

'The Original of Monarchies'

Author: Isaac Newton

Source: Keynes Ms. 146, King's College, Cambridge, UK

Published online: October 2002

<1r>

Chap. 1 **The original of Monarchies.**

The whole earth was by the first inhabitants divided into many coordinate governments according to the number of families. For when Moses had reckoned up the posterity of Noah to the fourth generation, he adds. These are the families of the sons of Noah after their generations in their nations & by these were the nations divided after the flood. Which is as much as to say, that as Noah divided the whole earth between his three sons & gave Europe to Iaphet; Asia to Sem & Africa to Ham without making any one Lord of the others territories: so each of these divided his part between his sons & each of them their parts between theirs without making any one Lord of anothers inheritance till the whole earth was distributed into independant & coordinate nations tribes & families. For what Moses saith of the division of the whole earth among all the posterity of Noah, he saith of the division of the several parts among the posterity of his severall sons. For when he had reckoned up the children & grand-children of Iaphet he subjoyns. By these were the Isles of the Gentiles divided in their lands every one after his tongue after their families in their nations. And so of the rest. So then upon the first plantation of the earth there were no standing kingdoms. Every father was sovereign Lord of his own inheritance during his life & then his sons became sovereign Lords of their several shares & so on till the earth was planted with innumerable scattered families not subject to any other Lords then their own common fathers. For I here reckon every father with all his posterity to be one family & upon the fathers death to break into so many families as he left sons surviving him.

Yet wars arising between them in some places sooner in others later about their possessions put things into some disorder. ffor it was the necessary consequence of such wars that those of a tribe or neighbourhood should consult together for their common safety & chuse out wise & valiant men to lead them against their enemies & fortify <2r> places with walls within which should be many houses for the people to resort unto out of the fields & villages in time of danger. And this was the original of cities & kingdoms. For these fortified places became the first cities & the fathers of families became the elders of the city composing a Council with the same legislative & judicial power over the whole body of all their families which every father had before over his own apart, & the captain of their forces being the most honourable & potent amongst the Elders became their King. For every city was in the first ages walled about with high walls & gates & barrs for its defence (Deut. 3.5 Levit. 25.30,31) & had its court of Elders (Deut. 22.15. Iudg. 8.14. Ruth 4.2.) & its country or territory of villages (Levit 25.31 Iosh. 21.12) which were therefore called the villages of the city (Iosh. 16 & 18 & 19.) And such Cities as these with their villages were the kingdoms of the first Kings, as is plain both because those kings are in sacred history called Kings not of whole nations or countries (as they were afterwards when grown great) but of cities only & because the cities were so very small & numerous. For Abraham& his confederates with an army of 318 men beat four kings with their army when they had newly beaten five others; & those five were kings of so many single cities Sodom, Gomorrah, Admah, Zeboim & Zoar. ffor the four first perished together in the Lake of Sodom & therefore bordered upon one another without any other cities between them & Zoar was the nearest city which Lot could fly unto from Sodom & is called a little one & yet had its proper king.

Its true that Nimrod built & reigned over divers cities but it may be presumed that he built them for his children & left to every one his inheritance. ffor Bochartus hath shewn that the son's of Chus were planted in several regions round about the Persian gulf from the furthest part of Arabia felix to the furthest part of Carmania, & therefore Chus with his family leaving the parts of Egypt where they first dwelt with their father Cham went into the region of Chaldea & Susiana (thence called the land of Chus) & subduing the inhabitants seated themselves there & on the Persian gulf, the father dividing his new territories among all his sons according to the law of those times & the lot of Nimrod falling in Chaldæa. For there was the beginning of Nimrods kingdom before he went into Assyria. And as Chus thus divided his territories <3r> amongst all his sons so it is to be presumed that his sons & grandsons (Nimrod as well as the rest) divided theirs among their children according to the same law till kingdoms became as small in those regions as in other parts of the world. ffor I shal shew presently that the famous Assyrian Monarchy grew up by conquest out of many small kingdoms long after those first ages. Another instance of this kind we have in the 12 sons of Ishmael who dwelt from Havila to Shur on the way from Egypt to Assyria. For when Moses had named them he subjoyns. These are the sons of Ismael & these are their names by their towns & by their castles, twelve Princes according to their nations. Gen. 25 16.

So then the first kingdoms were single cities & those perhaps not so big nor so well peopled as our Villages. And this seems to have been the state of things till after the days of Abraham. But at length many of these cities either by conquest or by consent for strengthning themselves grew into one kingdom & such kingdoms were in all places very small & numerous till after the age of Moses but yet by conquering one another grew bigger & bigger till the rise of the four Monarchies. ffor Moses thought 12000 men sufficient to fight the Midianites or Ismaelites & yet that nation was yⁿ divided into five kingdoms. In a small part of that small country of Canaan Moses conquered Og the king of Bashan who had sixty cities in his Kingdom & Sihon King of the Ammorites whose kingdom was much greater. ffor all the kingdom of Og was given only to half the tribe of Manasseh & the kingdom of Sihon sufficed for the two tribes of Reuben & Gad (Deut 2.12, 13. Iosh. 12.2.) In the rest of Canaan there were 31 Kingdoms conquered by Ioshua besides others left unconquered & these were grown up out of a far greater number of the first kingdoms. ffor Adonibezek king of one of these kingdoms had conquered twenty other kings & cut off their thumbs & great toes. In the lot of Iudah & Reuben there were at least 126 cities besides the daughters (as they are called) of Ekron Ashdod & Gaza (Iosh 15 & 19) By the daughters are meant the cities subject to the three Metropolises or mother-cities of these kingdoms which if we may reckon to be about 20 in a kingdom that is 60 in all the whole number will be 186 cities. In the Tribe of Levi alone there were 48 cities whereof nine were given out of the two tribes of Iudah & Reuben & ten out of the two Tribes & an half beyond Iordan (Ios. 21) & the rest out of the other Tribes in proportion to the number of cities in each (Num. 35.8) Whence its easy to compute that there were about a thousand walled cities in all Canaan besides those which had been rased by wars, & by consequence about so many kingdoms in the beginning before some of them conquered the rest.

The like number of little kingdoms seems in the first ages to have been spread over all Syria. For tho these kingdoms grew daily more great & less numerous, yet Syria continued divided into little kingdoms till the Assyrians invaded <4r> it. For in the reign of king David Hadadezer king of Soba (a town between Iudæa & Euphrates) was confederate with Damascus & three other kings of Syria who served him & had wars with Toy king of Hamath or Epiphania another city of Syria. And a little after Benhadad king of Damascus in his war with Ahab was assisted by 32 other kings which served him as tributary Princes: ffor upon losing the battel he displaced them & put captains in their room over their forces (1 King. 20.1, 24.) And yet Benhadad was not king of all Syria. ffor beyond him was the Kingdom of Hamath still standing & that also of Arpad or the Aradij both potent kingdoms & these kingdoms continued till the Assyrians conquered them.

For the whole Assyrian Monarchy seems to have risen out of such little kingdoms as these not long before the captivity of the ten tribes. The Prophet Amos^[1] about sixty or seventy years before that captivity, thus threatens them with what had lately befallen other kingdoms: Pass ye, saith he, to Cälneh & see, & from thence go to Hamath the great, then go down to Gath of the Philistines. Be they better then these kingdoms? ^x < insertion from f 3v > x But these Cities were not yet vanquished by the Assyrians. Gath was newly vanquished by Vziah king of Iudah (2 Chron. 26) & Hamath by Ieroboam king of Israel (2 King. 14) & while the Prophet in threatening Israel with the Assyrians instances in desolations made by other nations it argues that the Assyrians had not yet made any great progress in that vast career of victories which we read of a few years after. For about seven years after the captivity of the ten tribes when Sennacherib – – < text from

f 4r resumes > About seven years after that captivity when Sennacherib warred in Syria, he sent this message to the King of Iudah. ^[2] Behold thou hast heard what the kings of Assyria have done to all lands by destroying them utterly, & shalt thou be delivered? Have the Gods of the nations delivered them whom my fathers have destroyed as Gozan & Haran & Rezeph & the children of Eden which were in Thalassar? Where is the king of Hamath & the king of Arpad & the king of the city of Sepharvaim, of Henah & Ivah? † < insertion from f 3v > † And Isaiah^[3] thus introduceth the King of Assyria boasting. Are not my Princes altogether Kings? Is not Calno [or Calneh] as Carchemish? Is not Hamath as Arphad? Is not Samaria as Damascus? As my hand hath found the Kingdoms of the Idols & whose graven Images did excell them of Ierusalem & of Samaria: Shall I not as I have done unto Samaria & her Idols so do to Ierusalem & her Idols? < text from f 4r resumes > All this desolation is recited as fresh in memory to terrify the Iews, & these kingdoms to shew the largeness of the conquests are called all lands, that is all round about Assyria. It was the manner of the kings of Assyria for preventing the rebellion of people newly conquered to captivate & transplant those of several conquered countries into one anothers lands & intermix them variously. & thence it appears that Halah & Habor & Hara & Gozan & the cities of the Medes ^[4] into which Galile & Samaria were transplanted & Kir into which Damascus was transplanted & Babylon & Cuth or the Susanchites & Hamath & Ava & ^[6] Sepharvaim, & the Dinaites & the Apharsathchites & the Tarpelites & the Apharsites & the Archevites & the Devahites & the Elamites or Persians part of all which nations were led captive by Esarhaddon into Samaria, were all of them conquered not long before.

In these conquests are involved on the west & south side of Assyria the kingdoms of Mesopotamia whose royal seats were Haran or Carrhæ, & Carchemish or Circusium, & Sepharvaim a city upon Euphrates between Babylon & Nineve called Sipparæ by Berosus Abydenus & Polyhistor & Sipphara by Ptolomy, & the Kingdoms of <5r> Syria seated at Samaria, Damascus, Gath, Hamath, Arpad, & Rezeph a City placed by Ptolomy near Thapsacus. On the south & southeast were Babylon & Chalneh or Calno a city which was built by Nimrod where Bagdad now stands & gave the name of Chalonitis to a large region under its government, & Thalassar or Talatha was placed by Ptolomy in Babylonia upon the common stream of Tigris & Euphrates & the Archevites at Arecca or Erech a city built by Nimrod on the east side of Pasitigris between Apamia & the Persian Gulph, & the Susanchites at Cuth or Susa the metropolis of Susiana. On the east were Elymais & the Cities of the Medes & Kir a City & large region between Elymais & Assyria (Isa. 22.6) called Kirene by the Chalde Paraphrast & Latin interpreter & Carine by Ptolomy. On the northeast were Habor or Chaboras a mountanous region between Assyria & Media & the Apharsachites or men of Arrapachitis a region placed by Ptolomy at the bottom of that mountain next Assyria: & on the north between Assyria & the Gordiæan mountains was Halah or Chalach the Metropolis of Calachene built by Nimrod. And beyond these upon the Caspian sea was Gozan called Gauzania by Ptolomy. Thus did these new conquests extend every way from the very border of Assyria & make up the great body of that Monarchy: so that well might the king of Assyria boast how his armies had destroyed all lands All these nations † ^[8] had till now their several Gods & each accounted his God the God of his own land & the defender thereof against the Gods of the neighbouring countries, and particularly against that of Assyria & therefore they were never till now united under the Assyrian Monarchy: but now being small kingdoms the King of Assyria easily overflowed them. Know ye not, saith Sennacherib to the Iews, ^[9] what I & my fathers have done unto all the people of other lands? – for No God of any nation or kingdom was able to deliver his people out of mine hand & out of the hand of my fathers: how much less shall your God deliver you out of mine hand? He and his fathers therefore Tiglathpileser & Salmanaser were great conquerors & with a current of victories had newly overflowed all nations about Assyria and thereby set up this monarchy.

<6r>

< insertion from f 5v >

Tis true that this City † ^[11] including the large gardens & suburbs for feeding of Cattel, was a great city in the days of Ionah that is about eighty or an hundred years before the captivity of the ten tribes. Nahum^[12] who lived after the reign of Sennacherib represents that it had been long a populous city, and Herodotus that it reigned over the upper or greater Asia 500 years. And so long perhaps it might have been one of the greatest cities in the east, but yet it grew not up before the reign of Pul to that extent of Dominion which was called the kingdom of Assyria & accounted one of the great monarchies. ffor before his reign there is not one word of this Monarchy in all the scriptures, thô after he began to make it great, it's mentioned both in sacred

history & in the Prophets in the reign of almost every king. In the days of Ionas it was not so great & potent as not to be terrified at the preaching of Ionas & fear being invaded by its neighbours and ruined within forty days. After it grew potent its kings were constantly called kings of Assyria but till the days of Ionas they were called only †^[13] kings of Nineveh & at his preaching the decree of the King & his nobles for a solemn fast was published only through Nineveh. ffor by that name it seems the kingdom as well as the city was hitherto called. When Ieroboam the son of Ioash king of Israel had newly subdued the kingdoms of Damascus & Hamath, the Prophet Amos thus reproves Israel for being lifted up. ^[14] Ye which rejoyce in a thing of nought, which say, Have we not taken to us horns by our strength? But behold I will raise up against you a nation, o house of Israel saith the Lord & they shall afflict you from the entring in of Hamath unto the river of the wilderness. God here threatens to raise up a nation against Israel, but what nation he names not. That he conceales till the Assyrians should appear and discover it. In the prophetesies of Isaiah Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, Micah, Nahum, Zephany & Zechary which were written after this monarchy grew up, its openly named upon all occasions, but in this of Amos not once, thô the captivity of Syria & Israel thereby be the subject of the prophesy & that of Israel be often threatned. He only saith in general that Israel notwithstanding her present greatness should be captivated & that he would raise up a nation to do it, meaning that he would raise up above them from a lower condition a nation whom they yet feared not.. ffor so the hebrew word נִשְׂבָּר signifies when applied to men, as in Amos 5.2 1 Sam. 2.8. 2 Sam. 12.11. Psal. 113.7. Ier. 10.20. & 50.32. Hab 1.6. Zech 11.16. The Assyrian Monarchy therefore rose up after the writing of this Prophesy & by consequence in the reign of Pul & his successors. For after Ieroboam had conquered Damascus & Hamath his successor Menahem destroyed Tipsah with its territories upon Euphrates because in his expedition against Shallum who usurped the crown they opened not to him & ther <6v> fore Israel continued in its greatness till Pul^[15] (probably grown formidable by some victories) caused Menahem to buy his peace. Pul therefore reigning presently after the prophesy of Amos & being the first upon record who began to fulfil it, may justly (in the sense of the scriptures) be accounted the founder of this Monarchy.

Had we distinct accounts < text from f 6r resumes > Had we distinct accounts of those early ages I doubt not but we might find a much greater number of kingdoms which went to make up the body of this monarchy then we have reckoned up. For a^[16] almost all Mesopotamia continued in villages except Babylon untill the Greeks assembled them into cities because of the fertile soile, & all the Medes as Herodotus informs us, ^[17] after they revolted from the Assyrians & recovered their ancient liberty, lived for a while under their proper laws, being every where divided into δήμοι little polities (such as in scripture are called cities & kingdoms:) amongst which when rapines & wicked hostilities were every where committed without punish <7r> ment, they assembled in a Council & began to treat of their common state, & finding that those mischiefs were too grievous to be longer endured, & were not to be remedied without a common Iudge they agreed to set up a King over them who might govern the whole state by good laws. Thereupon they created one Dejoces their King & at his request built a palace fit for such a king & a City whose walls equalled those of Athens in compass, there being it seems till then no city in all Media big enough & well enough fortified & adorned for a royall seat. This city was Ecbatane, which some conjecture to be that now called Tauris by the natives but was much more eastward.. So then all Media was anciently divided into δήμοι small kingdoms which lived each under its own laws & warred with one another till they united under Deioces, & thereby laid the foundation of the Monarchy of the Medes & Persians. These δήμοι were towns next superior to villages δ < insertion from f 6v > δ villages, such as we call corporation towns & market towns, but which in the first ages were free & absolute cities each with its court & territory & subordinate villages. ffor what the Greeks call δήμοι the scriptures call the cities of the Medes. Their smalness & multitude may be learnt from hence that in Greece many of these δήμοι in the first ages combined under one head city such as was Eleusis or Cecropia or Mantinea or Tegea, & then many of these head cities combined under one Metropolis such as was Athens or Corinth or Thebes.

For the original of kingdoms was much the same in Greece & the lesser Asia & other countries as in the East. For Homer reconns fifteen — — — — < text from f 7r resumes > The original of kingdoms was much the same in other countries. For Homer^[18] reconns up fifteen several nations which came to the assistance of Troy, each under the command of it's own Prince, & yet all their territories together made but a very small part of Asia minor. The first great kingdom we read of there was the Lydian seated at Sardis, & that grew great only in the reign of its two last kings Alyatte & Cræsus.

And in Greece Homer reckons up twenty & nine several nations which sent their armies against Troy each under the command of its Prince, & some (being not yet grown into single kingdoms) under the command of more Princes than one. One of these nations was the kingdom of Athens, another that of the Argives or Mycenæ, a third that of Arcadia. These were three kingdoms & their kings, who were Menestheus, Agamemnon & Agapenor, led their forces against Troy. The rest were either kingdoms or aggregates of free cities or small kingdoms not yet well united into one government. For Pausanias tells us^[19] that all Greece was at first governed by kings before common wealths were instituted. By the original & ancient constitution of the kingdoms of Athens, Mycenæ & Arcadia you may understand that of the rest.

That of Athens is thus set down by Thucydides.^[20] Vnder Cecrops, saith he, & the ancient kings untill Theseus, Attica always κατὰ πόλεις ὤκειτο, πρυτανεία τι ἔχουσα καὶ ἄρχοντας was inhabited city by city, having magistrates & Prytanea or Courts with the Vestal fire adjoining. Neither did they <8r> consult the king when there was no fear of danger but each apart administred their own common-wealth & had their own Council. Yea some, as the Eleusinians with Eumolpus against Erichtheus, did sometimes make war. But when Theseus a prudent & potent man obtained the kingdom he took away the Councils & Magistrates of other cities & made them all meet in one Council & Prytaneum at Athens. To the same purpose Plutarch also relates^[21] how that the people of Attica were divided & difficult to be called together to consult about their common affairs & sometimes disagreed & made wars upon one another till Theseus perswaded them to convene into one polity which should be free & have the whole power lodged in the people excepting only that he would manage their wars & put their laws in execution. To which when they agreed he dissolved the Prytanea & Courts & Magistracy which they had in their several cities & erected in Athens one Prytaneum & Court common to them all, which, saith Plutarch is still there to be seen. So then the government of every city was at first complete & absolute in matters both civil & sacred. Every City had its Prytaneum or Vestal temple with a Court in it for the council of the City to sacrifice and consult about civil affairs. ffor the Magistrates in the first ages were also the Priests. And hence it is that πολιτεία polity, which signifies the government of a city, has been ever since used for the government of a kingdom or any other free & absolute government. Polemon tells us ^[22] that in this body of Attica there were an hundred & seventy δήμοι distinct peoples or cities, one of which was the city Eleusis so famous for her sacred mysteries. And these continued free till the reign of Cecrops their first common captain or king. For Philochorus relates^[23] that when Attica was infested by sea & land by the Cares & Bœoti, Cecrops first of any man reduced the multitude (that is the 170 cities) into twelve cities whose names were Cecropia, Tetrapolis, Epacria, Decelea, Eleusis, Aphydna, Thoricus, Brauron, Cytherus, Sphettus, Cephissia & Phalerus, & that Theseus afterwards contracted these twelve cities into one which was Athens. By this you may perceive that Cecrops the first king of Attica was only a Captain of the forces of all the cities elected in time of danger. According to the Arundelian Marble he was made their captain or king about 63 years before Cadmus brought letters into Europe, & Theseus was contemporary to the Argonauts, being the predecessor of Menestheus who went to the war of Troy.

The original of the kingdom of the Argives was much <9r> after the same manner. ffor saith Pausanias, ^[24] Φορωνεύς δὲ ὁ Ἰνάχου τοὺς ἄνθρώπους συνάγαγε πρῶτον εἰς κοινὸν σποράδας τεὼς καὶ ἰφ' ἑαυτῶν ἑκάστοτε οἰκούντας καὶ τὸ κωρίον ἐς ὃ πρῶτον ἡθροίσθησαν, ἀστυ ὠνομάσθη Φορώνικον: Phoroneus the son of Inachus was the first who gathered into one community the Argives who till then were scattered & lived every where apart: and the place where they were first assembled was called the city of Phoroneus. Others add that he set up an altar to Iuno & ordeined them laws & judicature & reduced them from a brutish & salvage life to a civil one. The altar was doubtless for the worship of the common assembly & the brutish life from which he reduced them was that of warring upon one another. He was contemporary to Cadmus or but a very little ancients. ffor when the Phenician merchants stole away his sister Io & carried her into Egypt the Greeks in revenge stole away Europa from the Phenicians.

The people of Arcadia were a branch of the Pelasgi & the Pelasgi are accounted one of the oldest nations of Greece. They had their name from Pelasgus their first king, it being usual in those days to call the people & country after the name of the king. This was not the son of Niobe Hesiod accounts him ^[25] αὐτόχθονα a son of the earth a native of the country & Pausanias tells us ^[26] that the Arcadians accounted him the first man & that he was their first king & taught the ignorant people to build houses for defending themselves from heat & cold & rain & to make them garments of skins & instead of hearbs & roots which were sometimes noxious, to eat the acorns of the beech tree: that all Peloponnesus was at first called from him Pelasgia, & that the city Lycosura which was built by his son Lycaon was the oldest of all the cities either in the continent or

in the Islands. This, saith he, was the first city which the Sun ever saw & after the pattern of this were other cities built. He saith also that Lycaon gave the name of Lycæus to Iupiter & instituted the Lupercalia to his honour: & slew an infant upon his altar, whence they feigned him transformed into a wolf. The Marble makes him contemporary to Pandion the grandfather of Theseus, Others make him a little ancients. Pausanias tells us that in the time of the sons of Lycaon the whole region was much increased in the number of cities & people, & that those his sons who were about 24 in number, shared his territories among them & built each of them one or more cities the names of which he there sets down. Only Oenotrus who was the youngest of the brothers sailed thence with his people into Italy. And this is reckoned the first colony which the Greeks sent abroad. The same <10r> division of the kingdom of Lycaon amongst his sons is mentioned also by Dionysius Halicarnassæus. And by this instance you may understand how upon the first peopling of Peloponnesus every father shared his territories amongst all his sons (as Moses describes) untill there was no more room for division. How these divisions united afterward into greater polities, Strabo has given us the following instances. [27] Homer, saith he, calls all the places which he reckons up in Peloponnesus, a few excepted, not cities but regions because each of them consisted of a convention of many δήμοι free towns out of which afterwards noble cities were built and frequented: So the Argives composed Mantinea in Arcadia out of five towns, & Tegea out of nine. And out of so many was Heræa built by Cleombrotus or by Cleonymus. So also Ægium was built out of seven or eight towns, Patræ out of seven, Dyme out of eight: & so Elis was erected by the conflux of many towns into one city. Here & in some passages above, its plain that by the δήμοι out of which cities arose, the Greeks mean towns of a middle degree between their cities & villages. Of such towns Herodotus tells you that all Media consisted till they built Ecbatane a city equal to Athens, & these towns the scripture as was said calls the cities of the Medes. How in Greece by erecting common councils with Prytanea such towns grew into cities & cities into the seats of kingdoms, the councils ever drawing a conflux of people, has been said above, & will further appear by the rise of kingdoms in Italy. Some of these councils were without a king, as the Amphyctionick council of twelve Greek nations which met twice a yeare in spring at Delphos in the temple of Apollo & in autumn at Thermopylæ in the Temple of Ceres built for that purpose. All sorts of people met to sacrifice & feast & buy & sell & the Princes to consult about the common welfare of the nations. One of the twelve nations were the Macedonians. They were not of this council in the beginning but were admitted afterwards in the room of the Phocians who were struck out for sacrilege. Iustin tells us [28] that the ancient Macedonia was a small region & its people a branch of the Pelasgi & Pliny saith [29] it was composed of 150 peoples. I suppose he means δήμοι towns. Out of these towns at length arose cities & little kingdoms for Iustin tells us that when Caranus led a colony of Greeks thither (which if to the nine first kings of Macedonia we allow a reign of about twenty one years apiece was about thirty years after the captivity of the ten tribes) he first seized the city Ædessa & then expelling Midas the king of a certain part of Macedon & afterwards other kings, he succeeded in the room of them all & thus uniting the nations of various peoples <11r> he first of all made one body of Macedonia & founded that kingdom which at length by subduing first its neighbours then other nations propagated its dominion to the furthest parts of the east. Herodotus [30] makes not Caranus but Perdiccas the son of Caranus to be the founder of this kingdom, & describes the kings of those times poor & mean below the degree of subjects in later ages, so that their meat was coockt for them by their own Queens. By conquering such kings either Caranus or Perdiccas became king of Macedon & his successors at length by conquering all Greece & the east erected the third Monarchy.

The rise of kingdoms in Italy was like that in other places. For Dionysius Halicarnassæus writes how the region where Rome was afterwards built was first peopled by barbarians called Siculi. This region, saith he, was afterwards taken from them by a long war by the Aborigines who till then lived in the mountains in towns without walls spread all over the region, but after the Pelasgi & other Greeks intermixed with them & helped them in their war against their neighbours, the Siculi being expelled, they compassed many cities with walls, & became possessors of all the territory between the two rivers Liris & Tiber. He speaks of the Aborigines & Pelasgi here as of two peoples intermixed, but a little after he takes them to be but two names of one & the same people brought hither out of Peloponnesus by Oenotrus the Son of Lycaon as above, & thus describes how in the beginning they peopled the western part of Italy. Oenotrus, saith he, having found a large region fit for pasturage & tillage but yet for the most part uninhabited, & where it was inhabited peopled but thinly: in a certain part of it purged from the barbarians he built cities little & numerous in the mountains: which manner of building was familiar to the ancients. Then he tells us how after they were grown numerous so as to want room they made war upon the Siculi, as above & forced them to leave Italy & seat themselves in the next Island, which was ever since from them called <12r> Sicily. This was that war in which the Aborigines first compassed many cities with walls as above. Out of such cities as these arose afterwards divers kingdoms

in Italy amongst which the Aborigines or Latines for a long time made but a small figure tho augmented by the new colonies of Ianus & Saturnus & Evander. They had a king before the Trojan war but without being united under him. For about 32 years after that war Ascanius the son of Æneas built the city Alba & instituted there a Council of all the cities under him with sacrifices to Iupiter: in the time of which solemnity one of the young men of best note governed the city; & this council was no doubt (like those of the Greeks) erected for uniting all the cities into one polity. The Vestal fire was also kept in Alba. This kingdom allowing their kings a reign of 21 years a piece one with another continued about 294 years & then Romulus with a few Latines laid the foundation of Rome about 20 miles from Alba. Strabo tells us^[31] that the Æqui, Volsci, & some Aborigines & the Rutuli & other greater and lesser cities dwelt about Rome when it was first built, & that they dwelt there freely village by village without being subject to any common nation – & that Romulus built Rome in a place assumed not by choice but by constraint which was neither fortified by nature nor had ground enough to supply the city nor men to inhabit it. For the inhabitants of the region lived each apart & reached to the very walls of the city & regarded not the Albani. Such were Collatia, Antemnæ, Fidenæ, Lavinium & other such like small cities not above 4 or 5 miles from Rome. To get men therefore he built an Asylum which drew a conflux of people, & with these he warred with the king of the Sabines at Lavinium & by compact inherited his kingdom, & being now grown strong it may be presumed that other little free cities round about easily complied with him. For Dionysius Halicarnassæus tells us ^[32] that this new kingdom as Romulus left it consisted of thirty Courts or Councils in so many towns, each with the sacred fire kept in the Prytanæum of the Court for the Senators who met there to perform sacred rites after the manner of the Greeks. Whence the Senators were called Curiales. But when Numa the successor of Romulus reigned, he leaving the several fires in their own courts instituted one common to them all at Rome. – After <13r> wards Servius Tullius, the feild being divided, as above, into about 30 territories, on the hills & such places as being fortified by the nature of the place might easily protect the husbandmen, he prepared refuges which the Greeks call δημοῦς. Hither every body fled out of the field when any enemies came & here they often staid all night. These had also their magistrates to whose care it belonged to know the names of the husbandmen who contributed within the limits of that refuge, & their farms whereby they got their living, & as often as it was necessary to call the countrimen to their arms & to lay a tax upon them those Magistrates called them together & taxed them. And that the number of the country people might easily be known & reckoned he commanded them to build, & dedicate Altars to the Gods who were inspectors & keepers of the refuge; Which altars they should yearly honour with sacrifices being all assembled together, & instituted a most honourable feast which they called the village-feast, & wrote laws concerning those sacra which the Romans still observe. – Then being very desirous to unite and conjoyn the cities of the Latin nation into one body polytick least being weakned by intestine discords & wars they should be deprived of their liberty by the neighbouring Barbarians he called together the chief men out of the several cities declaring to them for what great designe about their common advantage he had convened them. – And by this speech he perswaded them to build a Temple with an inviolable refuge at Rome at their common charge in which the people of all the cities being yearly assembled might perform publick & private sacrifices & buy & sell at set times. And if any quarrel or difference arose between them it might be determined at these sacra, the decision of the controversy being permitted to the arbitrimēt of the rest of the cities. He built therefore at the common charge of the cities the Temple of Diana in the hill Aventinus & wrote the laws of the compact made between these people in a pillar of brass which remains to this day being erected in the Temple of Diana & has the characters of the Greek letters which the Greeks used of old. <14r> Thus far Dionysius. By this unquestionable record you may see how difficult it was to unite the divided cities into one polity. You have also in the refuges or fortified towns a specimen of the first cities & kingdoms into which men convened when they began to make war upon one another

For better understanding the ancient state of Greece & Italy, the Chronology of those times is to be rectified. ffor the Europeans had no Chronology ancients then the Persian Monarchy. And whatever Chronology we have now of ancients times has been framed since by reasoning & conjecture. Pherecides Atheniensis in the reign of Darius Hystaspis or soon after wrote a large book of the Antiquities & ancient Genealogies of the Athenians & was one of the first European writers of this kind, whence he had the name of Genealogus And by these Genealogies the Greeks estimated times past but computed not by any Æra till about the end of the Persian Monarchy. Hippias who lived in the end of that Monarchy was the first that counted by the Olympiads & was derided for it by Plato. Plutarch ^{a[33]} saith that Hippias published a Breviary of the Olympiads supported by no certain arguments The Arundelian Marbles were composed 60 years after the death of Alexander the great & yet mention not the Olympiads, so that this Æra was not then received tho it

be now reputed the principal Æra of the Greeks. The annual Archons of the Athenians may be relied on as high as the warr of Darius Hystaspis with the Greeks, but in ancienter times are set too early with great intervalls of time between them. Plutarch ^{b[34]} represents great uncertainty in the originals of Rome & so doth Servius ^{c[35]} The old Records of the Latins ^{b[36]} were burnt by the Gauls 64 years before the death of Alexander the great & Q. Fabius Pictor the oldest historian of the Latins lived 100 years later then that king.

Now all nations before they began to keep exact accompts of time have been prone to raise their antiquities & make the lives of their first fathers longer then they really were. And this humour has been promoted by the ancient contention between several nations about their antiquity. For this made the Egyptians & Chaldeans raise their antiquities higher then the truth by many thousands of years. And the seventy have added to the ages of the Patriarchs. <15r> And Ctesias has made the Assyrian Monarchy above 1400 years older then the truth. The Greeks & Latins are more modest in their own originals but yet have exceeded the truth. ffor in stating the times by the reigns of those their kings which were ancienter then the Persian Monarchy they have put those reigns equipollent to generations & accordingly made them one with another about an age a piece reckoning three ages to an hundred years. For they make the seven kings of Rome who preceded the Consuls to have reigned 244 years which is one with another 35 years a piece & the 14 Kings of the Latines between Æneas & Numitor or the founding of Rome to have reigned 425 years which is above 30 years a piece, & the first ten kings of Macedon (Caranus &c) to have reigned 353 years which is above 35 years a piece & the first ten kings of Athens (Cecrops &c) 351 years which is 35 years a piece, & the eight first kings of Argos (Inachus, Phoroneus &c) to have reigned 371 years which is above 46 years a piece: Whereas according to the ordinary course of nature kings reign one with another but about 20 years a piece. So the 18 Kings of Iudah who succeeded Solomon reigned 390 years which is one with another 22 years a piece. The 15 Kings of Israel after Solomon reigned 259 years which is $17\frac{1}{4}$ years a piece. The 18 Kings of Babylon (Nabonasser &c) reigned 209 years which is $11\frac{2}{3}$ years a piece. The 10 Kings of Persia (Cyrus &c) reigned 208 years which is almost 21 years a piece. The 16 successors of Alexander in Syria (Seleucus &c) reigned 244 years which is 15 years a piece. The 10 in Macedonia (Aridæus &c) 156 years which is $15\frac{1}{2}$ a piece. The 28 Kings of England (William the Conqueror & his successors) $635\frac{1}{2}$ years which is $22\frac{2}{3}$ years a piece. The sixty & three kings of France (Pharamund & his successors) 1224 years which is $19\frac{1}{2}$ years a piece. Generations from father to son may be reckoned one with another about 33 or 34 years a piece or three generations to an hundred years. But if the Generations proceed by the eldest sons they are shorter so that three of them may be reckoned to eighty years. And the reign of Kings is still shorter because Kings are succeeded not only by their eldest sons but sometimes by their brothers <16r> and sometimes they are slain or deposed & succeeded by others of an equal or greater age, especially in elective & turbulent kingdoms.

So in the elective kingdom of the Romans, ninety or an hundred years may be a reasonable allowance for the reign of the seven kings before the Consuls, especially since all of them except Numa either died violent deaths or were deposed. And according to this reckoning Numa who was a Pythagorean Philosopher ^{a[37]} might live after Pherecides Thales & Pythagoras had brought Philosophy into Europe. And in the preceding hereditary kingdom of the Latines, the 14 kings between the death of Æneas & the building of Rome allowing them 21 years a piece one with another will take up 294 years more & so place the death of Æneas about 80 or 90 years after the death of Solomon. Whence the taking of Troy will be about 70 or 80 years later then the death of Solomon.

Again in the kingdom of the Spartans, after Menelaus the husband of Helena, & Ægisthus the murderer of Agamemnon, reigned successively Orestes & Tisamenus & after them two races of fifteen kings in each race untill the reign of Darius Hystaspis: so that by a double reckoning there were 17 reigns or successions of kings between the deaths of Menelaus & Ægisthus & the beginning of the reign of Darius & his contemporaries Cleomenes & Demaratus: which by reckoning 21 years a piece to each reign one with another amount to 357 years which counted backwards from the beginning of the reign of Darius place the beginning of the reign of Orestes about 103 years after the death of Solomon. At which rate the destruction of Troy will be about 90 or 95 years later then the death of Solomon.

Also after Orestes & Tisamenus there reigned at Argos Temenus & six others successively the last of which was Phidon who instituted weights & measures & coyned money in Ægina. He was the brother of Caranus the founder of the Kingdom of Macedon & between Caranus & Alexander king of Macedon (that king who

according to Eusebius began his reign in the 19th year of Darius Hystaspis) there were nine successive kings of Macedon so that between the death of Ægisthus & the 19th year of Darius there were 18 successive reigns all which at 21 years to a reign make 378 years & these years <17r> counted backward place the beginning of the reign of Orestes 100 years after the death of Solomon: at which rate the destruction of Troy will be about 90 years after the death of that king.

Again from Æsculapius to Hippocrates inclusively are reckoned 18 male generations by the fathers side & 19 generations by the mothers side. And because these generations being taken notice of in History were most probably by the principal of the family & so for the most part by the eldest sons, we may reckon about 25 or 30 years to a generation. And thus the 17 intervals by the fathers side & 18 by the mothers will at a middle reckoning amount to about 481 years, which counted backwards from the middle of the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus when Hippocrates flourished will reach up to the 55th year after the death of Solomon. And therefore Æsculapius & Hercules (whose sons were at the Trojan war) flourished about that time & the destruction of Troy which was one generation later was about 88 years after the death of Solomon.

And this agrees with the reckoning of those Historians whom Virgil followed in making Æneas & Dido contemporary. For Iosephus out of the Tyrian Annals tells us that Dido fled to Afric & built Carthage in the seventh year of her brother Pigmalion king of Tyre that is 90 years after the death of Solomon. Some old writers (as Philistus & Appian) have represented Carthage built even before the destruction of Troy & Strabo seems to make it built soon after. They celebrate, saith he,^[38] the dominion of Minos over the sea & the navigation of the Phœnicians who went beyond Hercules's pillars & built cities there & in the middle of the sea coasts of Afric presently after the war of Troy. Upon these & such like authorities Virgil seems to have grounded the Synchronism. For Teucer after the destruction of Troy being barred by his father Telamon from returning home into the Island Salamis sailed to Cyprus & there built a new city which he called Salamis & marrying the daughter of Cinyras he & his posterity reigned there till Artaxerxes Mnemon king of Persia took Cyprus from Evagoras the last of that race. ^[40] Also Agapenor the captain of the Arcadians after the destruction of Troy sailed to Cyprus & built there a new Paphus & temple of Venus about sixty furlongs from the old Paphus built <18r> by Cinyras. And Theopompus tells us^[41] that the Greeks who followed Agamemnon (meaning Teucer Agapenor & their companions) seized Cyprus & ejected Cinyras. It seems they did it by the assistance of Belus; for he & his son Pigmalion reigned over Cyprus or some part thereof & built the cities Citium, Lapethus & Carpatia,^[42] & Virgil introduces Dido speaking thus.

Atque equidem Teucrum memini Sidona venire
Finibus expulsum patrijs, nova regna petentem
Auxilio Beli: Genitor tum Belus opimam
Vastabat Cyprum & victor ditone tenebat.
Tempore jam ex illo casus mihi cognitus urbis
Trojanæ, nomenque tuum, regesque Pelasgi.

Servius adds: Cyprum subactam Belus concessit Teucro ut in ea collocaret imperium. Belus therefore took Cyprus from Cinyras & there gave seats to the Greeks who assisted him. Servius tells us that this Belus was called Methres & Iosephus calls him Matgenus. According to the Tyrian Annals he reigned nine years & died 83 years after Solomon. Whence it follows that Troy was taken about 70 or 80 years after Solomon's death.

Altho the Greeks & Latins had no certain Chronology ancienter then the Persian Monarchy yet the Phœnicians had Annals as ancient as the days of David. And Tatian^[43] in his book against the Greeks relates that amongst the Phœnicians flourished three ancient historians, Theodotus Hypsicrates & Mochus who all of them delivered in their Histories (translated into Greek by Lætus) that under one of the Kings (that is one of the Kings of Phœnicia) happened the rapture of Europa the voyage of Menalaus into Phœnicia & the league & friendship between Hiram & Solomon when Hiram gave his daughter to Solomon & supplied him with timber for building the Temple: and that the same is affirmed by Menander of Pergamus. And so Lætus ^{d[44]} conjoins the voyage of Menalaus with that league of Solomon & Hiram. But while the Historians allow no more time then the reign of one king between the rapture of Europa & the voyage of Menalaus it seems to me that they found only the rapture of Europa in the Annals of the Phenicians, & by conjecture subjoined the voyage of Menalaus as a thing which happend soon after. For that voyage <19r> was not of such moment to the Phenicians that they should record it, but Agenors losing his daughter and sending his sons in quest of her

affected them. For Lucian tells us^[45] that the Sidonians built a Temple to Europa & used money with her effigies sitting upon a Bull. If they had her memory in so much honour it may well be supposed that they entered her story in their Annals & the league between Solomon & Hiram was certainly entered Iosephus mentioning it out of the Annals of Tyre. The Phenician Historians therefore conjoined the rapture of Europa with the League between Hiram & Solomon because in the Annals of their country they found them together or within the short compass of a kings reign, & thence we may conclude that the rapture of Europa happened about the beginning of Solomons reign or some time in Davids. Now Eteocles & Polynices the sons of Oedipus the son of Laius the son of Labdacus the son of Polydorus the son of Cadmus & Harmonia slew one another in the war of the seven captains at Thebes & ten years after ^b[46] Thersander the young son of Polynices took Thebes from Laodamas the young son of Eteocles & was soon after slain by Telephus in going to the war at Troy in the sixt ^c[47] or seventh year of that war. These six generations by the eldest sons between the coming of Cadmus into Europe & the war of Troy could scarce take up less time then 140 years, which together with the four last years of that war being counted from about the tenth or twentieth year of Davids reign will place the taking of Troy about 80 years later then the death of Solomon as above. If Cadmus fled from Sidon with his wife Harmonia as the Sidonians ^a[48] relate, his son Polydorus might be born some years before he fled.

This reckoning is further confirmed by considering that the war of Troy by the consent of all antiquity was later then the reign of Sesostris & fell in with the latter end of the reign of Memnon. For Sesostris was Sesak who reigned in the days of Solomon & Rehoboam & Memnon died about 85 or 90 years after the death of Solomon as we shall shew hereafter.

So then Greece continued divided into many small governments till after the days of Solomon & if we should suppose the Argonautick expedition to be 35 or 40 years older then the taking of Troy & the rapture of Europa & coming of Cadmus into Europe to be 100 years older then that expedition & Cecrops, Pho <20r> roneus, Selex & Lycaon to be as old or a generation or two older then Cadmus, yet the first building of cities in Europe & uniting them into little polities & the first use of letters would scarce be older then the days of Samuel Saul & David. Till then the Greeks lived either without houses or in villages of huts^[49] & fed upon the spontaneous fruits of the earth without planting of trees without plowing & sowing without wine or beer without commerce or money, without laws or letters & even without fixed seats being in perpetual arms & often changing their seats as they drave out one another by force or sought a better soyle untill at length the villages combined to wall in some towns to which they might fly in case of danger & these towns united into bigger polities whose first kings gave their names to the people & countries they reigned over, as Achæus to Achaia, Ion to Ionia, Cecrops to Cecropia, Pelasgus to the Pelasgi, Pelops to Peloponesus, Hellen to the Hellenes, Dorus to the Dores, Danaus to the Danai, Atthis to Attica, Arcas to Arcadia &c. And this I take to be the reason why Greece was at first so very much divided & did nothing in common before the war of Troy. How mean the towns & cities were in those days may be understood by Ovids description of old Rome

^[50]

Pluris opes nunc sunt quam prisci temporis annis

Dum populus pauper, dum nova Roma fuit.

Dum casa Martigenam capiebat parva Quirinum

Et dabat exiguum fluminis ulva torum.

Iupiter angusta vix totus stabat in æde

Inque Iovis dextra fictile fulmen erat

Frondibus ornabant quæ nunc Capitolia gemmis

Pascebatque suas ipse senator oves.

Nec pudor in stipula placidam cepisse quietem

Et fœnum capiti supposuisse fuit.

Iura dabat populis posito mode Prætor aratro

Et levis argenti lamina crimen erat.

This was the state of Italy above 300 years after the death of Solomon, & other places of Europe more westward & northward were still more rude & barbarous.

The Franks & Britains continued divided into many <21r> small kingdoms till Iulius Cæsar invaded them & the ancient constitution of Spain was like that of the other nations. For Strabo speaking in general of the Colonies which the Greeks sent abroad into this & other nations saith: ^[51] The reason why the Greeks wandered to the barbarous nations seems to be the distraction of those nations into small parties & dynasties of such as through haughtiness would not combine with one another: whence it happened that they were weak against those who invaded them. This haughtiness prevailed chiefly among the Spaniards being accompanied also with their crafty nature & double mindedness. For they following a treacherous & thievish way of life, being bold in little things but attempting nothing great, neglected the acquisition of great power & society. ffor if they would have combined to defend themselves by their joynt forces, the Carthaginians could not by an incursion have conquered the greater part of Spain without opposition, nor before them the Tyrians & Celti who are now called Celtiberi & Verones, nor afterwards the thieves Variatho & Sertorius & if any others designed a greater dominion. Also the Romans by parts warring upon first one then another Dynasty of the Spaniards, spent much time in subduing them severally untill they conquered them all in the space of 200 years or above.

What Strabo tells us of the Greek Colonies may be easily applied to the Phenician, namely that they by reason of the smalness & weakness of the ancient kingdoms easily conquered wherever they pleased to seat themselves. Thus Carthage a colony of the Phenicians grew great before the Romans conquered it, but in the region ^{a[52]} which lay between the kingdom of Carthage & Mauritania & extended in length from Tritus to Metgonium ^{a[53]} six thousand furlongs, Strabo describes the kingdoms of the ancient inhabitants to have continued small & numerous till the Romans invaded them. For, saith he, ^{b[54]} that region was divided after various manners, seeing those among whom it was divided were very many & the Romans according to their emergent circumstances were friends to some & enemies to others so as in various manners to give to one & take from another. And as for Mauritania Tertullian ^{c[55]} tells us: Vnicuique Provinciæ et civitati suus Deus est, ut Syriæ Astartes ut Arabiæ Disares, – ut Mauritaniae Reguli sui. And who these Reguli were Saint Cyprian ^{d[56]} <22r> thus expounds: Mauri verò manifestè reges suos colunt nec ullo velamento hoc nomen obtexunt. Inde per gentes & provincias singulas varia Deorum religio mutatur dum non unus ab omnibus Deus colitur sed propria cuique majorum suorum cultura servatur.

If we pass from hence into India we shall find that country divided into many kingdoms even when Alexander the great invaded it, which was above two hundred years after Media & Persia were grown into a Monarchy.

The great antiquity of the kingdom of Egypt makes it difficult to give an account of its original but some foot steps there are therof in history. For the kingdom of Egypt under which Israel was in bondage seems to have comprehended but a smal part of Egypt as well because in two days time the children of Israel were scattered throughout all the land of this kingdom to gather straw (Exod. 5.12, 14) as because the king of this kingdom said that the children of Israel were more & mightier then his people (Exod. 1.9 Psal. 105.24) Which is an argument that Egypt then consisted of several small kingdoms of which this was but one.

In the seven years of plenty Ioseph laid up the corn in the cities of Egypt, the corn of the feild which was round about every city laid he up in the same Gen 41.48. And therefore the cities of Egypt being in those days the places in which the Egyptians inned their harvests they must have been not much further asunder then our villages & by consequence as numerous & small as the ancient cities of Syria & δήμοι of the Medes & Greeks. Which is an argument that the first constitution of Egypt was like that of other nations. For these cities like the δήμοι of Greece united under Common Councils & thereby grew into kingdoms.

For the common Councils of the Greeks were set up in imitation of those set up before in Egypt & the remains of such Councils continued in several parts of Egypt till the days of Herodotus. The Oracle, saith he, ^[57] at Dodona is very like that at the Egyptian Thebes, and the way of divining in the Greek temples is taken from Egypt. For the Egyptians were the first authors of making Conventions & Solemnities & Councils & the Greeks learnt <23r> these things from them. Of which thing I have this argument that their way was in use from ancient times but that of Greece lately instituted. Neither do the Egyptians assemble once every year but frequently, as in other places so chiefly & most studiously in the city Bubastis to the honour of Diana, secondly in the city Busiris to the honour of Isis. In which city seated in the middle of the Egyptian Delta is the greatest Temple of Isis. Isis is she who in Greek is called Δημήτηρ that is Ceres. Thirdly in the city of Sais to the honour of Minerva. ffourthly in Heliopolis to the honour of the Sun. ffiftly in the city of Butis to the honour of Latona. Sixtly in the city of Pampremis to the honour of Mars. Herodotus adds that these Conventions were celebrated with great sacrifices & other solemnities & were so numerous that in Bubaste alone there met seven hundred thousand men & weomen besides children. You have a specimen of them in the three annual feasts of the Iews, which shews the great antiquity of such conventions. When the Israelites in the absence of Moses revolted to the worship of Egypt & Aaron accordingly made them a golden calf which was an Egyptian God, he proclaimed a ffeast & the people on the ffeast assembled & offered burn offering & peace offerings & sat down to eat & drink & rose up to play & shouted with singing & dancing. Exod. 32. You have here the manner of the ffeasts which the people had been accustomed to in Egypt. Lucian^[58] seems to make these feasts in Egypt as old as Idolatry it self. ffor he saith that the Egyptians so far as was known were the first men who perceived the knowledge of the Gods & built Temples & appointed groves & solemn conventions.

This was peculiar to the Egyptians that they worshipped their Gods not in the images of men like the other nations but in those of various beasts.^[59] The temples of Egypt, saith Lucian,^[60] are beautiful & large being built of costly stones but if you seek a God within you will find either an Ape or a Stork or a Swallow or a Cat. To represent things by Hieroglyphicks was the sacred language of the ancient Egyptians, & the Birds Beasts & ffishes which they worshipped are nothing else then the Hieroglyphicks symbols or banners of <24r> their first kings & their worshipping them was certainly older then the days of Moses because described & prohibited in the second Commandment. Thou shalt not make to thyself any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above or in the earth beneath or in the waters below the earth thou shalt not bow down to them nor serve them (Exod. 20) that is thou shalt not make nor worship the likeness or image of any fowle in the heaven or beast or insect or plant in the earth or fish in the waters as thy fathers worshipped them in Egypt Deut 4.16, 17, 18. Iosh. 24.14. When therefore we are told^[61] that the Egyptians worshipped a Crocodile in Arsinoe, the Ichneumon in the city of Hercules, an Eagle & a Ram in Thebes, a Goat & the God Pan in the temple of the Mendesians, a sheep in Saïs, a Cat & Diana in Bubastis, a Dog & Mercury in Cynopolis, the fish Oxyrinchus in the city Oxyrinchus, the fish Latus in Latopolis, a wolf in Lycopolis, a Cynocephalus or Ape in Hermopolis, a Lyon in Leontopolis, a Mouse & spider in Athribis & other creatures in other cities: we are to understand that in these symbols the several cities worshipped their founders & first kings & that this worship was older then Moses & even as old as the Idolatry of Egypt. By the founders of cities I mean not their first inhabitants but those who erected Common Councils in them & thereby or by conquest founded their dominion over other cities & built them accordingly. The worshipping of such kings gave the first beginning to idolatry in Egypt Chaldea & the neighbouring nations from whom it spread into Europe & other places. And the multitude of cities in Egypt which had their several Temples, Gods, Conventions, High Priests & modes of worship argues the multitude of kingdoms & nations in Egypt when idolatry began.

The manner how the first cities of Egypt grew into kingdoms will be best understood by the constitution of the kingdom of Athens. For the Athenians were a colony of Egypt and Cecrops the first king of Athens was an Egyptian of the Nome or Province of Sais, & formed that kingdom after the mode of the Egyptian kingdoms ^a ^[62] He taught Athens the worship of the Egyptian Goddess Minerva who was worshipped in Sais. He distinguished the people into three <25r> orders the Gentry soldiers & Mechanicks as the Egyptians did, for the Egyptian Gentry were their Priests. He ordeined that the soldiers should be husbandmen & till all the land in time of peace as the soldiers did in Egypt. He first joyned one man & one woman according to a law in Egypt ordeined by Vulcan. He first introduced the Egyptian Gods among the Greeks, & as the Egyptian Priests wore linnen garments so did the Athenian. And, saith Diodorus,^[63] the sacrifices & ancient customes of the Athenians & Egyptians were alike. Now whilst he thus imitated the Egyptian customes in

other things we may reckon that he imitated them also in the Athenian polity of uniting many δήμοι & little cities into greater polities by Common Councils. For Pliny tells us^[64] that the people of Attica were the first among the Greeks who thus united & Herodotus^[65] that the Greeks in those things followed the example of the Egyptians.

It was the custome of the first ages for every king to have in his city a Prytaneum or place of publick worship for his people. And if any cities united into one polity under any common city they erected a common Prytaneum in that city without abolishing the particular ones. This was done in Italy after the example of the Greeks & in Greece after the example of the Egyptians. And as the Prytanea in the several cities of Greece were the remains of ancient kingdoms so were the temples conventions & religions in Egypt. So when we are told that Ioseph married the daughter of Potiphara Priest of On, we may understand that On had been once the Metropolis of a kingdom but before Ioseph's days the Priests of On lost their dominion as kings & became subject to the kings of another city. And the like of as many other cities as had Temples or Prytaneums without kings & also of the smaller cities whose Prytaneums were disused & extinct. For as in Greece when single cities became united into bigger kingdoms, their Prytaneums in time became disused & the common Prytaneum in the capital city only remained, so it is to be understood of Egypt.

These capital cities with their Prytaneums & Conventions seem to have laid the foundation of the Nomes or Nations of Egypt, every Nome having a capital city with a Temple & Priest & God & annual Conventions for the whole Nome & a Iudge for doing justice: so that the Nomes seem to be the remains of ancient kingdoms, the Priests of the capital cities retaining their Priesthood long after they lost their armies & power as kings. For in the first ages all kings were High Priests & Iudges till they became subject to other kings more potent then themselves. These little kingdoms of Egypt began to grow into bigger kingdoms before the days of Ioseph & by degrees grew into one Monarchy before the days of Solomon & then Sesak made a new regulation of the Nomes & built their Temples more sumptuously.

One of the first great kingdoms in the world was that of Egypt. For Pliny ^{a[66]} in reckoning up the first inventors of things ascribes to the Egyptians the invention of a royal City & to the inhabitants of Attica that of a popular one. Which is as much as to say that Athens was by the Greeks accounted the first city in the world under which other cities united into a popular dominion by a Common Council & the Egyptian Thebes the first City which became the seat of a Monarchy. For Thebes was famous in Homers days when the four Monarchies & their head cities were not yet talked of. For, saith Strabo, ^{b[67]} Homer knew nothing of the Empires of the Medes & Assyrians, otherwise naming. ^{c[68]} the Egyptian Thebes & her riches & those of the Phenicians, he would not have passed over in silence the riches of Babylon, Nineveh & Ecbatane. And for the same reason Memphis also & its miracles grew up after Homers days.. We have shewn how the cities of Egypt united very early into small kingdoms, & how those kingdoms grew at length into one Monarchy seated first at Thebes & then at Memphys remains now to be explained.

<26v>

Entitled the
original of
Monarchies.

25/K

[1] Amos 6.2

[2] 2 King. 19.11.

[3] Isa. 10.8

[4] 1 Chron. 5.26 2 King. 16.9 & 17.6

[5] *The contents of this note are only visible in the diplomatic transcript because they were deleted on the original manuscript*

[6] 2 King. 17.24. Ezra 4.9

[7] *The contents of this note are only visible in the diplomatic transcript because they were deleted on the original manuscript*

[8] † 2 King. 17.29, 30, 31, & 18.33, 34, 35. 2 Chron. 32.15.

[9] 2 Chron. 32.13, 17

[10] Ionas 3.6

[11] Ionas 4.11. Num. 35.3, 4.

[12] Nahum 2.8

[13] † Ionas. 3.6, 7

[14] Amos. 6.14.

[15] {2} King. 15.

[16] a Plin l. 2. c. 25.

[17] Herod. lib. 1

[18] Iliad. β

[19] Pausan. l. 9: initio.

[20] Thucyd. l. 2. p. 110

[21] Plutarch. in Theseo.

[22] Apud Strabonem l. 9. p. 396.

[23] Apud Strabonem l. 9. p. 397

[24] Pausan. in Corinthiacis.

[25] Apud Apollodor. l. 2. initio.

[26] Pausan. lib. 8. sub initio

[27] Strabo l. 8, p. 337.

[28] Iustin. l. 7

[29] Plin. Hist. l. 4. c. 10.

[30] Herod. lib. 8. prope finem.

[31] Strabo lib. 5. p. 229, 230.

[32] Dionys. lib. 2

- [33] a in Numa.
- [34] b in Romulo & Numa.
- [35] c In *Æn.* VII. v. 678
- [36] b in Romulo & Numa.
- [37] a See Plutarch in Numa. Dionys. Hal. l. 2.
- [38] Strabo l. 1. p. 48
- [39] Marm. Arundel. Strabo. l. 14. Pausan Attic. c. 3. p. 8, & Corinth. c. 29 p. 178. Anton. Liberal. cap. 39.
- [40] Strabo l. 14.
- [41] Theopomp. l. 12 apud Photium
- [42] Stephanus in Lapetho et Carpatia.
- [43] Tatian Orat. c. 9. Euseb. Præp. l. 10. c. 11.
- [44] d Apud Clement. Strom. l. 1 p. 326.
- [45] Lucian de Dea Syria.
- [46] b Pausan. Boeot. c. 5. p. 722.
- [47] c Dictys Cretensis l. 2 c. 2.
- [48] a Apud Euhemerum Coum. citante Athen. l. 14.
- [49] Vide Thucid. initio.
- [50] Fast. l. 1
- [51] Strabo Geog. l. 3 p. 158 a.
- [52] a Strabo lib. 17 p. 829 c, & p. 832 a
- [53] a Strabo lib. 17 p. 829 c, & p. 832 a
- [54] b Strabo ib. p. 831, bc.
- [55] c Apolog. p. 26.
- [56] d lib. de Idolorum vanitate.
- [57] Herod. l. 2
- [58] Lucian de Dea. Syr.
- [59] Strabo l. 17, p 805
- [60] Lucian Dial. in Imaginibus.

[61] Herod. l. 2 Strabo l. 17. p. 812.

[62] a Vide Diodorum lib. 1. p. 24, 25, 26.

[63] Diodor. l. 1 p 25 d & 26 a.

[64] Plin. l. 7. c. 56

[65] Herod. supra.

[66] a lib. 7. c. 56.

[67] b lib. 15. p. 735.

[68] c Homer. ιδ 9.
