

6. Because the stone that smiting the Great Image breaks it to pieces, cannot be Christ's spiritual Kingdom, set up upon his first coming, which this opinion as it doth say, so must it, or say nothing.

1. Because this Kingdom take its rise where the Feet and Toes are smitten, but Christ's spiritual Kingdom did not rise till many years after the Feet and Toes, in the sense of the Patrons of this opinion, were wholly dissolved, and in being no longer.

2. Because this Kingdom cannot become a mountain filling the whole earth so long as the Great Image, i.e. worldly powers stand, which is clear, because upon the total dissolution of the Great Image, it becomes a Mountain, and not before, ver. 34, 35. But now Christ's spiritual Kingdom may be a Mountain filling the earth.
in a spiritual sense, though the Great Image be not broken in pieces, i.e. though worldly powers are standing.

3 Because such a Kingdom is signified by the Stone as was represented by the Great Image, for the Kingdom of the Stone takes the place of the Great Image upon its dissolution. But the Kingdoms or Kingdomes signified by the Great Image were not spiritual, but outward; therefore such must be the Kingdom of the Stone.

4 Because such a Kingdom is here meant as mult answer to Daniel's scope in his answer to the Kings Dream. But if this Kingdom were spiritual only, then Daniel had misled the scope much for Nebuchadnezzars thoughts run of his Monarchy, according to which thoughts the Dream was directed, and Daniel interpreting it, undertakes to resolve him fully; For in a word (as faith Mr. Hunt whose Argument this is) Daniel intends two main points:

1 To comfort the Jews in the losse of their Kingdom and Liberty, shewing that after many changes it should be restored to them again.

2 To convince the King of his Tyranny over them, by which his third Heir should be nothing the warmer; another should take it from him, a third from him, and a fourth from him, which at length (maugre all their despight) should be returned to the Jews in greater glory then ever they lost it. Now whether the Spiritual Kingdom of Christ doth answer this scope or no, I leave (faith he) to the judgement of the godly wise.
Because such a Kingdom is here intended as
was to be continued to the Jews (after once they
should be possessed thereof) without alteration.
Some Text, It shall not be given to another people;
Iie from Daniels people; but when Christ came,
and brought his Spiritual Kingdom (whiles to be
impartly Spiritual,) he first preached the Gospel to
the lost sheep of the house of Israel, from whom
notwithstanding the Gospel was taken away and
given to the Gentiles.

6. Because the proper work of the Stone, to
which it is appointed, is to break in pieces earth-
ly Kingdoms, ver. 44. but Christ's Spiritual
Kingdom set up upon his first coming was not ap-
pointed to any such end; for then would not
Christ have commanded a subjection of the Sub-
bjects thereof to worldly powers.

And lastly, what prerogative and advance-
ment had it been for the Kingdom of Christ Spi-
rithual, to have broken down the Seleucida, and
other Horns of the Greek Empire, so long as a-
other Kingdom, the Kingdom of the Romans
succeeded in their place, to beat down the Church
by the Heathen Emperours, and Antichrist, for
longer space of time, and with greater and more
grievous persecution than ever was before?

This opinion therefore cannot agree to Daniels
first Vision, of the Great Image.

Secondly, for Daniels second Vision of the
four Beasts, Chap. 7. It no way agrees to it; for it
cannot be that the fourth Beast, having ten Horns,
verbs 7, should be the House of the Seleucida, or
that the little Horn, vers. 8, should be Antichrist,
Epiphanes, as this opinion holds.

I shall here oppose only the Arguments alleged by Mr. Parker from the learned Gerasimus in answer to it, as judging them sufficient, though yet if need be, there is more to be spoken.

Arg. 1. The Kingdom of the Seleucidae beareth to the Third Beast, and is one of the four Parts into which the Grecian Kingdom was divided after Alexander's death, expressly represented in his four wings, and four Heads, ver. 6. the truth of which interpretation will clearly appear by comparing with chap. 8. 8. 22. chap. 11. 4. for the King of Grecia is expressly distinguished from Alexander, as the whole from the part, comprehending both him, and the quadruplicate division among his Successors, chap. 8. 21, 22. therefore both he and the Seleucida, with other his Successors, are included in the third Beast, and cannot be extended to the fourth.

2. Because these four Beasts arose successively to subdue the world, ver. 2, 3. but the Seleucidae, and other Successors of Alexander succeeded into it already subdued by him.

Thirdly, The Preface prefixed to the fourth Beast. After this I saw in the night visions, and behold a fourth Beast dreadful, ver. 7. the propounding of him without a name, as an unknown Monitor; the solicitous and curious enquiry of Daniel concerning him, ver. 19. the showing of a farre larger & more accurate description upon him than upon the former Beasts, do plainly argue, That the fourth Kingdom here signified is farre more great and wonderful then any of the former, and
therefore cannot be the Kingdom of the Seleucidæ.

Fourthly, The fourth Beast is said to be dreadful, and terrible, and very strong, in comparison with the Beasts going before; having Iron teeth, and Brazen nails, devouring and breaking in pieces, and stamping the residue under feet. But the Kingdom of the Seleucidæ was weaker than that of Alexander, as is expressly said, chap. 8. 22, and did not devour and destroy so as the former Kingdoms, as entering upon a world subdued already by Alexander the Great, therefore the fourth Kingdom cannot be the Kingdom of the Seleucidæ. Thou wilt say, The fourth Kingdom is thus expressed, not in relation to the world, or State generall, but to the Jewish Church, unto which it was more terrible, and stronger than the former. But it is manifest that the Iron strength is the Character of this Kingdom, distinguishing it in a generall and unlimited comparison with the Kingdoms going before. To exert in some particular place, such as Judea, more cruelty, by reason of the weakness of the people, and not by reason of his own absolute strength, is not a sufficient reason that he should be Characterised, and distinguished from the others by the character of strength and fearfulness, no more verily then the Spanish Inquisition, or Phalaris, or some other Tyrant, may be superlatively compared in strength with Cyrus, Alexander, Julius Cæsar, because more cruel and formidable then they, in respect of some weak and not resisting persons, over whom without exertion of much strength they
they might easily exercise their tyranny. Again,
their strength was not so much terrible to the Jews
as Nebuchadnezzar or Haman was; and the
Jews against the Seleucidae would have vindica
ted themselves into liberty, and had defended
themselves sufficiently, had not the Romans come
upon them, and broken them down at last, and
the Seleucidae together. Lastly, it is expressly said,
That the fourth Kingdom is thus strong, arroya
and terrible, not only in relation to the Jews, but
also to the whole earth, ver. 23. for it devours, and
treads down the whole earth.

5 Because this Beast is said to be unlike to the
Beasts that were before it; whereas the Kingdom
of the Seleucidae was like other Kingdoms. Some
say, it was unlike in respect of the ten Horns; but
there (as they will have it) are ten succeeding
Kings, which in kind and nature is ordinary to
all Kingdoms. They say it is extraordinary in
this respect, because some of the Egyptian Kings
are mixed in the number. But what ground is
there of such a mixture? because (say they) they
are described, chap. xi. Ans. But in Chapter
eleven is no mention made of ten Horns, and the
number there is not adequately ten; no reason to
extrude some, to intrude others, but rather con-
trary to reason, as Gersom sheweth.

6 Because the fourth Beast hath ten Horns, and
a little Horn arising after them, by whom three of
the former were rooted out, ver. 7, 8. How will
this agree to the Kingdom of the Seleucidae? They
say, they are ten succeeding Kings, whereof An-
sichus Epiphanes is the tenth and last, and the
same the little Horn. Ans. But if only by succession, then really in all particular differences of time it had but one Horn, and to the Kingdom might rather be said to have one Horn then ten. These ten Horns here described, existed at the same time, not by succession, because the little Horn arose among them, ver. 8. and his look was more stout than his fellows, ver. 20. 3. How can Antiochus Epiphanes be both the little Horn, and also the last of the ten, seeing the little Horn is said to arise besides, and after them, ver. 8, 20, 24. 4. Antiochus cannot be the little Horn, because the little Horn arising, growth greater and greater, and more stately than the other Horns, ver. 8, 20, whereas Antiochus was not so great as his Father Antiochus Magnus. 5. What are the three Horns, and how did they fall before Antiochus? ver. 8. It is said, That they are Ptolemaeus Philopater King of Egypt, Seleucus the Brother of Antiochus, and Demetrius. But was Seleucus rooted out because he dyed by slow and lingering hatred? and how can Demetrius be one of the three which was not reckoned by the Authors of this opinion among the ten? ver. 8. Lastly, by the fall of the three the little Horn grew greater then the rest, whereas nothing was added to Antiochus besides the ancient Kingdom of the Seleucidae. 6. Sixthly, the little Horn rageth against the Saints until a time, times, and a half. How will this agree unto Antiochus, because (say they) the Temple was profaned by Antiochus three years and ten days? Ans. But here it is half a time; or half a year, as also appeared by com-
comparing chap. 12. 7. Apoc. 12. 14. and ten days makes not half a year. 7. The Beast felleth in the destruction of the little Horn, ver. 11. but the Kingdom of the Seleucida did not fall to Antiochus Epiphanes.

Because it is extended until the coming of Christ in the clouds of heaven, ver. 13. 14. which is his second coming, Apoc. 1. 4. Mat. 24. 30. 31. 26. 64. for it is not said that hee ascended in the Clouds, but that he came, ver. 15.

It is extended to the time when all the Kingdoms of the earth shall be the Lords, and his Christ, ver. 14. with Apoc. 11. 15. And when the Kingdom shall be given to the Saints of the most high, all Hostile forces utterly suppressed, ver. 14. 26. ch. 2. 44. Apoc. 11. 17. 18. And how can this bee verified in the Kingdom of the Seleucida?

Upon these grounds it appears, That the aforesaid opinion will no way agree to Daniel's Prophecy of the four Beasts, and the little Horn, (Thirdly, For Daniel's Great Prophecy, ch. 4. chap. 11. chap. 12. this opinion of Antiochus Epiphanes cannot agree to it.

Because the feet and toes of the great Image, chap. 2. The little Horn, chap. 7. and the fourth Person in this Prophecy, chap. 11. 21. are (as before I have observed) one and the same; but the two first, as hath been already proved, cannot agree to Antiochus Epiphanes, therefore not this last.

Because this Prophecy brings us to the time of the end, chap. 11. 35. Some of them of understanding shall fall to 17 them, even to the time of the end, ver. 35.
At the time of the end shall the King of the South push at him, chap. 12. 4. Seal the Book even to the time of the end, vers. 9. yea to the very end of days, when Daniel was to rise and stand in his lot. But go thy way till the end be, for thou shalt rest, and stand in thy lot at the end of days. But this cannot agree to Antiochus Epiphanes, whose Kingdom expired many years before Christ's first coming; Nor did Daniel arise and stand in his lot at the end of those days, viz. the days of his Persecution, which yet is promised to Daniel at the end of the days here spoken of. Further, this Prophecy is said to be for many days, Chap. 10. ver. 14. I am come to make thee understand what shall befall thy people in the latter days; for yet the Vision is for many days. For a long time, chap. 10. 1. in the third year of Cyrus a thing was revealed to Daniel, and the thing was true, but the time appointed was long. Now it is not ordinary in Scripture Phrase (a thousand years with God being but as a day) to call so short a time as was the time betwixt Daniel and Antiochus Epiphanes many days, a long time.

Because he who appears to Daniel, Chap. 10. 5, 6. Chap. 12. 7. being the same who appeared to John, Rev. 10. 5, 6. and also the time, times and a half, Dan. 12. 7. being a time peculiar to the Gentile Saints, Rev. 12. 14. it hence follows, that this Prophecy is to be brought down into the Apocalypticall times, and therefore could not have its fulfilling in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes.

To these let me add some few of the very many Arguments (all which would be tedious here to
Part 3. The end of the Fourth Monarchy.

to repeat) that are laid down by Mr. Parker in his Daniels Visions, and Prophecies expounded, p. 91. to 97. and again, p. 131. to p. 136. in opposition to this opinion.

1. How (faith he) was Antiochus Epiphanes a vile Person, to whom they gave not the honour of the Kingdom? seeing he was the lawfull Son of Antiochus Magnus, who (to use the words of Cyprus) was so great even from his Infancy, that then in the world known unto us, there was scarce another to be compared with him.

2. I require (faith he) a sufficient reason, if this be Antiochus Epiphanes; why as many, or rather more words should be spent upon him, than were spent upon all the Kings of Syria, and Egypt before him, whereof some were farre more notable in exploits then he? If any say that it is so because he was more notable in afflicting the Saints; I still demand, But why are so many words spent upon these Warlike exploits, that concerned not the Church? Besides, others before afflicted the Female Church for alittle, and yet their afflictions are not here mentioned. If his persecution did exceed, yet why should the description thereof exceed so much, being but short in duration, and not to be compared with those of Nebuchadnezzar precedent, or those of the Romans in the time following? But if it be said, The reason is because Antiochus is described as the type of Antichrist; I answer again; That the Type howsoever must be according to truth, and the words of description answerable to the things contained therein; the Holy Ghost would not present
He proves at large, that the Wars of this King, and the several expressions the holy Ghost useth in describing them, ver. 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32. cannot be applied to Antiochus Epi-

pilus, p. 93, 94, 95.

What should I speak ( faith he ) of the great afflictions of the Church by sword, flame, captivity, and spoyle, and that for many days, ver. 33. at certain gusts succeeding after interruptions? The Church now and then rising, and prevailing, ver. 32, 33, 34. and then at certain fatal revolutions, set by God, exposed again to fire and sword, ver. 35. How can these passages bee exhausted in the narrow and short persecutions of Antiochus?

5. That Phrase, ver. 36. He shall do what he lists, is usually applied to irresistible and uncontrollable Monarchs, ver. 3, 16. Chap. 8. 4. and cannot be applied to Antiochus, over whom the Romans were so imperious, that at the threatening look and command of the Ambassador Popilius, he was forced to retire out of Egypt, and leave his prey. Add to this, That he was inwrapped with many difficulties at home.

Lastly, Our aforesaid Author proveth large-
ly, p. 112, 113, &c. that those Characters, ver. 37, 38, 39. as, He shall not regard the God of his Fathers, neither shall he regard the desire of Women; neither shall he regard any God, but shall magnifie himself above all; He shall honour a God whom his Fathers knew not, and a strange God; he shall divide the
Land for gain; are not any one of them applicable to Antiochus Epiphanes; which things who desires to see I refer him to the Author, as judging what I have already said enough, if it be not of some thought more then enough.

From the whole it appears, That the aforesaid opinion of the little Horn neither doth, nor will agree to Daniel's great Prophecy.

Fourthly and lastly, For the Prophecy itself, Chap. 8. This opinion of Antiochus doth no way agree to it.

Take here likewise some of Mr. Parkers Arguments in answer to it. Daniel's Visions and Prophecies expounded, p. 36, 37.

1 This little Horn riseth when the transgressors are come to the full, and in the end of the Gracian Empire, chap. 8. 23, whereas Antiochus was in the midst, and far from the time of the great and full degree of transgressors.

2 The Horn here spoken of is in respect of his beginnings called a little Horn, whereas Antiochus was not so low at first as to be called a little Horn; for Antiochus in respect of his Parentage, and condition of Fortune which he had thereby, was so great, even from his infancy, that then in the world there was scarce another to be compared with him, being the undoubted Son of Antiochus the Great, and after Seleucus Philopater his elder Brother, right Heir of the Kingdoms of Asia, Babylon, and Syria.

3 This Horn is said to wax very great in comparison of the former Horns, vers. 9, whereas Antiochus although he was great from his beginning, yet
did not attain unto a condition greater than his fathers; Concerning which let the words of Graecinus be observed: He (faith he) never had full possession of the whole Kingdom of his Father Antiochus the Great, which hee possessed before the Roman War; the sinews of War also failed him not once. And as for that which Junius alleged concerning his taking of Egypt, if that were true, yet would it little help his cause, seeing it is manifest that his Father Antiochus did not let's exploits against Egypt. Indeed Antiochus Epiphanes did the second time invade Egypt, but with such a successe that he got more dishonour then honour thereby. Neither in other Wars was he so happy and fortunate, that therein he might be so farre preferred above his Ancestors. In sum, Antiochus Epiphanes had little or nothing more then the meaner sort of the Kings of Syria.

4 How did Antiochus Epiphanes so excellently magnifie himself unto the South, and to the East, and to the pleasant land? How unto the East, forasmuch as he was ignominiously put to flight, and expelled out of Persia in the East, by the Citizens of Elemais? How against the South, seeing in both his expeditions against Egypt, he was at last shamefully repulsed; the first time by the Captains of Ptolomeus, the second time by the Ambassador Popilius? And how unto the pleasant Land, forasmuch as after his intestine cruelty on the Jews, his Princes and Armies were in Judea over-thrown, and put to flight by the Jews, and their Captain Judas Maccabæus.
Part 3. The end of the Fourth Monarchy.

5 The Acts of this little Horn are extended to the time of the end, ver. 17. and of the last wrath, ver. 19. whereas Antiochus Epiphanes dyed long before the birth of Christ.

6 In the judgement (faith he) of a learned Author, the two thousand three hundred days are unapplicable to Antiochus Epiphanes. And Pererius sheweth (faith my Author) out of the first Book of Maccabees, that Antiochus his Persecutions began in the year of the Grecian Kingdom one hundred forty three, and ended in the year one hundred forty eight, which could not be longer then six full years; and therefore it cannot fill up exactly the measure of two thousand three hundred days, which space containeth six years; three months, and twenty days; for the three months, and twenty days, would over-abound. Pererius to salve this difficulty, faith; That the two thousand three hundred years may be extended to the death of Antiochus, which was in the next year following; but according to Daniels words, and the drift of the interpretation of the Authors of this opinion, the aforesaid two thousand three hundred years must not end in the death of Antiochus (although if they should, yet the difficulty of exact accommodation will still remain) but in the cessation of persecution and calamity of the Church, and in the purgation of the Sanctuary, ver. 13, 14. which being referred to the Jews, in the time of Antiochus, came to passe exactly in the year of the Greek Empire one hundred forty eight, as hath been said, and cannot be extended to the year following; therefore are not the two thousand three hundred years...
thousand three hundred days appliable to this time; yet because I finde some of our own, who confesse Daniel's other Prophecies to have a look to the end of the Fourth Monarchy, somewhat doubting of this, which therefore according to the common opinion they would make to terminate with Antiochus Epiphanes. Let me therefore add a reason or two farther to those already laid down by Mr. Parker.

The time of the end here mentioned, ver. 17, and the last end of indignation, ver. 19, are undoubtedly of the same interpretation, with the time of the end so oft spoken of, Chap. 11. 35, 40. Chap. 12. 4, 9, 13, and the accomplishment of indignation, Ch. 11. 36, which besides the wonderful agreements of either King in their description, of which for a taste compare these passages.

CHAP. 8.

Ver. 12. An Host was given him against the daily Sacrifice.

Ver. 11. By him the daily Sacrifice was taken away, and the place of his Sanctuary cast down.

Ver. 25. Through policy shall he cause craft to prosper in his hand, and by peace shall destroy many.

CHAP. 11.

Ver. 31. And Armies shall stand on his part.

Ver. 31. And they shall pollute the Sanctuary of strength, and shall take away the daily Sacrifice.

Ver. 23. After the League made with him, he shall work deceitfully.

Ver. 24. He shall enter...
Part 3. The end of the Fourth Monarchy.

Verse 12. It cast down the truth to the ground; and it practised and prospered.

Verse 24. He shall destroy the mighty, and the holy people.

Verse 25. He shall magnify himself in his heart.

Verse 25. He shall also stand up against the Prince of Princes, but he shall be broken without hand.

Verse 36. He shall speak marvellous things against the God of gods, and shall prosper.

Verse 32, 33. The people that know their God shall be strong, and do exploits; yet they shall fall by the sword, and by flame; by captivity, and by spoil many days.

Verse 37. He shall magnify himself above all.

Verse 45. compared with chap. 12. 7. He shall come to his end and none shall help him; and at that time shall Michael stand up.

I say besides all these agreements, the inculcating that Phrase in either Prophecy, as the bounds and limits of the tyranny of either King, at the time appointed shall the end be. chap. 8. 19. So ch. 11. 27. The end shall be at the time appointed, verse 35. The time of the end, because it is yet for a time appointed, is to me a clear Argument, that either Prophecy terminates at one and the same point. Now the point of time that Daniel's Prophecy in the eleventh and twelfth
twelfth Chapters terminates at, being not the end of Antiochus rage, but of the Fourth Monarchy; therefore not Antiochus rage, but the end of the Fourth Monarchy is also the point of time with which the Prophecy, chap. 8, doth likewise terminate.

8 Daniel is commanded to shut up the Vision, because it was to be for many days, vers. 26. But as it is not likely, that the Angel would have commanded Daniel to shut up the Vision, but rather have given a contrary command, as to John, Rev. 22. 10. Seal not the sayings of the Prophecy of this Book, for the time is at hand; in case the fulfilling of it had been so near as the times of Antiochus Epiphanes; so cannot two thousand three hundred Natural days, no nor the whole of the time from the day Daniel had this Vision, to the utmost point of Antiochus rage, be called in the Phrase of the Holy Ghost, who (as I have said before) calls a long time short, many days.

The conclusion from the whole, is, That that opinion which makes application of this Prophecy, chap. 8, to Antiochus Epiphanes, interpreting the two thousand three hundred years of the time of his rage against the Jews, neither doth nor will agree to any one of Daniels four Prophecies.

S E C T. 2.

 Ere I proceed, I shall here by way of digression lay down my own thoughts concerning the little Horn, chap. 8, 9. upon whom the whole stress of the Controversie lies.
All those that have seen, who differ from the common opinion of Antichus Epiphanes, will have this little Horn to be the very same with that. Chap. 7. and accordingly some apply it to the Romish Antichrist, some to Mahomet, some to the Norman Race, etc. The two last opinions of Mahomet and the Norman Race, I have disproved before, and that throughout all the Prophecies of Daniel. The first which interprets it of the Romish Antichrist is the most colourable, because its clear the little Horn, Chap. 7. is to be understood of him, and also a large and full description of Antichrist comes under this little Horn. To this therefore only I shall here oppose, and that by laying down my own opinion, which is,

That the little Horn, Chap. 8. is not Antichrist's Kingdom only, but the whole body of the fourth, or Roman Monarchy, which is clear.

1 Because in each of Daniels other Prophecies we have the Roman Monarchy set forth in its twofold estate. 1. In its pure Civil state. 2. In its mixt Antichristian state, as I have before proved, Part. 2. Chap. 4. Sect. 2. But if the little Horn in this Chapter signifie Antichrist's Kingdom only, then in this Prophecy we have the Roman Monarchy described only in its second state, and so this Prophecy is made to differ from the other three; Yea by consequence many hundred years.

2 Because the rise of this little Horn in the latter time of the Grecian Monarchy should here be leaped over, which is not in any of the other Prophecies, ver. 23. And in the latter time of their Kingdom, a King of fierce countenance shall stand.
stand up. What Kingdom is this? Answ. The Kingdom of the Greeks spoken of ver. 22, which after Alexander's death was broken and divided into four Kingdoms. This no ways agrees to Antichrist, whose rise was not till many hundred years after the dissolution of the third or Grecian Monarchy, but it punctually agrees to the Roman Monarchy, which had its rise (according to the very words) in the latter time of the divided Grecian Monarchy.

3. Because the rise of this little Horn is out of one of the four Horns of the Grecian Monarchy, ver. 9. And one of them (i.e. of the four Horns, ver. 8.) came forth a little Horn. This cannot be applied to Antichrist who rose out of the Roman Monarchy, nor the Grecian. But it agrees well to the Roman Monarchy, which consider it as it was a Monarchy in the account of the Holy Ghost here in Daniel; for by the way observe this Rule, That the Holy Ghost accounts none of the Kingdomes succeeding one another to be Monarchies, till they had swallowed up the whole, or some considerable part of the foregoing Monarchy; therefore though Cyrus before the taking of Babylon had obtained great conquests, yet his Monarchy in Daniel's sense begins thence. Alexander likewise had done great exploits before he encountered Darius, yet his Monarchy begins from his overthrow of him. In like manner, we are to reckon the beginning of the Roman Monarchy, from that time when it first began to bring under the Grecian Monarchy, which was when it did subdue to it self the Kingdom of Macedon (one of the four Horns, into which the Grecian
Grecian Kingdom after Alexander's death was divided) when the Macedonian Kingdom (which formerly had been the Seat of the third Monarchy) was turned into a Roman Province, then began the Roman Monarchy, from which time the same did daily increase till in the end by degrees one after another, it swallowed up the other Horns also.

Now observe the Roman Monarchy may well be said to rise out of one of the four Horns of the Grecian Monarchy in regard that that Kingdom, which in the account of the Holy Ghost before was no Monarchy by swallowing up the kingdom of Macedon (the Seat of the former Monarchy) now takes place of it, and becomes a Monarchy; and therefore many make observation of that remarkable Eclipsè of the Moon, which was total, and happened the night before that fatal overthrow of Persia by Æmilius the Roman Consul, through which the Macedonian kingdom was lost, as a Prognostication of this wonderful change.

4 Because this Horn in its first rise was a little Horn, which fitly agrees to the Roman Monarchy, consider it either, first as it became a Monarchy (as I said even now) by subduing to itself the Kingdom of Macedon, which (though it had been the ancient Seat of the third Monarchy, yet) comparatively with some other of the four Horns in the Greek Empire (viz. the Kingdomes of Egypt and Syria, which were more potent then that of Macedon) it was but a little Horn.

Or secondly, if we consider the manner of the
Romans' growth as they were a Monarchy, which was different from the growth of all the former Monarchies; For the former Monarchies had their perfection in a manner the first day they became Monarchies; but the Roman Monarchy is a Monarchy whilst yet it is little and more imperfect, and afterwards by a gradual growth through continuance of time it attains perfection. Cyrus swallows up the Babylonian Monarchy, Alexander the Medes and Persians, as it were at a mouthful, and in so doing, these Monarchies are at the top, arrive to their perfect stature the first day of their birth: But the Roman Monarchy otherwise, it comes creeping on (as were unseen) and by little and little encroaches upon the Grecian Monarchy, till in the end it hath devoured all.

First, it swallows up the little Kingdom of Macedon; by this it becomes a Monarchy; then about a hundred years after, it swallows up the Kingdom of Syria, and makes a Province of that; then sometime after the Kingdom of Egypt, then Palestina, and the Countries adjacent, making them Provinces, and so by degrees it swallows up the whole Grecian Monarchy; so that indeed we may say the Roman Monarchy comparatively, with what it grew to through continuance of time, was in its first birth but an Infant, and therefore is well called a little Horn.

This gradual growth of the Roman Monarchy (take it in its first, or second state, for herein one answers to the other, the growth of both is gradual) is lively set forth by the term Waxing; it waxed great towards the South, &c, and it waxed great.
Great, even to the host of Heaven, vers. 10. which word notes a gradual increase, whereas the growth of the other Monarchies was (as I have said) sudden.

Furthermore, whereas this waxing great of this little Horn in its first state is said to be TOWARDS the South, and TOWARDS the East, and TOWARDS the pleasant Land, it excellently sets forth the exploits of the Romans after they had subdued the Macedonian Kingdom; for hereupon they assault the Kingdoms of Syria and Egypt, whereof one lay towards the East of Macedon, or if you will rather of Rome or Italy, the other the South; and withall they invade Palestine, the Land of Canaan, which is here called the pleasant Land. So that in a word, a more accurate description of the first rise, and growth of the Roman Monarchy (according to what Histories record hereof) cannot be given, then is here in this Vision of Daniel laid down in but a Line or two.

5. Because this Horn, though little in its first rise, yet doth it in time wax exceeding great, vers. 9. greater than any of the Kingdoms that had been before it, exceeding them all, which agrees not to Antichrists Kingdom, but exactly to what we have of the fourth Monarchy, Dan. 2, 40. Chap. 7, 7.

6. Because the twofold waxing great of this little Horn, excellently sets forth the twofold state of the Roman Monarchy. As a Civil state only, in which state it subdues Nations to itself, and particularly the Land of Canaan; is waxed exceeding
great towards the South, and towards the East, and towards the pleasant land. 2 As a Mixt state, or a Civil and Ecclesiastical state both, in which period the great thing it doth is, to make war with the Saints, and tread underfoot the Holy City, Ver. 10. And it waxed great even to the host of Heaven, and it cast down some of the host, and of the stars to the ground, and stamped upon them. To this twofold waxing great doth most excellently agree that double title given afterwards to this fourth King, Ver. 23. 1 A King of fierce countenance, such is the fourth Kingdom, Dan. 2. 49. and the fourth Beast, Dan. 7. 7. 2 Understanding dark sentences, such is the Roman Monarchy, at least pretending to abundance of wildom, learning, and high speculations in its second state under Antichrist.

This twofold waxing great, and this double title, will agree to no opinion (neither to that of Antiochus, nor that of Mahomet, nor that of the Romish Antichrist, nor that of Charles Stuart, or the Norman Race in general) as it doth to this.

I conclude, therefore that the little Horn here mentioned, is the whole body of the fourth Monarchy, and not the same in its second state only.

Now the Roman Monarchy is here called the little Horn, the name before given to Antichrist, Chap. 7. for one, or both these Reasons.

1 Because there is a likelihood in their rise. The Roman Monarchy (as I have said) when it first began to creep up, was but little, and therefore Daniel, Chap. 7. 7. beholds the fourth Beast creep-
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creeping up in the night visions, i.e. this Beast was obscure, and in a manner unseen at first, none dreamed he would grow so terrible. A Beast, such was Antichrist, and for this reason called the little Horn Chap. 7. Or

2. Because Antichrist in the last days was to wield the Scepter in this Monarchy, and the sequel of the Prophecy was to go on chiefly upon him. And hence observe, we have in the Vision and explication both, onely a word (as it were to bring on the other) of the Civil state of the fourth Monarchy, the main of the Prophecy looking to its Antichristian state. Now as this is (I suppose) the very cause and ground of their mistake who interpret all this of Antichrist's Kingdom onely; so may it be the reason, why the name proper to Antichrist, should here be given to the whole Monarchy, because his Kingdom being a part of that Monarchy, was the thing chiefly in the following Discourse to be insisted on.

What I have said confirms our former opinion, that this Prophecy belongs not to Antiochus Epiphanes, but another thing; and consequently the two thousand and three hundred days are not to be understood of Natural days, but Prophetical.

S E C T. 3.

Having already proved that the two thousand and three hundred days cannot be natural days, but must be Prophetical; in the next place, a Question will arise, whether by the two thousand and three hundred days we are to understand
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stand so many dayes or years compleat?
A very worthy and learned Author; reading, according to the Hebrews, two thousand and three hundred mornings and evenings, which make but half so many compleat dayes, will have but half so many dayes (at most) viz. one thousand, one hundred and fifty, to he here accounted upon.

But to this opinion I must give my dissent.

1. Because this way of computing by morning and evening a part, is nowhere else found in all the Prophets.

2. Because it is the ordinary Scripture-phrase to put morning and evening for one day; Gen. 1:5. the evening and the morning were the first day, ver. 8. the evening and the morning were the second day, ver. 13.19.23.31. And therefore it is more consonant to Scripture-phrase to conceive that the Holy Ghost by two thousand and three hundred mornings and evenings, doth intend so many compleat dayes, then that he should mean onely so many mornings and evenings, which make but half the number of dayes.

3. Because by this Computation the very Prophefie itself becomes useless to us, who cannot from it make up any account; For untill some Head is found out where we are to begin, there can be no suppuation of years. Now I ask, (if the two thousand and three hundred years are to be understood of but half so many yeares, viz. one thousand, one hundred and fifty) Where are we to begin them? If we begin from the time Daniel had his Vision, how will one thousand, one hundred
one hundred and fifty years bring us thence to the
time of the end, when as two thousand and two
hundred years and upwards are passed already
since that time, and yet the end is not.

If we shall begin lower (as we must by above
a thousand years) let the head of our account be
shewed in the Text. Daniel, in all his other my-
stical Numbers hath still some clear head of ac-
count laid down: His seventy weeks have for
their Head the going forth of the Commandement
to restore and build Jerusalem, Dan. 9:25. His
one thousand two hundred and ninety, and his one
thousand three hundred thirty and five, have for
their Head the taking away of the daily sacrifice,
and setting up of the abomination that maketh
desolate, Dan. 12:11,12. Now let a Head of ac-
count be shewed in the Text for this. If it be said,
It is implied, though not expressed, ver. 13 to be
the taking away of the daily sacrifice; trampling
the Sanctuary, and Host underfoot. Ans. If this
be the Head of account, then must the Head of
this account, and the Head of the one thousand
three hundred thirty and five days, Chap. 12 be
one and the same; for that is the taking away of
the daily sacrifice. And if to, then let a sufficient
reason be given to reconcile these places, why the
account there (which begins with this) should
have one hundred eighty and five days or years
more in it, then this here; for who reckons shall
find the one thousand three hundred thirty five
to have in it so many years more then one thou-
sand, one hundred and fifty, especially consider-
too that the one thousand two hundred and thirty
K dayes,
dayes, and the one thousand three hundred thirty-five dayes, do both end in the full restauration of the Church, and through-cleansing of the Sanctuary, as is clear from the scope of either Prophesie. If it be said, some other taking away of the daily sacrifice is here to be sought for as Head to this Number, then that which was in Julians dayes. Ans. Grant it; yet must the time when this was done, be so stated as that the one thousand one hundred and fifty years may concur in their end with the one thousand three hundred thirty and five years; For the Prophesie Chap.8. and that Chap. 12. bring us both to one and the same point, viz. the last, most full, and glorious restitution of the Church, where either number must expire. This taken into consideration, I say no more; Let the time be stated.

4 Because we have a special mark set upon this Number of two thousand and three hundred days (which is not upon any other number in all Daniel, or the Revelations) to give us to understand that the time shall be long, v. 26. and the Vision of the evening and morning (i.e. of the two thousand and three hundred dayes, vers. 14. set forth by so many evenings and mornings) which was told, is true; wherefore shut thou up the Vision, for it (i.e. the Vision of the evening and morning, which as it was the last thing in the Vision, so is it here in the Interpretation) shall be for many dayes.

Now observe, the like is not said of any other mystical Number, neither of the two and forty months, nor of the one thousand two hundred and...
and sixty days, nor of the one thousand two hundred and ninety, the one thousand three hundred thirty and five, that it should be for many days. Indeed Daniel's last Vision, which contains in it his one thousand two hundred and ninety days, hath this said of it, It shall be for many days. Chapt. 10. 14, but let it be noted, that these words have not reference to the one thousand two hundred and ninety, the one thousand three hundred thirty and five days afterwards spoken off, but rather to the time of the Vision itself, which was in the third year of Cyrus King of Persia, Chapt. 10. 1, and this was near a thousand years higher than the Head of the one thousand two hundred and ninety, the one thousand three hundred thirty and five days; and therefore well may the Vision itself, which contains the one thousand three hundred thirty and five years, and over and above almost a thousand more, (not full forty wanting of the number) be called a Vision for many days or years. But now let it be shewed of any other number (besides this of the two thousand and three hundred) where we have any such mark set upon the number itself, that it should be for many days, as we have expressly here the mark set upon the number itself, The Vision of the evening and morning (or the two thousand and three hundred mornings and evenings) is true; therefore shut it up, for it shall be for many days.

Now certainly we can from hence learn nothing less than that the two thousand and three hundred...
hundred is a larger Epoch then either the one thousand two hundred and sixty, the one thousand two hundred and ninety, or the one thousand three hundred thirty and five (which are the largest besides it that we read of) for neither of them doth the Lord himself (with whom a thousand years is as a day) count long, or set a mark upon, that we should account them so; but this the Holy Ghost hath noted down as a long time, and marked it out that we might so look upon it; but now according to the foregoing account which reckons only one thousand one hundred and fifty years, it should be a hundred and ten years shorter then the least, and shortest of these; which how it will agree to this note here left us by the Holy Ghost, to give us special light and direction in things, I do not see.

Lastly, I shall say no more; The Labyrinth, the worthy Author of this opinion seems to be in, not knowing whether he may reckon one morning and one evening for a day, and so of two thousand three hundred mornings and evenings, make one thousand one hundred and fifty dayes or years; or whether he should reckon two evenings and two mornings for one day, so numbring the dayes and years (which he also doth, making two divers reckonings) according to the fourth part of the two thousand three hundred evenings and mornings, which makes five hundred seventy five dayes or years; appears to me to be confusion sufficient of that opinion; which should we follow it, yet concludes nothing certain.

The Conclusion then is, That by the two thou-

sand
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sand three hundred days; we are to understand two thousand three hundred days or years compleat.

S E C T. 4.

It being clear that the two thousand three hundred days are Prophetical days, and also to be understood of so many Prophetical days compleat; Our next Question is, where we are to begin this large Epoch?

A late Writer would have the beginning of this number to be fixed with the beginning of the seventy years captivity in Babylon.

But this opinion I cannot receive.

1 Because it is contrary to all the Prophetical numbers of Daniel and the Revelations, to go from the time of the Vision backwards for a beginning.

2 Because this beginning neither doth, nor can make the two thousand three hundred days to concur in their end with the one thousand three hundred thirty and five, unless some other Head be found for that number; which Head must be such too, as will bring the one thousand two hundred and ninety dayes, which ariseth from the same Head with the one thousand three hundred thirty and five, to concur also in their end with the one thousand two hundred and sixty, which concurrence of numbers must be upon the grounds laid down in my Key, These 17. and These 34.

3 Because this beginning exceeds the bounds of the Prophecy itself.

Quest. But where then are we to begin?

K 3 Answer.
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Answ. With the beginning of the Persian Monarchy, viz. in that year the Scripture calls the first of Cyrus; and that for these two Reasons; 
1 Because the Prophecy itself, which begins with the beginning of the Persian Monarchy (as compare vers. 3.4. with vers. 20.) warrants this before any other.
2 Because this beginning fitly agrees as to the scope of the Prophecy, so also to the time when Daniel saw this Vision.
The time of the Vision bears date the third year of the Reign of King Belshazzar, vers. 1.
This year was the last year of the Babylonian Monarchy; and to go strictly to the time of the Vision, it was in the latter part of the year, after Babylon was taken, Belshazzar slain, and the Babylonian Monarchy translated to the Medes and Persians; as the learned and judicious Dr. Lightfoot in his Harmony of the Old Testament upon Daniel the eighth hath clearly proved; his words are these; The first and second verses of this Chapter plainly shew that Belshazzar reigned but three years; for it telleth that in the third of Belshazzar, Daniel was in Shusan, the Royal City of Persia. It cannot be imagined, he was there in Belshazzars lifetime, for his preferment and residence was in Babylon, till Babylon fell; but his coming thither, was by the transporting of him thither by the Persian Monarch, after he had conquered Babylon, who as it appeareth by vers. 27. had preferred him there, and interested him in the King's employment. This (faith he) is called the third year of
of Belshazzar, purposely that we might learn to give the first year of Cyrus its proper Date, i.e. reckon the first year of Cyrus and Darius, not the year that Babylon fell, but the year after; and partly that we may observe how that in the very year the Medes and Persians destroy Babel, the Lord revealeth to Daniel the destruction of the Medes and Persians, and the Monarchies after them. Hitherto Dr. Lightfoot.

Give me leave to add, as a farther explication, that that Kings business, which ver. 27. Daniel is said to do, is no way likely to be Belshazzar, who neither knew Daniel, nor had Daniel to do with him, as the words, Chap. 5. ver. 10,11,12, 13,14,15,16. seem to import; but very likely to be Darius, who upon the taking of Babylon set Presidents over the Kingdom, or Empire, of which Daniel was first, Chap.6.1,2. And by reason of the nature of his employment, it was meet his abode should be in the Royal City of the Empire where he might better attend it then he could elsewhere. Now this was not Babylon, but Shushan, as appears, Esther 1.2. where therefore Daniel now was, not Visionally (as say some) but really and personally, as is clear from ver. 2. And I saw in a Vision (and it came to passe when I saw, that I was at Shushan in the Palace, which is in the Province of Elam) and I saw in a Vision, and I was by the River of Ulai.

Had Daniel been in the place here mentioned Visionally only, he would never have spoken of two places; for Visionally how could he set himself at Shushan, in the Palace, and also by the River
of Ulai at the same time, beholding the same Vision; the meaning therefore undoubtedly is, Daniel by virtue of his residence at the time he saw this Vision, was at Shushan in the Palace; but locally he was either walking abroad to pray, meditate, refresh himself, sec. by the River of Ulai; as when he saw his great Vision, Chap. 10. he was by the River Hiddekel, ver. 4. and this not Visionally, but really, for he had company with him, ver. 7, 8. so was Daniel at this time really and personally by a River called Ulai, near adjoining (in all probability) to Shushan the Palace, where he saw this Vision. Now what made Daniel there, if at the time of this Vision Babylon were not taken? It must therefore be that Babylon was now taken, and the Monarchy translated, although the Vision bears date (for the reasons given by Dr. Lightfoot) the third of Belshazzar.

Now it being so that Belshazzars third was the last year of the Babylonian Monarchy, and consequently Cyrus first, the very next year, our beginning of the two thousand and three hundred days, agrees most fitly to the time of the Vision; for observe the third of Belshazzar being the current year, it's necessary therefore that we do not bring that into our account, but let it fall: The very first year therefore that we either may, or can begin our account upon, is Cyrus first, which begun with the beginning of the following year; and therefore to begin the two thousand three hundred days, with the first of Cyrus, agrees most excellently both to the matter, and the time of the
the Vision. This therefore I conclude to be the only true beginning.

SECT. 5.

But ere I can proceed farther, one thing there is somewhat needful to be enquired into, viz. Whether or no is the second Monarchy to take its beginning (as I have said) from the first year of Cyrus the Persian; or whether had it not its beginning some years before under Darius the Mede? The ground of this Question is because Daniel makes mention of one Darius the Median taking the Babylonian Monarchy from Belshazzar, Dan. 5. 30, 31. and also speaks of him as a person distinct from Cyrus, Dan. 6. 28.

Some to salve this difficulty, will have this Darius the Mede to be King of the Babylonians not by Conquest, but by Election: And their conjecture upon this business runs thus. That King Belshazzar was slain the night after his great Feast, by a conspiracy of those of his friends that he called to his Banquet; amongst these conspirators this Darius the Mede was one, who being a man ancient, wise, and of great authority among the Babylonians, they (though he were a Mede and a stranger, yet) to avoid contentions for the Kingdom (Nebuchadnezzar's Line being ended in Belshazzar) confer it on him. Those of this opinion give to this Darius the Mede, some seventeen, some eighteen years.

Now although this opinion (as laid down by the Authors of it) hurt not us greatly, because the
the time they allow to this Darius the Mede, they give to the Babylonian Monarchy, (reckoning the seventeen years of his Reign into the seventy of the Captivity) and not to the Persian, which they with one mouth confess began with the first of Cyrus, who (say they) took the Babylonian Monarchy not from Belshazzar, but from this Darius the Mede; yet because if once we grant it, that the Reign of this Darius the Mede was distinct in regard of time from the Reign of Cyrus the Persian, there will be then force enough in Daniel to beat us, yea and all Chronologers off their ground, while they account the first year of Cyrus to be the first year of the Persian Monarchy; I shall not therefore let the opinion passe by without an examination.

And although it were enough to destroy the credit of it, to say, That the whole of the story this opinion is founded upon, is but pure conjecture, there being not one tittle in the whole Scripture to bring us to the belief of such a thing; yet shall I not insist upon that, but rather prove how that this opinion doth not only want Scripture warrant, but manifestly fights with the Scripture. For it is most evident from Daniel, that Darius the Mede there mentioned, did Reign in the beginning of the Persian Monarchy, and not (as faith this Opinion) in the end of the Babylonian.

The Reasons of this are:

1. Because Daniel (as I have proved before) was in that very year which is called Belshazzar's third, in Shushan, the Royal City of Persia: Now what
what made Daniel there, if in this very year the Monarchy were not translated? if the Monarchy were now translated, where shall we find room for the seventeen or eighteen years of its continuance afterwards?

It may be said Daniel was in Shushan by the power and authority of Darius the Mede, who (though he were now elected King of Babylon, yet) had still great power at home, and by virtue of that settles and prefers Daniel in Shushan.

Ans. But Shushan did not belong to the Territories of the Medes, but of the Persians; for it was the City Royal of that Country. Now lay the Authors of this opinion, Cyrus King of Persia was a professed enemy to this Darius the Mede, and did in the end take the Kingdom of Babylon from him. Upon their principle therefore how can it be imagined that Daniel should reside in Shushan in the time of Darius the Mede, if this Darius the Mede (as they say) did belong to the Babylonian Monarchy, and were an enemy to Cyrus? for may it be supposed that Darius’s power could settle and prefer Daniel in his enemies country, yea in the City Royal, and that of such an enemy as was more potent than himself? it cannot be.

2 Because this Darius the Mede did rule by the Laws of the Medes and Persians, as is clear, Dan. 6. vcrs. 8, 12, 15. he must therefore belong to the times of the Persian Monarchy, and not of the Babylonian; For who can think the Babylonians were so stupid, such Fools and Mad-men, as to suffer a King, a stranger, who came in amongst them
them not by any Conquest, or power that he had to conquer them, but (as faith this opinion) by their free choice, which was a matter of curtesie towards him? I say, to suffer such a one to rule absolutely by the Laws of his own Country, and not rather by theirs, is a thing that we cannot easily imagine that any other, unless very Fools or Mad-men (in such a case) would content unto.

3 Because it appears from the faith and frequency of Daniel, and his urging present deliverance so much as he doth in that prayer of his Chap.9. (which prayer was made in the first year of this Darius the Mede as ver.1. tells us) that Daniel did now look upon the sevency years as run out (which also he seems to intimate ver.2.) at this time of his praying; which consideration puts life, courage, faith, boldnesse into him. But now according to this opinion there should be seventeen or eighteen years of the sevency yet to expire; which surely in case Daniel had so looked upon it, it would have been a great cooling to his spirit, a quenching to his faith, so as he could never have urged (as he doth, ver.16,17.) a present turning away of Gods anger, causing his face to shine upon them; nor would he ever have pleaded (as he doth, ver.19.) defer not for thine own sake, O my God; For how could he with faith have uttered those words, defer not, if he had looked upon the time of their deliverance to be remote seventeen, or eighteen yeers?

4 Because the Scripture is clear and punctual that the Babylonian Monarchy ended in Belshazzar, there-
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therefore may we not look for any Darius to succeed him in that Monarchy. This we have, Dan. 5.26, God hath numbered thy Kingdom and finished it. These words are not to be referred to the Kingdom of Belshazzar in particular, but to the whole Babylonian Monarchy (called Belshazzar's Kingdom; because he now swayed the Scepter in it) the continuance whereof was numbered by God, or measured out to be seventy years, Jer. 25.11,12. Jer.29.10. which determined time was now expired or finished, as the Text tells us; Therefore no room is left for a Darius to succeed in this Monarchy.

5 Because Belshazzar's Kingdom is divided, when he loseth it, betwixt the Medes and the Persians, Dan.5.28. Thy Kingdom is divided, and given to the Medes and Persians; but according to this opinion, if Darius the Mede, as a King elected did first possess the whole, and after him Cyrus the Persian by Conquest gain the whole, what division were there? True, either have what once was Belshazzar's Kingdom; but seeing they succeed each other in it, and either is a possessor of the whole, here can be no division; where one hath all, is no division.

6 Because the words of the Holy Ghost, Dan. 11.1. import as much as if that this Darius the Mede had been used by God in the doing some eminent service for him and his people. Also v.3. in the first year of Darius the Mede, even I stood up to confirm and strengthen him. Gods standing up to confirm and strengthen Darius in the first year of his Reign is an Argument of some remarkable
able work that was done for God in this year: Now if we place Darius first year with the beginning of the Persian Monarchy, it's evident enough what this work was, namely, the giving way to Israel's return out of Babylon, the making him willing to that work, which outwardly might seem to his loss and disadvantage; but in case we place Darius first year (as doth this opinion) sixteen or seventeen years before the expiration of the Babylonian Monarchy, let it be shewn from Scripture, what that eminent piece of service was, that was done for God in that year.

From the whole I conclude, That Darius the Mede spoken of by Daniel, did not reign in the ending time of the Babylonian Monarchy, but in the beginning of the Persian.

But it may be said, If so, then of necessity must we begin the Persian Monarchy not with the first of Cyrus (as before) but with the first year of Darius; and if so, then is not the beginning of the two thousand three hundred days which (I have said) begins with the first of Cyrus, stated aright.

Answ. It doth not follow. For though it is confessed that Darius did reign in the beginning of the Persian Monarchy, yet doth it not therefore follow that Cyrus did not, unless it could be proved that these two did succeed each other, which cannot be from Scripture, but rather the contrary is manifest, viz., that Cyrus and Darius were contemporaries, and indeed Co-partners in the Kingdom of Babylon after the same was taken.
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taken. For let it be considered, that the taking of
Babylon was not an act performed by Cyrus
alone, nor by Darius alone, but it was their joint
act; they two (one being King of the Persians, the
other of the Medes; and as Histories report, allied
the one to the other) join forces, and with their
united strength march up against Babylon, be-
siege it, take it. And this is clearly the mind of
the Scripture, and that opinion only which with
Scripture approbation will stand. For,

1 The Scripture attributes the taking of Ba-
bylon to either of them, as being their joint act.
It is attributed to Darius, Dan. 5. 31., to Cyrus
Isa. 45:1, 2, 3. which is a clear Prophesy of Cy-
rus his taking Babylon. To lay (as some) that
Cyrus in the taking of Babylon did act as Gen-
eral of the Army under Darius, is not only a thing
without Scripture-warrant, but a thing in it self
very incredible, viz., that Cyrus who (as all
Histories report) had before the taking of Baby-
lon reigned some years as King among the Per-
sians, and was for his warlike exploits and vi-
tories the most famous man then living, having
also hitherto in his way met with no check or
frown of Providence, should upon the sudden in
the midst of all his Trophies and Victories, come
down from being a King, to be General only
under another.

2 The Prophesy we are now upon, Dan.8. Con-
cerning the beginning of the second Monarchy, doth
plainly hold forth this. For observe it, as the
third Monarchy of the Grecian is in the rise of it
described by a He-goat having one Horn, ver. 5.
which Horn was Alexander the Great; so the rise of the second Monarchy of the Medes and Persians is described by a Ram having two Horns, ver. 3. which two Horns are interpreted, the Kings of Media and Persia, ver. 20. Now as these two horns were both upon the Ram together, at the time of his pushing against the Babylonian Monarchy; for otherwise, why is he described as pushing with two horns? so must we conceive that Cyrus King of the Persians, and Darius the Mede with their united strength did push against the Babylonians, and overthrowing them did accordingly (untill by Darius death, the Monarchy fell to Cyrus alone) Reign together.

3 It is foretold to Belshazzar, Dan. 5. 28. that his Kingdom should be divided between the Medes and the Persians; But in case the same had fallen into the hands of Darius the Mede only, then (as I have observed before) there had been no division of the Kingdom; for where one hath all, is no dividing. Yea farther, if Cyrus had had nothing to do with the Monarchy till after Darius death, how then had Belshazzar's Kingdom fallen to him? it had been Darius his Kingdom, not Belshazzar's.

4 The Prophet Isaiah foretelling the ruine of Babylon, Chap. 21. makes mention of two Nations as spoiling of her, which two Nations are the Medes and Persians, ver. 2. A grievous Vision is declared unto me, The treacherous dealer dealeth treacherously, the spoiler spoyleth; Go up O Elam, besiege O Media. Now observe, Elam was that
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Province in which Shushan the Royal City of Persia stood, Dan.8.2. I was at Shushan, which is in the Province of Elam; by Elam therefore the Persians are meant, as by Medea the Medes, both which hand in hand, march up, besiege, spoil Babylon. And therefore in the following verses of this Chapter, the marchers up against Babylon, are described by a double Chariot, a Chariot of Asses and a Chariot of Camels; noting the Medes and Persians; which double Chariot by vertue of that union and near conjunction that was now between them, go both under the name of one, and are called but on: Chariot because they march up together so unanimously against Babylon, as if they had been but one people, and not two; which one Chariot is led on by a couple of Horsemen, excellently pointing out Cyrus and Darius the two Heads or Leaders of this Army, as ver.6. For thus hath the Lord said unto me, Go set a Watchman, let him declare what he seeth, ver.7.

And he saw a Chariot with a couple of Horsemen, a Chariot of Asses, and a Chariot of Camels, and he hearkned diligently with much heed, ver.8. And he cried, A Lion my Lord. I stand continually upon the Watch-tower in the day time, and I am set in my ward whole nights, ver.9. And behold here cometh a Chariot of men, with a couple of horsemen; and he answered and said, Babylon is fallen, is fallen, and all the graven Images of her gods hath broken unto the ground.

5 The first year of Cyrus the Persian when the Decree went forth for building the Temple, 2 Chron. 36,22,23. Ezra 1,1,2. is the very same
year with that called the first of Darius the Mede, Dan. 9:1. Chap. 11:1. For observe, the first year of Cyrus the Persian must be that very year, that immediately succeeded the ending of the seventy years of Captivity; for otherwise Israel's deliverance being not till the first of Cyrus, the time of their Captivity should be upwards of seventy years, which is expressly against the Prophesie, Jer. 29:10. Thus saith the Lord, That after seventy years be accomplished at Babylon, I will visit you, and perform my good word towards you, in causing you to return to this place. Now the first year of Darius the Mede was the same year, as is clear; because with the end of Belshazzar's reign, from whom Darius the Mede takes the Kingdom, the time allotted to the Babylonian Monarchy, which was seventy years from the time that Israel was first captivated, was now finished, Dan. 5:26. and also, because this seems to be the very thing that sets Daniel upon prayer and fasting, Dan. 9:2,3. the understanding by Books in this first year of Darius the Mede, that the seventy years were accomplished. Nay, let me say, it must needs be so, that the seventy years did expire with the first year of Darius the Mede, when Babylon was taken, and so consequently Darius first year, and Cyrus first, but one and the same year, because the forequoted Prophesie, Jer. 29. is clear, that after seventy years were expired, Israel should return from Babylon: And Jer. 25. 11, 12. speaks it yet more clearly, that Israel should serve the King of Babylon but seventy years, which so soon as accomplished, God would punish
punish the King of Babylon, and deliver them. Whence I conclude, that the seventy years are not to be extended any further then the time that Israel did serve Babylon, and the time that Babylon was punished of God: But Israel served Babylon no longer then the first year of Darius; for with his taking the Kingdom (as our former Reasons prove) the Babylonian Monarchy ended; if we should therefore suppose them in servitude afterwards, it must be to the Medes, not the Babylonians; and also Babylon was sufficiently punished of God, when the Babylonian Monarchy was translated to another people; both which things having their plenary accomplishment in the first year of Darius the Mede, therefore with that year must the seventy years of necessity expire; and if so, then must the first year of Darius the Mede be also the first year of Cyrus the Persian, in which Israel was set free: for otherwise they had remained in Captivity above seventy years. If therefore the first year of Darius the Mede, and the first of Cyrus the Persian, were one and the same year, then of necessity must their Reign be together; and therefore (I take it) that those words, Dan.6:28. speak of Darius and Cyrus as Co-reigners, and not as Reigning successively one after the other, unless we understand it only of the time that Cyrus Reigned alone after Darius death; So this Daniel prophesied in the Reign of Darius, and in the Reign of Cyrus the Persian.

Now the Reasons why Daniel speaks chiefly of Darius the Mede, as if the ruling power lay
in his hands only, seems to me to have been one of these two, or both.

1 Because Darius the Mede, being aged, and of the two the greater Polititian, took up his abode (Babylon being taken) in the Royal City of the Empire, managing the affairs of State, whilst Cyrus (who was the younger and the braver Soldier) was in all likelihood yet in the field, subduing, and bringing into subjection such Countries, Cities, and Towns, as did yet stand in the way of his absolute Monarchy. Hence Daniel whose employment lay in State affairs, having chiefly to do with Darius, makes mention of him as though he alone had been King.

2 Because Darius the Mede, being much the elder, and (as some think) Uncle to Cyrus, things might go mostly under his name, by reason whereof the name of Cyrus, whilst Darius lived, might be somewhat obscured; therefore Daniel mentions him, who of the two was vulgarly looked upon as the leading man in ordering affairs, and doth not take so much notice of the other, though yet he were in power equal with him. And surely there might be a glorious design of Providence in obscuring the name of Cyrus about the time Babylon was taken, through that of Darius; for the name of Cyrus (by reason of Isaiah's Prophecies) was grown so famous amongst the Jews, that had they but heard the name of Commander in chief before Babylon to be Cyrus, they had not been so surprised with their mercy, as it is ordinary with God to deal by his people in his more glorious appearances to be up-
on them before they are aware; but whilst they little think of a Cyrus, and hear a great noise of a mighty Darius, Babylon is taken, and instantly unlooked for, appears a Cyrus, as a first and leading man amongst the Conquerors; which certainly could not but so soon as discovered (which in all likelihood was presently as Babylon was taken, when now the Jews within Babylon by converse with them, come to have a more true understanding of the people themselves, the state and affairs of the Conquerors) wondrously affect the hearts of Gods people. And whether or no, as the perceiving on the one hand the seventy years to be out, so some such amazing Providence as this concurring on the other, might not be a whet to Daniels spirit the more, to be earnest in striving with God for his People, City, and Temple, I shall not (the Scripture being silent therein) take upon me to determine.

And this consideration of Cyrus being manifested and known to Gods people last, doth well solve those words, Chap. 8.3. The Ram had two Horns, and the two Horns were high, but one was higher than the other, and the higher came up last: Which words seem to have in them matter of objection against the thing we are speaking of, and they seem to import, as if that Cyrus (who is the higher Horn of the two) did succeed Darius; and if so, Then how is it true that hath been said, They did both Reign together? Now from what hath been said, the Answer is easy, that Daniel speaks not of the being of the two Horns, but of their appearance; the two Horns, were both
in being upon the head of the Ram when he pushed down the Babylonian Monarchy; but now, as to God's people they did not both appear at once; but Darius the lower Horn appears first, and Cyrus the higher Horn after him; so did they not to Daniel in the Vision; first Daniel beholds the lower Horn, then the higher. But if this suffice not (because there seems weight in the Objection) it may be otherwise answered; that Cyrus's coming up last, is not to be understood in respect of his being a Horn, but in respect of his being a Horn greater and higher than the other Horn: A Horn he was of power and authority equal with Darius, whilst Darius lived; but a Horn of higher and greater authority than ever his fellow Horn had; so he was not till after the death of Darius, when the whole Monarchy, which before was shared between them, fell to him alone; and in this respect Daniel sees him come up last.

If it be asked, how long these two, Darius and Cyrus, did reign together.

I answer, Two years, at the end of which Darius ( who was sixty two years old when Babylon was taken, Dan. 5.31.) by death (which is most probable) or else by resignation, devolves the whole upon Cyrus. Now that they did reign together two years, and no more, is clear, if we compare Dan. 1.21. with Dan. 10.1. Daniel Chap. 1.21. is said to continue till the first year of King Cyrus, i.e. so long Daniel did survive. In Chap. 10. Daniel sees a Vision in the third year of King Cyrus: How may we reconcile these places? did Daniel behold this Vision two years after
after he was dead? No, we may not think so; but that which doth, and onely can reconcile the places, is this, Chap. i. speaks of Cyrus’s sole reign; i.e. reckons from that time he began to reign alone; but Chapter 10. speaks of the whole of the time that he reigned from the taking of Babylon; now that was three years, until the time Daniel saw this Vision, two of which he reigned together with Darius, and the third (which is called Cyrus’s first Chap. i. 21.) he reigned alone. Here in our close it may be observed,

1 That the first year of Cyrus, Dan. 1. 21. is not the same year with that called the first of Cyrus, 2 Chr. 36. 22. Ezra 1. i. The one signifies the first year of his reign after Babylon was taken; the other the first of his sole reign, which was not his first year, but his third from the taking of Babylon.

2 That Daniel dyed in the self-same year, in which he saw his last and great Vision, which was in the third year of the Persian Monarchy; for he continues but till the first of Cyrus, viz. of Cyrus’s sole reign, which (I say) is the same year with that called the third of Cyrus, in which he saw his last Vision; for therefore (as I conceive) doth Daniel, who before had all along dated his Visions by the reign of Darius, date that last by the reign of Cyrus, to signifie to us how that in this third year of the Empire, Cyrus did reign alone. Daniel therefore continuing but till the first year of Cyrus his sole Reign, and the year in which Daniel saw his last and great Vision being that year; I therefore conclude, that Daniel dyed in that very year in which he had his last Vision; which
which near approach of Daniel's death seems to me to be hinted to him twice in the end of the Vision, Chap. 12.9. Go thy way Daniel; And again, in the very last words of all, But go thou thy way till the end be; for thou shalt rest, and stand in thy lot at the end of the days.

The summe of all our whole discourse in this Section, is, That Darius the Mede did not belong to the Babylonian Monarchy, but the Persian; and that the first year of Darius the Mede, and the first of Cyrus the Persian, are one and the same year.

CHAP. II.

Wherein in order to a more full clearing up of the foregoing account, viz. of two thousand and three hundred days, Daniel's seventy weeks are discussed.

S E C T. i.

Having in the fore-going Chapter fixed the Head of our Account, viz. with what time we are to begin the two thousand and three hundred years; I shall now through the Lord's assistance go on, and (as that which necessarily comes next to be handled in order to the making up our Computation) enter upon Daniel's seventy weeks, Chap. 9. 24, 25, 26, 27.

This seventy weeks is a lesser Epoch comprehended within the greater of two thousand and three
three hundred years, consisting of four hundred and ninety days; for seventy weeks being reduced into days, amount to the aforesaid number, which according to the Prophetical way of speaking is so many years, viz. four hundred and ninety years.

Two great knots we have here to untie:

1. Whether these seventy weeks relate to Old Testament, or New Testament times?

2. In case they relate to the one, or the other, where are we to begin, and where to end them?

As touching the first, it is the opinion of a worthy man, that this Prophesie is not to be understood of the times between the Babylonian Captivity and Christ, but rather points out the Churches Restauration in New Testament times from its bondage and servitude under Antichrist.

But this I cannot receive.

1. Because this opinion leaves us wholly destitute of Scripture-ground, either for the making up the years of the world, or for a right supputation of Daniels two thousand and three hundred years.

2. Because the determination of the seventy weeks is clearly and evidently upon the Jewish Church, whereas this should be upon the Churches of the Gentiles; This is evident from the words, vers. 24. Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people, and upon thy holy City. Thy people, and thy holy City, clearly denotes the Jewish Church, and the City Jerusalem, which was Daniels people, and City to be here intended, Nay it cannot be otherwise,
wise; for these words coming in as an answer to Daniel's prayer, most surely that people, and that City Daniel had been praying for, is here meant. Now this was not the Church and people of the Gentiles, but of the Jews, with the City Jerusalem, as the very expressions of his prayer declare.

Object. But the Prophets whilst they speak of the restoration out of Babylon temporal, do mystically imply, and under figures describe the restoration out of Babylon spiritual: Therefore though it is a truth that Daniel's prayer was directed for restoration out of temporal Babylon, yet notwithstanding was he closely under it led by the Spirit to the restoration out of Babylon spiritual.

Answ. True, the Prophets whilst they speak of the restoration out of Babylon temporal, do indeed mystically imply, and under figures describe the restoration out of Babylon spiritual; this in the general is a truth; but whilst there is an application made of this general Rule to this particular Prophesie, it fails; for our Author himself confesseth that Daniel in his prayer did cast in his thoughts the restoration out of Babylon temporal; and therefore the seventy weeks from his own principle, must have some relation to that, at least-wise as a type of the other. But a typical relation it could not be; for the Text having expressly said, that seventie weeks should seal up the Vision and Prophesie, we are here by cut off from looking after any Antitype, or any other fulfilling of these words then what was betwixt the coming out of Babylon literal, and the death
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death of Christ; therefore the relation they have to that time must necessarily be the whole intendment of the Prophesie.

3 Because the Phrases ver. 24. to finish transgression, to make an end of sins, to make reconciliation for iniquity, to bring in everlasting Righteousness, cannot without a manifest forcing be applid to any other time, then that wherein Christ suffered.

4 The Messiah the Prince, ver. 25, 26. being called the most Holy, ver. 24. (which is the Attribute of God alone) it is not sufferable that the same should be applied (as doth this opinion) to the Waldensian Princes, Zisca the Bohemian, or any other creature. To interpret the anointing the most Holy to be spoken not of any person but of things, viz. the bringing in of Christ's pure worship into his Church (which is the sense of the Author of this opinion) cannot be thought; seeing the only anointed One spoken of in all this Prophesie is the Messiah the Prince, who being a person, the anointing the most Holy must be of some person, not of things. Nay it seems strange to me, that the word Messiah signifying the anointed One, and this whole Prophesie pointing at the Messiah, it should once be thought that the anointing the most Holy can be meant of any other save the Messiah, our Lord Jesus Christ himselfe. And therefore learned Mede upon the words well faith, there is (faith he) no interpretation of any passage in this Prophesie could seem so harsh, but I would be content to admit it, rather than yield that by Messiah, the Prince here named, should be
meant any other than Christ our Lord and Redeemer. For (saith he) I am persuaded that the Church of Israel in the Gospel, and from them the Apostles took it, had no other place of Scripture, whence they did, or could ascribe the Name of Christ or Messiah unto him they looked for, but only from this of Daniel. These are Mr. Medes words, which carry a convincing demonstration along with them, that the Messiah here spoken of must be Christ personally; but this opinion we oppose, neither doth, nor can so hold.

5 The Messiah the Prince, or the anointed Governor (to use our Authors term) is not to be anointed until the seventieth week, vers. 24. Seventy weeks are determined to anoint the most Holy. But according to the express and declared mind of the opinion we oppose, the Messiah is to be anointed after seven weeks of the seventy, i.e. nine and forty years are expired. And indeed so considerable is this one Stone, that if removed, the very foundation, yea the whole fabric of this opinion goes to decay; for neither will there be room found for the Waldensian Princes, nor Zisca, at the end of the seven weeks, or nine and forty years, in case the Messiah, the Prince, be not anointed till the seventieth or last week; and this Stone needs not a hand to be put to it; for the Text itself hath removed it in telling us, that not seven, but seventy weeks are determined to anoint the most Holy.

6 The Messiah, the Prince, is said to be cut off, but not for himself. vers. 26. What could more fitly have been spoken to signify Christ's dying for the sins of his people?
And last, To say no more, The perplexednesse of this opinion, which knows not certainly where to begin the seventy weeks, whether with the Waldenses, A.D. 1160. or afterwards in the time of Wickliffe, 1370. argues the same to be no sure interpretation of this Prophesie.

Object. 1. This Prophesie seemeth not to relate to Old Testament times, because in no place of the New Testament do we find it used against the Jews, to prove the Messiah already come.

Ans. 1. No more do we any where find throughout the New Testament that ever Christ or his Apostles did make improvement of the departure of the Scepter from Judah to convict thereby the obstinate Jews; Is it meet that we say therefore, there was nothing in that for-shewing the time of Christs passion? the reason is as good for the one, as the other.

2 All Daniels Prophesies were by strict command given forth to Daniel again and again, to be sealed till the time of the end. That therefore this Prophesie of Daniel (which had Christ or the Apostles unsealed in part, would have set open a door of light to the whole) might remain sealed till the time of the end should draw on; therefore neither Christ nor his Apostles do urge this particular Prophesie to any such end, which indeed they could not have done without unsealing it, by determining the drift of the Prophesie, and also shewing the time to which it did relate; and in determining this, a fair way had been made for the suppuration of the two thousand three hundred years, Chap. 8. and thereby light also let into that Prophesie.
Object. 2. All Daniel's other Prophecies bring us to New Testament times, therefore this also.

Ans. The subject of all Daniel's other Prophecies is the four Monarchies, but not so this: the consequence therefore is not good.

As for all the other Arguments laid down by the Author (which are not a few) some to prove the Negative part of the Question, some the Affirmative, the bottom of them all is one of these two things, either,

1. False principles arising from, first, a misinterpretation of some phrases and passages in this Prophecy: Or secondly, From too great a restraining of some things in Daniel's other Prophecies (which our Author would have interpretative of this) to such and such particular Events: Or thirdly, from a leaning too much to the bare reports of History.

2. An interpretation of the phrases here, which set forth Christ his acts and sufferings by similar phrases in Daniel elsewhere, which point at Antichrist his acts, and the Churches sufferings under him; whence the conclusion is, That this Prophecy must relate to the times of Antichrist, and the captivity of the Church of the New Testament under him. But let it be considered, as Arguments of this nature, when they are not seconded by some others more solid, do mostly make up but a doubtful conclusion; so in the present case more especially the conclusion is such, yea the way of demonstration very unsafe. For Antichrist being Christ's Ape, acting over those things that Christ himself did, onely with this
difference, the acts as performed by Christ were holy and good, as done by Antichrist wicked and abominable. Hence it follows, that the acts of both are set forth by similar phrases and expressions. Christ by his death and sufferings caused virtually the Jewish sacrifice and oblation to cease (this being the time of its abrogation) v.27. and afterwards by a total ruin through Thunder, Lightning, and Earthquake, the very place of that sacrifice, he actually destroyed it in Julians time. Antichrist likewise (but in an evil sense) is said to take away the daily sacrifice, Dan.8.11. Chap.11.31. because he labours to destroy, and by his power suppresseth Christs true worship to set up his own. As Christ to set up Christian worship, destroyed the Jewish, so he to set up his Antichristian worship, would destroy the Christian; therefore are the one and the other said to take away the daily sacrifice.

Again, Christ is said for the over-spreading of abominations to make it desolate, i.e. make desolate the Jewish worship, their City, Sanctuary, which thing as it was caused by rejecting him, so after his death, was performed in part by Titus, and compleatly in the time of Julian. Antichrist likewise to place the abomination making desolate, Chap.11.31. i.e. to desolate the Christian worship, with-drawing people from it, by setting up his own abominable Idolatry, by which the whole world are bewitched, and led aside. Thus other similar phrases, by considering the thing as done by Christ, and done by Antichrist; or as relating to the Jewish Church and worship,
and the Christian, will be clear. And indeed this notion both lets a light into Daniel to reconcile seeming contrary places, and also (if duly weighed) turns up by the roots a great part of our Authors Arguments.

Add hereto, (which takes in those that remain) that there is in many things an Analogy betwixt Christs sufferings who is Head, and the Churches who are his body, and also betwixt the effects that follow upon either. Now one or other of these considerations will enervate the force of all the Authors Arguments, which (because many, and an answer to each, will take up much room, and also anticipate some things in my following Discourse) I forbear to give particular Answers unto, leaving the drawing them forth from these more general considerations to the meditations of the understanding judicious Reader.

The Author of this opinion (if any should blame me, or think I may injure truth whilst I conceal his name, and therewith his Arguments) is the godly and learned Mr. Parker in his Daniels Visions and Prophesies expounded upon Chap.9.

The Conclusion is, That the seventy weeks are not appliable to New Testament times, but belong to the times of the Old Testament.
Having in the fore-going Section proved that the Seventy weeks relate to the times of the Old Testament, the next Enquiry is, Where we are to begin this Epoch of Seventy weeks, i.e. four hundred and ninety years, and where to end them? In both these it is most necessary that our way be very clear, or otherwise we shall never carry a straight line downwards; and the way being once cleared, here the difficulty will not be great to find out, where Daniel's two thousand three hundred yeers expire, as we have already found where they are to begin. And indeed there is not an Epoch of years in all Daniel, and the Revelations, that there is more need of being upon sure grounds for the beginning and ending, then this of the Seventy weeks; for a failing here makes a general failing, because no account, whose Head is in the Old Testament, can be brought downwards to the New, but must descend through these seventy weeks; if therefore we mis-place them, we turn every account out of its proper Channel, cutting the way either shorter, or by wheeling about making it longer, then indeed it is; so that an error here is a fundamental error in Chronologie. We shall therefore desire in this to go the more warily, taking up nothing upon trust, but bringing even the most common received principles to the Touchtone of Scripture, and right Reason.

Now as for the first, viz.: The beginning of the Seventy
seventy weeks, the Text is clear, ver. 25. That we are to begin them from the 'going forth of some Commandement, and thus Commandement such too, as was not as yet gone forth when Daniel had the Vision, but to go forth afterwards.

Now we read in the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah of four Commandements going forth after this time.

1. A Decree, or Commandement of Cyrus, Ezra 1. 1, 2, 3. which is more fully repeated, Chap. 6. 3, 4, 5.

2. Of Darius, Ezra 6. 6 to 12.

3. Of Artaxerxes to Ezra, Ezra 7. 11 to the end.

4. Of Artaxerxes to Nehemiah, Neh. 2. 7, 8, 9.
Upon some one of these four must the Head of our account be fixed.

The most general opinion is, that we are to fix on the first, viz. The Edict of Cyrus in the first year of his reign.

But with this cannot I accord. My Reasons are,

1. Because this beginning can never bring the two thousand and three hundred days, to concure in their end with the one thousand three hundred thirty five, unless we find a Head higher for the one, or lower for the other; and in case either of these be found, yet must the Head be such, as shall also produce a concurrence in their ends between the one thousand two hundred and thirty, and the one thousand two hundred and ninety days, upon the grounds we have more then once referred to already.

2. Because the Angels pointing out to Daniel a certain
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certain Head for the beginning of this account, viz. the going forth of the Commandement to restore, and to build Jerusalem, vers. 25. is to mean Argument that the seventy weeks were not to be begun from the time of the Vision, (which in case we begin from the first of Cyrus was, Daniel having this Vision in the first year of Darius the Mede, which year was the same (as I have made appear) with the first of Cyrus the Persian) for the Prophetical manner is, when an account is to be begun some or many years after the time of the Vision, to fix upon some certain Head for the beginning of it, as Chap. 12. 11. but now when the account is to take its beginning straight-way from the time of the Vision to fix upon none, for which reason the two thousand and three hundred years, which begin from the time of the Vision, have no particular Head assigned in the Text.

3 Because the determination of the seventy weeks is expressly upon Daniel's Holy City, i.e. the City Jerusalem. Seventy weeks are determined upon thy Holy City. But Jerusalem was not the Holy City, nor could it properly be so called until many years after the first of Cyrus (as shall appear in our next Section) therefore are we not from thence, but from another time to begin the Seventy weeks.

4 Because the Head of account laid down in the Text will not allow this beginning; for observe, the Text in plain words hath laid down the Head of our account to be this, the restoring and building Jerusalem, vers. 25. Know therefore and understand that from the going forth of the Command
restore and to build Jerusalem. But now there was not the least word in all Cyrus Decree that did concern Jerusalem, but the whole ran upon the building of the Temple, as is clear, Ezra 1.2,3,4, where we have the substance of his Decree in these words, Thus saith Cyrus King of Persia, the Lord God of Heaven hath given me all the Kingdomes of the Earth, and he hath charged me to build him a house at Jerusalem which is in Judah. Who is there among you of all his people? his God be with him, and let him go up to Jerusalem which is in Judah, and build the house of the Lord God of Israel (he is the God) which is in Jerusalem. And whoever remaineth in any place where he sojourneth, let the men of his place help him with silver, and with gold, and with goods, and with Beasts, besides the free-will offering for the house of God that is in Jerusalem. Here is not one word in the whole that doth authorise the Jews to any farther work then what concerned the Temple, but now the building of Jerusalem (which is the Head laid down in the Text) was another, and a farther work.

Ob. But though the building Jerusalem be not expressed in Cyrus Decree, yet it is clear such a thing was intended, and the Jews by him authorised to such a work, as appears Isaiah 44. 28. That faith of Cyrus, He is my Shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure, even saying to Jerusalem, thou shalt be built. And Chap. 45.13. I have raised him up (viz. Cyrus mentioned vers.1.) in righteousness, and I will direct all his ways; he shall build my City, and he shall let go my Captives, not for price, nor reward, saith the Lord of Hosts:

Yea
Yea also from the very deportment of the Jews themselves in this business, who upon this Decree of Cyrus, before yet any other Decree was given forth, did allay the building of the City, which surely they would not do without a Commission, Ezra 4.12,13. Be it known unto the King, that the Jews which came up from thee to us, are come unto Jerusalem, building the rebellious and the bad City, and have set up the walls thereof, and joined the foundations. Yea from the very news brought to Nehemiah by Hanani, Neh. 1.2,3. that the wall of Jerusalem was broken down, the gates burnt with fire, which therefore surely had been built betwixt their coming out of Babylon, and Nehemias dayes; for it could have been no news to Nehemiah to have reported to him of the breaking down of the walls of Jerusalem, and burning the Gates by Nebuchadnezzar.

Anf. I must confess the Objection seems to have great strength in it, and (for truths sake) I have brought it forth in its full and utmost strength. But to come to an answer. In doing whereof, I shall, First, give some particular Answers to the Texts themselves. Secondly, Lay down some Scripture-considerations, which may be an answer to the whole Objection.

First, for the Texts themselves; And first, that of Isaiah Chap.44.28. That faith of Cyrus, he is my Shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure; even saying to Jerusalem, thou shalt be built. I take it, the latter words (in which liyes the force of the Objection) even saying to Jerusalem, thou shalt be built, may be very fitly, according to the scope.
of the place, interpreted to be the words of the Lord himself, not of Cyrus; for observe, in the foregoing verses, we have God brought in by the Prophet, assuring his people upon his word of many great things he will do for them, ver. 24. Thus saith the Lord thy Redeemer, and he that formed thee from the womb, I am the Lord that maketh all things, that stretcheth forth the Heavens alone, that spreadeth abroad the Earth by my self, ver. 25. That frustrateth the tokens of the Liars, and maketh Diviners mad, that turneth wise men backward, and maketh their knowledge foolish, ver. 26. That confirmeth the word of his Servant, and performeth the counsel of his Messengers, That saith to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be inhabited, and to the Cities of Judah, I shall be built, and I will raise up the decayed places thereof, ver. 27. That saith to the deeps be dry, and, I will dry up thy Rivers, ver. 28. That saith of Cyrus, He is my Shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure. Hitherto it is most evident, that the words have relation to God, as speaking: Now observe, God having assured his people of many great things already, he shuts up all with this, as the crowning mercy to all the rest, Even saying to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built, and to the Temple, thy foundations shall be laid. As to say, Over and above all I have promised already, I do also give particular assurance, That Jerusalem shall be built, and the foundations of my Temple there shall be laid. And to this our last English Annotations agree, interpreting them to be the words of God himself, by rendering the words, Even saying to Jerusalem, thou shalt be built, thus, and saying to
Jerusalem, thou shalt be built; so by the copulation and put for ever, making in effect the words to have relation, not to Cyrus, but to God himself, who had said thus and thus before, and now over and above faith, Jerusalem shall be built, and the foundation of the Temple there shall be laid.

Now looking upon the words thus, it doth not necessarily follow, because Cyrus gave Decree for the one, the building of the Temple, that therefore he did for the other also, viz. the building Jerusalem, but it proves that God would do both, and as he afterwards raised up Cyrus to do the one, so would he also raise up Cyrus, or some other, to do the other, when the time for doing it should be come.

Object. If it be said, but the building of Jerusalem cannot but be included in that of Jerusalem being inhabited, ver. 26. therefore if these be the words of the Lord also, there seems to be a Tautology, he should speak the same things twice.

Anf. Not so; for seeing to inhabit is one thing, and to build a place in order to its being inhabited, is another, the things though spoken apart, may both very well be spoken by the Lord himself, and that without any Tautology; and by how much the Jews had their eye chiefly upon this, the building their City Jerusalem, by so much doth the Lord give them greater assurance of it, by doubling the thing in a manner, yet without Tautologie, because set forth in several and divers expressions.

Object. But Cyrus is said to perform all Gods pleasure, ver. 28, and this he could not do, if he
did not as well give command for the building Jerusalem, as the Temple.

Ans. The Phrase of performing all God's pleasure, neither can nor must be stretched farther then this, viz. That whatsoever God hath determined to be done by Cyrus, that he should freely and cheerfully do, and accordingly so he did; First, He destroyed the Babylonian Monarchy, which were the oppressors of God's people. Secondly, He freely without price or reward gave full liberty to the Jews, who before were captives, to return to their own land. Thirdly, He made a Decree that they, come thither, should set upon the work of building the Temple. Fourthly, He laid a happy foundation (as I am now coming to shew) for the perfecting the whole work of God, both concerning the Temple, and Jerusalem also. More then this (I mean in reference to God's cause and people) cannot be proved that ever God determined Cyrus should do, and all this he did; and accordingly performed all God's pleasure.

Granting these words, Even saying to Jerusalem, thou shalt be built, to have relation to Cyrus; yet may the meaning of them be onely this, That God would make Cyrus the principal instrument, as of laying the foundation of the Temple, which was actually done by his decree, so also of building Jerusalem; but how?

Ans. By removing the great impediment, namely the Babylonian Monarchy (which had ruined Jerusalem, and was a professed enemy to it) out of the way, and letting the Jews (who whilst
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whilst Captives could never do it) free from their Captivity, which accordingly was done by Cyrus; God making him instrumental to raise Babylon, by which, as the Jews are thereupon by him set free to build the Temple for present; so also the supreme power came now to be in the hands of a Nation, who were more friendly to the Jews, and inclining to hear their complaints, and redresse their grievances for future. And in this sense it may well be said of Cyrus that he should say to Jerusalem, thou shalt be built, i.e. let open a door, which before was shut, for the building of it afterwards. And to this well agrees that other Text, Chap. 45. 13. I have raised him up in righteousness, and will direct all his ways; he shall build my City, and shall let go my Captives, not for price, nor reward. The building God's City, the Objectors themselves will never say was done actually by Cyrus Decree; The meaning therefore can be no other then this, That Cyrus should set open a door for the doing of it, by destroying the Babylonian Monarchy that had desolated God's City, setting the captived Jews at liberty, and laying a foundation for such a work afterwards, by putting forth a Decree to build the Temple, which might be, and was an inducement (as appears from Ezra 6. 1, 2, 3. compared with verses 6, 7, 8.) to his Successors after him to follow their noble Leader in kindness and respect to this Nation. And indeed it is a thing observable, that (for the general) of all the four Monarchies, the Persians were ever the most friendly to the Jews, and most ready to do them right and favour, following doubtlesse herein.
herein the example of their famous Founder Cyrus, to whom therefore, as being the leading man, whose example became a provocation to his Successors, the whole work, in Scripture, and that not amiss, is attributed.

As for the other place in Ezra, Chap. 4. 13, 13, it being onely the allegation of Judah's Adversaries, and written to Artaxerxes for this end, to put a stop to the work of God, I rather conceive them to be words of meer accusation, then of truth, by which those crafty enemies endeavour to make the case of the Jews as foul as may be; and to beget in the King the greater dislike of their proceedings, they sugget such things to him on purpose which might breed jealousie, and cause a discountenancing of the work; and therefore they set before him how potent a City, bearing rule over Kings, in former times Jerusalem had been, and how that now the Jews were re-edifying of it, had set up the walls, and joynd the foundations. And some colour there was for this; for the Jews had now laid the foundation of the Temple, as appears, Chap. 3. 11, and the malicious subtil enemies seeing a work on foot, and being willing to mistake, so they might, incite the King, and hinder the work, call this the building of the walls of Jerusalem.

Now the Reasons perswading me that this was onely the enemies false accusation, and that indeed there was no such thing in reality, are,

1. Because in Chap. 3. vers 8. to the end, where mention is made of the Jews building, and the
progress made in the work, there is not one word spoken of building any thing, but the Temple only.

2. Because the Adversaries of Judah, when first the report of the Jews building was brought to them, had no report of the building Jerusalem, but of the Temple only, *Ezra* 4:1.

3. Because it was in building the Temple the Adversaries at first offered to join and build with the Jews, which Zerubbabel, Jeshua, and the rest would not give way unto, whereupon the Adversaries openly oppose; all which is clear, *Ezra* 4:2, 3:4, 5. A clear Argument, the work the Jews were about, and that the Adversaries knew well enough, though they will not know it, was not building Jerusalem, but the Temple.

4. Because the work that the Adversaries upon receipt of Artaxerxes Letters (in answer to theirs) do cause to cease, is, not the building of Jerusalem, but the building of the Temple, *Ezra* 4. ver. 23, 24. Now when the copy of King Artaxerxes Letter was read before Rehum and Shimshac the Scribe, and their companions, they went up in haste to Jerusalem unto the Jews, and made them to cease by force and power. Then ceased the work of the house of God, which is at Jerusalem, so it ceased unto the second year of the reign of Darius, King of Persia. Now observe, the work the Jews were about, was the work caused to cease, for so ran the Kings Commission, ver. 21, 22. the work caused to cease, was not building Jerusalem, but the Temple, the Temple-building therefore, and not the building Jerusalem was the work.
The Jews were now about. Now though we suppose Ezra to be chiefly intent to set forth the Temple-work, yet doubtless, having so frequent occasion to mention the building, a hint would have been given by him, as well as the Adversaries, of building Jerusalem, had such a work been in hand.

5 (Which makes it apparent that the thing was a mere fiction) because, the Adversaries in their Letters to Darius, after Zerubbabel and his party were fallen anew to that very work, which before they were constrained to let fall, have not so much as one word of this, Chap. 5. vers. 6, 7, 8, &c. But now they can tell the King plainly what the Jews were about, viz., building the Temple, and not go in the dark, calling a Temple a City; and all they now propose to him is, only that search may be made whether Cyrus made a Decree for such a thing, or no. A clear Argument their former juglings were by this time discovered at Court; though having juggled, what by their own power, the prevalency of friends above, and that colour they had for an excuse, it was but a mistake, they saw foundations laid, and walls built, they thought it had been for a City, though upon better information they hear it was only a Temple; and they could do no other, but out of that due respect they bare to their Prince, his honour, and welfare, advise him of it; and however though a City it were not, yet the one, if suffered to go on, would make way for the other; By such Arguments (I say) having by jugglins at first put a stop to the work,
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Secondly, They speak not a word neither, in these their first Letters, of Cyrus Decree, which yet they could not be ignorant of, for the Jews had informed them of it, Chap. 4.3. yea the very Adversaries had hired Counsellors against the Jews to frustrate their design, as Chap. 4.5. What need of hiring Counsellors against a business that hath no colour of Law for it?

Quest. What may be the reason they are silent in these things?

Ans. Because the discovery of either of these might have brought their juggling to light. Had they hinted a word of building the Temple, they above would have enquired, What, are they building a Temple, and building a City too? which would either have driven them to confess the truth, 'Tis a Temple only, but what it may grow to in time we know not; Or else by averring both, they had cut themselves off their fair excuse for time to come in case of discovery, viz. That it was but their mistake, they thought it, by the greatness of preparations, and magnificence of foundations, to be a City, but it proved but a Temple. Again, Had they but hinted the Decree of Cyrus, enquiry then would have been made for the Decree, to see what that allowed the Jews to do, and whether they exceeded the bounds of it, before passing any definitive sentence. And this Decree brought forth, would discover what the Jews had authority to do, more then which the Adversaries knew well enough, they could not justly, in case strict enquiry should be made into the business
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charge them with, and therefore they hold it policy to conceal altogether that Decree also. Which Decree, yet afterwards (see the wretchedness of men.) when their juggling is come to light, in their next address to Darius, Chap. 5. they make a great noise of, as willing thereby to hide their former malice, by making those above to think that in their former address they were not so much enemies to the Jews, as loath to see and countenance any irregular proceedings, and that now having had satisfaction from the Jews that they had a Decree of Cyrus for what they did, they only think good to intimate, that the thing may be looked into, whether such a Decree there were, or no; not without hopes undoubtedly, that through continuance of time, and mutation of affairs, the same might be lost, which in case it were, they not only should wipe off the aspersion of malice, which now lying up on them made all charges ineffectual, but also find a fair opportunity to draw up a new charge. But God who knows the rage of his enemies, and takes care of his people, had provided otherwise, and turns this their crafty rage against the work, even to a promoting of it, as appears from the issue, Chap. 6.

As for the third foot of the Objection taken from Hanunie's report, My Answer is, That the breaking down of the wall of Jerusalem, and burning the Gates, relates to the ruins of Jerusalem in the days of Nebuchadnezzar.

My Reasons are,

1. Because no Scripture mentions any building
of the walls of Jerusalem betwixt the time of Cyrus and Nehemiah (the forementioned Texts, I have proved too weak) therefore we have no ground, for faith, that ever such a thing was.

2 Because it's likely, if the walls had been rebuilt by the Jews that came up in the days of Cyrus, and afterwards broken down again by enemies, and gates burnt, they would also as well have broken down the Temple and burnt that, for their malice was as great against the one, as the other; yea if more against any, it was the Temple, which, being the place of the Jews worship, was most abhorred by the Adversaries, who hated them only for Religion sake; but this was not done, for Nehemiah coming to Jerusalem found a Temple there, Neh.6, 10.

3 Because should I grant (which yet I cannot, there being not one tittle of Scripture for it) that City and Wall was built before, yet must we confess with all, that this work was an obscure thing, and no way to be compared with the after famous building of Nehemiah, memorized by a whole Book, written particularly upon that subject, and therefore not fit in comparison of the other, to be made head of Daniel's Seventy weeks.

As for the ground of this part of the Object: That it could have been no news to Nehemiah to have heard of the ancient ruins by Nebuchadnezzar.

Ans. Neither indeed was it, nor is the business between Nehemiah and Hanani a hearing and telling of news (as we commonly understand.
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They were more spiritual, and better employed then so. Hanani was a faithful man, one that feared God above many; Neh.7.2. This holy man coming to Nehemiah, another choice Spirit; two choice spirited men being now met together, having both of them great hearts for the cause of God, they (as 'tis comely for Saints at all times when they have the like opportunity, to do) presently fall into discourse about things that concern the people of God, and God's cause, at that day, and all the news that passes between, is indeed matter of so spiritual a concernment that it is too low a term to call it news. Saith Nehemiah to Hanani, brother Hanani, how fares it with our brethren at Jerusalem? O faith Hanani, their condition is sad; they are still in the old posture, a reproach to the Heathen, and the wall of Jerusalem lyes broken down, the gates burnt with fire. This thing this good man reports, not so much as a matter of news (though in part of it news there was) as indeed a thing which was the present burden, grief and affliction of his own soul, and the souls of the remnant at Jerusalem; how that Jerusalem (the building of which they had long expected) continued still a heap; and withall how that now (as it is God's ordinary way to affect the hearts of his people, and heighten his enemies against a work, when the time thereof is come) the thing lay more heavy upon the spirits of all the remnant then ever, and also the enemies did more reproach them with their unbuilt City then ever; In this last lay all the news, (if we may
Nehemiah, upon hearing this, and through that heart-warming discourse that had passed between them, goes home from this meeting, wondrously affected with the condition of God's people, and cause, and betakes himself to his Closet, and there spreads the whole before the Lord; the issue whereof is favour, in the sight of the King, and authority from him to go to Jerusalem and build it.

Thus much by way of answer to the Texts in which the force of the Objection lyes.

Secondly, I now come to add two or three Considerations from Scripture, which may be an answer to the whole of the Objection.

1 Consideration, Whether it be not a very strange thing to suppose, that the Jews having been charged with such a thing as building Jerusalem, and the work they were about stopped upon it; that yet afterwards the original Copy of Cyrus Decree being found out among the Court-Rolls, in the second yer of Darius, and transcribed by Ezra, Chap.6. 1,2,3,4,5. not one word should be mentioned of that about which had been so much noise and stir by the enemy; but as the Command, Chap.1. So here the Decree should run altogether upon building the Temple, and not a tittle in it of Jerusalem; which, who can think otherwise? but that had there been but the least clause in Cyrus Decree, empowring the Jews to the building Jerusalem, upon which the Jews had undertook it, Ezra, though it were to vindicate the actings of his Nation (and to shew that what they did, which was so cryed out
out against; and they suffered so much, though unjustly through forged accusations, for, was not without Law and Authority) would not doubtlesse, had the Jews been really guilty of the act, or the Decree allowed them any such thing, in transcribing the Decree, have left it out.

2. Consideration. Whether the very words and manner of expression used by the Angel, do not import an Effective command, such a command as upon the going of it forth did cause a restoring and building Jerusalem? vss. 15. Know therefore, and understand, that from the going forth of the Commandement to restore and to build Jerusalem. Observe, the Command is a Command expressly to restore and to build, which it is not proper to call that Command, which by virtue of it itself alone doth never produce any such effect; considering too, that Gods Commands (as we are to look upon this; though he use man as an instrument) are every of them always effective. Now let it be considered, whether the naked Decree of Cyrus ever had any such effect? nay, is not the contrary evident, viz. That for many years after the going forth of that Decree, even till the twentieth of Artaxerxes, Jerusalem lay waste as a ruined heap, Neh. 1. 3. and when the time of building it came, the work had for its basis, not that Decree, but a new one of Artaxerxes, by which only Nehemiah acts, and not at all by the Decree of Cyrus, as is manifest from the whole of his Book.

3. Consideration. Whether the Angels giving Daniel so many serious hints to pry well into
this thing, and to take heed of a too hasty conclud-
ing any thing, lest he should mistake, vers. 25. Know thereforc, and understand, vers. 23. un-
derstand the matter, and consider the Vision, vers. 22. I am now come forth to give thee skill and un-
derstanding: I say, whether it seem not to import, that it would be a very hard thing to make a right conclusion here, and that Daniel himself, and others, would be exceeding apt to mistake this commandement, upon the going forth of which the seventy weeks were to be begun, and therefore the Angel bids him be very cautious, and mark well every word and tittle that he was to speak, that so he might not through affection, or otherwise, be drawn to make a conclusion too suddenly. Now let it be seriously considered, whether or no could there be any such difficulty in the thing itself, or such aptness in Daniel and others to mistake about it, in case the Decree of Cyrus were the thing here aimed at. For con-
sider, Cyrus himself being so expressly notified by name, by the Prophet Isaiah, many years before, (which Prophesie Daniel undoubtedly was not unacquainted with) and also this Decree being the first, and so the most famous, and also brought forth in such a wonderful remarkable manner by Gods stirring up the heart of Cyrus, a Hea-
then, Ezra 1. 1. and also coming forth imme-
diately upon the prayer of Daniel, for Daniel prays in the first of Darius, vers. 1. and the De-
cree comes forth in the first of Cyrus, Ezra 1. 1. both which (I have before shewed) were one and the same year, it cannot be thought that were
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this the Decree we are to look at, that either Daniel himself, or any other would have been ready to mistake here, but would soon say, our conclusion must be so, here must we begin, and nowhere else; And therefore (I conceive) that Daniel whose thoughts now run upon the ending of the seventy years Captivity, and had been praying for that, and the Decree of release being just now ready to come forth, that by all these things meeting together, neither he, nor we, might be so overlet with affection, as instantly, without any further search, to pitch down our standard here, therefore doth the Angel give so many serious hints to Daniel to look upon this thing as a matter of great weight, a thing very hard to hit the right nail, in making conclusions, and a hundred to one, if he did not conclude false; and with all strongly to give a check to his thoughts, which now were all occupied about the ending of the Captivity, and therefore would be ready to catch up any thing to begin from thence, he points him to another beginning, viz., When a Command should go forth for restoring and building Jerusalem, that so Daniel upon the going forth of that famous Decree of Cyrus, which was to be presently, might not (having the foregoing hints, and this word, laid in before as a Caveat) be deceived, and begin the account of his seventy weeks from thence, but still look up, and wait upon God for another time.

Yea undoubtedly the Angel being so carefull in this to make us know and understand, would, had the Decree of building the Temple been
that here mentioned, have given it that name, and not another, of restoring and building Jerusalem (betwixt which two were many years) hereby opening a wide door of mistake to after-times who should live to see this Decree, as well as the others, and yet must account from the other.

4. Consideration. Which I take from the mouth of the Prophet Zechary, who began to prophesie in the second year of that Darius who advanced the work of the Temple, as Zech. x. 17. Ezra 4. 24. compared with Chap. 5. 1. which was many years after the first of Cyrus. Now observe, in his time God's measuring Line for the building of Jerusalem had not as yet passed upon it, as is clear from Chap. 1. vs. 6. and Chap. 2. 1, 2, 3, 4. In Chap. 1. vs. 16. Zechary hath this by way of premise, A line shall be stretched forth upon Jerusalem. In Chap. 2. Zechary Visonally sees the thing done, having withall a promise added to it, that Jerusalem again should be inhabited, vs. 1. I lifted up mine eyes again, and looked, and behold a man with a measuring line in his hand, vs. 2. Then said I, Whither goest thou? and he said unto me, To measure Jerusalem, to see what is the breadth thereof, and what the length thereof, vs. 3. And behold the Angel that talked with me went forth, and another Angel went out to meet him, vs. 4. And said unto him, Run, speak to the young man, saying: Jerusalem shall be inhabited as Towns without walls, for the multitude of men, and cattle there, in. Now mind it, Zechary's seeing the thing Visonally, with
with a promise it should be done is a clear argument that the real passing the measuring line upon Jerusalem, for the building thereof, was a thing not yet done, but to be some time after. Now consider, can we imagine that God should cause a Decree to come forth by Cyrus for the building of Jerusalem, before yet himself had passed his measuring line upon it? or that the Jews, having such choice guides with them as Zerubbabel and Jeshua, should attempt to lay the foundations, and build up the walls of Jerusalem, and that in a way of fore-stalling Providence, laying their measuring lines before yet God had laid his? surely it cannot be.

My Conclusion therefore from the whole is, That that famous Decree of Cyrus, so generally harped upon, cannot be the Commandement here spoken of, from the going forth of which we are to begin our Epoch of four hundred and ninety years.

S E C T. 3.

Besides the Decree of Cyrus, which Decree was the first, we read in Ezra of a second Decree that concerned the Jews, and their welfare, which forth came from Darius, whereof mention is made Chap. 6, vers. 6, 7, 8, &c.

But this cannot be the Commandement here spoken of, which by the Angel is made Head of our account, for the same reason disproving the former, because this Decree concerned the Temple only, not Jerusalem, whereof we have not one
tittle in the whole Decree; and also it concerned not so much the building of the Temple, as the removal of that which was an impediment in the way to the going on of the work, which work had still for its basis the old Decree of Cyrus; only the impediment is removed by virtue of a new; but now the Decree which is to be Head of our account is a Decree expressly to build; therefore cannot be this Decree.

Yet the learned Mede in his Treatise upon Daniels Weeks (whom I am necessitated here to mention by name, because I can neither state his opinion, nor answer it, without referring oftentimes to the Author) is of the mind our fixation must be here.

That by which he would evade the reason of the words, viz. That we are to begin from the building of Jerusalem, is, He would distinguish the beginning of the Holy City, from the beginning of Jerusalem; For (saith he) the Holy City is so called of the Temple the principal part, and therefore the time of the restitution thereof is to be reckoned from the time that the Temple was built; but by Jerusalem is understood the external buildings and walls of the City, which were not restored till some time after the Temple & Sanctuary was finished. Daniels Weeks p. 3. (as the Treatise is printed by itself, as it is printed with his whole Works, the Page is different.

To speak more plainly to the Readers capacity, Mr. Mede's opinion is this; That the seventy weeks are one Epoch, and the sixty two weeks another, being a lesser period of time comprehended within the Seventy, whose beginning (as he saith
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Page 19.) was to be after the Seventy were begun, and the end before they should be ended.

And as he makes the Seventy weeks to begin from the perfecting the work of the Temple in the sixth year of Darius Notthus, as is his opinion, and to end with the destruction of Jerusalem; so doth he the sixty two weeks to begin from the seventh year of Artaxerxes, when Ezra had Commission to cause to return, and carry with him as many of the Jews as he would to Jerusalem, Ezra 7. 7. 13. and also from the twentieth year of the same Artaxerxes, when Nehemiah obtained leave to build Jerusalem, Neh. 2. and to end with the death of Christ. Onely he makes a difference betwixt Solar years, and Lunar, reckoning sixty two Solar years from the time of Ezra's going up, to the Death of Christ, but sixty two Lunar from Nehemiah's: sixty two weeks, or four hundred thirty four Lunar years, being (as he faith) so many less, then so many Solar, as there are years betwixt the seventh and twentieth of Artaxerxes, p. 21. and to this latter beginning he makes the Command to build Jerusalem to refer, and not to the former.

This is the full of Mr. Medes opinion, which with what clearness I am able, I have set forth; and now must say, though I highly honour the Author, and his judgement in many things, yet in this particular cannot I close with him.

My Reasons are,

1. Because the concurrence of the two thousand three hundred dayses in their end, with the one thousand three hundred thirty five, the one thousand
two hundred and sixty days, with the one thousand two hundred and ninety (both which stand upon firm Scripture-ground): is absolutely destroyed by this opinion of the Seventy weeks.

2. Because Mr. Mede's great and only Reason inducing him to this Computation, is weak, uncertain, without Scripture-ground, yea destructive to Scripture-principles.

His Reason is, to reconcile humane Histories, and Daniel's Seventy weeks. Now supposing it to be done, yet in matters of faith the reason is weak, and as good as nothing, because the foundation is humane History, which is no ground of my faith.

2. It is uncertain, because humane Computations are different, and in things different a choice cannot be made, without some other rule to guide the choice.

3. It is without Scripture-ground, because First, Scripture hath nowhere told us that we should make bare humane reports the ground of our faith, but manifestly the contrary. Secondly, No other grosse summe in the whole Scripture doth inforce the beginning and ending of the Seventy weeks to be as Mr. Mede hath stated it, which could that be made out, it must then be granted that Mr. Mede hath reason sufficient to adhere to the reports of those he follows, rather than of others, who in computing the same time differ in their accounts, and consequently he should have, though not a particular, yet a general Scripture-ground; but his opinion having neither the one, nor the other,
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other, hath no Scripture-ground at all.

At is destructive to other Scripture-principles, viz. those principles which are the foundation of our first Reason.

Because Mr. Mede's Distinction (which is the foundation of his whole Opinion) is unsound; yea, if the ground of, it be thoroughly weighed, there is enough in the thing itself, to overthrow the whole building. For whereas Mr. Mede would put a difference between the Holy City and Jerusalem, making the beginning of the Holy City to be from the time the Temple was finished, but the beginning of Jerusalem not to be till afterwards. Let it (in answer therefore) be considered, That although the Temple, when spoken of alone, is called the Holy place; yet is it never called the Holy City, but with a reference still to Jerusalem. As the City Jerusalem is no otherwise said to be Holy, but as it hath reference to the Temple, the only place of God's worship being there fixed; so cannot the Temple, the place of God's Holiness, be called a Holy City any otherwise than as it hath reference to the City Jerusalem joyned to it; both compacted together, make up the Holy City, either claiming a share in the name. That it is Holy, is from the Temple, that a City, from Jerusalem; that a Holy City, from both. And therefore it is observable, as Jerusalem is never in any other Scripture called (unlesse in a Prophetical way of what should be for future) the Holy City, but still with reference to the Temple fix'd in it, so do we not find in all Ezra (which Book relates to the time we are upon)
upon so much as once mention made of the Holy City, till afterwards in the days of Nehemiah, Chap. 11.18, which was after Jerusalem was built, and City, and Temple, now again standing together. Yea whereas the Angel faith to Daniel, Seventy weeks are determined upon thy Holy City, what City doth he mean, but that City Daniel had been praying for, which was not the Temple onely, but Jerusalem with its Temple both together? Now seeing that Seventy weeks are determined upon the Holy City, and the Holy City cannot be so called from the Temple onely, but Temple and City together, it therefore follows that there can be no other beginning of the Seventy weeks, but what is fetched from the time when Temple and City were again joined together, so making up the Holy City, Daniel's Holy City; nor can the duration of the Seventy weeks be any longer then Jerusalem stands with its Temple in it, owned by God for the place of his worship; which as it cuts off both Mr. Medes beginning and ending of his Seventy weeks, who begins before the City was built, and ends many years after God had rejected the Temple as the place of his worship; So is it a strong Argument against any beginning whatsoever that shall begin the Seventy weeks any time before City and Temple stood together, or ending, that shall end them any time after God had rejected the Temple as the place of his worship.

4. Because Mr. Medes beginning of the Seventy weeks (take the same nakedly in it self, and our
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The foregoing Arguments set aside) appears improbable; for he begins with the sixth of Darius Nothus, the King under whom (as he supposeth) the Temple-work was advanced in his second year, and finished in his sixth. But how improbable is this that Darius Nothus should be the Darius here meant, even from Mr. Medes own Concession, who upon the matter grants us one hundred and thirteen years between the first of Cyrus, and the sixth of Darius Nothus; for, saith he, p. 9. the sixth year of Darius Nothus is concurrent with the three hundred and thirtieth Nabonassaran year; but now the first year of Cyrus was An. Nabon. two hundred and seventeen, as affirms Helvius (Sir Walter Raleigh and some others go seven or eight years higher) which is one hundred and thirteen years, walking by Mr. Medes own rule, and keeping to the lowest reckoning. Now though the Temple-work was after Cyrus first at a stand for divers years, yet not for one hundred and thirteen; for consider, Zerubbabel, who leading Israel out of Babylon in the first of Cyrus did lay the foundation stone, hath a promise made to him that he should lay the Top-stone, Zech. 4. 7, 8, 9. Nay not Zerubbabel only, but also some who were so antient at the coming out of Babylon, that they had seen, and could remember the stateliness of the first Temple, which was destroyed fifty years before Cyrus first, by Nebuchadnezzar, were alive in Darius's second year, as is clear, Hag. 2. 2, 3. now allowing for the time (which we must) of their age when the first Temple was destroyed (for
were they not then of some age and judgement too, they could not so remember as to judge betwixt the one and the other, viz. the first Temple and Second) and adding hereto, the fifty years betwixt the destruction of that Temple, and Cyrus first, and one hundred and nine, betwixt Cyrus' first, and Darius Nothus his second year, and the whole upon account cannot amount to less then one hundred and seventy years, which age is very improbable.

5 Because Mr. Medes ending of the Seventy weeks not till the time of Jerusalems destruction, is expressly against the several Characters of the Text, ver. 24. (which point us to the time where the Seventy weeks are to end, as the words, verf. 25. point us to the time where they are to begin) as shall be made appear in due place. Now beginning and ending both being mis-placed, the whole must needs be weak, yea, altogether false.

6 And lastly, Because Mr. Medes confirmation and make good this opinion, is constrained to lay down (and that in his very foundation) two strange Assertions, for either of which the Text itself affords no solid bottom, nor any other Scripture sufficient warrant; and they are,

1 Mr. Mede interprets the Angels words, verf. 25. Know therefore, and understand, that from the going forth of the Command to restore and to build Jerusalem, to have relation not to the beginning of the Seventy weeks, but of the sixty two weeks, whereas it is most evident that the period of time the Angel had spoken of in the foregoing
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verse (with a determination there of the end) the
beginning of which Daniel now seeks after, and
the Angel declares to him, was the Seventy
weeks, not the Sixty two weeks, which is not
spoken of till afterwards; and therefore it's more
agreeable to the scope of the words, to make the
going forth of the Commandement to restore
and to build Jerusalem the beginning of the Se-
venty weeks, then of the Sixty two weeks; to
which if they are to be referred, the Angel should
point out a period for beginning, before he had
told Daniel any thing of the time. Nay, if this
Command to build Jerusalem be not the begin-
nning of the Seventy weeks, then is there not in all
the words any express Head of account for them,
for there is no other Head; but this only, in the
words, unless we say the Seventy are to be be-
gun from the time of the Vision, which is as wide
from, and as inconsistent with Mr. Medes whole
Discourse, as any thing can be said. Yea farther
observe, the Angel lays down this Head of ac-
count with great care, that Daniel might not
mistake, Know therefore, and understand. Now
it is not a thing likely, that the Angel should take
so much care to make us understand aright the
beginning of the lesser Period (as Mr. Medes tells it)
of the sixty two weeks, and take no care to point us
a beginning for the greater Period of the Seventy
weeks, which (as Mr. Medes also faith) compre-
hends the other; and therefore by consequence, if
we know not where to begin and end that, the
bare knowledge of the other will add but little
to us.
Mr. Mede is driven to assert the seven weeks and the sixty two weeks, ver. 25., to be one and the same; he reading the words thus, There shall be sevens of weeks, and threescore and two weeks; that is (faith he) many sevens of weeks, so many as amount to sixty two weeks of years; there being in sixty two weeks, nine times seven wanting one, which little want (faith he) makes no matter, there being eight whole Sevens besides in the number, p. 12. So he makes the sixty two weeks explicatory of the seven weeks, and the same number to be in both, only set forth under diverse expressions. But this as it seems to be over-curious; so Mr. Mede himself saw so many intricacies in ascertaining it, that he confesseth p. 14., that could the seven weeks be well bestowed the chiefest difficulty were taken off this Prophecy. Nay let me say, this cannot be, but only with that supposition that the seventy weeks are one period, and the sixty two another, which hath been disproved already. To all the rest I might adde, that Mr. Medes distinction between Solar and Lunar years, which must come in to help, or else all said will not do, is over-curious, yea groundlesse, having no firm footing, to warrant such a way of computing either in the Text, or any other Scripture.

The Conclusion is, That Mr. Medes opinion, which begins the seventy weeks with the sixth year of Darius Nothus, is not that which we are to embrace and cleave to as truth, and the mind of God in this place.
A third Decree, or Commandement, we have in Ezra Chap. 7. viz. of Artaxerxes in the seventh year of his Reign; but this cannot be the Commandement we are to look at; for neither did it concern the building of the Temple, which work, as to the building, was finished before in the sixth year of Darius, Ezra 6. 15. nor the building Jerusalem, whereof not one word is spoken. But it was only a Licence given to Ezra, and some Jews with him, to go up to Jerusalem to offer sacrifice, and if need were to repair the Temple, in case of any decay there might be since the time the building-work was finished, or otherwise to add something to the work by way of beauty or ornament, which seems to be intimated, Ezra 7. 27. with a Command moreover to the Treasurers beyond the River, to furnish Ezra with monies and other necessaries for the expediting hereof; which looks in nothing like the Commandement we are now enquiring after. I might add, that several of the Reasons we have before laid down to disprove the former opinions, fall with equal force upon this, as might be shewed; but I forbear, because the reason of the Text lies so directly against this, that there needs no more to be rehearsed.

There is but one Decree more that any can imagine, and that is of Artaxerxes, in the twentieth year of his Reign, and given forth to Nehemiah; of which we may read Nehem. 2.
Now this (as I conceive) is the Commandement, from the going forth of which, we are to begin this Epoch of four hundred and ninety years.

My reasons are,

1. Because this Commandement came forth in as solemn a manner as any of the other. The first Decree of Cyrus came forth presently upon Daniels praying and mourning, so doth this upon Nehemiah, Chap. 1. 4, 5. The one hath as solemn a rise, as the other.

2. Reason, Because the work that this Decree concerned, was a work in itself as famous every whit as the work of the Temple, as appears, First, By the large description we have left us of the thing, by the Lord himself; a whole Book (viz. Nehemiah) being written in a manner upon this subject, in which we have the work, in the parts and circumstances of it, more exactly laid down than is the work of the Temple in the foregoing Book of Ezra. Secondly, The great opposition it met with by enemies, declaring it to be a work wherein Gods cause and glory was greatly concerned. Thirdly, The calling of this work, Gods work, Neh. 3. 5. and a work in which God did so eminently appear in carrying it on, and defending the workmen, that the very enemies themselves confess the work to be wrought of God, Nehem. 6. 16. which considerations are sufficient to silence some exceptions I have met with, under-valuing this work of Nehemiah, as a private businelle, and a thing too mean to be made the Head of this famous Epoch. And indeed I have sometimes thought, that one reason why so large
large a story is left us of this work, might be, be-
cause without a knowledge hereof, we could ne-
ever have found the certain time with which we
are to begin Daniel's seventy weeks, which is a
thing of so great concernment, as the Head of no
one number in Scripture like it.

3. Because this Decree agrees much better to the
Angel's words, then either the Decree of Cyrus, or any
of the other two: For observe, the Commandement
spoken of by the Angel, is a Commandement to
restore and build Jerusalem. Know therefore and
understand, that from the going forth of the Decree
to restore, and to build Jerusalem. Yea such a
building as should rear up again the street and
walls of Jerusalem, as the following words shew:
Now neither of the former Decrees did this, for
when Nebuchadnezzar first thought upon the work, the
walls of Jerusalem were broken down, the Gates
burnt with fire, Nebem.1.3,4. after the work of
building the walls was finished, yet the houses
were not builded, Nebem.7.1,4.--the City was
large and great, but the people were few therein,
and the houses were not builded. The meaning
surely is, That notwithstanding there might be
here and there particular houses in which the
people did reside, yet Jerusalem as a City with
houses compacted making a street, was not yet
built (which is the thing the Angel mentions to
Daniel, to the end we might not look upon the
building of some particular houses, to be, in the
intent of the Holy Ghost; the building of Jeru-
salem, but rather reckon it from the time when
walls and street began to be built.) But now,
in Nehemiahs time both these were done, he built the walls of Jerusalem, and that in so short a time as was even a miracle, Nehem.6.15. and he built the houses also, and Artaxerxes Decree did authorize him to do both these, Chap.2.5,8. And this was a larger power then ever was given before by any of the precedent Decrees.

4 Because this beginning stands reconciled (as our computation of the two thousand three hundred dayes by virtue of it will make appear) with those Scripture-principles, which require a concurrence in their ends between the two thousand three hundred dayes, and the one thousand three hundred thirty-five, and also the one thousand two hundred and sixty dayes, and the one thousand two hundred and ninety; which all the other beginnings are at variance, and open war with.

What shall I say more? to make the whole of this long Discourse clear and undoubted, in one word, Consider, That the Jews had a twofold Restoration, and a double building-work; First, A spiritual Restoration, or a Restoration as they were a Church, and a building-work attending that, viz. Of the Temple; Secondly, A Civil Restoration, or a Restoration as they were a Commonwealth, and a building-work attending that, viz. Of the City Jerusalem. Both these Daniel in his prayer had been pleading for, viz. The Restoration of City and Sanctuary. Accordingly, in the answer given to him by the Angel, we have a double Command; First, A Command which concerned the first only, viz. The Temple-work, which
which was the Command of Cyrus, and is that Commandement which is said to come forth at the beginning of Daniels supplication, vers. 23. i.e. whilst Daniel is praying Cyrus enacts this Law, and so part of Daniels prayer had a present answer; Secondly, A Command respecting the second, viz. The work of the City and Commonwealth, which is the Commandement to restore, and to build Jerusalem, vers. 25.—The coming forth of this was to be for future; and (I take it) this latter Commandement hath therefore this particular notation, Of building Jerusalem, that Daniel, nor we, might not mistake, and account it the same with the other, vers. 23. Now observe, the Angel fixing the Head of the seventy weeks upon the Command for building Jerusalem, it is a clear Argument that we are to begin the seventy weeks with the Jews Civil Restoration, not their Spiritual.

The Conclusion therefore is, That the Commandement from the going forth, of which we are to begin our four hundred and ninety years, is the Commandement of Artaxerxes to Nehemiah, in the twentieth year of his Reign.

Thus much as touching our beginning of this famous Epoch of Daniels seventy weeks, or four hundred and ninety years.

**SECT. 5.**

Having found out the beginning of Daniels seventy weeks; our next Enquiry must be where we shall end them.
Worthy Mr. Mede (with whom we have been contending already about the beginning) is of opinion that we are to end the seventy weeks with the destruction of Jerusalem; But having before proved his Beginning to be false, his End must necessarily be so too. And indeed, the most of our Reasons, but the three first especially, laid down to disprove his beginning, do lie as strongly against this end, take the same, as it is asserted by him, or any other.

But that which here I shall farther add, is, That this ending of the seventy weeks is altogether repugnant to the Text, which points us to another ending point, viz. the death of the Messiah; as the evident Characters in the Text declare.

1. CHARACTER. The seventy weeks are determined upon Daniel's Holy City. Seventy weeks are determined upon thy Holy City; therefore to be extended no farther than the time that Jerusalem remained the Holy City. But now Jerusalem (as I have observed before) remained the Holy City no longer then God did own the Temple in it as the only place of his worship; and this was only till the Death of Christ, the Messiah; after which the veil of the Temple is rent in twain, the Jewish Sacrifice and Oblation ceaseth, Neither in this Mountain, nor in Jerusalem shall men now any longer (i.e. excluding other places, as it was all the time of the Law) worship the Father.

2. CHARACTER. The seventy weeks are there to end where the Jews transgressions are finished, or come to the full. Seventy weeks are.
determined upon thy people, and upon thy Holy City, to finish the transgression. But this was done in the crucifying the Lord of life, for then did the Jews fill up the measure of their Fathers, as is evident from that Parable Matt. 21.33. to the end; first the servants of the Lord of the Vineyard are killed, ver. 35.36. Thus were the Prophets one after another by their Fore-fathers. But last of all (Faith Christ) The Lord of the Vineyard sends his Son, saying, They will reverence my Son, ver. 37. But these wicked Husbandmen kill him likewise, ver. 38. hereupon transgressions are come to the full, the Lord of the Vineyard miserably destroys these wicked men, and lets out his Vineyard to other Husbandmen, ver. 40.41. And what can better evidence transgressions being now come to the full, than this? the chief Heads of the Jews, and the popularity, with one mouth crying out, when the sentence of condemnation was passing upon Christ, His blood be upon us, and our children, invoking hereby Heaven for judgement and destruction upon themselves and their posterity; yea it is yet more evident that transgressions at this day were come to the full, because, though some particular persons, upon the wonderful miracles of Christ's Resurrection, sending down the Spirit, and the preaching of the word of the Gospel hereupon sent forth among them, did afterwards come in and imbrace this Christ; yet never had the body of the Nation, nor their Rulers from that day forwards hearts so much as to acknowledge their most wicked fact, much less repent them of it.
A third, fourth, and fifth CHARACTERS. The seventy weeks are then to expire when an end was made of sin, reconciliation made for iniquity, everlasting righteousness brought in.

Seventy weeks are determined to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness: But all this was eminently done in the day of Christ's sufferings when he gave up the Ghost, saying, It is finished.

The Conclusion is, That we are to end Daniel's seventy weeks with the Passion of Christ.

SECT. 6.

Unto the foregoing Opinion, which ends the seventy weeks with the Passion of Christ, doth excellently accord the seven weeks, and the sixty-two weeks in the following verse (which Mr. Mede confesseth to be the greatest knot in this Prophesie) the difficulty hereby being wholly taken off, and thereby our opinion as touching the ending of the seventy weeks confirmed.

But ere this can be made appear, it will be necessary that the knot concerning the seven weeks be untied.

Four opinions (besides that of Mr. Medes, whereof mention was made before) there are of these seven weeks, neither of which can I receive.

1. The first is, that which would have the seven weeks to be weeks of days, and the sixty-two weeks, weeks of years; the meaning of the opinion is, That
That the days of the seven weeks should be understood of Natural days, a day consisting of four and twenty hours, but in the sixty two, of Prophetic days, a day for a year, and accordingly it would have these seven weeks to be meant of the two and fifty days, wherein the Wall of Jerusalem was finished, Neh. 6. 15. which (faith the Author) though they are indeed somewhat more than seven weeks, yet short of seven and a half, and so not to be regarded in account of weeks.

But this cannot be,

1. Because it is against all Scripture accounts, yea reason it self, to conceive that in one and the same Epoch of seventy weeks, we should (without any compelling reason from the Text to do) interpret some of the weeks of days Natural, some of days Prophetic.

2. Because The Angel assigns no proper work to the seven weeks, as distinct from the sixty two, no reason therefore we should. Nay, in case we so do, its more consonant to the Angels words to attribute the building of Jerusalem, with its Wall, to the sixty two weeks, then to the seven weeks; For faith the Angel, Sixty two weeks the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublesome times.

2. A second opinion (and the most common) is, That which makes the seven weeks the Period of time the second Temple was building, and the sixty two weeks the time thence to Christ, in which time Jerusalem was again built, and inhabited.
This cannot I subscribe,

1. Because it supposeth seven weeks of the seventy to be expired before Jerusalem began to be built, whereas I have already proved at large the seventy weeks are to take beginning thence. The very foundation therefore of this opinion is a mistake as to the beginning of the seventy weeks.

2. Because it is a thing that cannot be proved from the testimony of any clear undeniable Scripture, that the second Temple was in building seven weeks, i.e. nine and forty years. As for that, John 2.20. Forty and six years was this Temple in building, which place some make interpretative of Daniel's seven weeks, supposing the Temple to be perfected in the seventh week, towards the end, or about the middle of it, which will agree well to six and forty years; Not to say, In case the thing were so, that the words can have no relation to Daniel's seventy weeks, the seventy weeks not beginning (as I have proved) till after the Temple-work was finished;

My Answer is, That it is a thing doubted among good men, whether these words have any relation at all to Zerubbabel's Temple, or not; for some conceive they relate to Solomon's Temple, which computing from the time David made preparation for the building thereof, till the same by Solomon was finished, amounts to about six and forty years; But others, with more reason, and likelihood of truth, refer them to the Temple Herod built, who (to
ingratiate himself with the Jews) pulled down the former Temple Zerubbabel had built, building, instead thereof, another more large, rich and sumptuous Temple (as is testified by Josephus, Antiq. lib. 15. Cap. 14.) which Temple was the Temple then standing; And this work (as Dr. Lightfoot in his Harmony of the four Evangelists upon the Text, proveth) had been in hand exactly six and forty years before the time Christ and the Jews had this Discourse, the probability of which opinion (considering the Jews spake of a Temple that was, not that had been) weighs down, in my opinion, all others. But if yet any do adhere to the opinion of Zerubbabel's Temple, and accordingly set this Scripture against my Argument, let them (which they must) produce some Scripture speaking the thing that Zerubbabel's Temple is here meant; till that is done, we are in uncertainties, and an uncertain ground is too weak to prove a thing, or disprove the contrary.

And indeed learned men generally seem not in the present case to lay much weight upon this Text; for those, on the one hand, who conceive the second Temple was finished in the sixth year of Darius Hystaspes, reckon not half six and forty years, betwixt Cyrus his first, and Hystaspes sixth year: And those, on the other, who judge the work was not finished until the sixth of Darius Notbus, reckon between the first of Cyrus, and the sixth of Notbus, above twice six and forty years: Yet is not this Text
judged by either to have that weight in it, as to make them alter their opinions.

Alsted (in Chronologia Monarchia Persarum) would find out a way to uphold this opinion, viz.

That Zerubbabel's temple was six and forty years in building, and yet will not have the compleat finishing of the work to be till the sixth year of Darius Nōthus, which (according to his account) reckoning from the second year of Cyrus, when the foundation was laid, was one hundred and eleven years. But to do this he reckons only the time they were building, leaving out the time the work was at a stay. But as it is a most unlikely thing, that the Jews, being so considerable a company, as was that company that came up from Babylon, and attending wholly to this work, should spend six and forty years in the mere building-work, who afterwards in Nebemias's time did in two and fifty days build the whole walls of Jerusalem, Neh.6.15. So is it as unlikely (which yet Alsted to make good his opinion supposeth) that those enemies of Judah should sit still, and suffer the work quietly to go on, without intermedling in the least to their prejudice, six and thirty years together, viz. all the time of Darius Hystaspes, who at other times were ready and active, whenever they saw the work on foot, to hinder it.

To say no more, the whole of the opinion is made up of meer suppositions; As first, That the Darius, Ezra 4.5, is Hystaspes. Secondly, That the Jews did build all the time of his Reign. Thirdly, That Abasuerus, Ezra 4.6, and Artax-
erxes verl. 7. were two divers person. Fourthly, That Ahasuerus was Xerxes the Great. Fifthly, That in the beginning of his Reign the Temple-work was stopped, which yet went on again in the six last years of his Reign. Sixthly, That the Artaxerxes, Ezra 4.7. was Longimarus, who throughout his Reign, forty years together, hindered the work. Seventhly, That Darius, who in his second year set the work on foot, bringing it to perfection in his sixth, was Darius Notius; never all one of all which can be proved by any clear Scripture, yet not one of them but is and must be supposed, to make good this opinion.

Let the Reader therefore judge what probability is in it; And also by the way take notice, to learn hence never to take up things upon trust; what a do is made, by not a few, to prove a thing that is not, or at least that cannot be made appear to be? to prove Zerubbabels Temple was six and forty years in building, because it is said, Six and forty years was this Temple in building; whereas indeed, if we follow the opinion to the heels, it cannot be proved that Zerubbabels Temple is there spoken of. Could any demonstrative Text be brought to prove that, it would then be worth while to look after the six and forty years, but to spend time about it, while the main Question is begged, is but lost labour.

A third opinion there is of these seven weeks, which makes them to be the term of time Jerusalems Wall and City was building, which was nine and forty years (faith the Author of it) reckoning
reckoning from the first of Cyrus to the two and thirtieth of Artaxerxes, when Nehemiah having finished the whole work returneth again to the King, Neh. 13, 6.

But this cannot be,

1 Because what I have already said in my second Reason, in answer to the first opinion, lies with the same weight against this.

2 Because the building of Jerusalem was no part of Cyrus Decree (as formerly I have proved) which yet this opinion supposeth; yea the whole stress of it lies upon the neck of this supposition.

3 Because in beginning the seven so high, it doth also begin the seventy weeks as high as Cyrus, which is an error.

4 Because the Author fails greatly in point of Chronologie, whilst he accounts but nine and forty years betwixt Cyrus first, and Nehemiah’s Artaxerxes two and thirtieth year, which upon a due examination (when we shall come to it) will appear to be many more.

4 There is yet another opinion also of these seven weeks (not much differing from that I named last) viz. That these seven weeks are the time Jerusalem, with the rest of the Cities of Judah were building and repairing.

But this cannot stand, because of our second Reason, laid down in answer to the first opinion, which batters this also; and also because, the very foundation of it is neither Scripture, nor Story, but pure and meet conjecture, as Master Mede proveth, who opposeth himself to this opinion.

What hath been hitherto said by way of Answer to each, is sufficient to shew the inconsistency of all those opinions, with the words, which make the seven weeks one time, the sixty two another, assigning several works to the several times.

Seeing therefore none of these can stand, nor the fore-mentioned conjecture of Mr. Mede, I shall now lay down what I conceive of the Text, reading the word thus, with an alteration of the stops onely, *Know therefore, and understand,* that from the going forth of the Commandement to restore, and to build Jerusalem, unto the Messiah the Prince, shall be seven weeks, and sixty two weeks, the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times. The meaning is, That from the time the command to build Jerusalem should go forth, until the appearance of the Messiah, should be sixty nine weeks; all which time, notwithstanding the great troubles and overturnings that within it should be in the world, through the translation of the Monarchy from the Medes and Persians to the Grecians, and from them to the Romans (all which fell out within this time) and the distractions of particular Kingdomes, and the great opposition that should be made against the Jews; yet such should Gods care of, and his providence over his people be, in this so mighty a hurly burly, and commotion of Nations, and particular oppositions made against them, as that in despight of all, Jerusalem
lem throughout this troublous time should continue building and built. And so observe, the words, as they set forth the length of the time from the day Jerusalem should begin to be built, untill the Messiahs appearance, so do they include within them a sweet and gracious promise of the care God would have of his people, through and amidst all these tossings, untill the Messiah should appear, they should still be preserved one way or other, who ever went to wrack; and this notably answers to Daniels prayer, being a blessed quieting of his spirit, and to the event also. And indeed, one principal thing that makes this place so knotty, is in a manner but a trifle, viz. making a half point betwixt the seven weeks, and the sixty two weeks, where none should be made, and neglecting a Coma at the end of the sixty two weeks, where for the more ease understanding of the words its requisite one should be.

Now, as for the Reason why the seventy weeks, which first are mentioned whole, ver. 24. are afterwards broken into parts, I conceive it to be this onely, That hereby the mystery of this Prophecy might be the greater, and the time the harder to compute, which otherwise (the Head of the seventy once found) would have had no difficulty in it; therefore, that the mystery might be so much the greater, we have the seventy weeks, which are first mentioned whole, broken into three parts, two smaller, and one greater, which are expressed severally; first, seven weeks, then sixty two weeks, then one week, ver. 27.
and that too in such a manner, as if the seven weeks had relation to one thing, the sixty two to another, the one, to another; whereas it is not so; but all put together make up but that seventy we had before, and serve to point us to the time of our Saviour's Passion, which is said, ver. 26. to be after sixty two weeks, that is, sixty two added to the other seven, making sixty nine; then, viz. at the end of sixty nine weeks, in the beginning of the seventieth, is our Redeemer anointed to his work: Hence that Character of the seventy weeks, ver. 24. Seventy weeks are determined to anoint the most Holy. This day of his anointing, is the day of his appearance to Israel; being anointed, he goes forth the rest of that seventieth week, till the time of his Death, preaching the Gospel, doing good; healing those that were sick, casting out Devils, &c. And this I conceive to be the thing meant by his confirming the Covenant with many for one week, ver. 27. And indeed this agrees excellently well to that of Paul, Rom. 15. 8. Now I say, that Jesus Christ was a Minister of the Circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the Fathers. Christ himself by his own preaching must confirm the Covenant made with the Fathers, which (faith the Apostle) is the reason why he was made a Minister of the Circumcision, i.e. a Minister under the Law. Now this he did in the beginning of the seventieth week, going about preaching the space of three years, and but three, as is clear, Luke 13. 32, 33. And this was
till towards the middle of the week (i.e. till four years before the four hundred and ninety were fully expired) at which time he was cut off, which I take to be the meaning of those words, In the midst of one week shall he cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, ver. 27. i.e. Christ's Death which fell out, not in the end, but in the middle of the last and seventieth week, did put an end to all the Jewish Sacrifices and Worship; the Great Passover being slain, all other Sacrifices terminate in him.

And indeed that Christ's Passion must necessarily fall out about the middle of the seventieth week, is clear, because the Text speaks positively that it should be but seven weeks, and sixty two weeks, i.e. sixty nine weeks, until the Messiah shall appear; So soon therefore as ever the sixty nine weeks were at an end, and the seventieth but begun, we must of necessity conclude the Messiah did appear, for otherwise it should be upwards of sixty nine weeks to his appearance. Now the thing which will make all clear is, what we are to understand by his appearance. We may not understand his Birth; for if so, then he not being put to death till he was four and thirty years old, which space of time contains almost five of Daniel's weeks, it should be seventy three, or seventy four weeks to the cutting off of the Messiah, whereas the Text tells us he is cut off after sixty nine weeks, or after seven weeks, and sixty two weeks, which make sixty nine.

I have in my Key, Thes. 57. pitched upon the time
time of his Baptisme, but not so considerately, for though his Appearance then was to John Baptist, and some few Disciples whom he chose, yet did he not till afterwards appear publickly.

This Appearance of his, I do therefore conceive (following herein the learned Mede) is to be reckoned from that time in which he begun to preach publickly the Nation of the Jews, declaring himself to be the Messiah, which was (as Mr. Mede hath well noted) after his Harkinger John had now finished his message, and was cast into prison; which circumstance of time is precisely noted in the Evangelical story, and the place also where he began his preaching. Mark 1.14. After John was put in prison, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the Gospel of the Kingdoms of God, and saying, The time is fulfilled, i.e. (faith Mr. Mede) the last week of the sixty two weeks is now come, Matth. 4.12. compared with 17. This is the very time and place whence Peter reckoned the beginning of Christ's Prophecie in his Sermon to Cornelius, Act. 10.37. That word which was published throughout all Judæa, and began from Galilee, after the Baptism which John preached, and which is an evidence that this was the time of his anointing by his Father, Luke tells us Chap. 4.18,19,20,21. That when he first opened the Book to teach the people in Nazareth of Galilee, he opened upon that place; The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor; Upon which Text our Saviour himself Comments, ver. 21. This day is this Scriptury
Scripture fulfilled in your ears; as if hee should say, This day is Daniels seventieth week begun, now is the Messiah anointed; from this time (which according to Mr. Mede was a full year after Christs Baptism) we are to reckon those three days or years, Luke 13:32,33. To this opinion the several Passovers betwixt Christs Baptism and Death, do best accord, which in case the Principle were as demonstrable, as it is received and owned by good men, that of the Passovers alone doth necessarily infer that four years must passe betwixt his Baptism and Death.

This opinion, though it differs from what I have laid down in my Key, yet is it so far from destroying my Harmony, that it suits it better then that doth; for by the addition of this year, the two thousand three hundred dayes, and the one thousand three hundred thirty five, do both fall at the end of the year one thousand seven hundred and one; but according to the Computation there laid down, one falls at the beginning of the aforesaid year, the other at the end. This being so, let it be considered how long it was betwixt Christs beginning to preach, and his Passion, none will say it was seven years, the forequoted Text, Luke 13, shews it to be but three. And this no way repugns to Daniels half week; for the Scripture is not so curious in dividing as to go to the exactnesse of a half week, it is sufficient that there is the half of the years contained in the week, though some few months be wanting:
And therefore well and considerately did our Translators render the half of the week by the midst of the week, which phrase mollifies the rigor of Division, and helps to remove the scruple that might otherwise arise through the want that there is, in this division, of some few months. Now I say, Christ from the day of his anointing, which was at the very end of the sixty ninth week, and in the beginning of the seventieth, preaching but three years, and then being crucified, it necessarily follows, that his Passion must bee, not at the end, but in the midst of the week, which week too can be no other then the seventieth and last. And therefore (as I have observed in my Key) it is said, ver. 26. after threescore and two weeks (i.e. sixty two added to the seventy, making sixty nine) shall the Messiah be cut off, and not after seventy weeks, because Christ's sufferings came upon him before the seventy week was fully and compleatly expired.

And upon these reasons I have concluded in my Key, Thes. 57. that we are not to account upon so many years fully as there are days in seventy weeks, but to deduct four out of the seventieth and last week, because Christ's sufferings (which are the point where the seventy weeks expire) fell out to be in the very close of the third day or year of the seventieth and last week.

And indeed it is an Argument of Gods special care, that he should leave in this Prophecie, such clear hints, to prove that we are to cut off four years of the 70th week, without which we should have
have run on to the end of it, and so computed four years more than we ought; which, besides the breach that hereby would be made in Chronology, would have made this Prophecie irreconcilable with the reports of the several Evangelists as touching the time that passed betwixt Christ's Anointing and Passion.

Object. But it is said, vers. 27. He shall confirm the Covenant with many for one week; Which one week can bee no other but the seventieth and last; for it is spoken of as a week distinct from the seven weeks, and the sixty two weeks; If therefore after sixty nine weeks are passed, one week is spent in confirming the Covenant, then must we needs place the Death of Christ, which was his last and sealing act, not in the midst, but in the end of the seventieth week.

Answ. Not so; for under the Phrase, One week, is not comprehended the whole week, but the half only; and this is clear from the next words, in the midst of the week shall he cause the Sacrifice, and Oblation to cease. In the midst of what week? Anf. Of the one week, therefore Christ's Death must fall in the midst or half (though not the exact half) of the one week; and if so, must not be brought down to the end of that week. If it be said, The half week is to be understood of the latter half, and that it is the error of the Translators, which renders the half of the week, by the midst of the week, for it may as well bee taken for the latter
latter half, as the former. To that I answer; If so, then doubtlesse the Angel would have said in the end of the week, and not in the half of the week; for the one is a proper phrase, the other improper; the one leaves the thing without scruple, the other leaves a knot where none would look for any; for who would ever imagine, that the Angel, whilst hee speaks of a half of the week, should mean the end. Nay, it cannot be otherwise, but that that which is here called one week, must bee the former half only, and no more, for this reason, because the work to bee done in the one week, is confirming the Covenant.

Now this confirming the Covenant, being the highest act of Christ, as hee was a Minister of the Circumcision, it necessarily follows, that Christ could do this no longer then within that time that he was laying out himself in his Ministerial Function.

This confirming the Covenant cannot therefore be a work of seven years durance (which must bee, if wee take the one week for a full week) but of three only, which agrees well to half of a week, and (for what I have said before) the former half.

If any be curious to know the reason why it should bee called, One week, and yet but half a week only meant thereby?

Answ. It is with respect to the seventy weeks, sixty nine of which hee had already reckoned in two parts, first seven weeks, then sixty two:
now because the seventieth week, which in the grosse summe was reckoned, had not yet in the parts been mentioned, hee therefore now brings that in, calling it one week, yet with laying down such Cautions and Considerations, as that wee may well perceive, this one week, though called a week (with a respect to the other weeks of the seventy, that it is in the grosse sum conjoinyned with) is not indeed to bee understood of a whole week, but the first half only.

Object. But if the cutting off of the Messiah bee in the middle of the week, how then are there seventy weeks determined on the Holy City?

For answer. Mr. Mede hath a Notion concerning this, worthy to be written in Letters of gold; Onely he applies it to his opinion, viz. That the seventy weeks are to end with the destruction of Jerusalem. So much as concerns that I shall alter in reciting it. The Notion speaks thus; It should be observed (though it useth not so to be) that the Angel reckons not by single years, but by weeks; If he had said there should be four hundred and ninety years to the Passion of Christ, then indeed to make good the prediction, Christ must have suffered in the last year: But when he saies it shall bee seventy weeks, it is enough if so be Christ suffer in the seventieth week. For if those who reckon by years, if the year designed answers the event, will not stand upon the compleatnesse of months and dayes; nor those
those who reckon by days, upon the compleat-ness of hours and minutes; no more in the Angels' reckoning here by weeks, if so be the number of the weeks be compleat, are the parts of a week to be exacted. Seeing therefore the Text is clear, that the Messiah is to bee cut off in the seventieth week, it matters not as to the making up of seventy weeks, though the thing were done in the middle of the week; for sufficient it is, that the same is done in the seventieth week.

Thus the sundry great knots, as touching the seven weeks, the sixty two weeks, the one week, and the half week, are all untied by this opinion, which ends the seventy weeks with the Passion of Christ, which no other opinion in a way agreeable to the Text, other Scriptures, yea reason it self, either hath done, or can do.

By this therefore we are yet farther confirmed in our foregoing Position, viz. That we are, with the Passion of our dear Lord and Saviour, to end Daniels Seventy Weeks.

SECT. 7.

Object. But against this our ending of the seventy weeks, it may be objected, viz. That the seventy weeks cannot end with the Passion of Christ, because it is manifest from sundry expressions in the Text, that the very Prophesie looks
looks farther, and treats of things that relate to another time; For ver. 16. mention is made of the destruction of Jerusalem, both City and Sanctuary, which was performed many years after Christ's death by Titus Vespasian. The people of the Prince that shall come shall destroy the City and Sanctuary, and the end thereof shall be with a Flood. Yea the following words in the very same verse, Unto the end of the War desolations are determined, relate to a time much lower, according to the Exposition I myself have given of them, Key, Thes. 17. Yea likewise those words verse 27, For the overspreading of abominations hee shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall bee poured upon the desolate, must needs relate to the very last times, in which the Jews, who for crucifying and rejecting the Lord of Glory, were given up of God to remain a desolate, forsaken people, until the Consummation, or the time of the end, shall be again received into favour, and restored under Christ to greater Liberty and Glory then ever. Therefore must not the seventy weeks end as before, but bee extended to some farther time.

Answ. The foregoing Expressions, though they come within the compass of the Vision, yet not within the compass of the seventy weeks; or thus, Though they are a part of the words of the Prophecy, yet are they no part of the seventy weeks; that is, They
do not relate to things done within this time, but things to be done afterwards, when the seventy weeks should be expired. For observe, The Angel having informed Daniel, that after seven weeks, and sixty two weeks (i.e. sixty nine) to be reckoned from the going forth of the Command to restore and to build Jerusalem, the Messiah should appear, who having confirmed the Covenant part of the seventieth week, should in the midst of that week be cut off, by which Death of his, he should put an end to the Mosaical worship, &c. Hee now goes on relating farther, what should befall the Jews hereupon, even until their last Restoration, not any longer speaking of things as referring to the seventy weeks (to the end of which hee was come already) but as suiting the former Discourse, and also answering Daniel's desire, which was, to know the final issue of things concerning his own people; and therefore the Angel tells him, that the Messiah being cut off, the Jews City and Sanctuary should thereupon be destroyed, the body of their Nation bee made desolate, in which desolate, forlorn, unchurched condition, they should remain even unto the time of the end, when Christ notwithstanding all their unkindness to him, would yet make himself known unto them, taking that poor desolate people into his arms and favour again; and this last of their Restoration seems to mee to bee the thing hinted in the very last words of the Prophecie, and
and that determined shall bee poured upon the desolate, i.e. (as I conceive, otherwise nothing at all is here spoken of their Restoration) That determined One, viz. the Christ, the Messiah, the determined time of whose first coming was seventy weeks, and who accordingly at the end of that time did come, was cut off by the Jews, Jerusalem for this destroyed, they made desolate, unshurched, untill the consummation, shall in the consummation, or in the time of the end, bee poured upon the desolate, that is, reveal himself unto, pour out his Spirit upon, this desolate Nation, who now shall see and confesse, that that act of their Fore-fathers in crucifying Christ, was indeed the cutting off of their Messiah, or that determined One promised to them at the end of seventy weeks.

Thus though the Prophesie itself brings us as low as Christ's second coming, yet are not the seventy weeks to be brought down thither; but we are to end them, as before, with the Passion of Christ; and whatsoever expressions have a farther look, we are to interpret them not as having a respect to the seventy weeks (which are compleat without them), but as spoken to this end, to give Daniel information, how the case should stand with his people, between the time of their rejection for the cutting off of the Messiah (where ends the seventy weeks) and their Restoration.

Thus much as touching Daniels Seventy Weeks,
CHAP. III.

Wherein Inquiry is made into the number of the
Years that passed betwixt the first of Cyrus,
and the twentieth of Artaxerxes,
when Nehemiah received his
Commission to build
Jerusalem.

SECTION I.

Having in the fore-going Chapter found our
the true beginning and ending of Daniels
seventy weeks, it now remains, That we enquire
into the number of the years that passed from
Cyrus first, unto the twentieth of that Artaxerxes
when Nehemiah went up to Jerusalem with
Commission to build it.

And the more is this piece of our way to be
heeded, because Chronologers themselves differ
no lesse than above a hundred years, some from
others, in computing this time; and a hundred
years lost or gained is no little matter.

I shall therefore, as hitherto I have done, so in
this also, make Scripture-Text compared and laid
together my chief rule; shewing what probabili-
ties I have from the Scripture it self for the
thing which I assert; and by those examining
others opinions, chusing or refusing upon no other
account.

To come therefore to the Question.

Quest. What number of years are we to account
The end of the Fourth Monarchy. Part 3

upon betwixt the first of Cyrus, and the twentieth of Artaxerxes?

Anf. It is the opinion of Dr. Lightfoot in his Harmony of the Old Testament (whom I am necessitated for truths sake here to mention by name (as Mr. Mede before) because I can neither bring forth his strength, nor my own, without references to the Author) that we are to reckon upon seven and thirty years only, which by him are laid down thus, viz. Cyrus three, Artaxerxes Ahahuerus fourteen, Artaxerxes Darius twenty, the whole is seven and thirty.

But though I much value the learning and judgement of the Author; yet cannot I conclude with him in this.

1 Because the allowance of so few years to this Period, can never (unlesse new Heads, agreeable to Scripture and Reason, be found out for each several number) cause a concurrence in ends betwixt the two thousand three hundred days, and the one thousand three hundred thirty five; the one thousand two hundred and sixty days, and the one thousand two hundred and ninety, which upon the account of the Reasons laid down in my Key, Thes. 17. and Thes. 34. must be.

2 Because the several suppositions upon which this opinion is built, are not onely in themselves uncertain, but even inconsistent with other parts of the Scripture History, and Right-reason. And therefore of necessity the foundation being sandy, must the opinion fall.

Now the things by Dr. Lightfoot supposed, which are botome for this opinion, are these.
Part g. The end of the Fourth Monarchy.

1. That Artaxerxes Abasurus, mentioned Ezra 4, 6, 7, was Son and next Successor in the Persian Monarchy to Cyrus. Asserted in his Chronicle upon the Book of Hesther.

2. That this Artaxerxes Abasurus reigned but fourteen years in all. Asserted upon Hesther 10.

3. That Darius, in the sixth of whose Reign the Temple-work was finished Ezra 6, 15, and Artaxerxes, in the seventh of whose Reign Ezra went up to Jerusalem, Ezra 7, 7, 7, and Nehemiah afterwards in the twentieth; Nehem, 2, was one and the same person under two names. In the Chronicle upon Ezra, Chap. 6. Chap. 7. Chap. 9, 10.

4. That it was the compleat number of seventy years from the time that Nebuchadnezzar destroyed the first Temple, until Darius second year, in which the building of the second was advanced. In the Chronicle upon Hesther, 18.

5. That Ezra was Son to that Serajah the High Priest, whom Nebuchadnezzar slew at the time the first Temple was destroyed, 2 King. 25, 18, 92, and therefore must necessarily be born before the destruction of Solomon's Temple; which being fifty years before Cyrus first, and Ezra being so active now in the days of Artaxerxes, it cannot agree to his age and activity; that the time betwixt Cyrus first and Artaxerxes twenty, should be long. Upon Ezra 7.

6. That the design of the Holy Ghost in the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah is to give us a Chronicle of the Persian Kings. Upon Nehemiah p. 284.
These Six Particulars, which I finde here and there scattered in Doctor Light-foot, and have for the better discussing of the thing put them into this order, will upon a due examination be all of them found too light.

1 Particular, That Artaxerxes Ahasuerus was next successor to Cyrus.

Ans. This is a thing very unlikely; 1. Because Cyrus Son being so deadly an enemy to the Jews, as that he by his power did put a stop to the work of the Temple, his Father yet living (as is by Doctor Light-foot himself, p. 190. and others affirmed) we cannot conceive the Jews would attempt to build whilst he was alive; or put case they should, there would be no need of writing Letters to this wicked wretch, and in them coyning false accusations to cause the work to cease, (as the Adversaries do to Artaxerxes) for he of himself was, and would have been ready enough to hinder the work.

2 The very Circumstances of the Text argue this Artaxerxes to have been at a further distance from Cyrus then his immediate Successor; for, 1. He seems to have been a very stranger to the state of the Jewish affairs, and therefore receiving Letters about them, causeth the Chronicles to be searched, Ezra 4. 19. to finde what manner of people the Jews had been: now it is not likely that Cyrus Son should be such a stranger to this People, their State, and Affairs, whom his Father knew so well, and he succeeding his Father (according to Doctor Light-foot) after his Father had reigned three years. 2. He seems likewise to have been...
been altogether unacquainted with Cyrus decree, which Cyrus Son was not; for how could he, and yet hinder it whilst his Father was alive? But this Artaxerxes was, which the Adversaries knew well enough, or undoubtedly durst not otherwise have charged the Jews with building a City, when themselves knew it was but a Temple, lest hereby they should give the King occasion to reply, What now, are they building a City? I am sure my Father Cyrus never decreed that; and so by this, their craft and malice should come out.

All the colour that I finde in Doctor Light-foot for this opinion, is, That Cyrus Son was a hinderer, and so was this Artaxerxes, p. 190. But doth it therefore follow he must needs be Cyrus Son? might not Cyrus Son be one hinderer, and this Artaxerxes another after him? which is the more likely opinion for the Reasons before gi-

gen.

Now in case this Link prove weak, the Chain is easily broken: for if between Cyrus and Artaxerxes did reign any other King, then will the years betwixt Cyrus first, and the twentieth of the other Artaxerxes be more then thirty seven,

2. Particular, That Artaxerxes Ahasuerus reigned but fourteen years in all.

Ans. It is the grant of Doctor Light-foot, that Artaxerxes Ahasuerus, Ezra 4. is the same with that Ahasuerus we read of in Esther, upon which grant (as sufficient for us) we shall at present go, leaving the proof of the thing to another place; now let us by this rule examine the Position. We read in Esther that full thirteen years of Ahasue-
...reign were run out in that very Month wherein the Jews cut off their enemies in Shushan, and elsewhere, as is evident. Compare Chap. 3. 7. with Chap. 9. 1. He hath then from this day (according to Doctor Light-foot's account) but one year more to reign.

Now let it be observed what after this was done, and see whether or no the thing were likely to be compassed in a year.

First, Mordecai sends Letters to all the Jews that were in all the Provinces of King Ahasuerus, and near to establish the fourteenth, and fifteenth days of the Month Adar, as days of Thanksgiving to be kept perpetually every year, Chap. 9. 26, 27.

Secondly, The Jews of the several Provinces receive these Letters, and upon receipt assemble together, Ordain, and Institute for themselves and posterity, that these days should be observed as Mordecai had written, ver. 25, 26, 27, 28.

Thirdly, The report of this is carried back again to Shushan from all quarters, and thereupon Esther the Queen, and Mordecai the Jew, write Letters the second time, and send to all the Jews, in the one hundred and twenty seven Provinces, to confirm what upon receipt of Mordecai's first Letters they had decreed for themselves and their seed, ver. 29, 30, 31.

Now observe, the Dominions of Ahasuerus, over which the Jews were scattered, were so vast and large, that when upon Esther's Petition a Counter-decree was to be sent forth to put stop to the Decree of Haman, although the sending of
it forth was seven or eight Months before the time Haman's Decree was to have been put in execution, as will appear by comparing Chap. 8. 9. with Chap. 9. 1. yet left through the length of the way it should come, too late, Mordecai sends Posts on Horse-back every way, and that upon swift Beasts, Chap. 8. 10. and with all they go forth hastned and pressed on, ver. 14. Now if in seven Months time by swift running Posts there could hardly be a conveyance of a Message into all parts of Abasuerus Dominions, how can we imagine that afterwards, when Letters were sent forth not thus hastned, but more leasurely, they should be conveyed all over Abasuerus Kingdom, and the Jews thereupon from several parts meet together, hold a Council, institute a Day to be kept by themselves and posterity, and the report of this when done returned again to the Court from all parts, and upon this, new Letters by way of ratification of their proceedings sent again from the Court to the Jews thorough-out all the one hundred twenty seven Provinces, and all this within the space of one year.

Add to this, That the greatness of Mordecai under this Abasuerus, Chap. 10. his being accepted of the multitude of his Brethren, his seeking and endeavouring, as before their deliverance, so now the wealth of his People, his speaking peace to all his Seed, seems clearly to argue that these things were not of one year's continuance, but of a longer time. Such choyce mercies given of God to his people, especially after such bitter storms, are not usually so short lived.

Q 4

This
This stone removed, the building goes to decay, for in case Artaxerxes Ahasuerus reigned but one year more than fourteen, then will there bee found upwards of thirty seven years between the first of Cyrus, and the twentieth of Artaxerxes.

3 Particular, That Darius, Ezra 6. and Artaxerxes, Chap. 7. are one and the same, only a change of the name, and so consequently the seventh of Artaxerxes when Ezra went up to Jerusalem, Ezra 7. 7. was the year following that in which the Temple was finished, which is called the sixth of Darius, chap. 6. 15.

Answ. This I can by no means give assent to.

1. Because I finde Artaxerxes mentioned as a person distinct from Darius, Chap. 6. 14. And the Elders of the Jews built and finished it, according to the Commandement of the God of Israel, and according to the commandement of Cyrus and Darius, and Artaxerxes King of Persia: now by the same reason that Cyrus is a distinct Person from Darius, by the same must Artaxerxes likewise. Now the Artaxerxes here named cannot be that Artaxerxes we read of, Chapter four, 1. Because he was before Darius time, but this seems by the order of placing to have been afterwards. 2. He was a hinderer of Gods Work among the Jews, yea put such a stop thereto, that upon the very stop hee put, it is said, Ezra 4. 24. The work ceased until the second year of Darius; but this Artaxerxes is a furtherer, and such a one as did further Gods work.
work effectually, as did Cyrus and Darius; he
must therefore be that Artaxerxes Ezra speaks of
afterwards.

Obj. If it be said, But how did he give com-
mand for building the Temple, which work the text
faith expressly was finished in the sixth of Darius,
which was before his time?

I answer; 1. We may very well understand
these words of something done by Artaxerxes,
with the vast sums of Money he gave himself, and
commanded his Treasurers, Chap. 7. 15, 16, 20,
21, 22. to give forth to Ezra, either by way of
reparation of the Temple, which through many
years time since the same was built was gone to
decay; or else by way of Ornament, adding to
the beauty of the building, which is manifestly
hinted, vers. 27. Blessed be the Lord God of our
Fathers, which hath put such a thing as this in the
Kings heart, to beautifie the House of the Lord
which is in Jerusalem; and also the very words of
the Decree, vers. 20. 23. import as much as one of
these: Or,

2. I may answer, That those words, The El-
ders of the Jews builded and finished it according to
the Commandement of Cyrus --are not to be under-
stood in so strict a sense as to limit each command
to the Temple-work only; but in a more large
sense, as having reference to those severall Com-
mands given forth by the Persian Kings, which
concerned the Jews welfare, and the carrying on
Gods Work among them, whereof one was gi-
ven forth by Cyrus in the first of his reign, another
afterwards by Darim, and two more after that by
Artaxerxes; and because Artaxerxes had in a
more especial manner been Benefactor to Ezra,
and the Jews in his time, therefore Ezra, upon
occasion of relating the story of the finishing of the
House, having made mention of the other two,
Cyrus and Darim, will not pass over Artaxerxes,
but by anticipation names him before, though
his story come not in till afterward; not so much
minding the curiosity of that particular Questi-
on, whether all three had been forwarders of that
particular work of building God's House, as be-
ing intent to express the truth of the matter in
generall, viz. That all three, Cyrus, Darim, and
Artaxerxes had been friends to the Jews, and fur-
therers of God's work among them.

2 Because Ezra, coming up to Jerusalem in the
7th of Artaxerxes, findes a High Priest, who was
Grand-child to him that was High Priest in the 6th
of Darim, when the Temple-work was finished; Je-
fsha being then High Priest, but one Eliafhib is now
High Priest; compare Ez,ra 10.6, with Neh. 3.20,21
True, Ezra calls not Eliafhib High Priest at this time,
as doth Nehemiah afterwards; yet no other High
Priest being mentioned, and withall Eliafhib be-
ing so aged that he had then a Son, a Priest, viz.
Johanan, Ez,ra 10.6. it is very probable he was at
this time High Priest. Now observe, this Elia-
fhib was Grand-childe to Jefhua who acted with
Zerubbabel, as Nehem. 12.10. And Jefhua begat
Jojakim, Jojakim also begat Eliafhib ---- All
laid together, can we imagine that in the space of
one year (for by DoStor Light-foots reckoning it
is no more) the Grand-father should be dead, and the Father after him, and the Grand-child High Priest in the room of Grand-father and Father? or suppose he were not High Priest till afterwards, yet so aged as to have a Son grown up to be a Priest, who can believe it?

3 Because Nehemiah, Chap. 5. 15. makes mention of Governours to have been in Jerusalem before his time, that had oppressed the people, and that did not fear God; for in this he opposeth himself to them, he feared God, therefore did not so as those former Governours. Now amongst these we may not reckon Zerubbabel, who was a righteous Prince, one that feared God, and also Governour from the first coming out of Babylon untill the second Temple was finished; nor may we take in any Governours who did bear rule afterwards from the time that Ezra went up to Jerusalem untill the days of Nehemiah, because in all this time Ezra was authorized by King Artaxerxes to set Governours and Magistrates over the people, Chap. 7. 25. And thou Ezra, after the wisdom of thy God that is in thy hand, set Magistrates and Judges--; now it is not likely that Ezra, a man inspired by God, would set up such Governours, or if through mistake he should the first time so do, yet having seen the evil of it, he would be more wary in his next choyce. These unjust oppressing Governours must therefore be supposed to bear rule betwixt Zerubbabel's time and Ezra's; and if so, then cannot we think with Doctor Light-foot the time should be so little as one year; if more, then of necessity must Darby and Artaxerxes be two distinct per-
Now this which is the main Foundation-stone not being firm, the building must needs be weak: for if Darius were one person, and Artaxerxes another, then put case Darius dyed that very year the Temple was finished, which is a thing very unlikely, considering he craved the prayers of God's people, unto whom he had been such a friend, that he might live long, Ezra 6. 11. And also suppose Artaxerxes his next Successor, yet because Ezra's going up is not till Artaxerxes' seventh year, there will be upon the result six years more than Doctor Light-foot hath accounted for, which makes such a breach in his building as cannot be made up again.

4. Particular. That it was seventy years complete, and no more, from the time the first Temple was destroyed, till the second of Darius, when the building of the second was advanced.

Ans. This opinion standing upon the two first Suppositions, viz. 1. That Artaxerxes Abasuerus was Cyrus next Successor. 2. That this Artaxerxes Abasuerus reigned but fourteen years in all, both which we have before disproved, it falls of itself; for in case we conceive any other King to have reigned betwixt Cyrus and Artaxerxes Abasuerus, or conceive Artaxerxes Abasuerus to have reigned more years than fourteen, the number of years amounts to above seventy, and if so, then Doctor Light-foot's computation must needs be amiss.

5. Particular. That Ezra was Son to that Serajah the High Priest, whom Nebuchadnezzar slew at the time the first Temple was destroyed, which
which Doctor Light-foot proves from Ezra's Genealogie, Chap. 7. 1.

Ans. This I must confess, look upon it one way, it seems to have in it much strength, yet look upon it another, and it seems altogether improbable; for, according to this reckoning, suppose Ezra to be born but the year before Jerusalem's destruction, when his Father was slain, yet must we (as faith Doctor Light-foot himself) suppose him fifty years old at least in that very year which the Scripture calls Cyrus first; Now laying hereunto Doctor Light-foot's own words upon Nehem. 13, which are these, Ezra faith he lived near the times of Jaddua, who met Alexander the Great coming to Jerusalem, for he wrote the Book of Chronicles in the time of Johanan Iadduaes Father, Nehem. 12. 23. and so he lived well towards the expiration of the Persian Monarchy. Now let us lay all together and weigh the whole; Ezra was fifty years old in Cyrus first year, after that he must out-live four generations, and in the fifth generation write the Book of the Chronicles; that four generations (though Doctor Light-foot doth not observe it) did pass betwixt the first of Cyrus and the days of Johanan Iadduaes father, is evident, Nehem. 12. 10, 11. And Jeshua begat Jojakim, Jojakim also begat Eliashib, and Eliashib begat Jojada, and Jojada begat Jonathan, and Jonathan begat Jaddua. Now observe, Jeshua was High Priest in the first year of Cyrus, at the coming out of Babylon, Ezra 3. 2. Ezra out-lives him, there is one generation; Jojakim succeeded him, there is a second; Eliashib him, there was a third;
third; Jojada him, there was a fourth. All these Ezra out-lived, and in the fifth generation, namely of Johanan or Jonathan Jadduaes Father, hee wrote the Book of the Chronicles; hee must therefore certainly be very aged, that after fifty years of age should out-live four generations, and live to see the fifth; yet this did Ezra in case hee were Son to that Serajah.

It is therefore (Iconceive)much better to say, that that Serajah, the Son of Azariah, the Son of Hilkiah — mentioned Ezra 7. 1. was not immediate Father to Ezra, but rather Grand-father, or Great Grand-father; now Ezra coming out of his Loyns is called his Son, though he were not the immediate Son, or next Issue, for one of these Reasons.

Either first, because that Serajah was more famously known, being High Priest, and killed at the sacking of Jerusalem, then possibly Ezraes next Father was, and therefore Ezra passeth over him in silence, and begins his Descent from the other, who was more famously known.

Or secondly, because that Serajah was the first in the Line of Ezra upwards that was High Priest: for though others did come betwixt Ezra and him, yet were none of them High Priests; for the Priest-hood from Serajah went on in another Line, not that of Ezraes Father, but that of Ikbozadaz (or Iosedecb) father of Ieshma, 1 Chron. 6. 14,15. Ezraes Father therefore, though he came of the House of Aaron, yet because he was not of Aarons Line he passeth him over, beginning his Genealogie from the first of his Ancestors that
that was of that Line, namely Serajah.

Or Thirdly (which I rather incline to) because it is very probable Ezra's immediate Father was also named Serajah, and because the name of Father, and Grand-father, or Great Grand-father was the same, he therefore in counting his Pedigree passeth over his Father, and such other (if any did come between) as passed betwixt him and Serajah, and begins (as I have said) from him. Now a like example to this we have in the very text, Ezra 7. if we compare it with 1 Chron. 6.4 to 15. for in the Genealogie, as we have it in Ezra, we finde betwixt Shallum and Merarioth but four generations, viz. of Zadok, of Abitub, of Amariah, of Azariah; but in the very same Genealogie as it is laid down in the Chronicles, we have betwixt these two no lesse then ten Generations; And what is the reason hereof? Why this; we have in the Chronicles between Shallum and Merarioth two Zadoks, two Abitubs, two Amariahs, two Azariahs; now Ezra in his Genealogie to shun repetitions, contents himself with naming each one, and then leaps over the rest of the same name. Now as I said, Ezra's Father being in all likelihood named Serajah, that Ezra might not come over with the same name twice, he therefore omits him, and begins with that Serajah, who yet was more remote, carrying on his Pedigree from him. And that the thing I have said, viz. That Ezra's Father was named Serajah, yet not Serajah the High Priest, hath in it a probability, is clear, because Neh. 11.11, we read of one Serajah, which
which could not be Serajab the High Priest, who was slain long before, but this Serajab was then living, and dwelling in Jerusalem, and yet notwithstanding his Line is the very same with Ezra, for he is Son of Hilkiab, Son of Meshullam, (or Shallum) Son of Zadok, &c. and therefore in all likelihood no other but Ezra’s Father.

And here again observe as a further confirmation of the thing before noted, viz. That because the same name should not be brought over twice, therefore is Serajab the High Priest here passed over, and all betwixt him and Nehemiah’s Serajab; and the Pedigree of this Serajab begins with Hilkiab, the Son of Shallum, the Son of Zadok, though yet Hilkiab was not immediate Father to this Serajab, but at a great distance separated from him two or three generations at least; two we read of, Ezra 7. 1. viz. Serajab the High Priest, and Azariah, which both come betwixt Nehemiah’s Serajab and Hilkiab. I say therefore, that it is a thing very likely, that Ezra’s immediate Father was named Serajab, and for the reason he would not come twice over with the same name, and the former reasons put together, he therefore passeth him over, and begins more upwards in his Line, viz. with Serajab the High Priest, which is a thing more probable by farre, then to imagine that Ezra who was fifty years old in the first of Cyrus, should afterwards out-live four Generations, and in the Fifth be a Writer of Chronicles, as doth necessarily follow upon Doctor Light-feats opinion; yea that he who was fifty years old when the Persian Monarchy began, should live (as faith Doctor
Lightfoot till towards the expiration of it; which considering that the Persian Monarchy lasted two hundred years, it beginning (faith Helvius) in the sixty second Olympiad, and ending in the one hundred and twelfth, how to each Olympiad four years being allowed (which is the rule of computation by Olympiads) the fiftie Olympiads of the Persian Monarchy make up the even sum of two hundred years; which is a term so long, that notwithstanding with God nothing is impossible, yet to me it seems very improbable, That Ezra, a man fifty years old at the beginning of this time, should live towards or near the end of it. This very number of years I confess is not mentioned in Scripture; yet however the fore-going Text assuring us this Monarchy lasted no less then five generations, we may well conclude the time could not be much lesse.

6 Particularly, That the design of the Holy Ghost, in Ezra and Nehemiah, is to give us a Chronicle of the Persian Kings.

Ans. This cannot I conceive, but judge the contrary, viz. That the design of the Holy Ghost is another thing, namely, to record the state of the Jewish affairs, not in the least intending a Chronicle of the Kings of Persia; and my reason is, because the Scripture hath not ascertained us that Artaxerxes Ahasuerus was next Successor to Cyrus, not Darius to him, nor hath it told us how long any one of the Persian Kings did reign; and therefore it seems very unlikely that the intention of the Holy Ghost should be to give us a Chronicle of the times, and yet leave us alto-
Nay, what need was there of continuing the ordinary Scripture Chronicle any further than the end of the seventy years Captivity? seeing with the first of Cyrus, where the seventy years expire, we have a Divine Chronologic left us of the whole of the time from that very year, until the second coming of Christ; if therefore we have but sufficient left us in the Scripture to make out upon sure grounds this account, viz. of the two thousand three hundred years, we need not after once they are begun, carry on the Scripture Chronicle upon any other foot but this only, of the two thousand three hundred years. By the help of which number, being ordered by a wonderful hand of Providence, there to begin where the seventy years of the Captivity ended, (after which we are altogether in the dark, as to the questions, Who reigned, or how long? having nothing (were this number thrown aside) to build our faith upon but Human reports) we have a certain Scripture Chronologic from the very day of the Creation until the day of Christ's second coming. Those know not what they lose, nor indeed what inconvenience in this respect they draw upon themselves, who would have these two thousand three hundred days to be Natural days; nor that Author neither, who would have but half so many years understood as there are days, so fixing the head of this number downwards very low in the times of the New Testament; for seeing Daniel's
four hundred and ninety years cannot be begun with the first of Cyrus (as I have proved before) but do begin with the twentieth of Artaxerxes; let it be shewn from any other Scripture (this Number, and the Argument lying in it, being set aside) the certain number of years between Cyrus first, and the twentieth of Artaxerxes; if this can be done, I am wonderfully mistaken, and I think I may be bold to say it cannot; If it be not done, I am sure then the very grounds of Chronology will be fallible; and if so, what may we expect the Conclusions will be? Well therefore (if all be considered) may this number go under the title of the account of the Wonderful Numberer, as Daniel calls it.

By this I am further confirmed in my beginning of the two thousand three hundred years, that I have begun them aright, in beginning them with the first of Cyrus; and that they may not be begun either higher or lower: for what need have we of beginning them with the beginning of Nebuchadnezzar's Tyranny over Israel, seeing the duration of that is set forth by another number of Seventy years, to the end of which Seventy years the grounds of Chronologers are perfect, without a supply from this? to carry this therefore up into that time is superfluous.

Again, should we begin them lower than the first of Cyrus, then because we have no other Scripture-ground to go upon but this only, for many years that followed, a defect will be (as I have laid) in the very foundation of Chronology. Seeing therefore we may not begin them either
either higher or lower, the beginning we have stated, and that only is the truth.

From all that hath been said, it appears, that Dr. Lightfoot's Suppositions, are but Suppositions, not having in them the force of Arguments to uphold the thing they would countenance; Nay, the very things themselves, look upon them in our Answers, do clearly argue the time betwixt Cyrus first, and Artaxerxes twentieth, to be much more than seven and thirty years.

Besides, Dr. Lightfoot's suppository grounds, something farther of a like nature may be urged, which seems to argue that the time betwixt Cyrus first, and Artaxerxes twentieth year, could not be long. As

First, the names of those who sealed the Covenant with Nebemiah, Chap. io. are many of them the very same with the names found in the Register of those who came up with Zerubbabel, Ezra. 2. it seems therefore that those persons were now living, if so, then cannot the time be esteemed long.

Ans. The names, Ez. ra 2. and again Nebem. 10. are not names of men, as particular persons, but as Heads of Families, for which cause the persons mentioned by name, are called the chief of the People, the Princes, Nobles, Neh. 9. 38. Chap. 10. 14. 29. Hence the Head of the Family of Parosh, goes under the name of Parosh (as he was a publick person, and Head of a Family so called) in the generation Zerubbabel lived in, and also afterwards in Nehemiah's generation. Not that Parosh (and so of all the rest) signifies in both
both one and the same particular person, but indeed the Head or common person of one and the same Family, which (that the distinction of Families hereby might be the more conspicuous, and the better preserved) is called *Parosh* in Zerubbabel's time, and *Nehemiah* likewise, though these two were separated at least a generation from each other, as I have already observed. And that it is a thing ordinary to give to a publick person, whether Prince, or Nobleman, as Marqueffe, Earl, &c. besides his own proper name (which is peculiar to him) a name common to him, and all that do, or shall succeed him in his place, as such, is a thing we cannot be ignorant of. And also (which is the thing to be minded) as such a one who is a publick person in all his publick actions, layes by his private name, and acts by vertue of his name as such; so the Heads of each Family acting as publick persons; First, In leading their Families forth out of Babylon in Zerubbabel's time; Secondly, In sealing the Covenant for themselves, and the whole Family they were Heads of, in *Nehemiah* time, they lose their names as they were private men, and retain only that common name, which was given to them, as publick persons; and hence it comes to passe, that there is still the use of the same names, though yet persons and generations were different.

Secondly, The Register mentioned *Nehem.* doth somewhat vary, in respect of the number of persons in sundry of the Families, from what we read of *Ezra* 2. Now what may be the reason
reason hereof? Why, (faith Dr. Lightfoot in his Harmony upon Nehemiah, page 204.) Nehemiah's Register is a Register of the persons as they were then living in his time; but Ezra's of the persons as they were at their first coming up with Zerubbabel in the first year of Cyrus. And if so, then considering that the variation between one Register and the other, is but small, it will strongly argue, that the time between Zerubbabel and Nehemiah could not be long.

Ans. The Reason given by Dr. Lightfoot is a mistake, and against the Text, and will not reconcile each place; For observe, It is expressly said of Nehemiah's Register Chap.7. that the same was found by Nehemiah, yea and found so written as he delivers it in the following verses, ver.5. And my God put it into my heart to gather together the Nobles, and the Rulers, and the People, that they might be reckoned by Genealogie. And I found a Register of the Genealogie of them which came up at the first, and found written therein; These are the Children of the Province, &c. The Register therefore was not a Register made up partly of the persons then living, and partly of those mentioned in the old Register, because then the Register should be of Nehemiah's making; but the Register he speaks of, was a Register he found written to his hand. Nay, how can we think it should be so, seeing it was upwards of seven and thirty years (in case we follow Dr. Lightfoot's own reckoning) from the time Zerubbabel went up (when the first Register was made) unto this time, which was after Nehemiah was come to
Jerusalem, and had built the walls of the City? Now observe, as there is in most families mentioned in either Register the very same number of persons; so likewise is there in both Registers one and the same number of Horses, Mules, Camels, Asses, as compare, Ezra 2.66, 67. with Nehem. 7.68, 69. Now who can believe it, that in seven and thirty years there should not be diminished, nor increased not one person in many Families, which Families too consisted some of divers hundreds of persons, some of thousands? Not in so great a multitude, not one Horse, not a Mule? It is therefore more consonant to truth, and will better reconcile each place, to say, That as Zerubbabel at his first coming up drew that Register, Ezra 2. So suddenly after, when by coming and going, some change and alteration was made of persons, he drew a second; which second List or Catalogue, Nehemiah in searching lights upon, but misleth the first. And as this doth much better reconcile each place, so doth it no way injure us; Nay, that Nehemiah is fain to go to search old Registers to find the Genealogie of the persons then living, is an Argument rather that the former generation who came up with Zerubbabel was extinct, yea had been so some time (the persons now living having in a manner forgotten their descent;) then that they should be alive.

Thirdly, Ezra is particularized by name, as being one of those that came up at the first with Zerubbabel, Nehem.12.1. it cannot therefore be, considering how active this Ezra was even in Ne-
hemiahs dayes, that the distance of time betwixt Zerubbabel and Nehemiahs should be very great.

Ans. No Argument at all is, or can be fetched out of the Books of Ezra and Nehemiahs from the agreement or likelihood of names, unless only in such places, where besides the bare name we have something else laid down that carries proof with it, that we are by the same name always to understand the same particular person, and no other. And the reason is, because it is a thing of most common use in these two Books, to give the same names to diverse and sundry persons, as who consults either book diligently shall find no leffe then three or four different Jeshsues, and about some eight or nine distinct Zechaarias; four several Eliahs, viz. Eliah the High Priest, and three other of that name, we have in the tenth Chapter of Ezra only; Seven or eight distinct Shemiahs, and as many Mephullams are recorded in these two books. Divers other like instances its most easie to produce. Whence it follows, that the use of the same name proves nothing at all as to this or that particular person, in case there be not in the Text some other notation, which devolves the name upon this or that person, as considered distinct from all others; As for example, When Jeshua is called, either Jeshua the High Priest, or Jeshua the son of Jozadak, this is a manifest notation of the person, distinguishing him from all others of that name; when Nehemiahs is called Nehemiahs the Tirshatha, or the Governor, or Nehemiahs the son of Hachaliah, this denotes the particular person, and distin-
guiseth him from that Nehemiah the son of Azbek, Chap. 3. 16. But now in the Text objected, we have only a bare name, without any other notation, and therefore it proves nothing. Nay, it is manifest from the Text, that that Ezra who is recorded as one of them that came up with Zerubbabel, cannot be the Ezra so much spoken of in this Book; For, observe, ver. 12, 13, &c. and we shall find, that in the days of Jojakim, who was Father to that Eliashib that was High Priest in the days of Nehemiah (as ver. 10.) the Ezra who came up with Zerubbabel, and also the Serajah, the Jeremiah, Amariah, &c. mentioned with him, ver. 1, 2. were gone, and another generation were come up in their rooms, in the place of Serajah, we have now Meraiah; of Jeremiah, Hananiah; of Ezra, Meshullam; of Amariah, Jehohanan, and so of all the rest; so that not only this Ezra is gone, but there is a change even of a whole generation in the days of Jojakim. And this Jojakim being father to Eliashib must needs be of the generation before Nehemiah, for in Nehemiah's days, Eliashib the son is High Priest, by consequence therefore Jojakim was now dead. Now consider, the Ezra who wrote the book of Ezra, lived and acted with Nehemiah, but the Ezra who came up with Zerubbabel was removed, and another in his place a generation before Nehemiah's days; therefore though the name is one, yet have we not one, but two persons signified by it; the Ezra who came up with Zerubbabel was one, the Ezra who acted with Nehemiah another; and
and for this reason is this latter (as seems to me) called *Ezra the Priest*, the *Scribe*, vers. 26. and *Ezra the Scribe*, vers. 36. to distinguish him from the foregoing *Ezra*, vers. 1.

From the whole it appears, that as Dr. Lightfoot's Allegations singly are too weak, so these added to them (which (if I mistake not) is the utmost that with colour of reason can be urged from Scripture-Text) will not help his opinion, to narrow the time betwixt *Cyrus* first, and *Artaxerxes* twentieth into so little a compass as thirty seven years; nor will they maintain any other opinion whatsoever, that either is, or may be stated, that doth or shall so shorten this time, as that the whole put together will not amount to more than one full age.

Yet with all let me say, when I consider the whole, and how great a shew of reason there is (if things laid down in the Books of *Ezra* and *Nehemiah* be taken up upon the first look) to cut this time short, I do not at all wonder, that the *Jewish Writers* (whose averseness to take up reports from Heathens, though ever so true, and aptness to look upon these Books as a Chronicle (a thing never intended by the Holy Ghost) and mis-understanding the Story by taking up things too hastily, might cause in them this error) should adhere to this opinion of the shortness of the time betwixt the first coming up from the Captivity, and *Nehemiah's* dayes, and that Dr. Lightfoot, Mr. Broughton, and others, should follow them; for truly there seems at first blush, to be much more reason for such an opinion, than
any other; but when things are once thoroughly weighed, and well digested, the contrary is manifest, and an unprejudiced eye will easily see that this Thread must be drawn out somewhat more at length, then the Jewish Writers, or Chronologers that adhere to them will allow of.

The Conclusion is, That the Opinion of Dr. Lightfoot, and others, who following the steps of the Jewish Writers do bring this time into a little scantling, is a mistake, and not that certain rule by which we are to measure this Period.

**S E C T. 2.**

Seeing we may not steer our course by the fore-going opinion, it is necessary that some further enquiry be made into this business, viz. what number of years passed between the first of Cyrus, and the twentieth of Nehemiah's Artaxerxes.

Now because Artaxerxes (as also Darius) was a name common to more than one or two of the Persian Monarchs, we must therefore in order to the Principal Question in the first place discuss another, viz.

Quer. What Artaxerxes was that from whom Nehemiah received Commission to build Jerusalem?

Ans. That we may the better find out this, I shall first enquire, what Darius that was by whose order the Temple work was revived; for that Darius was Predecessor to this Artaxerxes, as is evident,
1 From his place in the Story, we read of Darius, Ezra 5, but not of this Artaxerxes till afterwards.

2 The Holy Ghost making a clear distinction betwixt Cyrus, Darius, and Artaxerxes, places Artaxerxes after Darius, as being his Successor, as he doth Darius after Cyrus as his, Ezra 6. 14.

3 Ezra coming up to Jerusalem in the seventh year of that very same Artaxerxes, in whose twentieth Nehemiah received his Commission, finds a Temple there, and did sacrifice, Ezra 8. 34, 35. Therefore must this Artaxerxes be Successor to Darius, for until the sixth of Darius no Temple was built.

Nay, he was not only Successor to him, but Successor at such a distance, as appears to me he was not his next Successor, but rather next to his next, which is clear from that great change and alteration that there was in the Jewish Church and State both, betwixt the sixth year of the one, and the seventh of the other.

1 In the Church, in the sixth year of Darius, Jeshua in all probability was alive, and High Priest, as lay these Scriptures together, Hag. 1. 14, 15. Chap. 2. 2, 3, 4. Zech. 3. 6, 7. Chap. 6. 11, 12, but in the seventh of Artaxerxes (as I have before observed) Eliashib who was Grandchild to Jeshua, stands in place of his Grandfather.

2 In the State, there had been Governors that oppressed the people, and did not fear God, betwixt Zerubbabel's time, who was Governor in
in the sixth of Darius (and how long after is not known to us) and Ezraes, who came up to Jerusalem in the seventh of Artaxerxes, which is an Argument of some good distance of time betwixt these two.

The question here then will be, 

What Darius was that who by his Decree did the second time set the Temple-work on foot?

Ans. Some (and not a few) will have this Darius to be Darius Hystaspes, who succeeded Cambyses the Son of Cyrus in the Kingdom: But this cannot be, because betwixt Cyrus and that Darius who set the Temple-work on foot, did reign one Artaxerxes, Ch. 4.7. by whom the work was hindred; but none such reigned betwixt Cyrus and Darius Hystaspes.

To say (as do some) this Artaxerxes, though recorded before, yet reigned after Darius, is so expressly against the Text, that I cannot admit such a thought, for the Copy of the Letters of Artaxerxes is the very thing which puts stop to the work of the Temple; for it seems the Jews upon the change that now was in the Empire, through the death of the Monarch that was, had by vertue of their old Commission from Cyrus, set upon anew of themselves, the Temple-work, as hoping the new Prince would favour their enterprise; now the enemies seeing this, dispatch away Letters in haste to Artaxerxes, containing a charge against the Jews, who in answer returns them Letters, with a strict command to go up to Jerusalem, and cause the work to cease, which upon receipt of, and reading the Kings Letter, they straight-
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way did, and thereupon the Work of God ceased until the second year of Darius, Ezra 4. 23, 24. it is therefore a Question without question that Darius was Successor to this Artaxerxes, as he was Predecessor to the other.

Some others therefore perceiving that the former opinion will not agree with the Text, will have this Artaxerxes to be Cyrus Son, and next Successor (commonly called by Historians Cambyses) but this opinion is as unlikely as the other is untrue, as I have proved already in answer to Doctor Lightfoot.

There is yet another opinion, which affirms this Artaxerxes to be Smerdis Magus, the Counterfeit, who reigned seven Months betwixt Cambyses and Darius Hytaaspes. But certainly had the cessation of the Work of the House of God been for no longer time then is given to it by this opinion, which cannot be much above a year, if we consider that Smerdis (as themselves say) reigned but seven Months, out of which seven Months we must allow some time for the news of Cambyses death, being brought to Judah's Adversaries; some time more for their sending their Letters; (which being subscribed by so many sundry people, living in sundry places, as verse ninth intimates, it is likely could not be much less time in preparing) some more time for that search of the Chronicles upon this Letter, vers. 19. and some more yet for the Kings answer to them again; and considering withall that Darius Hytaaspes who succeeded Smerdis, did (according to their Principle) in the second year of his reign set the work
on foot again; the whole compared together it
will appear, that the work could not cease very
little more then one year; which time being so
short, it can hardly be thought that the Scripture
would take notice of it, much less with such an
Emphasis, setting such a mark upon this busi-
ness, as verse lai; Then ceased the Work of the
House of God, so it ceased until the second year of
Darius. None that reads the words can think the
cessation here spoken of was only a Twelve-
months business. I say not that the very story
of Smerdis (which though unto mere stories I
give little credit, yet being the Adversaries Wea-
pons I may use them) the which reports him all
his time in a manner to have been shut up in his
Chamber, neither daring to shew himself a-
broad, nor admitting any to come to him, gives
just ground of suspicion he could not be this Ar-
taxerxes, who seems by what is recorded of him
in this Chapter, Ezra 4. to have been no such re-
tired person, but of a more publick life.

But to put an end to this variety of opinions, I
take it the Text itself hath decided the Contro-
versie, telling us plainly that this Artaxerxes was no
other then Ahaseurus; he who is called Artaxerxes
verz. 7. being called Ahaseurus verse 6. the person
in both being one and the same; only the Holy
Ghost having first made mention of the accusati-
on of Jehovah’s Adversaries in the general, with a
declaration of the time when they wrote it, viz. in
the beginning of Ahaseurus reign, verse six, pro-
ceeds to mention the same more particular-
ly, with the names of the Persons that wrote it,
and a Copy of the Accusation it self, and what ef-
fect it had; in which following discourse there
is only a change of the name, he being now cal-
led Artaxerxes (a name common to many of the
Persian Kings, as Pharaoh was to the Egyptians)
who had before been called Ahasuerus. If you
ask what Ahasuerus this was, I answer, The same
in all likelihood that we read of throughout the
Book of Hester; for, setting aside Hesters story,
we do not read of the name Ahasuerus but twice in
all the Bible, Dan. 9. 1. and here in Ezra. That
Ahasuerus Daniel mentions cannot be Hesters Aha-
suerus, for that Ahasuerus Daniel tells us was
King of the Medes only, Hesters is King of Media
and Persia both; Hester 1. 3. 2. Daniels Ahasue-
rus being Father to that Darius who together with
Cyrus took Babylon, could not (because the Babyl-
onian Monarchy was standing in his days, and pos-
sessing a great part of those Countries) have his
Monarchy extended from India even to Abyssinia;
over one hundred twenty seven Provinces, which
Ahasuerus who married Hester had, Ch. 1. 1. In all
likelihood therefore (we reading of no other of
that name) this Ahasuerus Artaxerxes, Ezra
mentions, is the very same with him we read of in
Hester. And indeed the Apocryphal Book of
Hester (which although I credit not as Scripture,
yet may the same credit be given to it as to other
Histories) calls him by no other name then
Artaxerxes, who in Hester is called Ahasuerus; so
that it seems either name was given to him, and
because of that (he being known to some by the
one, to some by the other) both Ezra give him.
both; first calling him Ahasuerus, then Artaxerxes.

If it be said, But if this Artaxerxes were Ahasuerus in Hester, one would think Hester having such influence upon him, and Mordecai such power under him, it should have caused that the work of the Temple should have gone on again?

Ans. Not so, for the Decree to hinder the Work of the Temple was made, as the Text faith, in the beginning of his reign, which was before that Hester was married to him. Now a Decree once made, Hester (as appears in the business of Haman) was not forward to move the King to alter his Decree; yea, put case she had, yet was it a custom amongst the Medes and Persians, not to repeal any Law, whilst the King that made it lived; and therefore Ahasuerus, though Hester begged it on her knees, could not repeal the Decree against the Jews, only by another Decree gives them liberty to stand up in their own defence, and make resistance against those that should seek their lives. So that I say the Law once made, it was not an easy thing, though Hester was greatly in the Kings favour, and Mordecai in great power, to repeal it, whilst Ahasuerus lived, but for his life the work is, and must be at a stand, though Darius after him (which is an argument that this custom of making irrepealable Laws was binding only to that King that made them, the term of his own life, but not to his Successor or Successors) did repeal this Statute, and by a contrary Decree set the work on foot again.

Now it being so, that in all likelihood that
Abasuerus Husband to Hester is the same here meant that hindered the work of the Temple, then, as both the former opinions (which carry not half the probability this doth) concerning Cambyses and Smerdis are disproved; who both put together (and allowing them whatsoever is in any History given to them for the time of their reign) did not reign so many years as we have in Scripture recorded touching this Artaxerxes; so it is evident that Darius Hystaspes could not bee that Darius that gave life again to the Temple-work; for he succeeded in the Monarchy (as all affirm) within one year after the death of Cambyses, Cyrus Son, and next Successor; but now, betwixt Cyrus and that Darius, did reign, and that for many years, one Abasuerus, or Artaxerxes, by whom the work was obstructed.

If any yet further curiously enquire, which of those Kings named by the Greeks this Abasuerus should be, seeing they give to none of the Persian Monarchs that name;

I answer; I suppose him to be Darius Hystaspes himself, and amongst other Reasons might be named, this is one, The activeness of Mordecat in his Court; now Mordecat being one of those carried Captive in the days of Jeconiah, Hester 2. 5, 6. which was at the beginning of the seventy years, the age of Mordecat, in case we fix upon any of the Persian Monarchs on this side Hystaspes, will be such as will hardly agree with the story of him and his activity; and this being so, the supposed helper of the Temple-work, is the real hinderer of it.
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The Conclusion is, That that Darius who after Cyrus set the Temple work on foot, cannot be Darius Hystaspes.

Another opinion there is, which will have this Darius to be Darius Notthus; but to this cannot I subscribe, partly for what I have already said in answer to Master Medes beginning of the Seventy weeks; who there maintains this opinion; and further, for what I said but even now, in my answer to Doctor Lightfoot, That Ezra upon his coming to Jerusalem found that generation who had been builders of the Temple, and the next generation to these, extinct, and in their Graves, and a third generation surviving. Now Darius Notthus reigning but nineteen years, we can hardly think (Artaxerxes being next Successor to him) that by the Seventh of Artaxerxes when Ezra went up to Jerusalem, which accounting from the Sixth of Darius, when the work of the Temple was finished (at which time Zerubbabel and the rest were alive) amounts but to one and twenty years; that I say in one and twenty years space (though it is granted many might) yet that a whole generation should be gone, and the generation after them, and a third generation come in place, seems very strange.

Darius Notthus therefore was not that Darius which did advance the building of the Temple.

Quer. But what Darius are we then to fix upon?

Ans. Darius Longimannus, called most commonly, Artaxerxes Longimannus, who was Son to Xerxes the Great, and Father to Darius Notthus.
Now the reason why I fix here, is, because this fixation agrees well to the story of things on both sides, in respect of time more especially.

1. For the succeeding part of the story, that which follows betwixt the finishing the Temple-work, and the building Jerusalem, it will well suit with it; for this Darius reigning forty years, (which long reign above other his Predecessors I conceive was the fruit of Gods Peoples prayers, which Darius makes one reason of his Decree for carrying on the work of the Temple, that the Jews might offer Sacrifice, and pray for his life, Ezra 6. 11.) I say, he reigning forty years; if we begin from the sixth year of his reign when the Temple-work was finished, and adding to the thirty four years, the remainder of his reign after the Temple was built, the nineteen years of Darius Notbus his Successor, and the seven years of Artaxerxes who succeeded him, at which time Ezra went up to Jerusalem, the whole amounts to sixty years; and if we also take in the thirteen years after, when Nehemiah went up, it advance-eth the number to seventy three: now that in the space of about seventy years there should be such a change of Governours and People, the old dead and gone, new come in their room, is no strange thing to conceive. This opinion therefore well suits the succeeding part of the story.

2. For the fore-going part, it suits it much better then any of the other opinions. For, those that fix upon Darius Hyphasis, cannot (as I have proved) finde an Artaxerxes between him and Cyrus that was a hinderer to the work, which yet the
such a one was, is evident from the story. Those who fix upon Nothus make the time so wide between the laying the foundation of the Temple, and the finishing the work, as can hardly be imagined; neither of these opinions therefore will suit with that part of the Divine Story, which precedes the building of the Temple. But ours, which fixeth upon Longimanus, will suit it very well; for first, The block that lies in the way of the first of the two former opinions, is by it removed, we having already found an Artaxerxes that was a hinderer, and also a Predecessor to this Longimanus. Secondly, The block that lies in the way of the second, in regard of the length of the time, is hereby well removed, our opinion cutting the time between the laying the Temple's foundation, and the finishing the work, shorter by full forty years than that opinion doth.

Obj. But yet it may be said, That even according to our opinion, the time between Cyrus first, and Darius second year will seem too long, for walking by our own rule laid down in our Key, Thes. 45.48. the time amounts to seventy years, thus;

Cyrus, three years.
Cambyses with the Magi, eight.
Darius Hystaspes, thirty six.
Xerxes, twenty one.
Darius Longimanus, two.

The current year, viz. the second of Longimanus, I take into the number, because it is very probable it was not till towards the end of that year that Darius Decree came forth, for the Jews fall not to the work till the latter end of the sixth month, Hag. 1.
14, 15. and it was some time after that (as Ezraes Story makes appear) that the Decree came forth; which may therefore possibly, and most likely, if we thoroughly weigh the whole of Zecharies Vision, be in the eleventh Month he mentions, Zec. i. 7, and being so, but a month and a few days are wanting of a compleat year, which little want, where the account is by years, is never reckoned. Now hence the Objection riseth; If seventy years be allotted to this time (which our opinion grants) then must the age of some persons, viz. those who had seen Solomon's Temple, and were alive at this day, as Hag. 2. 2, 3. be no lesse than one hundred and thirty years; for suppose them to be sixty years old in Cyrus first, to which sixty, adding these seventy, we have the aforesaid number; which age seems too great for the generations since Moses his time.

Ans. Not so; for we finde Jechonias the High Priest (who was not long before the Babylonian Captivity) to have lived as long, 2 Chron. 24. 15, and also (as is testified in the first Book of Maccabees) Mattathias the Priest, Father to Judas Maccabaeus, lived one hundred forty six years, Chap. 2. verse last. Indeed the age might seem too great, should we (as do some) fix upon Darius Notibus, so taking in forty years more; but here it is otherwise, forty years is cut off, which in a mans age is no little matter.

Again, Observe, that this age was not the age of Zerubbabel, Jeshua, and that generation that came out of Babylon, but the age of those who were carried into Babylon by Nebucadnezzar, and so indeed were of the generation before Zerubbabel.
bel, and the multitude that came up with him, though yet some of them were living at this day.

Obj. 2. I have met with it objected, That the time from Cyrus first, to the end of Darius second, could not be very long, because no Priest was by the Law to officiate above twenty years; from thirty years old to fifty was their limited time, Numb. 4. vers. 2, 3, 22, 23, 30, 35, 39, &c. now Jeshua was High Priest in Cyrus first, and so likewise in Darius second, the distance therefore could not be great, no not twenty years.

Ans. This Law was not a Law for the High Priest, but only for the inferior Priests, the Levites, as is clear;

1. Because wheresoever it is spoken of, Levites only are mentioned, as being subject to it.

2. Because the work itself, that at fifty years of age they were exempted from, was servile work, work that was a burden, as the bearing about of the Tabernacle, vers. 24, 25, 26. which work too they were to be appointed unto by the High Priest, as their Master and Lord, as vers. 19, 27. therefore did not this work, and so not this Law, belong to him.

3. I finde particular instances of High Priests that did officiate when they were above fifty years old; what shall we say to Eli? was not Eli High Priest when upwards of fifty, considering he was ninety eight years old when he died; 1 Sam. 4. 15. and yet Samuel (who it is evident was born in the time of Eli's Priesthood) but a child even then when Eli was very old, and his eyes dim, as is clear,
clear, chap. 2. compare ver. 18, 19, with ver. 22, and chap. 3, ver. 2. compare with ver. 8.

But the instance of Jeho'ada is undeniable; for observe, he creates Joash King, 2 Chron. 23. Joash reigns forty years, chap. 24. 1. Jeho'ada dies before Joash, ver. 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22. Jeho'ada is one hundred and thirty years old when he dieth, ver. 15. if therefore Jeho'ada died in Joash his fortieth year, yet considering that he crowned Joash King, and that in the time of his Priesthood, and died not till he was aged one hundred and thirty years, it will necessarily follow that he was High Priest at ninety years old. This Law therefore was not a Law for the High Priest, but only for the Levites; they ceased to officiate at fifty years of age, but the High Priest was such during life; and indeed he could not otherwise have been a fit Type of Christ, who ever liveth to make intercession for us.

This Objection, because I have met with it, I thought good to answer, though otherwise I should never have objected it to my self.

I know nothing else can be said for a shorter time, unless we should here again bring up those forty six years, John 2. 20. with Daniel's seven weeks, chap. 9. 25. both which I have answered before in traversing the seventy weeks.

The time therefore from the beginning of Cyrus first, unto the end of Darius second, may well be reckoned seventy years, notwithstanding the weight of any objection against it.

But to come nearer; what if we may finde in Scripture this time to be meted and measured sev-
venty years? If the Scripture measure agree to the measure of the ancient Greeks, it will add credit to their reports in more things then this one.

Let us here take into consideration Zecharies seventy years, Chap. 1. 12. chap. 7. 5. this seeming to me to be their proper place.

That these seventy years should be understood of the seventy years of the Captivity, cannot be, because (as Doctor Lightfoot hath well observed in his Chronicle upon Hester ten) the seventy years of the Captivity, beginning with the fourth of Jehojakim, did end long before this time, viz. with the third of Belshazzar, or the last year of the Babylonian Monarchy; but the seventy years Zecharij speaks of, bring us to the second of Darius, which is many years upwards in the Persian Monarchy.

Doctor Lightfoot's own account will not neither help the business; for as he hath nothing but those former suppositions (which having been put into the balance were found too light) to maintain that conception, viz. That that Darius who advanced the work of the Temple, did reign at such a distance from Cyrus; so if these two things be thoroughly scanned,

1 What Darius it was who set this work on foot.

2 At what distance from Cyrus (I speak now of time in the general only) the compelling circumstances of the story, each duly weighed and laid together, will necessarily infer him to have liyed, (both which my former discourse will
give some light into) it will then appear, That
Doctor Lightfoot himself hath exceeded the
bounds of seventy years, as many years as hee
chargeth upon the fore-going reckoning, account-
ing it worthy, for that reason only, to be cast out;
by his own rule therefore, his own must go out
with it.

What will those Opinions make of these seven-
ty years, that will have the finishing of the Tem-
ple-work to stand at forty six years distance from
Cyrus, as some; or else at one hundred and ele-
ven, or one hundred and thirteen years, as o-
thers; seeing it is most evident that the complaint
the Angel makes of seventy years sufferings was
in the second of Darius, Zech. 1. 7. compared with
ver. 12. which was but four years before the work
was finished, as appears from Ezra 6. 15. May
these allow the seventy years to be the years of the
Captivity? if so, there had need be some good
reason shewn for it, why the Holy Ghost, after
the seventy years of the Captivity were ended,
and forty and odde years more run out (as it fol-
lows upon the one opinion) or upwards of an
hundred years more, (as it follows upon the o-
ther) should speak still of seventy years.

For my own part, I think these seventy years are
to be reckoned from the first of Cyrus, from the be-
going of which year until the end of Darius second,
(at which time the Angel makes this complaint,
and therefore the time of the complaint is ex-
pressly noted to be in the eleventh Month, upon
the twenty fourth day of the Month, in the second
year of Darius, which was the very close of the
year,
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year, only one Month and a few days wanting) are reckoned by the Greek Historians exactly seventy years, as I have before observed, and so indeed these seventy years are not the seventy years of the Captivity, but another seventy, taking beginning where they end?

Obj. But if so, why doth the Angel plead God's having had indignation against his people threescore and ten years? he might have pleaded twice threescore and ten years.

Ans. We must consider the Angel here spoken of (which is Jesus Christ) now speaks by way of complaint, How long, Lord wilt thou not have mercy— and therefore he purposely lets fall the first seventy years, taking no notice of them, because as to that time he had no cause to complain, they had deserved it highly, provoked his Father, for which cause Jerusalem was justly made a ruinous heap: It was the penalty of that Law, or outward Covenant made with this people at the coming out of Ægypt, that in case they did rebel they should be carried captive into other Countries out of their own Land, Levit. 26. verse, 27, 28. to the end; and observe, this was the highest punishment of all, inflicted for highest breach of the Law, therefore mentioned in the last place. Now all the seventy years of the Captivity they were under this very punishment, therefore the thing being most righteous, and indeed a thing unavoidable, if God would be just, considering the terms of the Covenant this people stood under, Christ (who pleadeth righteously) will not complain of it, lest he should complain of his
his Father for doing that which was most righteous, and which he could not without breach of Justice have omitted. But now as to the time that passed afterwards, he had cause to complain, because all this time was over and above the prefixed time of their punishment, and therefore he complains, Lord how long wilt thou not have mercy on Jerusalem, and on the Cities of Judah, against which thou hast had indignation these three score and ten years? as to say, These seventy years of thy indignation are more than should be; and that Christ speaks by way of complaint is clear, because God is fain to give him good words to still him, and tell him the work should be deferred no longer, ver. 13, 14, 16, 17. an Argument that he had some cause to complain, and that upon this account, the work had been deferred, and that for so long a time as seventy years. So that this Text, rightly considered, is an Argument for us, and holds forth thus much, That we are not to begin these seventy years till the seventy of the Captivity were ended; for Christ complains of the wrath of his Father to his people all these seventy years; but as to the seventy years of the Captivity, which was only satisfaction to that outward Covenant they had broken, Christ had no cause to complain of one day of that, nor would he, the punishment being most just; and the Covenant broken, and no punishment inflicted had been unjust.

Obj. 2. But if this opinion be true, why also are the Fasts of the fourth, and the fifth, and the seventh, and the tenth Month said to be of seventy years caution.
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nuance, Zach. 7. 5. with Chap. 8. 19. seeing from the time Jerusalem was taken, the Temple destroyed, &c. which things are the grounds of their fasting, it was now to this time (as we account it) one hundred and twenty years, viz. fifty in Babylon after Jerusalem and the Temple were destroyed, and seventy after the coming thence.

Answ. The only foot that this Objection stands upon, is a supposition that the aforesaid Fasts were kept in Babylon; Now as to that I answer.

1. That there is no Scripture proving such a thing. That, Psalm 137. 1, 2. wilt not do it, for it is one thing to weep occasionally, (which is the weeping there mentioned, God's people sit down by the Rivers of Babylon, one while they call Sion to remembrance, another while they are scoffed at by the Babylonians, these things draw forth occasional tears) but it is another to weep in the solemn Assembly, and as a solemn Ordinance, which calls upon me to weep and mourn, and that at such a time. Now such was the weeping of the fourth, and fifth, and seventh, and tenth Months, which were times of weeping and mourning, instituted and ordained by the publick authority of the Jewish Church, to be celebrated yearly; though by the way remember, that their practice in this is not a binding rule to us in Gospel days; National institutions in Spiritual matters ceasing with their National Church.

2. As there is no Scripture for it, that these solemn Fasts were kept in Babylon; so look upon the thing in reason, and it seems no way likely or
probable; for consider, the Fasts were Publique and National, kept not by some particular persons, but by the whole Body of the Congregation of Israel, as appears, Chap. 7. ver. 5, 6. Now it may with good reason be queried, Whether it be a thing at all probable, that the Babylonians would admit of such exercises under their very Noses?

Obj. If it be said, Though the thing were publique, as to the Jews, that is, the whole Body of that Nation in Babylon did Fast, yet might they so appoint their meetings, as that the thing might be kept from the knowledge of the Babylonians?

I answer, Consider, that as these Fasts were Publique, so also they were set Fasts, appointed to several times, and the celebrated annually, year after year, and that for a long time, seventy years; all which things laid together, we cannot imagine that the celebration of so many days, for so many years together, should, or could be a thing so private as to be hid from the Babylonians; if it were known, then I say must they be kept with their allowance. Now considering Babylon the place, Satans busie rage to stir up his Instruments against any Spiritual work, the Babylonians themselves being Idolaters, and Worshippers of a false god, with all the occasions of these solemn meetings, whereof that of the fourth Month was in memorial of Nebuchadnezzars taking Jerusalem, which fell out in this Month, 2 King. 25. 3, 4, Jer. 39. 2, 3. That of the fifth, for the burning of the Temple, which was done the tenth day of this Month, 2 King. 25. 8, 9, Jer. 52. 12, 13.
That of the seventh Month for the death of Gedaliah, which hapned in this Month, and was the cause of the total dispersing of the remnant left in Judea, Jer. 41. 1, &c. That of the tenth, for Nebuchadnezzar's siege which was laid against Jerusalem in the tenth day of this Month, 3 King. 25. 1. Jer. 52. 4. All which occasions of these solemn Assemblies (that of the seventh Month excepted) was such as might suggest to the Babylonians, that this people assembled together yearly to lament their good success and prosperity. Let us lay all together, and where we want a determinate rule, conjecture, whether (the premises considered) it be a thing likely that the Babylonians would permit such constant yearly Exercises in Babylon or no?

I am therefore inclined to think, That the appointment and celebration of these Publicke solemn Fasts, was not in Babylon, but upon their coming thence; after the people of Israel had liberty given them by Cyrus to return from Babylon, and were come up to Jerusalem, with their hearts greatly raised through the present sense of their deliverance, and also with expectations of something more than ordinary, that God would now do for them; and having no sooner set hand to the work, but are stopped, contrary to expectation, they are now put upon looking backwards, to see what might be the cause God should deal thus with them. And to this, their hearts being now melted, and affected under the present sense of their deliverance, they are in a frame and posture much better then while they remained in Babylon.
bylon under a Cloud, and a sense of wrath, which we know ever unfit, and makes a Soul incapable of looking back upon former ways and walkings. Now looking backwards they finde, That they had received such and such heavy stroaks from God formerly, which stroaks fell upon the whole Body of the Nation, yet had they never as yet in any solemn way humbled themselves before God for those their sins and provocations, which brought these stroaks upon them: Hereupon they appoint several days of Humiliation to bee kept yearly, till the anger of the Lord should be removed; and the better to stir up their hearts, (through a putting them in remembrance by the stroak) they appoint their days upon such and such times as the stroaks, which did prove most fatal to them, fell upon them, which is all the reason can be given of the appointment of the Fasts in such and such Months, as is before specified.

And therefore observe, in the fourth of Darim, in the ninth Month, when now the people of God perceiving the storm to be well blown over, the Temple-work being now on foot again, and brought to some perfection, do send men, as Sherezer, Regemmelech, &c. to enquire whether they should any longer (it seeming that God was now pacified) go on with that fasting which they had continued for seventy years; the answer is given by the Prophet to the Congregation there present, and the People that were in the Land, ver. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10. and not to those in Babylon, of whom not one syllable is spoken. A clear Argument that Sherezer, Regemmelech, &c. were not
sent by the people in Babylon, (as faith the general opinion) but were indeed employed, being two Honourable persons, by the whole Body of the People now in the Land, to go up to the House of the Lord, and enquire for them, concerning this practice they had so long continued among them; Whether Gods wrath seeming now to be pacified, they should continue it any longer. Answer hereupon by the Prophet is given to the people of the Land, proving clearly, that this Fast was not a Fast in Babylon, but a Fast that had been kept up and continued by the people of the Land, which (as I have said) began upon their coming thither, and the cause till this day remaining, had been continued by them ever since; through which long continuance of time it was even now grown into a form, therefore God by the Prophet seems at first to disown it, Chap. 7. 5, 6. and yet afterwards (as being a thing lawfull and good in its first institution, though through continuance of time abused by them) he owns it, Chap. 8. 19. So that this text rightly understood, is so farre from hurting us, that contrariwise it brings with it a second testimony to prove the truth of our Affertion, that it was seventy years betwixt Cyrus, and the Darius that forwar ded the Temple-work.

If any should yet think our measure to be misapplied, and that surely it could not be so long as seventy years from the return of the Captivity to the end of Darius second, I shall add one consideration more, viz. That Iddo, who was Grandfather to the Prophet Zechariah, as appears Zech.
was one of them that came up with Zerubbabel, as we shall finde, Nebem. 12. 4. which Iddo Nehemiah speaks of, that it was the same person, and not another of the same name appears, in that we finde Zechariah, (and that in the daies of Jojakim sonne of Jeshua, which well agrees to the latter times of Zechariah's Prophecy) mentioned by name, as succeeding in the line of Iddo, ver. 16, and though Zechariah is there recorded amongst the chief of the Priests, yet doth not that hinder but it should be this very Zechariah, seeing most ordinarily Prophets were taken from amongst the Priests; Jeremiah was of the Priests of Anathoth, and yet a Prophet, Jer. 1. 1. Ezekiel was a Priest, Ezek. 1. 3. and yet a Prophet. All therefore that can be gathered thence is, That Zechariah as hee was a Prophet, so also he was one of the chief of the Priests.

Now Zechariah who mentions these seventy years, being Grand-childe to one that came up with Zerubbabel, it may very well bee thought, that betwixt these two, as much time as seventy years may be allowed, and yet no monstrous Conclusion.

From the whole it appears, That to fix the advance of the Temple-work upon the second year of Darius Longimanus, doth not at all jarre, but rather hath an admirable concurrency, so as no opinion besides it, with what seems to be most clear in Scripture, as touching the time betwixt Cyrus first year, and Darius second.

Withall (though I would not be over-curio-
sous, for I hate over-much niceness and curio-
sity
First, We have Seventy years Captivity in Babylon.

Secondly, Seventy years of mourning in the Land after their return thence, before the Work of the Temple can go on.

Thirdly, After that we have Seventy years, and seven odd, (observe, though we have some odd, yet they run still upon the Number seven) before the Jews can have liberty to build their City, and form themselves into a Common-wealth; for so many years passed between Darius second, and the time of Nehemiah's Commission.

Lastly, We have Seventy Weeks, which makes seven Sevens, from the building Jerusalem, to the Passion of Christ.

In a word, from the beginning of the Captivity, until Christ's Passion, we have ten Seventies, and three odd years; for though I mentioned even now seven odd years, yet it must be remembered, that four years out of that seven are to be deducted, to supply the want of those four years, which I have before proved are to be cut off from the seventeenth and last of Daniel's weeks; these deducted, there then remain three odd only. Now allowing these three to the time Christ Preached, which was three years, we may then say, That from the beginning of the Babylonish Captivity, when Israel lost their Kingdom, to
the annoyning of the Messiah, or the first visible appearance of Christ their King, was exactly ten times seventy years, which maketh seven hundred, running still upon the Number seven, both in the tens and hundreds. Within which time Matthew makes mention of fourteen Generations to have lived, Matth. 1. 17. Note, That they must make short Generations, that begin the seventy weeks with the first of Cyrus.

Seeing therefore that to pitch upon Darius Longimanus, as he that in his second year set on foot the work of the Temple, doth better then any other opinion agree to the Divine Story, and other Scriptures, as to the time and things fore-going and succeeding the Temple-building, I. do therefore conclude, That that Darius, whom the Greeks call Longimanus, was the Darius under whom the Temple-work was finished.

Another Question now will arise, (which answered, we come to our main Conclusion driven at throughout this Section) viz. What Artaxerxes was that which succeeded Darius Longimanus? for (as I said at first) the Artaxerxes we are now enquiring after must needs be, by the clear circumstances of the text, such a one as did succeed that Darius, which gave life to the building of the Temple.

Now this is confessed on all hands to be that Artaxerxes whom the Greeks call Mnemon, who was next Successor to Longimanus his next, Darius Notthus succeeding Longimanus, and Artaxerxes Mnemon, Darius Notthus.

This Artaxerxes was he that first gave Commission to Ezra, in the seventh year of his reign, to go
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go up to Jerusalem, furnishing him largely with monies, and afterwards to Nehemiah, in the twentieth of his reign, to build Jerusalem; which friendliness of his to God's cause and people went not unrewarded, for he reigned forty three years.

And which I cannot but mention to set it before Rulers, of all the Persian Monarchs, Longimanus and Mnemon, who had been of the most forward in favouring the People of God, and promoting his cause, were blessed of God with length of days beyond any their Predecessors, or Successors in the Empire.

And which is another thing most observable, that by looking over these Histories mine eye hath been cast upon, viz. That so long as any of the Race of Cyrus (who first appeared to own the cause of God) did continue, so long did the Persian Monarchy stand; but under the very first King that was of another Race, viz. Darius Codomannus, or Darius the last, who was (as is affirmed) a stranger to the blood of Cyrus, the whole Monarchy is lost, and translated from the Medes and Persians to the Grecians; So mindful was God of what Cyrus did for his people, that whilst any of his Seed remained, he would not give the Kingdom to another.

Now, besides what hath been said already from the scope of our Discourse since I entred this Section, it is a thing most evident, that Artaxerxes from whom Nehemiah received his Commission, was, yea can be no other than, Artaxerxes Mnemon, because two things are clear in Scripture concerning this Artaxerxes, which can be applied to no other but Mnemon; as,  

T 3
That he reigned many years, two and thirty, Nehemiah mentions, Chap. 13. 6.

That the time of his reign was towards the latter end of the Persian Monarchy, which is clear hence, because Nehemiah, who lived all the time of this Artaxerxes, did afterwards live to see that Generation in which the Monarchy was translated: for he makes particular mention of Iddo the High Priest, who met Alexander the Great at his coming to Jerusalem, and of that Darim under whom the Monarchy was lost, Nehem. 12. 11.

22. Which clearly proves this Artaxerxes must be Mnemon, none of the Monarchs after him reigning so long, as the Scripture itself records him to have done.

Ere I can yet reach our Conclusion, there is one knob in the way to be evin'd.

Obj. If Artaxerxes Mnemon be the Artaxerxes we are to fix upon, from the twentieth of whose reign Daniel's seventy weeks are to be begun, then considering they end with Christ's Passion, Daniel's account will superabound the account of all Historians, who find not so many years as four hundred and ninety between the one time and the other.

Ans. 1. There are not so many over and above in this account, but there are full as many wanting in their account, who begin Daniel's seventy weeks with the Decree of Cyrus; and whether we reckon more or less, the matter is one and the same; yet is the bone there swallowed without tricking, by not a few godly and able men.

2 I answer; In case what I have said as touching the beginning and ending of Daniel's seventy weeks
weeks be truth, and it will not accord with Daniel's Prophecy of the seventy weeks, nor with other Scriptures, to state any other beginning or ending; then of necessity must we either condemn the Holy Ghost for mentioning more years within that time then indeed there are, or Historians of neglect, in not having accounted for so many years as they should; and who shall we? Let God be true, but every man a Liar.

If it be said, But why will I depart from the reports of Human Writers here, when as I made use of them before to measure another time?

Ans. 1. I did not make use of them before, as building any faith upon them, but because I finde the account they have kept of the time to be agreeable to the Scripture account; and so farre I am bound to beleev they have kept accounts aright, not because they say so, but because the Scripture faith so; and this I verily think, that there is sufficient in Scripture to make out this our account, though they (I mean the Heathen Writers) were not; yet withall I am of the minde, that the considering what they say, and laying it to those things that are left us in the Word, may (through the Spirits guidance) be a help to us in things wherein they are in the right, as to the more speedy finding them, and the more easie making them out; yet we holding this as a most constant and infallible rule, That all their reports must be bowed to the Scripture, and not one tittle of Scripture made to bow to them; Upon this Principle therefore, supposing the Heathen Writers to have computed sixty or eighty years from Cyrus...
first to Longimarus second, yet would I reckon seventy, and not regard their reports; and also upon this Principle, because the Scripture hath so clearly determined the beginning and ending of the seventy weeks, I judge I am bound to account as many years betwixt time and time as Daniel doth, though Human Writers will not allow it. This Scripture rule once found determines all the different accounts of times that are left us by Human Writers, and declares whether or no any of them be in the truth, and in case any are, who they are.

But secondly, Should we go to the bare Authority of Man, yet in common reason more credit is to be given to what is recorded by the Greeks as touching the times of the Persian Monarchy, then to what Writers in after times did record, as touching the continuance of the Gracian, and the succeeding years of the Roman until Christ. The reason is, because the Monarchy of the Persians was more stable, and not subject to those strange mutations, (tossing the Ball of the Kingdom from one to another, and back again) which ordinarily cause mistakes in Historians. But who knows any thing of the Gracian Monarchy, knows that it was after Alexanders death a very heap of confusion, through the scuffle that arose betwixt Alexanders Captains, as was the whole World afterwards, when that terrible Beast, the Roman Monarchy, was rising; so that within this time the best of Historians might mistake, and lose many years. If I had not therefore Scripture to back me, yet this would a little help the
cause, why I follow the reports of some, and reject others, because more credit upon a more rational account is to be given to those I follow, then to the other from whom I dissent.

From the whole of my Discourse in this Section my Conclusion is, That Artaxerxes, in the twentieth of whose reign Nehemiah went up to Jerusalem, was Artaxerxes Mnemon.

SEC. 3.

It being clear from what we have said in the foregoing Section, That Artaxerxes Mnemon was the Artaxerxes that gave Commission to Nehemiah, in the twentieth year of his reign, to go up to Jerusalem and build it; The way now lies open for us to compute the years appertaining to this period, which is the first upon account, though in order of handling I have placed it in the cloze of our Discourse, as seeming to me to be in that respect its proper place.

The Question is, What number of years are we to account from Cyrus first, where begins the two thousand three hundred days, till Artaxerxes Mnemon's twentieth (or to speak more properly his one and twentieth) where begins Daniel's seventy weeks?

If the Scripture will help us here, then need we not much regard what Chronologers say; but we may without, and though it bee against them, conclude the full and certain number of years even from Cyrus first till Christ's Passion, for as for the time betwixt Mnemon's twentieth and Christ's Passi-
on, {Daniels seventy weeks are an infallible rule to measure that by; now, if a like Scripture-rule, or a rule equivalent thereunto, whole very matter whereof it is made is the Word, may be found to measure the time betwixt Cyrus first, and Memnon twentieth, then have we the measure of the Sanctuary to mete the time from Cyrus first till our Lord's Passion; this being the only approved and sealed measure, all other measures must be squared by it, not it by them.

The Account the Greeks give us of this time, (which almost all Chronologers adhere unto) I have laid down in my Key, Thes. 45, 46, 47. by which reckoning (but three years being allowed to Cyrus after his taking Babylon) the years are one hundred forty seven.

The reason why I give to Cyrus but three years, when the Greeks allow him thirty, I have also there declared, Thes. 48.

Some more persons then I have there specified did reign in the Persian Monarchy betwixt Cyrus and Artaxerxes Memnon, as betwixt Cambyses and Darius Hystaspes, the Magi reigned seven Months; betwixt Xerxes and Artaxerxes Longimanus, Artabanes reigned seven Months; betwixt Artaxerxes Longimanus, and Darius Notbus, reigned first Xerxes the second two Months, after him Sogdianus seven Months. But the time of the reign of these, as laid down by Chronologers, doth not at all break squares, as to the foregoing number of one hundred forty seven years, for the seven Months of the Magi are reckoned into the last year of Cambyses, to whom, together with the Magi,
Magi, eight years is given, but he alone reigned but seven years and five months, to which Chronologers adde the seven months of the Magi, so giving eight years to Cambyses. So for the rest, Artabanus seven months are included in the last year of Xerxes, whose reign with these seven months added made up but twenty one years. The two months of Xerxes the second, and the seven of Sogdianas are all included in the fortieth and last year of Longimanus, who with these nine months added, reigned forty years.

And for this reason, because these reigned so short a time, no one of them filling up a year, and the time of the reign of each being always included in the reign of his Predecessor, are the Names of these by many left out, and not put into the ordinary Catalogue of the Persian Kings.

But should I lay the bottome of my demonstration here, I should depart from my own rule; I am therefore to enquire what Scripture faith to our Question, and whether that will allow this number of years, yea or no.

As to the Question therefore, first in the general, let us see whether there be any footing in Scripture for so long a time, leaving the set number of years.

Now as to this let it only be minded again which hath been proved already, viz. That it was Seventy years from the first of Cyrus, till the time that the Work of the Second Temple was again set on foot by Darius; here we have (the odde seven years set aside) the half of the time, now for the other seventy seven wee have this to say (the ground
ground of which hath been also laid down before) that Jeshua was High Priest in Darius second year, Ezra 5. 1, 2. but now in Artaxerxes twentieth, Eliashib (Jeshua's Grand-child) was High Priest, Nehem. 3. 1, 20. who also was so aged at Ezra's coming up to Jerusalem, which was thirteen years before Nehemiah, that he had a Son a Priest, Ezra 10. 6. time must be allowed for this change, and to allow seventy seven years is no absurd conclusion. Put the one and the other together, and as many years as one hundred forty seven may well be thought to have passed, betwixt the time of Cyrus Decree, and Nehemiah's Commission.

But it will be said, Although it may be conceived that this time was as long, yet is not what hath been said ground sufficient for a determined time; But now the time we are seeking after must be a determined time, for a few years more or less puts our whole account out of order.

In answer here to, I grant that we have not a determined time of one hundred forty seven years upon any particular sum mentioned in Scripture, but in case we have it upon general Scripture Principles, or the account of any grosse sum, and no particular text so contradicting, but that the time may be judged as long, the proof is good, and proof of this kind is as firm as any other; for if proof by a grosse sum be not admitted, let any (if they can) cast the time how many years Israel abode in Egypt, and after that how many years it was from Jeshua dividing to the twelve Tribes the Land of Canaan by Lot, until the time that the Judges began to bear rule; these times can be coun-
counted no otherways, but only by a grosse summe; if therefore, proof by a grosse summe be denied, the very foundation of all Chronology is razed.

Now I say, though we have not any particular Text that doth ascertain us that this time was exactly a hundred forty and seven years, neither more nor less; yet we have it upon general Scripture principles, and the account of a grosse summe.

My Argument lyesthus, The two thousand three hundred dayes must expire at the same point with the one thousand three hundred thirtyfive. The truth of this is evident beyond denial, from what hath been already said as touching either Prophesie, that Chap. 8. and the other Chap. 11, 12. which determines, First, that the matter and scope of either Prophesie is one and the same. Secondly, that either Prophesie hath one and the same end, both shutting up with the end or final destruction of the fourth Monarchy. This being so, the two thousand three hundred dayes, which bring us to the end of one Prophesie; the one thousand three hundred thirtyfive, which brings us to the end of the other, must necessarily expire at one and the same point.

Hence I conclude,

That having so much of the two thousand three hundred dayes upon firm and particular ground as will make the two thousand three hundred dayes to end with the one thousand three hundred thirtyfive, saving only these one hundred forty seven years, that therefore because they
must end together, and with this allowance will, but without it cannot, must the remaining years run upon the grose summe, and so be counted one hundred forty seven, not a year more or lesse. And this consequence is so natural and necessary, that put case the account of the Greeks were thrown out of the doors, and all that we have said before in our two former Sections and this, proving that the time may well be judged as long, were yet unsaid, yet in case no particular Scripture do necessarily prove this time must be either shorter or longer, I say this alone determines that the years from Cyrus first, to the time of Nehemias Commission, must be one hundred forty seven, not a year more or lesse.

If it be said, But the weight of our Argument lies upon the beginning of the one thousand three hundred thirty five dayes; which should another beginning then that which I have elsewhere stated be found for them, our Conclusion is nothing.

I answer, Whosoever is not satisfied with that beginning we have formerly laid down, but seeks another, must mind these two things; 1 That he so fix the head of the one thousand three hundred thirty five dayes, as that he make them to expire at the same point with the two thousand three hundred. 2 That he also make the one thousand two hundred and ninety, (which ariseth from the same Head with the one thousand three hundred thirty five) to end at the same point with the one thousand two hundred and sixty. If either of these be not done, those manifold Scripture-principles, laid
laid down in my Key, Thes. 17. and Thes. 34. are destroyed. Now he that shall undertake this work, I question not but that after he hath well considered all, he will find it a more easie thing to beleev, then prove.

But secondly, I answer, That the beginning of the one thousand three hundred thirty five dayes with Julian, is the only beginning (setting the Harmony alide) that is consonant to truth. I argue thus. The taking away of the daily sacrifice, and setting up the abomination that maketh desolate, which is the Head of this number, Dan. 11. 11, 12. must be taken either in a litteral sense, as referring to the people of the Jews, or in a spiritual, as referring to the Gentile Saints. That the words should here be understood in a spiritual sense is no way likely to be the mind of Daniel in this place, the reason is clear, because, the promise of a certain time of Deliverance, ver. 1. which was the very thing that put Daniel upon querrying, and drew forth these answers about the time, is made expressly to the Jews, which therefore are twice in that first verse called Daniels People.

The Prince that standeth for the children of thy people -- at that time shall thy people be delivered. Although the Gentile-Saints in Daniel are called the holy people, the understanding people, the people that know their God, the Saints of the most high, &c. yet are they never called thy people; that is a phrase peculiar to the Jews, as chap. 9. 24. chap. 10. 14. chap. 11. 14. and no where applied to the Gentiles. Now whereas the Holy Ghost when hee gives forth that time of deliverance by way of
Promise, which afterwards he measures, useth
this phrase twice together, thy people, thy people, it
clearly denotes, that he is speaking of the Jews, and
that the time of deliverance first promised, afterwards measured, hath a special relation to that
people; so as that no deliverance whatsoever from
Captivity and Bondage, unless it be a deliver-
ance of Natural Jews, can be a fulfilling of this
place. Seeing therefore that the taking away of
the daily Sacrifice in this place must be understood literally, we must apply it to the time when
this was done in part, or in the beginning, or else
to the time when this work was thoroughly per-
fect ed. The partial performance hereof was in
Vespasian's time, when the Jews losing their Tem-
ple, in respect of the outward building, were put
by sacrificing, and could sacrifice no longer, the
place in which all their Sacrifices were to be of-
fered, being now demolished. This is that Christ
points at, Matt. 24. 15. and this was, to speak
properly, rather a Ceasing of the daily Sacrifice,
then a taking it away.

The compleat performance hereof was in Juli-
ans time, when the Jews lost their Temple, not
only in respect of building, but also in respect of
the very being of it, the very foundation being
now removed, and the Temple-ground itself lost
by an Earthquake.

Now the Question is, Whether of the two are we
to chuse for our Head to the one thousand three hun-
dred thirty five days, whether the demolishing of the
Temple-building in Vespasians time, or the utter de-
struction of the Temple being, in Julians?

Ans.
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An{. Not the first, because the deliverance pointed at in the end of this time, being (upon our aforesaid ground) a deliverance of the people of the Jews, the event (considering that the time from that beginning is expired long since) doth necessarily prove it false. And this Argument from the event is firm and good, considering the premises, viz.: That the Jews are here spoken of, and assurance given to Daniel of their deliverance after such a time. If therefore we see the time run out, and that many years, and yet no such thing in accomplishment as the Jews deliverance, we may truly say, some other beginning must be sought; for there can be no error in the Word itself, whatsoever may be in men's interpretations thereof. It necessarily therefore follows, (because the words being to be understood literally, as pointing to the Jewish people, and the place of their Worship, we have no other beginning) that we should begin with the second, viz. The completing of this work of Temple-desolation, which fell out in the time of Julian. So that to begin the one thousand three hundred thirty five days with Julian, hath more approbation from Scripture (waving our Harmony) than any other opinion.

Now the one thousand three hundred thirty five days being begun there, our former Argument for one hundred forty seven years between the coming out of Babylon, and Nehemiah's time, will appear good upon the gross sum: for, by this allowance, the two thousand three hundred days will, without it cannot, and (as yet they must) with the one thousand three hundred thirty five.
That the Greeks, and most Chronologers that follow their accounts, do compute the same number of years from the beginning of Cyrus first, until the end of Artaxerxes Mnemon's twentieth, cannot be looked upon as an Argument against us; but if anything, it is rather an Argument for us; Let us not, because every man is a Lyar, make the Word of God (which in this case speaks enough for us, though men had said nothing) a Lyar too. If the Devil should speak agreeable to this rule, so farre there is truth in him; but if Angels speak against it, it is because there is no truth in them.

Obj. But Daniel, chap. 11. 1, 2. reckons but four Kings, after Cyrus, to have reigned in the whole Persian Monarchy, until the time that the Monarchy was translated to the Greeks. And if so, then may not this time, which contains not the whole, but a part of the time of that Monarchy, be counted so long as one hundred forty seven years.

Ans. Should I grant the thing, yet is it not impossible; for if but four reigned, if we allow to the reign of each fifty years (which is nothing miraculous) the three first alone will exceed our time, and the others reign added will go as farre as any conceive the Persian Monarchy did last. They that urge this, must prove from Scripture, that these did not reign so long, or they do nothing against our former Arguments, which do strongly infer, (till the contrary be proved) that if betwixt Cyrus and Alexander, but four did reign, they must reign so long.

But secondly, I do not grant the thing, nor see the
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the least shew of reason from the text to recede from the account of the Greeks, but rather to adhere to them.

The Question is, whether the fourth King there spoken of be the last King of the Persian Monarchy, yes or no?

Ans. Daniel saith not so, nor will his words rightly interpreted infer so much. The words in Daniel, (which were spoken in the third year of Cyrus, as Daniel to. 1.) are only these, Behold, these shall stand up yet, (i.e. succeeding Cyrus, who was present King when this was spoken) three Kings in Persia, and the fourth (i.e. the King that should succeed these three) shall be farre richer than they all, and by his strength, through his riches, he shall stir up all against the Realm of Gracia.

Here is not a word that the fourth should bee the last, but that the fourth should be richer than all the other, and by his strength, through his riches, stir up all against the Realm of Gracia. Now how exactly doth this answer to what is recorded by the Greek Historians? if we count the Government of the Magi to be one of the three first Kings that succeeded Cyrus; for though they continued in the Government but a little while, for which cause some (as I have said) confound their reign with the reign of Cambyses; yet they being a Head distinct, the Scripture, which speaks of things distinctly, and as they are, account them so, not regarding their short continuance.

Now I say, the Magi being reckoned one of these three, how partly do Daniel's words answer to the reports of the Greeks? for Cyrus they reckon
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reckon as the first, and the founder of the Persian Monarchy; after him they reckon, 1 Cambyses, 2 The Magi, 3 Darius Hystaspes. Here are the three standing up after Cyrus, the fourth they mention (who succeeded Darius Hystaspes) is Xerxes the Great, who is famously known in the stories of those ancient Writers, for two things.

1. For his Riches, which his Father Darius Hystaspes had hoarded up, and that in so great abundance, that he was called the Hoorder of the Kingdom.

2. For his notable expedition against Greece, carrying with him no less than a Million of Soldiers (some reckon them very many more, almost two Millions) which were transported over the Sea, with upwards of five thousand Gallies, and other Vessels. See Sir Walter Rawleighs History of the World, Lib. 3. Cap. 6. Sect. 1. These two things which Xerxes (who according to the Greeks was the fourth King after Cyrus) was so famous for, are the very things pointed at by Daniel, as 1. That the fourth King should be farre richer than they all, i.e. than all his Predecessors. 2. That by his strength, through his riches, hee should stir up all against the Realm of Grecia.

Obj. But though Daniel doth not call the fourth King after Cyrus, the last of the Persian Monarchy, yet the following words infer little lesse; for the very next that we read of after this fourth King, is Alexander the Great, vers. 3. And a mighty King shall stand up, that shall rule with great Dominion, and do according to his will. These words can be understood of none but Alexander the Great, as the follow-
following verse makes appear. And when he shall stand up, his Kingdom shall be broken, (so was Alexander by his sudden death) and shall be divided towards the four Winds of Heaven, and not to his posterity; (thus was Alexander, who dying without issue, his Kingdom was divided between his four chief Captains) nor according to his Dominion which he ruled, i.e. none of Alexander's Captains were so potent as he; which words agree exactly to those, Dan. 8. ver. 8, 21, 22. where we have the very same description of Alexander.

Ans. I grant it, that Alexander is here meant, yet doth it not therefore follow that the fourth King before mentioned must be the last of the Persian Monarchy, unless it could be proved, that Daniel's enumeration of Kings, respects the whole Monarchy of the Persians, so as not one King more reigned in that Monarchy than is there mentioned, which I am sure cannot be done from Scripture. The story of Ezra will not at all help it, till they have proved the same of that also, viz. That it is a perfect Chronicle, and hath given us a perfect enumeration of the Persian Monarchs; which is a thing (as I have formerly observed) not in the least intended in those Books.

But rather to put the matter out of all doubt, the businesse in Daniel lyeth thus. The Holy Ghost is treating, not of particular Kings, but of Monarchies in generall; and therefore it is no part of his scope to tell us how many Kings did reign in this or that Monarchy, (which is not a thing observed in any of the Kingdoms afterwards spoken of in this Chapter, therefore should not be urged as any part..."
part of the scope here, but his drift is to shew us;

1. How many Monarchies, from that time untill the time of the end, should bee in the world.

2. What remarkable changes should be in these Monarchies themselves, not as to the reign of particular Kings, but as to the alteration of Governments.

3. What more noted things should be done in the time of these Monarchies, by either of them, as considered under this or that Government, either against Gods people that were, the Jews; or Gods people that are, the Gentiles; or against both in the time of the end, or the evening of the Worlds, or worldly Kingdoms day; or what more remarkable rents, occasioning tearfull Civil broyls, Commotions, Divisions, &c. should befall this or that Monarchy within the time of its particular continuance.

And lastly, Whence, or upon what occasion, the translation of Monarchies from one people to another (as from the Medes and Persians to the Greeks, from them to the Romans, and from them the translation of the Kingdom and Dominion, and greatness of the Kingdom under the whole Heaven, into the hands of another people, viz. The Saints of the most High, who till this day had always and ever been crushed, by and under these Monarchies) should arise. In these things lies the main scope of the Holy Ghost, who doth not in the least drive at such a thing, as to tell us what particular Kings succeeded one another in this or that Monarchy, but only names things of this nature.
nature so far as they serve the main scope, but no further.

Now observe, the thing the Holy Ghost would have us learn (as seems to me) from the second and third verses of this Chapter, is this; As to take notice of such a Monarchy as was that of the Persians, so more especially to mind the cause, and the occasion of the translation of this Monarchy from the Persians to the Græcians, and the time when this cause should be given, and the ground of a Quarrel betwixt these two Nations laid. Now to make out this, he tells us, how that after Cyrus three Kings should arise in Persia, and a fourth after them, which fourth should be very rich, and strong, and through the greatness of his strength and riches, should stir up all against the Realm of Græcia. This (as I have before said) was most exactly to a tittle fulfilled in Xerxes the Great, who was the fourth King after Cyrus in the Persian Monarchy; exceeding all his Predecessors in power and riches, and with all his power invades the Realm of Græcia. Here now is the ground of an inveterate hatred and quarrel laid betwixt these two Nations, which afterwards occasioned the translation of the Monarchy; for the Greeks, though at present they maintained their own Cause, and did worst their potent Enemie, yet was this work (as Histories record) chiefly done by Sea, where (though they were but a handful to the other, yet being of the two the more skilful in Sea-affairs, and the more resolute in this kind of fight, having with all the better ships) in the great Battle of Salamis they gained the day; yet when this was done, though
hereby they delivered themselves, were they not so potent by Land as to invade their enemy. But many years after, when that valiant Commander, Alexander the Great (who durst attempt any thing) arose in Greece, then the bad blood begotten by this invasion (though it were more than a Generation or two before) began to work, and the old grudge is remembred; and Alexander, in way of revenge of the old Quarrel, invades the Persians, by which invasion the Monarchy is translated from the Persians to the Grecians. So that the Holy Ghost takes notice of the Kings reigning in Persia, only so farre as serves his turn, viz. To point out the time when the groundwork of that irreconcilable quarrel between the Persians and the Grecians should be laid, which would in time prove the overthrow and translation of the Monarchy, as it then was in the hands of the Persians. This was done by Xerxes invasion of Greece, which quarrel afterwards is taken up by Alexander, who to revenge the injury done to his Country (though long before) by the Persians, invades them, overthrows their Power, wrests the Monarchy out of their hands.

This is the true meaning of the place, without forcing or squeezing the text. Now consider the thing, and what can more punctually agree to the Heathen stories than doth this of Daniel? to which, if we lay what wee have said before, as touching the time betwixt the return from the Captivity, and Nehemiah's days, from both we may conclude, That these ancient Writers, (though Heathens) have given us a true account of
of the Persian Monarchy, both as touching the persons that reigned, and the time how long.

And notwithstanding the Jewish Writers, as Josephus, Philo, &c. vary from the Greeks, yet are not their reports to be credited so much as the reports of the Greeks; and the reason is, because we have much more ground to suspect them of partiality, than the other; for Josephus, Philo, &c. might out of design mention such kings only as they finde in Ezra, because, besides the misunderstanding this place of Daniel, they might have such a conceit that Ezra's book was a perfect Chronicle, and therefore in naming more, should cross not this only, but that also; and also, being Jews, might scorn to take a relation from the Gentiles, whom they esteemed Liars, and accursed. But now the Greeks had no temptation of this nature before them, which might move them out of meer design to be silent as touching any Kings that were, or tell us of Kings that were not. Nay, how can we readily think they should so do, when as they do not only record persons but their acts, of which many are things known, and famous? Yea further, whereas the History-Writers themselves, living at sundry times of the Persian Monarchy, did each mention the King that reigned whilst he lived, as Herodotus mentions Xerxes, Thucydides, Artaxerxes Longimanus; Xenophon, Darius Nothw, Artaxerxes Mæmon, &c. Now is it likely they would tell such lies in the very face of the times they lived in, as to endeavour to make people believe such and such Kings reigned over them, when every childe knew the contrary?
Let us not Censure even Heathens beyond the rules of Reason, nor, because we are sick of their reports, spew out the truth of the Scripture with them.

This Objection therefore doth not so offend us, but that we may, notwithstanding it, safely and truly conclude; That the number of years from Cyrus first, to Artaxerxes Mnemon's twentieth (taking in each current year) are one hundred forty seven.

S E C T. 4.

Having found out the true and certain Number of years from Cyrus first, unto the year of Christ's Passion, we are now to run the remaining years of the two thousand three hundred, upon our Christian Epoch, or that account which is commonly called the Year of the Lord.

Here I must nakedly confess my self to bee short of a clear Scripture-rule, to ascertain us how many years have passed since the time of Christ's Passion. And this I may say, it is a thing impossible (considering all Scripture Records did cease suddenly after) that such a rule should be produced by any, as yet; though withall I am of the minde, that a little time will furnish us with a clear Scripture-rule (all the accounts of men being set aside) to measure the years of the World by, and that from the day of the Creation, until Christ's second coming. And lest this should seem a Paradox, I explain my self thus; That I conceive the Scripture hath determined the whole of this time, either by particular sums,
or grosse sums; now concerning every grosse sum this rule is to be observed, That the ending of this or that grosse sum (where the Scripture hath left us no other rule but only the grosse sum) can never be apprehended by a Divine Faith, but only in the accomplishment of that thing the grosse sum points at. When the thing is in being, then we may (though there were no account of mans in the World) say, now so many years are past; but before it is in being, though wee know the true beginning of the grosse sum, yet can we have only a Human Faith as concerning its end, i.e. to say, at such or such a time the thing pointed at by the grosse sum will have its accomplishment. Now for so much as concerns the time from the Creation untill the ending of the seventy years of the Captivity, we have it all in Scripture, partly upon particular sums, partly such grosse sums, whose ends being already pasted, they are in that respect as clear and demonstrative as any particular sum; but for the time since, it runs wholly upon the grosse sum, which grosse sum is this wonderfull Number of two thousand three hundred years. Now observe, although we have ground (and that from the necessary concurrency of each Number in their end, so tarre as the fixation of the Head of the one thousand three hundred thirty five with Julians Act, is Scripture-proof) to conclude, that at the time when Julian set the Jews to re-edifie their Temple, so many years of the two thousand three hundred were run out, as that the remaining years at that day were only one thousand three hundred thirty five, yet can wee
not upon Scripture-ground descend lower, until we shall see the Jews beginning to stir.

When this thing shall be visible, then may we, because Daniel hath expressly determined this to be forty-five years before the ending of the one thousand three hundred and thirty-five, or the two thousand three hundred days, upon Scripture-ground also determine, That now so many of the two thousand three hundred years are expired, as that the years which remain are only forty-five. This therefore would bring light into the whole, and, did we see their stirring, it would be no difficult thing to measure by an infallible rule the years of the world, from the Creation until Christ's second coming, (which speaks much for the perfection of the Scriptures, viz. That they alone, without any help of man (could we but patiently wait for the times of manifestation) are strongly able to perfect every of their accounts) but, till the set times of manifestation, it cannot infallibly be; for taking it for granted, That we have upon Scripture-account the Heads of Daniel's one thousand two hundred and ninety, or John's one thousand two hundred and sixty years, i.e. that the one and the other must begin at such and such a year; yet must we (till we see the things in accomplishment, that each Number points at) trust Human Records as to this, viz. That so many years from the beginning of the one or the other Number, until this day, are run out: This I say, till we see the accomplishment of things, can never be known but by the accounts of men; but when once we see things in accomplishment, then suppose men had kept...
kept no account at all, yet may we determine as well without them as with them; and all Conclusions then being founded upon pure Scripture, will be infallible.

Obj. But it may be said, Perhaps when these things pointed at by these Numbers shall come to be in accomplishment, it will be so darkly, as that we shall not be able to discern it.

Ans. Not so; for observe it, those actions which have been the concluding-points of grosse sums, God did never in Old Testament-times bring forth in obscurity, but clearly and manifestly, so that his people could see the action, and the end of the set time together; much lesse therefore should we expect it in New Testament-times, in which all things are more clear. It is therefore sufficient to call into question the Head of any Number whatsoever, in case we see the whole of the time run out, and yet the thing in accomplishment so dark, as that wee cannot tell whether it be fulfilled or no. God never dealt thus by his people in times of Old, when light was lesse, therefore we are not to think he will deal thus by them in Gospel-times, when light is greater. Most surely, when Gods times are run out, his very works will be so manifest, that reason shall finde no room for to object; Divine actions will then silence reasoning.

I do therefore conclude, That although unto the beginning of the one thousand three hundred thirty five days, our rule for the measuring of the two thousand three hundred is clear from Scripture upon the fore-going Principle,
that these two Numbers end together, and there-
fore wherefover wee begin the one thousand
three hundred thirty five days, must wee conclude,
that with that time or year, whatsoever it be, must
of necessity be run out exactly nine hundred sixty
five of Daniell's two thousand three hundred years;
for otherwise the years remaining of the two thou-
sand three hundred will bee more or lesse then
one thousand three hundred thirty five; and
if so, then cannot the two thousand three hundred,
and the one thousand three hundred thirty five, end
together; yet as to the time since, 'till we see the
Jews stirring, we cannot by any Scripture-rule de-
termine how many years have passed from that
time to this.

Here therefore I freely confess, wee are (and
must be till we see things in accomplishment ) at a
loss, as to our certain and infallible rule.

We may say, That it is a thing very probable,
(and my reason for it I shall give by and by ) that
our Christian Epoch (more especially within this
time ) hath given us a true account, and neither
lost nor gained years; but to conclude the thing
absolutely, because the testimony, though ever to
ture, is but Human, we may not.

Though therefore I determine upon a particu-
lar year, yet not so absolutely, but that I do con-
fpess, That in case men in their accounts of that
time, which at present to us is undetermined by
Scripture, have lost or gained years; by so much
will things in accomplishment fall either sooner or
later than the year I have fixed upon.

Now, though I will not here take upon me to
deter-
determine (as judging the thing upon a pure Scripture-account indeterminable) whether Scottigers account of the Year of our Lord, or the vulgar account be the true (only adde, That should the first, which fixeth the day of Christ's Birth two years higher than the vulgar account, be the truth, then the one thousand two hundred & sixty days, the one thousand two hundred & ninety, do end with the end of the present year, one thousand six hundred fifty four; but if the last, viz. the vulgar have the truth in it, then do they end with the end of the year, one thousand six hundred fifty six, the year I have always hitherto pitch-ed upon for the Witness.\textit{Rise, Jews shining, \\textit{Rise,}} though I confess I am in a great doubt, which we are to hold to, but less than twelve Months will untie this knot, and unriddle this Mystery; yet that neither account, though they vary two years as to their beginning, have since upon their reck-oning either lost or gained years, seems to me a probable truth upon our fore-going Principle, viz. of the concurrence of the two thousand three hundred, and the one thousand three hundred thirty five days, in their end. For supposing some miscarriage may have crept into either of these, or rather both. (for, setting aside their small difference as touching the beginning, they both, as to number of years since Christ, I speak the very same thing) in all likelihood the miscarriage must bee within the time of the first three hundred years; for since that time Christian Religion hath been the Religion of a principal part of the World, and hath always gone upon a publick date; but now
now in case any miscarriage were in that time, then seeing we must after once Daniel's one thousand three hundred thirty five years are begun, allow the like number of years (viz. one thousand three hundred thirty five) of the two thousand three hundred, to it, that these two by this allowance may concur in one end; it will follow, that so many years over or under as the miscarriage hath been, so many years, by that time we have counted the years of the two thousand three hundred before Christ's Passion, and the years of the two thousand three hundred which follow the beginning of the one thousand three hundred thirty five, will be found within this time (viz. between Christ's Passion, and the beginning of the one thousand three hundred thirty five years) over or under the general sum of two thousand three hundred; for if the years within this time have been counted more than they should, then will the total sum of the years be more upon account of the whole time put together, than two thousand three hundred; if lesser, then lesser; so that the two thousand three hundred must by this means either be stretched or crooked, neither of which must be; for this, two thousand three hundred, is of all, the most exquisite and perfect rule to measure times by, it being the very Date that Heaven hath set upon all worldly Kingdoms, the account that the wonderfull Numberer of times and seasons hath left us. It therefore being a thing Divine, determines of all accounts that are Human, but suffers it self to be determined by none.
This Harmony therefore of the two thousand three hundred years, and the one thousand three hundred thirty five in their end, as it doth determine the truth of all our account till Julian, viz. That we must of necessity reckon nine hundred sixty five years, of the two thousand three hundred, to be expired at the time of Julians Act, not a year more or lesse, for if upwards of nine hundred sixty five years were expired before Julian, then would there not be one thousand three hundred thirty five remaining; if lesse, then more, either of which destroys the harmony: So likewise doth it determine, that in all probability our Christian Epock hath neither lost nor gained years from that time to this day, because if any where it had lost or gained years, it is likely it should be within the first three hundred years; but there it did not, therefore much more unlikely that since, (when Christian Religion hath been more famous, and gone upon the publique Date of the greatest Empire in the World) it should have lost or gained any.

Having thus made good the whole of our account, there is nothing now remaining but that we cast it up, to the end we may see where, or with what year Daniels two thousand three hundred years expire.

For the better doing hereof I shall divide the whole into Six Periods.

1. Period, Contains the number of years from the beginning of Cyrus first, unto the end of Arsatxes Mennons twentieth, (note, That the

X

twenti-
twentieth year of Cyrus, though Nebuchadnezzar received his Commission within that year, yet being the current year, is to be reckoned into this Period; the same rule is also to be observed in all the following Periods) the years of this Period are one hundred forty seven.

2 Period, From the end of Artaxerxes Memnon twentieth year, unto the end of the thirty fourth year of our Lord; The years of this Period are (the four last of Daniel's four hundred and ninety being cut off, for our Reasons laid down in opening Daniel's seventy weeks) four hundred eighty six.

3 Period, From the end of the thirty fourth year of our Lord, until the end of the year three hundred sixty six; the years of this Period are three hundred thirty two.

These three first Periods contain years, nine hundred sixty five.

4 Period, From the end of the year three hundred sixty six, until the end of the year three hundred ninety six; the years of this Period are thirty.

5 Period, From the end of the year three hundred ninety six, to the end of the year one thousand six hundred fifty six; the years of this Period are one thousand two hundred and sixty.

6 Period, From the end of the year one thousand six hundred fifty six, to the end of the year one thousand seven hundred and one; the years of this Period are forty five.

These three last Periods contain of years, one thousand three hundred thirty five.
The years of the three first, and the three last
Periods put together, make up exactly 2300.

The sum of all is, That Christ's Personal Ap-
pearance,
Israel's compleat Redemption,
The final overthrow of \( \text{Beast} \),
The binding of the Dragon,
The total dissolution of the Fourth Mo-
narchy,
The beginning of the one thousand years reign
of Christ and the Saints, ( all which things are
concurrent ) falls to be, Anno Dom. one thou-
sand seven hundred and one, about forty seven,
or forty eight years hence.

Yet whether or no Jesus Christ, who tells us,
that for the Elects sake these days ( that is, the
days of the sore trouble which will befall the
Jews more especially towards the ending-time
of the last forty five years ) shall be shortened,
may not appear some years sooner, and so cut
short this determined time, is a question too
hard for mee to decide; but the appearance
of our blessed Lord, the great God, and our
Saviour Jesus Christ, will put an end to this,
and all other Controversies. When we shall see
no more ( as all "our fight now is ") through a
Glaffe darkly, but face to face : Now wee know
in part, but then shall we know perfectly, even as
we are known.

In faith of which blessed day let us rejoice,
in expectation of it let us always be found waiting and watching. That whenever our Lord cometh, whether at even, or at midnight, or at the Cock-crowing, or in the morning, he may not, coming suddenly, finde us sleeping. And what I say unto you, I say unto all, watch, Mark 13. 37. So enable us Lord to do, and come O Lord Jesus, come quickly. Amen, Amen.
The Calculation of Daniels 2300 Years, showing their beginning, their end, and the Harmony of other Mystical Numbers with this.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The several Periods</th>
<th>The years of each Period</th>
<th>The Harmony of other mystical Numbers</th>
<th>The total Sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. From Cyrus first to Artax.</td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. From Artax, 20. to Christ's Passion, A.D. 34</td>
<td>486</td>
<td></td>
<td>633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. From Christ's Passion to Julian's act, A.D. 366.</td>
<td>332</td>
<td></td>
<td>965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. From Julian's act to Beasts Rise, A.D. 3969</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>With the beginning of this Period begins Daniels 1290, 1335 years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. From Beasts Rise to the end of his reign, A.D. 1656.</td>
<td>1260</td>
<td>John 1260 years begin &amp; end this Period.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. From the end of Beasts reign, to the end of the Fourth Monarchy, A.D. 1701.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Concurrent with the end of this Period is the end of Dan. 1290 days, the 30 of the former Period added to the 1260 of this, making up that number. Thus Dan. 1290. and John 1260. concur in their end.</td>
<td>2255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concurrent with the end of this Period is the end of Dan. 1335 years, the 45 years of this Period added to the 1290. of the two former, making up that number. Thus the 1335. & the 2300. concur likewise in their end.
A General Rule for the right understanding of Prophecies, together with a more full opening the great Mystery of Daniel's little Horn.

It is a most certain truth, that every Prophecy left us in the Word of God, hath in itself sufficient Characters to lead us, by comparing the Characters of it with the mind of God in other Prophecies, to the knowledge of the substance of that truth that is in it held forth; for otherwise the word should be imperfect, and not able to expound it self.

These Characters are the Keys of this or that Prophecy, which when found, it will be easy to unlock it; but if these be missed, all men's endeavours in opening Prophecies will be in vain, and their labours lost.

These Keys, in some Prophecies where a man can hardly go any way but one, are quickly and with ease found; but in others, where by reason of the various turnings and windings there seem to be as many ways to go in as there are words, the finding of them is a thing most hard; and the
Searcher, in case he have not a better guide than himself, shall never finde them.

The knowledge of the true Keys of any Prophecies from Counterfeit ones, ariseth from the fitness of the Keys to the Wards of the Lock, i.e. to the several parts of the Prophecy itself; and all other Prophecies concurrent with it; for this is certain, that if the true Key be found, it will open whatsoever lyes within that Prophecy, or any other that hath dependence upon it. Hence, those Keys how neatlysoever they may be wrought, which will open but a part or a Prophecy, but not the whole, are not the true Keys, but counterfeit.

Two things there are that are absolutely destructive to the finding of these Keys.

1. An Affection to any pre-conceived opinion that may bee in a man, as touching this or that Prophecy, before yet hee hath found the certain Key thereof. So farre as any such thing is in any, instead of seeking the true key, hee will make a key, and form it to his own opinion.

2. A founding Conclusions (which should all bee built upon manifest demonstrations taken from the naked Letter of the Text, and no other foundation) upon Allegories, i.e. because many things in this or that Prophecy seeme fairly to allude to such or such an event, therefore must that event needs be the meaning of the Prophecy.

This is the most fallible way of interpreting Prophecies of all other; for how easie a thing is it, considering that some Prophecies (as Daniel for instance,
instance) lead us through many Ages, as many as amount to no less than two thousand years and upwards, that within so long a time a man should finde more occurrences than one that will in many things agree to what is fore-told in such or such a Prophecy?

Hence come those innumerable mistakes of Expositors, both of former, later, and present times also, they run (without a due respect to the indubitable Characters of the text) the meaning of this or that Prophecy, upon this or the other likely event, and so, as many likely events as mens reading or wits can help them to, so many interpretations shall we have of the Prophecy. And this evil hath crept in, by that in some sense good, but as it is ordinarily understood and made use of, greatly abused Saying, viz. That the best Interpreter of Prophecies is the event.

It is a most dangerous thing therefore to run from the naked Letter of the text, when the meaning of any Prophecy is sought after, to Allegorical flourishes, because where the Letter is let aside, and the Allegory made the rule of interpretation, there can be no certainty of truth, in regard Allegorical interpretations are as various as mens inventions.

Now how a man shall ever bee able to judge of truth in variety, in case he have not some other rule to walk by than that which produceth this variety, I cannot tell.

Although therefore it is confessed, that many phrases
phrases in this or the other Prophecy do require a Spiritual meaning to be put upon them; yet (I say) the Characters themselves, by which this or that Prophecy, as to scope and time, is distinguished from all others, are ever to be looked for in the naked letter of the Text, which is the only standing and fixed rule, and not in any Mystical or Spiritual interpretations, which are as variable and uncertain as mens imaginations; and in case these general Characters which are deducible only from the letter, are once found, it will be then a thing more easy to give a right sense of particular Phrases, and to determine concerning them, in which we are to cleave to the literal, in which to seek a Spiritual interpretation.

For an example, I shall pitch upon Daniels little Horn, which as it is one of the most famous Prophecies in all the Scripture; so is there not any one (I mean that is so considerable) that hath fallen under more mis-interpretations then it; which mistakes are multiplied daily through that earnest inquiry that by the Saints of this Generation is made after the mind of Daniel; and though it may be thought, enough as to it hath been already laid in the precedent Discourse, yet because some through weakness cannot, others byassed with some particular affection to this, or the other opinion, will not apply those things as they ought to be applied, I thought it not unmeet to take up this Prophecy here again, and make it the example of my Rule.

Now the sure and certain Characters of this little Horn, which are deducible from the letter of the
the text, and which (all put together) cannot be
made agree to any opinion but only that which is
the truth, are such as these.

1 CHARACTER, The Kingdom of the little
Horn must be in the latter days; the reason is, be-
cause the extreme and utmost part of Nebuchadnezz-
zars great Image, viz. the feet and toes, Dan. 2. 41,
42, 43, are the same with the little Horn, Chap. 7.
This needs no proving, because it is universally
granted, whatsoever interpretation is by any put
upon the little Horn, carries along with it this
concession, That the little Horns Kingdom, cha. 7.
and the feet and toes of Nebuchadnezzars Image,
chap. 2, are the same, at leastwise in respect of
time. Now the feet and toes of Nebuchadnezzars
Image falls within the later days; the reason is,
because the Image it self brings us down to the lat-
ter days, vers. 28. which cannot be, in case the
feet and toes which are the extreme and utmost
part thereof, were not to be extended as farre as
the latter days.

To whose Kingdom this phrase is most pro-
perly appliable, the Apostles use of the same
phrase, 1 Tim. 4. 1, 2, 3. doth clearly teach us.

2 CHARACTER, This Kingdom of the lit-
tle Horn must necessarily appertain to the Roman
Monarchy.

That it cannot belong to the Gracian is clear, be-
cause the Gracian Monarchy, whether we con-
der it as united under Alexander, or as in its four-
fold division afterwards, is comprehended under
the third Beast, Dan. 7. 6. but now the Kingdom
of the little Horn belongs not to the third Beast,
The great Mystery of Part 3

for the Little Horn ariseth among, the ten Horns of the fourth, vers. 8.

That it cannot be any power distinct from, and succeeding the Roman Monarchy, is also clear.

1 Because no place in Daniel or elsewhere doth so much as once countenance any such opinion as this, viz. That there should be any worldly Government succeeding the Roman Monarchy. Nay, let me say, the Scripture is clear against such a Notion, for it is manifest, Dan. 7. 12, 13, 14. Revel. 19. 11, 12. compared with vers. 19, 20. That the destruction of the Beast, (i.e. the Roman Monarchy as under Antichrist) is upon the appearance of Christ; if so, where shall we then finde room for the Government of the little Horn to succeed the Roman Monarchy?

2 Because the Beast is slain, his body destroyed, and given to the burning flame: and that for the blasphemies of the little Horn, Dan. 7. 11. This Beast (I say) can be no other but the fourth and last Beast, vers. 7. which Beast is the Roman Monarchy.

Hence I gather two things.

1 That the government of the little Horn cannot be a Government distinct from the Roman Monarchy, a thing the Roman Monarchy hath nothing to do with; for then, why is the Roman Monarchy punished for the blasphemies of the little Horn?

2 That the Government of the little Horn cannot be a government succeeding the Roman Monarchy; for it is most clear from the words, That the fourth Beasts Kingdom is in being, and that at the time
time the little Horn blasphemies. Now it would be improper to say, That the little Horns Government succeeds the Fourth Monarchy, and yet that Monarchy still in being, even in the time of the little Horns Dominion.

3 Because if the little Horns Kingdom, or Government, succeed the Roman Monarchy, then have we in Daniel five Monarchies preceding the Kingdom of Christ and his Saints, viz.

1 The Monarchy of the Babylonians.
2 Of the Medes and Persians.
3 Of the Grecians.
4 Of the Romans.
5 The Monarchy or Government of the little Horn. If so, then must not Christs Kingdom be called the Fifth Monarchy, but the Sixth.

If therefore the little Horn can neither belong to the Grecian Monarchy, nor succeed the Roman, then must the same of necessity appertain to the Roman Monarchy.

3 CHARACTER, The Little Horn must be a power equivalent to the whole body of the Fourth Monarchy. This is clear, Dan. 2. which Prophecy considers the Fourth Kingdom. 1 As an Iron Kingdom, vers. 40. 2 As a Kingdom of Iron and Clay, vers. 41, 42, 43. yet both but one Kingdom, and therefore that which is called the Fourth Kingdom, vers. 40. is called the Kingdom, vers. 41, 42. shewing us, That the Holy Ghost was still speaking of one and the same Kingdom, for otherwise he would for distinction sake have called the feet of Iron and Clay another Kingdom, but calling it the Kingdom, it hath a mani-
nisset reference to that Kingdom he had mentioned last, viz. the Fourth, which Kingdom is called an Iron Kingdom, to set forth the state before Antichrist came in, a Kingdom of Iron and Clay, to set forth the state afterwards.

They that would see more reason hereof, may consult with our fore-going Discourse.

4 CHARACTER. The little Horn signifies such a power as consists of ten parts, which ten parts are so many Kings, not succeeding in one and the same Kingdom, but reigning in a Kingdom divided into ten parts. This appears Dan. 2. 41, 42, 43, 44. for the Power here mentioned (which is the same with the little Horn, Chap. 7.) consists of ten toes, vers. 42. which toes are called Kings, vers. 44. In the days of these Kings shall the God of Heaven set up a Kingdom. which words cannot have relation to all the Four Monarchies; for the God of Heaven set up no Kingdom, no not in a Spiritual sense, in the time of any of the Four, but the last only; why should it then be said, these Kings in the plural number? if not to give us to understand,

1 That the ten toes here spoken of are to be understood of so many Kings.

2 That the Kingdom of the Stone should begin, and that before the Roman Monarchy, as consisting of ten Kingdoms, should be ruined; for it is the Kingdom of the Stone that smites the feet and toes, and breaks them to pieces.

Again observe, That these Kings are not to be understood of so many Kings reigning successively in one and the same Kingdom, but must of Kings
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Kings reigning contemporary in so many distinct Kingdoms, which Kingdoms (though distinct in themselves, yet) do all meet in one common Head, as the toes do all meet in the feet. This is evidenced, not only by the distinction of the toes in themselves, but also by the division of the fourth or grand Kingdom among them, so as that no one hath the whole, but one hath this part, another that, therefore it is said to be divided, vers. 41. And also by their endeavour to mingle themselves, thereby to form themselves again (if it might be) into one entire Kingdom, vers. 43. an Argument that they cannot be Kings succeeding each other, but must be contemporary. To whom, or to what power this Character of ten Kings agreeth, see Rev. 17. 11, 12, 13, &c.

5 CHARACTER. The little Horn is a Power of long continuance; which is clear,

1. From the many and great things attributed to the little Horn, Chap. 7. 20, 21, &c. Chap. 8. 10, 11, 12, 24, 25. but chiefly, Chap. 11. vers. 21 to 40. which things cannot be performed in one, no not in many ages.

2. From sundry Phrases and expressions that the Holy Ghost useth in description of him, Chap. 7. 25. he shall wear out the Saints of the most High, which Phrase plainly imports length of time; a short suffering, though ever so bitter, cannot properly be said to wear out the Patient, but an affliction is said to wear out a man when it is heavy and long. So Chap. 11. 33. They that understand among the people shall instruct many, yet they shall fall by the Sword, and by flame, by Captivity, and by spoil many days;
days; noting a long time, vers. 35. And some of
them of understanding shall fall to try them—even to
the time of the end, because it is yet for a time ap-
pointed; which words clearly hold forth, That the
end is not presently to be expected, when this lit-
tle Horn shall begin to rage, but rather it is to be
looked upon to be at some distance, therefore these
words are brought in together with the little
Horn's rage, the end is yet for a time appointed; as
to say, Do not look for the end presently, no;
this suffering must be both sharp and long also.

6 And last CHARACTER, The little Horn
must be understood of such a Person, State, or Power,
unto whom the Characters Daniel in his Four Pro-
phesies hath left us, will agree; 1 Universally.
2 In a more eminent manner than to any other Per-
son, State, or Power that ever hath been in the
world.

This Character, though it is not so properly
built upon the express Letter of the text, as are
the fore-going, yet is it founded upon right rea-
son, consistent with the letter of the text. For
observe, the agreement of the Characters of the
little Horn to the Thing, Person, or Power sign-
ified by it, must be,

1 Universal, for otherwise we irreverently,
and blasphemously charge the Holy Ghost with
multiplying Characters ignorantly, and in vain,
in case but one Character be unappliable to the
thing characterized.

2 They must agree in a more eminent manner
to that thing, whatsoever it be, that is signified by
the Little Horn, than to any other thing; the reason
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is, because whatsoever is spoken of as done by the Little Horn, he is spoken of as doing that thing by way of eminency; *ie.* so, and in such manner, as never any other did.

He is a Blasphemer by way of eminency; for he speaks great words against the most High himself, Dan. 7. 25. Marvellous things against the God of gods, Chap. 11. 36. Magnifies himself to the Prince of the Host, Chap. 8. 11: *ie.* makes himself equal with Christ.

An Idolater by way of eminency; for he honours a God whom his fathers knew not, Chap. 11. 38. a strange God, not acknowledged by any before him; vers. 39.

An Oppressor by way of eminency; for he changeth Times and Laws, Dan. 7. 25. divides the Land for gain, Dan. 11. 39 invades (not by force of Arms; but) peaceably, the fatted places of the Province, doing therein that which his Fathers have not done, nor his Fathers Fathers, Dan. 11. 24.

A Persecutor by way of eminency; for he doth by his Persecutions even wear out the Saints of the most High, Chap. 7. 25. Destroys wonderfully, *ie.* so as never any before him did, the mighty and holy people, Chap. 8. 24. Destroys the understanding people all manner of ways, by Sword, by Flame, by Captivity, and by Spy, Chap. 12. 33. whatsoever he doth, he doth it by way of eminency; *ie.* in such manner as was never done before.

Thus much for the Characters of the Little Horn.

I shall in the Conclusion add this word, That in the fore-going Characters agree so fully

...
the Romish Antichrist, (to whom as these, so all the Characters besides them in Daniel, will most aptly accord.) So, in case the Romish Antichrist be not the little Horn, it will necessarily follow, that we have nothing left us from first to last in this Prophecy that concerns Antichrist's rage against the Saints and holy City, his tyranny over, and oppression of the Nations, which now hath continued, in such manner, as the like was never before it, for above one thousand two hundred years; for in case the things spoken of the little Horn be not appliable thereto, nothing throughout this Prophecy is. Whatsoever is spoken of the Fourth Beast, ver. 7. of his dreadfulness and strength, his Iron teeth, his devouring, breaking in pieces, stamping the residue with his feet, his having ten Horns, had all its accomplishment, (as my fore-going discourse proveth) in the Roman Monarchy before Antichrist came in; which was the most dreadful Power, devouring, breaking in pieces the Nations, stamping the residue, (i.e. the Powers of the Monarchies before it) with its feet, that ever the earth saw, and had also ten Horns, being exactly divided into ten parts by Augustus Cesar. The whole therefore of the seventh verse is but a description thereof, which will be more clear, if we compare it with verse twenty-three, which tells us, That the power of this Fourth Beast was exercised, not against the Saints in any peculiar way, as all Antichrists rage hath been, and the little Horns is, but against the whole earth, without difference or respect, making it its great and only business to tread that down, and subdue it to itself; It shall be diverse from
from all Kingdoms, and shall devour the whole earth, and tread it down, and break it to pieces. This being so, may, in case that part of the Prophecy which concerns the Little Horn be not to be applied to Antichrist's rage and tyranny, no part is, and if so, let it be considered.

1. How unlikely a thing it is that the Holy Ghost, when he was informing Daniel of the state of things in the World, from the time that the Kingdom of the House of David was subjected by Nebuchadnezzar, till it should be restored by and under Christ the true David, should leap over at once above half the time, nor leaving in throughout the whole Prophecy so much as one syllable to inform us, what should be done within that time.

2. That he should leap over that time too, which was at time in many respects so remarkable for observation, as never was time in the world before.

1 In respect of a new kind of Power bearing rule all this time, viz. a Civil Power and a Spiritual mixed together, and in this mixture the Spiritual to be the Head, the like to which was never found in any of the preceding Monarchies, no not in the world before.

2 In respect of a new kind of Idolatry, worshipping a Breaden god, Saints, Reliques of Saints, &c. an Idolatry never heard of in the world before.

3 In respect of a new kind of Persecution, a Persecution of the precious Servants of God, by one professing himself in his Title to be the Servant of the Servants of God; a Persecution of the true and faithful Members of Christ, by one styling himself Christ's Vicar.
4 In respect of a new kind of Tyranny; tyrannizing over the Conscience, and forcing it, making Merchandise of the souls of men, Rev. 18. 12, 13.

5 In respect of a new kind of oppression; oppressing the people, robbing them of their wealth and substance, by craft, and not by power; as what are all the Popish inventions of Masses, Pardons, Pilgrimages, Penance, Purgatory, their Abbeys, Monasteries, &c. but mere tricks and devices, by which they divide the Land, Dan. 11. 39. enter into the fattest places of every Province or Nation, ver. 24. and this by craft, Dan. 8. 25?

6 In respect of a new kind of Blasphemy; for a man to profess the greatest holiness and love to God of all others, and yet to make himself God, suffer himself to be called God, worshipped as God; thus robbing God of his honour, whilst he professeth to serve, love, and honour him.

I say, that a time having such noted characters upon it, as never had time in the world before, should by the Holy Ghost (whilst lesser things are observed) be wholly buried in silence, cannot be thought.

Nay thirdly, That the Holy Ghost here should wholly leap over that time, and those transactions, which are in a manner the subject of all, or most of the Apocalyptic Visions, when as Daniel and John do help to expound each other, is very strange.

An Objection.

The Conception of some good men of our days is, That the little Horns Kingdom doth not denote the whole body of Antichrist, but points
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at some singular Person or Power that is to arise in the evening time of Antichrists Kingdom; so making in their conclusion the Saints of this Age to be the only subjects of the Little Horns rage.

Answer.

1. This is very improbable, though it were upon no other reason but the former only, viz. the loss of so much, and withal so remarkable a time, as is, and must be lost by this opinion.

2. Very uncomfortable; for supposing the Little Horn to be but newly risen, yet if withall we consider those things which are most evident from the text, concerning him. 1 That his continuance must be long. 2 That throughout this long time, he shall in a most fearful and dismal manner rage and tyrannize, trample the Saints, oppress the Nations; What an uncomfortable opinion is this to us, and all the people of God at this day, who look for their redemption to be at hand, to entertain such a thought, that the Little Horns Kingdom is but now begun? which if so, then sure enough neither we, nor our Childrens Children, nor the Generation after them, shall ever live to behold those glorious days, which, yet is the faith of many, will break forth even in this Generation. Nay how uncomfortable a thing is it, to think that all the Persecutions that have ever yet been in the World, are in a manner but Flea-bites, both for greatness and length of time, to that persecution that is now beginning? which must be in case the Kingdom of the Little Horn be but now begun; for he is the only Persecutor of the Saints, and oppressor of the Nations by way of eminen-
cy; that Monster that never had the like before him, nor shall have after him.

3. Grounded upon a mistake, which mistake is another conception of some, who are of opinion that the Little Horn denotes a single Person, viz. That the Little Horn's rise and rage is to be the immediate fore-runner of the Beast's final ruin, and that for this reason the description of this Little Horn is insisted upon so largely in Daniel's Prophecies.

But this cannot be.

1. Because it is needless, and superfluous so much should be fore-told of this Little Horn, as this end only, when as in case nothing had been spoken of him, we have a more sure, certain, and undoubted word to point us to the ending-time of the Beast's reign, viz. the truth of those several mystical numbers that concern the Beast: It is unacquaintedness with the one hath made good men to apt to close in with this other.

2. Because the destruction of that, which comprehends the whole of the Beast's Kingdom, cannot be a sign of the destruction of the Beast's Kingdom; but to doth the Little Horn; for it is equivalent to the whole body of the Fourth Monarchy, and is a Power consisting of ten Kingdoms, as I have before proved.

4. The foregoing conception favours too much of partiality, and of too high thoughts of our selves, and too low of the Saints before us, whilst in effect by such a conclusion we render the Holy Ghost mindlees of all the sufferings of so many Millions of the precious Servants of Jesus Christ, who in
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Former Ages have in the flames, by Sword, and otherwise, sacrificed their lives for the testimony of Jesus, against the Beast, as not to mention one word of all their sufferings; and yet so mindful of us, who comparatively with them have never suffered the thousandth part, nor can suffer more should they do their utmost, as to leave such a large Narrative of our afflictions.

Nay further let me add, (which follows up on the other:) we do hereby in a manner accuse the most righteous God of partiality and inequality, whilst we make him to forget all his other Children much better than we, and to take notice of us, and our sufferings only. Let us not have so much affection to ourselves, as not only to lay aside all due respect to that blessed cloud of Witnesses our Fore-runners and Betters, but also to make the ways of the most righteous God unequal; yet this (remembering what but now was said, that in case by the Little Horn's rage and blasphemy the tyranny of Antichrist be not set forth, no mention at all is by Daniel made thereof) doth necessarily follow, such a conception being admitted.

The sum of all is, That as those Characters of truth, left us in the naked letter of the text, are the most certain rule to go by, to finde the minds of the Holy Ghost in Prophecies; so walking by that rule, Daniels Little Horn is, and can be no other, but the whole body of the Romish Antichrist.
A particular Clause, in our Discourse about the Times, opened.

It hath been said in the close of my fore-going Discourse about the times, That it cannot be determined from Scripture, whether the present year one thousand six hundred fifty four, or the approaching year, one thousand six hundred fifty six, be the last of the Beast's reign, and the Witnesses wearing sackcloth.

The ground of this uncertainty lies in the doubtfulness of the year of our Saviour's Birth, which although the Scripture tells us it was in the days of Augustus Cæsar, yet in regard it hath not told us, how long the said Augustus Cæsar reigned, therefore the doubt remaineth. Nor will Human Records help us herein, because they are divided within themselves, and differ some from others a year or two, as touching the number of the years the said Augustus reigned.

Two opinions there are about the time of Christ's Birth, the one fixing it two years higher, the other two years lower. The Vulgar Account, (which we have followed, because the most known, and the common Date) inclineth to the latter. The account of Scaliger (which is owned by other Modern Chronologers, as Calvinis, Alstedius, Helvius, &c.) chuseth the former.
The difference betwixt these cannot be determined by Scripture, nor can it be certainly made appear, till the event hath decided it, which is the truth.

Our proof from Scripture is firm and good, that the year one thousand six hundred fifty six from the birth of Christ, must necessarily be the last year of the Beast's reign, and the Witnesses wearing sackcloth.

This is demonstrable from the two thousand three hundred days; for since that with the year of Christ's Passion, which was, Anno Dom., thirty four, six hundred thirty three of Daniel's two thousand three hundred years were expired (as I have proved) it therefore follows, that from that year to the end of the Fourth Monarchy are to be reckoned but one thousand six hundred sixty seven years more, which one thousand six hundred sixty seven years being added to the former number six hundred thirty three, as they make up the two thousand three hundred years (which are the utmost date of the Fourth Monarchy) compleat; so do they also make the two thousand three hundred years to expire with the year from Christ's Birth, one thousand seven hundred and one, for add one thousand six hundred sixty seven to thirty four (the year in which Christ suffered) and we have the aforesaid sum. Now in regard the end of the Beast's reign, and the Witnesses wearing Sackcloth falls forty five years before the final destruction of the Fourth Monarchy, it therefore follows (the Date of the Fourth Monarchy expiring in the year one thousand seven hundred
hundred and one from Christ's Birth) that the end of the Beast's reign, and the Witnesses wearing Sackcloth, which is to be fixed forty five years above the other, must of necessity expire with the end of the year one thousand six hundred fifty six from the birth of Christ.

But now, because the time of Christ's Birth is (as to the year) doubtful, therefore (I say) can it not be determined what year we are to pitch upon, as the year one thousand six hundred fifty six from the Birth of Christ.

If the account of Scaliger (which ascends two years above the vulgar) be the truth, then of necessity, (in case years since Christ in the counting have not been lost, as it is a thing very improbable any should, upon the reason we have given in the precedent Discourse) must this present year one thousand six hundred fifty four, be the last of the Beast's reign, and the Witnesses wearing Sackcloth; for in case Christ's Birth be to be fixed two years higher than the beginning of our Vulgar account, it will follow, that the year which we (following the Vulgar account) call the year one thousand six hundred fifty four, ought to be accounted, and really is, from Christ's Birth the year one thousand six hundred fifty six; and if so, then will the next year after this be the year in which the German Witnesses, and the Saints elsewhere shall put off their Sackcloth, and be no longer subject to the tyranny of the Beast. But if the Vulgar account be true, then will the year we commonly call fifty six be the last year of the Beast's tyranny, and the Witnesses wearing Sackcloth, and consequently with
with the beginning of the year one thousand six hundred fifty seven must we expect the blessed day of the Saints putting off their Sackcloth, and leading into captivity that Beast, that for one thousand two hundred and sixty years together hath captivated them. This being a question of great moment, which makes a variance two years throughout all our accounts, and withal not being (as I judge) determinable by Scripture, unless (as I have said) it could be proved how many years Augustus Caesar reigned, which in case it could be done, then indeed John's beginning to preach in the fifteenth year of Tiberius, Luke 3. 1. would somewhat help us, I thought good (having but hinted it before) to give here in our closet the true and full state thereof, leaving the two different accounts to the Readers consideration, and the certain determination of the thing itself to the event; Only adding, that although in my account of times I have walked by the Vulgar reckoning, as that which is to persons generally best known, yet have I not done it from any such light, as persuades me, that the Vulgar account is to be chosen and adhered unto rather than the other; therefore having shewed where this knot lies, I leave it to time and Divine Providence to untie. A few days will resolve this question, and many more.
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Wherein is contained,

2. A General Rule for the right understanding of Prophecies, together with a more full unfolding the Great Mystery of Daniel's Little Horn.

3. An Explication of a particular Clause in the fore-going Discourse about the Times.

By J. T.
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A few Conclusions touching Christ's Kingdom, and the general Scope and Method of Daniel's Prophecies.

I.

Hat Christ should have an outward visible Kingdom, in which as King of Kings he should be exalted, is the promise of the Father antiently made to Christ, (Gen. 49. 10, 11. compared with Isa. 63. 1, 2, 3. Revel. 19, 15, 16. Numb. 24. 17, 18, 19. So Rom. 4. 13. compared with Gal. 3. 16.) and is that thing of which all the Prophets have spoken.

II.

A Type of this Kingdom was the Kingdom of the House of David, erected in the midst of God's peculiar, in time of old, and bearing rule over the Nations about it. Hence Christ as King goes frequently under the name of David. Ezek. 34. 23, 24. Chap. 37. 24, 25. Hos. 3. 5.

III.

This Kingdom became, in time, subjected by Nebuchadnezzar, and after that wholly removed,
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ved (the Scepter being taken away) by the Romans, at the time of Christ's first coming, so that from Nebuchadnezzar's time until this day, no outward visible Kingdom, which may be called Christ's, hath been in the world.

IV.
Yet an outward visible Kingdom Christ shall have, else could not the Promise have its fulfilling, nor the Type its Anti-type.

V.
But yet as David's Kingdom, the Type, was very little in its beginning, and afterwards became a Monarchy, bearing rule over the Nations about it: so doth this Kingdom of Christ begin as a Stone, afterwards becomes a Mountain.

VI.
Further, as David's Kingdom went to decay before Christ's first coming, its absolute Sovereignty being taken away by Nebuchadnezzar, yet had not the Scepter wholly removed untill the time of his coming: So doth this Kingdom begin to recover, as it is the Stone, before Christ's second coming, therefore said to be set up in the days of the ten Kings, Dan. 2. 44. yet shall it not be compleatly a great Mountain (or a Monarchy bearing rule over all the earth) untill this coming.

VII.
Yet as God is swift to take Vengeance for his people, but slow to take vengeance upon them: So when God comes to recover this outward Kingdom, by breaking in pieces all worldly Powers that now possesse it, the time betwixt the beginning of this work, (which begins with the

Three where the Stone begins to smite) and the compleating of it, is by the determinate Counsel of God much shorter, than was the time betwixt the subjecting and total removing of that foregoing outward Kingdom, which was the Type of this.

VIII.

As the people of God in the time of the Old and New Testament both, did and do by faith expect this Kingdom, and shall accordingly, when the same shall be set up be Joynt-heirs, and Inheritors thereof: So hath God given us perfect assurance of it, and how, and when the same shall be erected, and what should befall the people of the Old Testament, and of the New also, throughout all Ages till the erecting of it, and that out of the mouths of two infallible Witnesses, viz: Daniel a Prophet of the Old Testament, and John an Apostle of the New.

IX.

The scope of Daniels Prophecies, which begin, some with, some suddenly after; the time where the Kingdom of the Type was subject, and terminate with the compleat setting up of the Kingdom of the Anti-type; is to give full assurance of the thing itself, viz. That this Kingdom, which for many Ages together before Daniels time had had being in the Type; should also after many days have being in the Anti-type; and also to give certain knowledge (that thereby the faith of Gods people throughout this long time might be the better born up in a patient expectation of this Kingdom) how, and by whom the Scepter of the World should be swayed from that day, in which
which the Kingdom of the House of David was subjected, until the time the same should be restored with greater Power and Glory, and more Dominion, than ever before it had, under Christ the true David. And for this reason it is that Daniel takes notice of no worldly Monarch before Nebuchadnezzar, by and under whom David's Kingdom was subjected.

X.

As this outward visible Kingdom, throughout this long Period, was by Divine appointment to fall into the hands of four great Monarchies, viz. 1 The Babylonians, 2 Medes and Persians, 3 Greeks, 4 Romans, which one after the other should possesse the Kingdom, and bear rule over all the earth, till in the end that Ruler should come, whose goings out have been from everlasting, and whole right by Purchase, Promise, and Donation of the Father, the Kingdom is, and take the same from the last of these into his own hands: So answerably in the Book of Daniel wee have in four Prophecies (his Seventy weeks excepted, which treat of another thing) these described, the time of their reign determined, and their final ruine (and therewith the revolution of the Kingdom into the hands of Christ, and his Saints) fore-told.

XI.

The Four-fold Repetition of the same things, or the speaking of the same things over in four Prophecies, was, to the end Daniel might have light let in by degrees, as he was able to bear it, and also, that it might be set home more strongly upon
upon his heart, and the hearts of God's people in general, to whom these glorious Discoveries were made, that the things themselves were established by God, and should most certainly be fulfilled in their season, Gen. 41. 32.

XII.

The Prophecies themselves are: 1 That of the great Image, Chap. 2. 2 That of the four Beasts, Chap. 7. 3 That of the Ram, Hee-Goat, and Little Horn, Chap. 8. Lastly, Of the King of the North, and King of the South, Chap. 11. the matter contained in the three first of these is represented to Daniel by way of Vision, in the last, by lively voyage.

XIII.

The two first of these, viz. That of the Great Image, and that of the four Beasts, comprehend within them all the four Monarchies; the two last, the three last only; the reason whereof is, because Daniel had not his two last Visions till the expiration of the first, or Babylonian Monarchy: Now Prophecies being not of things past, but to come, therefore the Babylonian Monarchy, being passed at the time of the two last Visions, no mention at all is made in them of that Monarchy.

XIV.

The succession of these four Monarchies is excellently set forth in that golden Method, and Order, that is observed in each of the aforesaid Prophecies; the description of them in that wonderful suitablenesse and harmony that is in the matter.
XV.

The Babylonian Monarchy is the first, to which the Images head of fine Gold, Dan. 2. 38. compared with 37, 38. and that first Beast, Chap. 7. 4. do relate.

XVI.

The Medes and Persians succeed the Babylonian, to whose Monarchy belongeth the silver Breast, and Arms of the Great Image, Chap. 2. 32. The second Beast, chap. 7. 5. The Ram with two Horns, Chap. 8. 3, 4, compared with ver. 20. and what by lively voyce is spoken to Daniel, Chap. 11. ver. 1, 2.

XVII.

The two Arms joyned to one Breast, which is the Persian resemblance, Chap. 2. and the two Horns growing upon one Head, which is their resemblance, Chap. 8. are a most lively embleme of two powerful Nations, viz. Medes and Persians, either of which hath an Arm & a Horn of strength, uniting into one, to make a Monarchy.

XVIII.

The third Monarchy is of the Grecians, which is considered in Daniel, First, as united in one; Secondly, as divided and broken.

XIX.

To the Grecian Monarchy, in its united state, doth belong that devouring belly, which gathers all to itself, Chap. 2. 32. That third Beast, considered as winged, and swift in motion, Dan. 7. 6. (which swiftnesse of march is noted as peculiar to Alexander, Dan. 8. 5. and is here excellently set forth by giving four Wings, i.e. two pair
pair of Wings to this Beast, noting his swift march, and speedy conquests) the Great and notable Horn of the rough Goat, Dan. 8. 5. compared with ver. 21. and what is spoken to Daniel of that mighty King, Dan. 11. 3.

XX.

The divided state of the Gracian Monarchy, is set forth by the thighs of the great Image, Dan. 2. 32. the four Heads of the third Beast, Dan. 7. 6. the four Horns of the He-Goat coming up in the room of the great Horn, Dan. 8. 8. with ver. 22. and what by voice is delivered to Daniel, chap. 11, ver. 4, 5, &c. to ver. 14.

XXI.

The Fourth and last Monarchy is of the Romans, which Monarchy in either Prophecy is set forth in its two-fold state. First, its state before Antichrists rise, Secondly, its state afterwards; the one I have formerly called its pure Civil State, the other its mixt State.

XXII.

The Roman Monarchy in its first State, where in it chiefly attended to the work of Conquering and subduing Nations, is set forth by the Iron Legs of the great Image, Dan. 2. 33. which Iron-legged Kingdom, or rather this fourth Kingdom considered as Iron-legged, is said to break in pieces, and subdue all things, ver. 40. By the fourth Beast, Dan. 7. 7. but yet considered only as a warlike Beast, most dreadful and terrible to the Nations, devouring the whole earth, treading it down, and breaking it in pieces, ver. 23. By the Little Horn, considered in its first waxing great,
Dan. 8. 9. by which waxing it becomes exceeding great, pushing down all standing in its way, towards the South, and towards the West, and towards the pleasant Land; and by what is spoken to Daniel, of the Conquests of the King of the North, vers. 14. to 21.

XXIII.

The Roman Monarchy in its second State, wherein the work it principally attends to, is, oppressing the Nations subdued already, persecuting the Saints, treading under-foot the Holy City, is set forth by the feet of the great Image of Iron and Clay, Dan. 2. 33. by the Little Horn, Chap. 7. by the Little Horn in its second waxing great, Chap. 8. 10, 11, 12, 24, 25. by the vile Person, or that proud King, Chap. 11. whose description we have at large, vers. 21. to vers. 40. and afterwards goes under the title of the King of the North, ver. 40. to the end of the Chapter.

XXIV.

All the aforesaid Prophecies, though their beginnings are different, yet have they but one and the same general end.

XXV.

This end is the final dissolution of the Fourth Monarchy, and the establishment of the Fifth, contemporary with both which is the Personal appearance of Christ.

XXVI.

The two last Prophecies conclude with the destruction of the Fourth Monarchy, the two first with the greatness and glory of the Fifth; yet are not for this reason their ends different, because
though the things themselves are two, yet both shall be performed by that one act of Christ's personal appearance. It is the appearance of Christ that destroys the Fourth Monarchy, establisheth the Fifth.

XXVII.

The admirable Harmony in every title betwixt these so antient Prophecies and the events; or betwixt the things fore-told so many Ages ago, and the things transacted in the Ages since, is a strong and convincing Argument of the infallibility of the Prophecies themselves, and of the certainty of the performance of the things yet to be accomplished.

XXVIII.

The glorious work of setting up Christ's outward visible Kingdom, which is the thing pointed at in all the fore-going Prophecies, is the great work of the present age, and time we live in.

XXIX.

The mystical Numbers of Daniel and John both, which direct us to the time in which this Kingdom is to be set up, all which expire (as the fore-going Discourse proveth) within the compass of this Age; the visible dispensations of God, which in our days have been very wonderful, all tending to such a thing; the cries of Saints, and their faith and expectations generally looking this way; the opposition of the Devil, and the World against, and the malignity of men of worldly Principles, unto this glorious truth, and blessed work, do all speak that we are come to the dawning of that day in which Christ will, in
Despite of Satan, and the World's rage, and all the Carnal policy of men of earthly Principles, establish his own Kingdom.

XXX.

The former being true, it is in itself no strange thing, nor ought to be matter of stumbling or offence to any, that the Witnesses of Christ in this our day direct their testimony against Civil Powers (as they are in their present constitution, bearing forth evidently the excellent brightness, and the terrible form of the Great Image, Dan. 2. 31.) which yet Saints of former Ages subjected themselves unto, and never medled with, because the case with them and us is vastly different. They lived within the compass of that time in which the Great Image was to stand, the World and worldly Powers were to bear rule; which that they might do till their day should come to an end, it was necessary that Saints in all Ages heretofore should subject themselves to them, and never bear a testimony simply and directly against Civil Powers of a worldly constitution; nor indeed could it be any part of their testimony, because God having set a time how long worldly Powers should continue, it behooved not them to attempt before the time, to take from the World what by Divine permission for such a time was allotted them. But now the case is otherwise, for we being come to the beginning of that day, in which the Great Image must be smitten, till the same is crumbled to dust, and finally carried away with the wind of God's Wrath, and that Kingdom and Dominion which before the Great
Image did hold as its by right, to bee translated and given to the Saints of the most High; as every Work of God must have light for its Basis, because God leads his people to the execution of his will, not blinde-fold, but by light; therefore of necessity must the Witnesses of Christ in this Age bear forth such a testimony of truth as may lay a foundation in the hearts of Gods people for such a work. And indeed, as the work that God is now about to do is a new thing in the World, viz., the regaining that Kingdom which hath been in the hands of the World for now upwards of two thousand three hundred years (viz. ever since the beginning of the Seventy years Captivity in Babylon) so by the same reason, that truth which must be laid as foundation to this work, can bee no other but a new thing in the World. It is therefore no Argument against the truth of Christ's visible Kingdom, that Saints, our predecessors in the Ages before us, meddled not with these things, nor stickled in such a Cause or Controversie as the Saints now do; it was then no part of their work, but it is now the Master-piece of ours.

And in case any then at that time did stickle, yet they brought nothing to perfection, because they attempted Gods Work before his time. But now the time being come, as God hath in a more wonderful manner than ever stirred up the hearts of his Saints to bear witnesse, so shall not their Witnesse-bearing (as to this great thing) be
be in vain; for let the Devil and the World do their worst, the outward visible Kingdom, and Dominion, and the greatness of the Kingdom under the whole Heaven shall revolve (and that suddenly) into the hands of the people of the Saints of the most High, who shall then take them Captives whose Captives they were, and shall bear rule over their Oppressors. Amen.
Daniels Description of the Four Monarchies in Four Prophecies, and Christ's Kingdom succeeding them, shewed in the following Table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Monarchy</th>
<th>Second Monarchy</th>
<th>Third Monarchy</th>
<th>Fourth Monarchy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Prophecy, Chap. 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Second Prophecy, Chap. 7</strong></td>
<td><strong>Third Prophecy, Chap. 8</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fourth Prophecy, Chap. 11</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Head, vers. 32, 38</td>
<td>First Beast, vers. 4</td>
<td>Ram with two Horns, verse 3, 4</td>
<td>The matter delivered by voice, verse 1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Breast and Arms, ver. 32, 39</td>
<td>Second Beast, vers. 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belly of the Image, ver. 32</td>
<td>Third Beast as swift and winged, vers. 6</td>
<td>Hee-Goats great Horn, vers. 5, 6, 7, 8</td>
<td>Mighty King, ruling with great Domini-on, vers. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Images Thighs, vers. 32</td>
<td>Third Beast as having four Heads, vers. 6</td>
<td>Hee-Goats four notable Horns, vers. 8, 22</td>
<td>The matter delivered by voice, vers. 4, 5 to 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Leggs, vers. 33, 40</td>
<td>Fourth Beast as Warlike, subduing Nations, vers. 7</td>
<td>Little Horn, in its first waxing great, vers. 9</td>
<td>King of the North described, vers. 14 to 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feet of Iron and clay, ver. 33, 41, 41, 43</td>
<td>Little Horn, vers. 8, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26</td>
<td>Little Horn in its second waxing great, vers. 10, 11, 12, 24, 25</td>
<td>Vile Person, ver. 21, to 40 and King of the North, ve 40 to end.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Begins as a stone in the days of the ten Roman Kings, Chap. 34, 44. Becomes a Mountain filling the earth, upon Christ's appearance, and total dissolution of the Fourth Monarchy, Chap. 35, Chap. 7, 13, 14, with 26, 27.
# A TABLE

## The most material things handled in this Book.

### Part I.

- Audling some things of more general concernment as to the whole discourse.
  - **Chapter 1.** Shewing the justifiableness of the enquiry, p. 1. to 9
  - **Chapter 2.** Proving, That the mystical Numbers of Daniel and the Revelations, do hold forth a certain, definite, and determinate time, p. 9. to 14
  - **Chapter 3.** Clearing and confirming our General distinction, That the end of the Beast's tyranny relates to one time, the end of the Fourth Monarchy to another, p. 14. to 21
Part II.

Computing the time of the Beast, and shewing where the limited time of his tyrannoy ends.

Chap. 1.

Discussing the subject more general concernment, as to this particular Question.

Sect. I.

Stating the Question, and shewing the ground we are to go upon for answering it, viz. The forty two Months, the one thousand two hundred and sixty Days, wherein these differ, and why the one number is set by months, the other by days; p. 21, 22

Sect. II.

Proving, that both days and months are Prophetical, p. 23

Sect. III.

Shewing, that the forty two Months, the one thousand two hundred and sixty Days, signify one and the same time, and also begin and end together, p. 24, to 28

Chap. 2.

Disproving the sundry false beginnings of this Epoch.

Sect. I.

That the forty two Months, the one thousand two hundred and sixty Days, are not to be begun with the time of Constantine the Great, p. 28 to 37

Sect. II.

That they are not to be begun with the year four hundred forty two; p. 37, 38

Sect. III.

That they are not to be begun with the time when Boniface
Boniface was made universal Bishop by Phocas, p. 39, 40

Chap. 3.

Stating and confirming the true beginning.

Sect. I.

The true beginning fixed Anno Dom. three hundred ninety six. This to be the true is proved by two Reasons.

1 Taken from the Harmony of mystical Numbers.

2 From the eminent Apostacy about this very time.

Sect. II.

A third reason of our beginning taken from the devastation of the Roman Empire. Two things proved.

1 That our account is to begin from the time this devastation began.

2 That this was in the aforesaid year, p. 48 to 56

Chap. 4.

Proving and confirming yet further our fore-going beginning.

Sect. I.

A Fourth Argument of our beginning taken from the time of the rise of the Beasts Horns, wherein is shewed, First, When the Horns began to appear; Secondly, That the rise of the Horns must necessarily be a little while after the rise of the Beast, p. 56, to 61

Sect. II.

An Objection made, Daniel saw the rise of the little Horn after the rise of the ten. Here by way of digression is discoursed of Daniels little
The Table.

Little Horn, and it is proved, That Daniels little Horn cannot signify Mahomet, or the Turkish power, p. 61. to 69

Here also occasionally Daniels King of the North, and King of the South, chap. 11. is discoursed of, p. 69. to 77

Sect. III.

Proving, That by Daniels Little Horn cannot be meant William the Conqueror, taking in with him the whole Norman Race of Kings sitting on the English Throne, not Charls Stuart the last of that Race, p. 77. to 85.

Sect. IV.

A returning to the Objections to which answer is given, p. 85. to 89

Sect. V.

Three Arguments more to prove our beginning. 
1 Taken from the great likelihood there is of the Witnesses lying dead at this day, which thing the aforesaid beginning doth necessarily infer, p. 89
2 Taken from the visibility of those very things at this day, which the Scripture hath fore-told us shall occur within the last three days and a half of the one thousand two hundred and sixty. Five things are instanced in, which the Scripture hath fore-told shall happen within that time, all which are visible at this day, p. 90, 91, 92
3 Our beginning may not be fixed either higher or lower, therefore must be as it is stated, proved. p. 92. to 98

Part III.

Computing the time of the Fourth Monarchy, Chap.
The Table.

Chap. 1.
Of Daniel's two thousand three hundred days:

Sect. I.
That the two thousand three hundred days do not belong to the time and Story of Antiochus Epiphanes; where is shewed at large that Antiochus Epiphanes cannot be he of whom so much is spoken in Daniels Prophecies, p. 98. to p. 120

Sect. II.
Proving, that the Little Horn, spoken of Dan. 8, signifies the whole Body of the Roman Monarchy, p. 120. to p. 127

Sect. III.
Shewing, that the two thousand three hundred days are not to be understood of half so many years, but signifies so many years compleat, p. 127. to 133.

Sect. IV.
That the two thousand three hundred days are not to be begun with the first year of Cyrus, p. 133. to 137

Sect. V.
Shewing two things:
1. That Darius the Mede, of whom Daniel speaks Chap. 5. 30. did not belong to the Babylonian Monarchy, but the Persian, p. 137. to 142
2. That the first year of Darius the Mede, and the first of Cyrus the Persian, are one and the same year, p. 142. to 152

Chap. 2.
Wherein, in order to a more full clearing up of the fore-going account, viz. of two thousand three hundred
Sect. I.
That the Seventy weeks do not relate to New Testament-times. p. 152. to p. 161

Sect. II.
That the Seventy weeks are not to be begun with the Decree of Cyrus. p. 161. to 183

Sect. III.
That they are not to be begun with the Decree of Darius, Ezra 6. 6, 7. 8, &c. p. 183. to p. 193

Sect. IV.
That they are not to be begun with the Decree of Artaxerxes, in the seventh year of his reign, Ezra 7. 11, 12, 13. p. 193
That they are to be begun with the twentieth year of Artaxerxes, when Nehemiah received his Commission to build Jerusalem, Nehem. 2. p. 194. to 198

Sect. V.
That the Seventy weeks end with the Passion of Christ, p. 198, 199

Sect. VI.
A resolution of sundry knots about Daniels Seven weeks, his Sixty two weeks, his one week, and his half-week, p. 200. to 217

Sect. VII.
An Objection against our ending of the Seventy weeks, answered, p. 217. to 225

Chap. 3.
Wherein enquiry is made into the number of the
The Table.

The years that passed betwixt the first of Cyrus, and the twentieth of Artaxerxes, when Nehemiah received his Commission to build Jerusalem.

Sect. I.
Disproving the grounds of that Opinion, which cuts this time much shorter than it should bee.

p. 225. to 251

Sect. II.
Proving, That that Artaxerxes, from whom Nehemiah received his Commission, was him whom the Greeks call Mnemon.

p. 251. to p. 281

In order to the clearing this, is shewed, That that Darius who advanced the Temple-building, could not be Darius Hystaspes, p. 253. to 281, nor Darius Nothus, p. 259. but was Darius called by the Greeks Longimanus.

Here Zecharies seventy years are opened, p. 260, to p. 274

Sect. III.
Proving, that the time betwixt Cyrus first, and Artaxerxes twentieth, was exactly one hundred forty seven years.

p. 281. to p. 290

An Objection from Dan. 12. 1, 2. That but four Kings did reign in the Persian Monarchy after Cyrus, answered.

p. 290. to p. 298

Sect. IV.
Something discussed about our Christian Epoch.

p. 298. to p. 305.


A 2 Added
The Table.

Added by way of Appendix.

1. A general Rule for the right understanding of Prophecies, together with a more full opening the great Mysterie of Daniels Little Horn, p. 311. to p. 320
2. A particular Clause in our Discourse about the times opened, from p. 328. to 331
3. Some Conclusions touching Christs Kingdom, &c.

FINIS.
Books lately Printed, and sold by Livewell Chapman.

The Voice of the Spirit, or a Discovery of the Witnessing work of the Spirit, by Sam. Petto Minister of the Gospel.

The New Non-conformist, witnessing both to small and great, some of those glorious things which the Apostles, the Prophets, and Moses did say should come to passe. Written by Mr. Christopher Feake Minister of the Gospel, and now a Prisoner for the Truth.

A Declaration of several of the Churches, and godly People, in and about the City of London, concerning the Kingly interest of Christ, and the present sufferings of his Cause, and Saints, in England.

A Sermon of the Fifth Monarchy, proving, that the Saints shall have a Kingdom here on Earth, which is yet to come, after the Fourth Monarchy is destroyed by the Sword of the Saints, the followers of the Lamb. Preached by Master Tho. Goodwin, some years since, at Crooked Lane London.
An Image of our Reformed Times, or Jehu in his proper Colours; displayed in some Exercitations on the second of Kings, the ninth and tenth Chapters, setting forth, The opportunity was given him to do his work in, The Cause he had committed to him to manage. Also his Policy, Zeal, Profession, Hypocrisie; with his Sins, and their aggravations; reason for all this. Concluding with a word, to Jehu, Jebronadab, his Counsellor, and the persecuted and despised people of God. By Col. Edward Lane of Hampin-unlo.

This Author hath three other Books, being called, Generation-Work, in Three Parts.

In the First Part is shewed what Generation Work is, and how it differs from other works of a Christian.

Secondly, That Saints in their several Generations have had their proper and peculiar works of their Generations.

Thirdly, That it is of great concernment for a Saint to attend to the work of his Generation.

Fourthly, What the present work is.

Fifthly, How each one may finde out the part of it that is properly his work.

Sixthly, How the Work may be so carried on, as God may be served.

The Second Part is, An Exposition of the seven Vials, and other Apocalyptical Mysteries.
The Third Part is, An Exposition of the Prophecies of the two Witnesses, from the eleventh, twelfth, and fourteenth Chapters of the Revelations.

To which is added, A Key to unlock the Mystical Numbers in Daniel, and the Revelation.