

# Draft sections of the 'Chronology of Ancient Kingdoms Amended' and of a treatise on Daniel: section d

**Author:** Isaac Newton

**Source:** Yahuda Ms. 25.1d, National Library of Israel, Jerusalem, Israel

**Published online:** October 2013

---

<1r>

The world was at first governed by kings & kings were then both Lawgivers & Iudges & their kingdoms of small extent, no king reigning over more then his own country Ninus was the first who violated this primitive constitution out of desire of dominion invaded he neighbours. Every city with its villages was a polity (as the very word still signifies) & every polity a sovereign kingdom, untill conquest introduced subordination of governments. Every father at first was a king. For the four first ages so much celebrated by the Poets are the ages of the four first generations of Kings & those kings were only fathers Noah is that Saturn who reigned in the golden age **{illeg}** & Ham that Iupiter who reigned in the silver age. For this theology was originally Egyptian & the Egyptian Iupiter is Iupiter Hammon. **{illeg}** Noah reigned till the division of the earth between his sons. Then reigned Iupiter in his own lot till the division thereof between his sons. Then in **{the}** brazen age reigned Osiris & Isis with their brethren in their several lots till Chus not content with his own inheritance invaded the inheritance of the posterity of Sem & planted his sons (as Bochartus has shewn) in several regions round about the Persian gulf from the furthest part of Arabia felix to the furthest part of Carmania. And with this war & the reign of the sons of Chus in their several territories began the iron age. Nimrod was at this time planted by his father in the land of Shinar. & there saith Moses was the beginning of his kingdom: but not content with this country he went out thence into Assyria & planted that land with his posterity p{lant}ing them in several seates which at length grew into cities.. Whence Assyria is called the land of Nimrod, Micah. 3. And as Noah divided his kingdom between his sons & H{a}m his kingdom between his sons & Chus his kingdom between his son so doubtless the sons of Chus (Nimrod as well as the rest) according to the law received from their fathers divided their several kingdoms among their sons, & so on untill families for wan{t} of room to spread into, grew into towns & the competition between several families in the same town altered the law of dividing the inheritance equally between all the sons & brought in the custome of giving all to the eldest son for preserving the family in its power & authority. [So then the first parents were soveraign kings & their kingdoms were no greater then their families. Every family was a kingdom till several families for want of more room to spread into began to live together in the same town & then the commerce between the families made it necessary for ending all differences that their fathers should appoint some one of their number to moderate & judge between them all & do the office of a common father: & thus the first towns became cities & king <1v> doms & the fathers of families which had hitherto been kings became elders of cities, & the towns which grew up afterwards with in the territories of any citty became the villages of the city. And from this small beginning kingdoms have ever since (whether by war or compact) grown greater & greater & governments more & more compound untill the rise of the four Monarchies. Whence it came to pass that the histories of the first ages have been generally buried in oblivion.

For whilst kingdoms were small, their actions were too numerous & too inconsiderable to deserve a lasting memory.

## Chap 2. Of the Assyrian Monarchies.

The first Monarchy of great {ex}tent was the Assyrian. Tis usually reckoned as old as Ninus or Nimrod the founder of Nineve: but this opinion resting only upon the authority of Ctesias & those who borrow from him has been justly called in question by Sir Iohn Marsham. Nimrods kingdom could not be like those now in being: for the world was not then peopled. He conquered not to reign over nations, but to plant his posterity in a good soile, & according to the example of his father Chus & the laws of those ages left the soile divided amongst his children. For he built several cities in Assyria & those cities could be nothing {illeg} at first then the families of his children which were planted by him in several places & in time became cities & grew great & by consequence were so many kingdoms. For Resen as well as Nineve was in the time of Moses a great city & by consequence either then was or had been a great Kingdom distinct from that of Nineve For as families became cities, so cities grew great only by being the seats of Kings. F The Kingdom of Assyria Herodotus dates not from the first founding of Nineve but from some later beginning. For accordin{g to} him it stood but 520 years untill the defection of the Medes & about 120 years <2r> more untill Cyaxeres overthrew it & so it began about 150 years before the reign of Saul. over Israel But we are not to reckon that it stood all this time in it's greatness. The cities

The Kingdom & City of Babylon was founded by Nebonassar an Assyrian about 34 years before the defection of the Medes, & peopled with Arabians collected thither into a body from the neighbouring regions (Isa. 23.13) These Arabians seem to be of the posterity of Chavilah the son of Chus. For his seat compassed Babylon on the south & west, lying in the way from Egypt to Assyria & extending from the Persian gulf & mouth of the Pasitigris or Pison to the south-western elbow of the Euphrates Gen 2.11 & 25.18. 1 Sam. 15.7.) These Arabians the Greeks & Latines called Chaulotæans whence perhaps the name of Chaldæans was given to those in Babylonia. But the kings of Babylon were Assyrians & Medes till the reign of Cyrus as appears by the title of Ptolomies Canon of them. Whence Nabonadius the last of the Kings of that Canon was a Mede & by consequence is the same with Darius the Mede. For the rest were Assyrians unless you will add also the last but one to with Medes. In the 68<sup>th</sup> year of their kingdom Assarhaddon king of Assyria became king also of Babylon, & reigned over both kingdoms thirteen years. & soon after happened the war between the kingdomes of the Medes & Assyrians & the invasion / of Asia by the Scythians, upon which occasions I conceive it was that the kingdom of Babylon became again divided from the kingdom of Assyria. For it appears out of Herodotus that the Babylonians fell off from the Assyrians after the Medes. And since Herodotus speaks of divers

<2v>

The first kings were only fathers of families & their famili{es} were their kingdoms. For the 4 first ages so much celebrated by {illeg} antiq. are the ages of the four first generations of kings. Saturn In the golde{n} age, Iup. in the silver one &c This Theology was Egyptian, & so that Iupiter here is Iupiter Hammon & by consequence ḥ is Noah. Noah reigned first till the division of the earth between his sons. Then reigned 4 in his own lot till the division thereof between his sons & then in the brazen age reigned Osiris & Isis with their br. — — So then Nimrod or Ninus left no standing kingdom: Assyria like all other countries became at first divided among many families, & every family was a town & a kingdom, & every father a king. But when towns began to hold many families the fathers made a Council & became elders of the City & the moderator whom they appointed to do justice among them all supplied the office of a common father or king & the towns which came up afterwards became villages of the City: & fo – For I put reckon the same const. of things in Assyria as in other countries not only for the reasons above but also because the scripture makes no mention of the Assyrian monarchy till [the reign of Phul: which was] above 1300 years after Nimrod invaded & peopled that land In the days of Ioshua & the Iudges Mesopotamia had a king of its own (Iud ) & therefore was not yet subject to the king of Assyria. In the days of David the king of Soba reigned over part of Mesopotamia. There is no mention of the Assyrians passing the river Euphrates till the reign of Phul which

was above 1500 years after the flood, & therefore the Kingdom of Nineve began not to grow great till about that time.

<3r>

**Chap.**  
**The history & chronology of the Babylonian monarchy**  
**with respect to the the Jews.**

The Jews seem to know little more of the Babylonian & Persian Monarchies then what they have out of the Books of the old Testament, & therefore own no more kings nor years of Kings then they can find in those books. The Kings they reckon are only Nebuchadnezzar, Evilmerodach, Belshazzar, Darius the Mede, Cyrus, Ahashuerus, & Darius the Persian. The last Darius they reckon to be the Artaxerxes in whose reign Ezra & Nehemiah came to Ierusalem accounting Artaxerxes a common name of all the Persian Kings. Nebuchadnezzar, they say, reigned 45 years, eight with Iehojakim & 37 afterwards (Ier. 1.25. 2 King 25.27.) & Belshazzar reigned three (Dan. 8.1) & thence to Evilmerodach they allot 23 years to make up 71. For because the Prophecy of the 70 years was given in the first year of Nebuchadnezzar & the city taken (as they reckon in his second year, they date those 70 years from that second year to the end of Belshazzar's reign. Then to Darius the Mede whom they reckon the first King of the Medo-Persian Empire they ascribe but one year or at most but two (Dan. 9.1) to Cyrus three years incomplete (Dan. 10.1) to Ahashuerus 12 years till the casting of Pur (Esth. 3.7) one year more till the Jews smote their enemies (ch. 9.1) & one year more till Esther & Mordecai wrote the second letter for the keeping of Purim (ch. 9.29) in all 14 years, & & so reckon 70 years also from the destruction of the Temple & City to the second year of Darius Zach. 1.1, 12 to Darius the Persian they allot above 32 years (Nehem 13.6) reckoning that the Persian Monarchy during the standing of the second Temple flourished only 34 years, untill Alexander the great overthrew it. Thus the Jews reckon in their great Chronicle calle Seder Olam Rabba. Whence its plain that we are to expect little or no light from them in the history of <3v> these kingdoms but must have recourse to the scriptures themselves compare them with the records of the Greeks.

Now the years of Nabopolassar the father of Nebuchadnezzar are determined by an eclips of the Moon observed at Babylon in the fift year of his reign in the 127<sup>th</sup> year of Nabonassar April the 22<sup>th</sup> as Ptolomy has recorded. He reigned 21 years & Nebuchadnezzar 43 (according to Berosus & the canon of Ptolomy) & Nebuchadnezzar died in the 37<sup>th</sup> year of Iehojakin's captivity (2 King. 25.27) & by consequence in the 27<sup>th</sup> of Zedekiah's, & therefore Zedekiah was captivated & the city & temple burnt in the 16<sup>th</sup> or 17<sup>th</sup> year of Nebuchadnezzar & 158<sup>th</sup> year of Nabonassar. For they were burnt in one of the Iewish sabbatical years (Ier. 34.) in the beginning of the 11<sup>th</sup> year of Zedekiah, in the fift Iewish Month that is a month or two after midsummer (2 King. 25.)

Zedekiah therefore began his reign in spring in the 148<sup>th</sup> year of Nabonassar & Iehojakim succeeded Iehojakim in the winter before. For when Iehojakim had reigned three months he was carried captive to Babylon in the beginning of the Iewish year (2 Chron 36.9, 10) Now his captivity happened in the end of the eighth year of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar over Iudea & Zedekiah's in the beginning of the nineteenth year of the same reign (2 King 24.12 & 25.8 Ier. 32.1) & therefore Nebuchadnezzar began to reign over Iudea about midsummer in the 140<sup>th</sup> year of Nabonassar, about two years before the death of his father Nebopolassar.

Before all this, Pharaoh Necho in passing through Iudea to make war upon the King of Assyria & take from him Carchemish a town of Mesopotamia by Euphrates slew Iosiah, King of Iudah & three months after when he had beaten the Assyrians & taken Carchemish with the adjacent regions from them captivated Iehoahaz the successor of Iosiah & made Iehojakim king in his stead & put the land to tribute (2 King. 23. 2 Chron 35) whence Iehojakim began his reign in summer. in the 137<sup>th</sup> year of Nabonassar. For he reigned 11 years incomplete & his fourth year fell < insertion from f 4r > in with the first of Nebuchadnezzar over Iudea (Ier 25.1.) < text from f 3v resumes > About the < insertion from f 4r > beginning of the reign of Iehojakim when Pharaoh warred against Carchemish Assuerus or Cyaxeres King of the Medes assisted by Nebuchadnezzar made war also upon the King of Assyria, destroyed Ninive, & ruined the Kingdom (Tobit. 14.15) & left the southern & western part thereof to the King of Babylon, who thereupon ☉ < insertion from the left margin of f 4r > ☉ who thereupon sent his son Nebuchadnezzar with an army against Syria & Phœnicia which had

revolted to the King of Egypt, & invited the King of the Medes to his assistance. Berosus tells us the story as if the Prefect of Egypt Syria & Phœnicia had revolted from the King of Babylon & Nebuchadnezzar was sent to rescue him: but Egypt was not yet conquered by any foreign Kingdom, & therefore had no Prefect. Berosus should have said the King of Egypt to whom Syria & P{hœ}nicia had revolted. Nebuc{h}adnezzar ‡ < insertion from the right margin of f 3v > ‡ therefore being sent by this father to recover these Provinces invited Astibares ( Assuerus ) the king of the Medes to this war (as <sup>a[1]</sup> Alexander Polyhistore relates) & the third year of Iehojakim entring these Provinces with an army, beseiged Ierusalem, tooke it, spoiled the Temple & reduced the Kingdom of Iudah into servitude: & the next year routed the army of Pharaoh – – – < text from the left margin of f 4r resumes > < text from f 4r resumes > sent his son Nebuchadnezzar with an army into those parts. Nebuchadnezzar therefore in the third year of Iehojakim coming into Syria beseiged Ierusalem & took it & spoiled the Temple & reduced the Kingdō of Iudah into servitude < text from f 3v resumes > <4r> Iehojakim came Nebuchadnezzar against Syria & took Ierusalem spoiled the Temple reduced the kingdom of Iudah into servitude & the next year routed the army of Pharaoh at Carchemish by Euphrates & took from the King of Egypt all that pertained to him from Euphrates to the river of Egypt. (Dan. 1.1. Ier. 46.2. 2 King. 24.1, 7) & whilst he was pursuing these victories heard of the death of his father Nabopolasser, & thereupon returned to Babylon leaving his army with his servants as <sup>a[2]</sup> Berosus Thus by the fall of the Kingdom of Assyria did the Kingdoms of Media & Babylon grow great together. But Babylon prosecuting its victories further grew the greater & therefore is reckoned the first Monarchy. It comprehended Susiana, Babylonia, Mesopotamia, Syria, Phenicia Idumea, Moab, Ammon & part of Arabia & some add part of Afric.

Now in the first year of Nebuchadnezzars reign over Iudea which was the fourth of Iehojakin's, Jeremiah prophesied that the land should serve the King of Babylon 70 years, & that at the end of 70 years God would punish the King of Babylon & make the land of the Chaldeans desolate (Ier. 25.1) & thereby bring back the Jews from captivity (Ier 29.10) To the year of Nabonassar 140 in which their servitude began add 70 years & the dominion of Babylon will end in the year 210. And so it did according to the Canon of Ptolomy. For this is the first year of Cyrus in Babylon according to the Canō. F Cyrus by the common consent of all Chronologers Diodorus, Thallus, Castor, Polybius, Phlegon, Tatian, Africanus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Eusebius, Ierome Cyrill. began his reign in Persia in spring When the first year of the 55<sup>t</sup> Olympiad was above half run out by consequence in the 189<sup>th</sup> year of Nabonassar & reigned full thirty years, the nine last of which (according to the canon) were over Babylon & therefore began in the 210<sup>th</sup> year of Nabonassar & ended in the 219<sup>th</sup> year, as the Canon represents.

The same account may be gathered also from the reign of the intermediate Kings. For Evilmerodach succeeded his f father Nebuchadnezzar in spring in the 37<sup>th</sup> year of Iehojakins Captivity, ( 2 King 25.37) & by consequence in the 45<sup>t</sup> year of Nabuchadnezzars reign over Iudea He reigned three years according to the Canon or two according to Berosus, & After him reigned Belshazzar 5 years according to the Canon or 4 years & 9 months according to Berosus, & then reigned Darius the Mede 17 years ‡ < insertion from f 4v > ‡ according to both, & all these years make up 69 or 70 unto the reign of Cyrus.

The same account may be gathered from the reign of the kings of Tyre. For <sup>a[3]</sup> relates out of the Phœniceā records that Tyre was beseiged by Nebuchadnezzar 13 yearstogether in the reign of its King Ithobalus. Now this seige began after the 11<sup>th</sup> year of Iehojakin's captivity (Ezek. 26.) & ended about the the 27<sup>th</sup> year of the same captivity or a little before (Ezek. 29.17 that is about the beginning of the 35<sup>t</sup> year of Nebuchadnezzars reign over Iudah) & in the end thereof, Ithobalus their king was slain (Ezek. 28) & after him according to the Tyrian records reigned Baal & others as in the following table.

Nebuchadnezzar	34 years 3 months
Baal –	10 years
Ecnibalus & Chelbes	1 year
Abbarus –	3 months
Mytgonus & Gerastratus	6 years

Balatorus –	1 year
Merbalus –	4 years
Iromus –	20 years
<u>Summ</u>	<u>76 1/2 years</u>

Now In the 14<sup>th</sup> year of Iromus say the Tyrian records, suppose in the middle of the year the reign of Cyrus began in Babylonia. Subduct therefore 6 1/2 years from 76 1/2 y, & there will remain 70 for the reign of the Kings of Babylon over Iudea untill

Some date the 70 years from the captivity of Iehojakim others from that of Zedekiah: but they are plainly the duration of the reign of the King of Babylon over Iudah & the the rest of the nations & ended with his fall & with the first year of Cyrus, 2 Chron 36.21, 22. Ier 25.1, 12

Now its very remarkable that this prophesy was the cause of its own fulfilling. Isaiah two hundred years before called Cyrus by name & prophesied that God said of him, Cyrus is my shepherd he shall perform all my pleasure even saying to Ierusalem thou shalt be built, & to the Temple, Thy foundation shall be laid &c Isa. 44.28. & Jeremy predicted the time when Cyrus should conquest Babylon & do this & these prophesis being made known to Cyrus he presently put ## forth a proclamation throughout all his kingdom in writing, saying Thus saith Cyrus King of Persia, The lord God of heaven hath given me all the Kingdoms of the earth & he hath charged me to build him a house at Ierusalem which is in Iudah. Who is there among you of all his people? his God be with him & let him go up .

< text from f 4r resumes >  
<5r>

## Chap. 2. The history & Chronology of the Persian Monarchy with respect to the Iews

At the captivity of the 10 tribes the Medes were subject to the King of Assyria (2 King 17.6) but but a little after when Sennacherib lost his army in Iudea & returning back to Ninive was slain by his sons, The Kingdom of the Medes was originally a branch of the Assyrian Monarchy. At first it was of no very great extent. The first king who began to enlarge the kingdom was Phraortes. He conquered the Persians & made war upon the King of Assyria & took Susa from him but was slain in battel. His son Cyaxeres pursuing the war beseiged Ninive in the beginning of his reign but in the seige was opprest by a great inundation of Scythians who from that time reigned over Media for 28 years together, but then Cyaxeres inviting them to a feast slew them in drink & having recovered his kingdom renewed the war against the king of Assyria & by the assistance of Nebuchadnezzar destroyed Nineve as above. Ctesias & Alexander Polyhistor call him Astirbares that is Astivares or Assueris. For he is that Assuerus who with Nebuchadnezzar conquered Ninive ( Tobit. 14.15) & whose younger son Darius succeeded Belshazz in the Kingdom of Babylon. He reigned 40 years & Astyages his eldest son reigned after him, 38 years according to Eusebius & Syncellus, or 40 according to a canon printer by Scaliger in the 2<sup>d</sup> book of his Isagogical canons, & then was conquered by Cyrus in the 189<sup>th</sup> year in the 189<sup>th</sup> year of Nabonassar. For the 30 years reign of Cyrus are dated from this conquest. Subduct the 80 years reign of Cyaxeres & Astyages, & the beginning of the reign of Cyaxeres & inundation of the Scythians will be in the 109<sup>th</sup> year of Nabonassar & the slaughter of the Scythians in the 137<sup>th</sup> year & the ruin of Ninive a year or two after will fall on the first or 2<sup>d</sup> year of Iehojakim's reign as it ought to do by the history thereof given above. The Kingdom of the Medes thus grown great by the conquest of Assyria stood about 50 years till it was conquered by Cyrus. ‡ < insertion from f 5r > ‡ He was the son of Cambyses a Persian & of Mandane the daughter of Astyages king of the Medes & Persians. By causing a defection of the Persians he made war upon Astyages & by conquering him founded no new kingdom but only translated the government from the Province of the Medes to that of the Persians. Whence the Medes & Persians are constantly reckoned by Daniel <5v> as one kingdom. # < insertion from f 6v > # This is confirmed by Æschylus who flourished in the reigns of Darius Hystaspis & Xerxes, & reckoning the Kings of

this Monarchy down in order to Xerxes begin with the Medes as if they & the Persians were kings of one & the same kingdom

Μῆδος γάρ μῃ ὁ πρῶτος ηγεμῶν στρατοῦ.  
 Τὸ δὲ ἄστυ Σούσων ἐξεκείνωσε πεσόν.  
 Ἄλλος δὲ ἐκείνου παῖς τὸ δ' ἔργον ἥνυσε.  
 Τρίτος δ' ἀπ' αὐτοῦ Κυρος, εὐδαίμον ἀνὴρ. &c  
 He that first led the army was a Mede  
 He emptied the falling city of Susa  
 The next who was his son finished the work  
 The third from him was Cyrus a happy man.

Sir Iohn Marsham would hence infer that before Cyrus there were two kings of Persia of the stock of the Medes distinct from the kings of the Medes & because Xenophon calls the two first kings Astyages & Cyaxares & Cedrenus confounds Astyages & Darius Medus the sons of Ahasuerus with one another, Sir Iohn concludes that the first king called a Mede by Æschylus was Darius the Mede & that there were at this time two Astyages & two Cyaxares, the one reigning over the Medes the other over the Medo-Persians. But thus to divide the kingdom of the Medes & Persians & unite those of the Persian & Babylonians before the reign of Cyrus is a fancy without any foundation in antiquity. The meaning of Æschylus is plainly this that in the Kingdom then flourishing was founded by the Kings of the Medes the first of which who began to conquer was Phraortes He conquered the Persians as Herodotus affirms & so became the first King of the Persians in that Monarchy. The second was Cyaneres his son who finished the war against the Kingdom of Assyria which his father had begun. And then (after Astyages whom Æschylus omits) reigned the Persians Cyrus & his successors.

Now because this Kingdom consists of two Provinces the northern of the Medes & the southern of the Persians, whereof the one rose up after the other, Daniel represents it by a Beare which raised himself up on one side & by a Ram with two horns whereof the lowe (that of the Medes) rose up first. < text from f 5v resumes > Because this kingdom consisted of two provinces the northern of the Medes & the southern of the Persians whereof the one rose up after the other, it is represented in Daniel by a Beare which raised himself up on one side. This kingdom conquered three other great Kingdoms & therefore is represented by a Beare holding three ribs in his mouth between his teeth. First Cyrus made war upon Cræsus King of that ancient, rich & potent kingdom of Lydia & thereby propagated his dominion into the lesser Asia as far as the Euxine Sea & Hellespont. Then he conquered his Vnke Darius who upon the fall of the Medes had escaped to Babylon & there in the 4<sup>th</sup> year of Cyrus conspiring with the nobles against Belshazzar as Berosus relates, was by their common consent made king. in his room. This is the second rib. The third is the Kingdom of Egypt. This kingdom was invaded by Nebuchadnezzar & made tribute to Babylon but not ruined. It enjoyed its own Kings till Cambyses the 2<sup>nd</sup> King of Persia invaded it & made it a Province of the Persian Monarchy, & therefore is justly reckoned a distinct rib from that of Babylon. < text from f 5r resumes > & then the Kings of Persia reigned as in the following table.

	began to reign	reigned years
Cyrus –	an. Nabonass 189 in spring	30
Cambyses. – smerdes	219 in spring	8
Darius Hystaspis –	227 in spring	36
Xerxes. – Artabanus	263 in spring	21
Artaxerxes Longimanus	284 in summer	41
Xerxes II Sogdian		
Darius Nothus –	325	19

Artaxerxes Mnemon	344	43
Ochus –	387	23
Arses –	410	3
Darius Codomannus –	413	5
Alexander the great	417 Octob. 2	

<5v>

Smerdes reigned 5 months, Artabanus & Sogdian each of them seven & Xerxes II a year but the short reigns of these kings in summing up the years of all the kings do not use to be reckoned apart but are included in the reigns of their predecessors. Some allot only two months to Xerxes II but then the reign of his predecessor Artaxerxes must be reckoned only 40 years & the reign of his successor Darius Nothus must end not at the same time with the Peloponnesian war as Diodorus affirms it did but in the summer before. Eusebius takes 3 years from the reign of Artaxerxes Mnemon & gives them to Ochus. The monarchy was translated to the Greeks by the battle at Arbela Octob 2 in the year of Nabonassar 417, but Darius was not slain till a year & some months after. Whence Africanus reckons that the Monarchy stood 230 years & Agathias 228.

The years of Cambyses & Darius Hystaspis are fully determined by three eclipses observed at Babylon & recorded by Ptolemy: those of Xerxes by the battle at Marathon four years & some months before the death of Darius & by the passage of Xerxes over the Hellespont to invade Greece in the beginning of his sixth year in the time of the Olympic games: those of Artaxerxes Longimanus by the coincidence of his twentieth year with the 4<sup>th</sup> year of the 83<sup>d</sup> Olympiad as Africanus informs us & by the news of his death coming to Athens in winter in the seventh year of the Peloponnesian war as Thucydides a writer of those times has recorded: those of Darius Nothus by the coincidence of his 13<sup>th</sup> year or some part thereof in winter with the 20<sup>th</sup> year of the Peloponnesian war as Thucydides also set down, & by his death a little after the end of that war in the same Olympic year as Diodorus informs us. For the war began in April an. 1 Olymp 87, lasted 27 years & end April 14<sup>th</sup> an 4 Olymp 93. All these things are so well determined by Eclipses & other records of good credit & so far agreed upon by Chronologers that I do not think it material to enter into any dispute about them.

The difficulty is to agree the Jewish history set down in Ezra & Nehemiah, with the history of these kings written by the Greeks & Latins For some would have the Temple to be built in the <6r> reign of Darius Nothus & the city in the reign of Artaxerxes Mnemon; others refer these things to the reigns of Darius Hystaspis & Artaxerxes Longimanus. The latter opinion I take to be true but because divers are of the former opinion & thereupon ground erroneou interpretations of Daniels weeks, I shall now for settling the true interpretation of so important a prophesy & clearing up the history of the books of Ezra & Nehemiah shew that the latter opinion is the truth, & for this end I shall premise the two following observations.

Obs. 1. All the middle part of the Book of Nehemiah from the 5<sup>t</sup> verse of the seventh chapter to the 9<sup>th</sup> verse of the twelft contains the history of what was done at Zerubbabel's return from captivity in the reign of Cyrus.

<7r>



First that all the middle part of Nehemiah's book from chap 7. v. 5 to chap 12 v.9 contains the history of what was done at the return from captivity under Zerubbabel in the reign of Cyrus. For Nehemiah tells you he took it out of the register of those who came up at first Nehem 7.5, & then out of that register first recites the second chapter of Ezra, & after that the history of reading the law & sealing a Covenant in the seventh month after their return when they set up the altar & began to sacrifice & to keep the feast of Tabernacles according to what they found written in the law of Moses. Nehem 8.14 Ezr. 3.2, 4. Then he recites in the 11<sup>th</sup> chapter how the people who came out of captivity with Zerubbabel to Ierusalem cast lots to dwell one of ten in

Ierusalem & the other nine parts in the other cities: & lastly in the beginning of the 12<sup>th</sup> chapter is a register of the Priests & Levites who came up from captivity with Zerrubbabel & Ieshua as tis there exprest.

For clearing up this Observation I need only tell you that when Ezra read the law the Levites who made the people understand it came up with Zerubbabel & Ieshua as you may see by comparing their names Nehem. 9.5. & 12.8 Ezra 2.40, & 3.9 & that the names of all the chief fathers of the Priests & Levites who then came

<7v>

### **The true chronology of the Persian Kings is as follows**

<8v>

After Artaxerxes reigned Xerxes II two months, Sogdian 7 months & Darius Nothus 19 years. He died an 4 Olymp 93 & then reigned Artaxerxes Mnemon 43 years. Artaxerxes Ochus 23 years Arses 3 years & Darius Codomanus almost 5 years He was conquered by Alexander with great an 2 Olymp 112 Kal. Octob. & died towards the end of the next Olympic year.

<8r>

up with Zerubbabel & were 24 in number (Nehem 12.) are found subscribed to the above mentioned Covenant made at that reading of the law Nehem 10. And lastly that the 11<sup>th</sup> chapter of Nehemiah is recited in 1 Chron. 9, with some variety & reading, & there those who went by lot to dwell in the cities are called the first inhabitants after the captivity. And amongst those who were then by lot to dwell at Ierusalem are reckoned Mittamiah the Levite who was over the thanksgiving & the porters Shallum, Akkub, Talmon 1 Chron. 9. 15, 17 Nehem 11.17, 19 who came up at first with Zerubbabel Ezra 2.42. Nehem 12.8.

So then if we would understand fully the history of the Iews at their first return in the reign of Cyrus, we must compare this part of the book of Nehemiah with the book of Ezra, & consider how both may be set together so as joyntly make up one entire history. And this will be done by inserting the 11<sup>th</sup> chapter of Nehemiah between the two last verses of the 2<sup>d</sup> chapter of Ezra & the 8<sup>th</sup> 9<sup>th</sup> & 10<sup>th</sup> chapters of Nehemiah between the 6<sup>th</sup> & 7<sup>th</sup> verses of the third chapter of Ezra. For so the whole story will be read in continued order of time. By the first insertion you will understand how the people who came up to Ierusalem with Zerubbabel went thence by lot into their cities & dwelt there till the seventh month came as is exprest in the last verse of the 2<sup>d</sup> chapter of Ezra & first of the 3<sup>d</sup>: & by the second insertion you will understand how the Priests & people, in setting up the altar & offering sacrifices from the first day of the 7<sup>th</sup> month, & keeping the feast of Tabernacles, as is described in the third chapter of Ezra, were instructed out of the law of Moses publicly read to them at the same time by Ezra. For Ezra refers to this reading of the law in saying: They built the altar of the God of Israel to offer burnt offerings thereon, as it is written in the law of Moses the man of God – They kept also the feast of Tabernacles, as it is written. Ezra 3.2, 4.

The second observation I would make is for clearing up the history of the Iews in the reigns of Darius & Artaxerxes: & it is that the middle part of the fourth chapter of Ezra concerning Ahashuerus & Artaxerxes, that is from the 6<sup>t</sup> verse to the 26<sup>t</sup> inclusively, is a fragment of history inserted by some mistake of the scribe in a wrong place of the book of Ezra & ought rather to have been added to the end of the book. And my reasons are these. <9r> First I consider the the first book of Esdras is nothing else then the genuine book of Ezra interpolated between the first & second chapters with the letter to Artaxerxes & the Kings answer & with the story of the three young men speaking wise sentences & augmented in the beginning with part of the second book of Chronicles & in the end with a fragment of the book of Nehemiah. Omit these interpolations & additions & you have in this book of Esdras an ancient translation of the genuine book of Ezra into greek: & in this translation all the above mentioned middle part of the 4<sup>th</sup> chapter is wanting. I conceive therefore that when Antiochus Epiphanes caused the sacred books to be burnt & all men to be slain who concealed them, & the Macchabees recollected what had escaped; there were found two fragments of history relating to the Persian Monarchy, which the Iews knew not how better to dispose of then by inserting them into the book of Ezra. Some therefore inserted them between the first & second chapters of this book, & this was the originall of the book of Esdras. Others (whether the Sanedrin or any of the scribes) rejecting the story of the



three young men speaking wise sentences as spurious, inserted only the fragment concerning Ahashuerus & Artaxerxes into the middle of the fourth chapter as a genuine record, & this I take to be the original of the book of Ezra as we now have it. And by the like accident I conceive it is. that the book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Israel & the books of the Prophets cited in the book of Kings & in that of the Chronicles of the Kings of Iudah are lost. & that a fragment of the prophesies of Isaiah are now found added to the end of the book of Zachary & that in the 1<sup>st</sup> book of Samuel the story of Davids playing before Saul to drive away his evil spirit & becoming <10r> his armour-bearer & Saul's loving him greatly has been inserted before the story of Davids killing Goliath when Saul knew him not but asked again & again whose so he was. [And so in the new Testament Criticks have observed that the words For thine is the kingdom the power & the glory have been added in Matthew to the Lords prayer & the story of the woman taken in adultery inserted in Iohn's Gospel & Mark's Gospel augmented by the 12 last verses & by consequence Matthews by the last chapter. For had Matthew written the story of the resurrection Mark who copies after him would scarce have omitted it. And this Origen seems to have been aware of when he commented on all Matthew but the last chapter. However these addition being ancient records approved by the Church we receive them as of the same authority with the rest of the books & only reserve a liberty of interpretation where any of them has been inserted in a wrong place.]

The fragment therefore concerning Ahashuerus & Artaxerxes being inserted in one place in Ezra & in another in Esdras, I take to have been a lose piece of history inserted to both books in the times of the Maccabees, & think it ought rather to have been added to the end of the book, & that for these reasons. First because by inserting it in the middle of the fourth chapter the story of building the Temple is interrupted. It concerns only the building of the City & so respects the time after the Temple was finished. Secondly because the letter to Artaxerxes was written against the Jews who came up from captivity in his reign, & by consequence against Ezra & those who came up with him. For the letter to Artaxerxes runs thus: Be it known unto the King that the Jews which came up from thee to us are come unto Ierusalem building the rebellious & bad city & have set up the walls thereof & joyned the foundations. † < insertion from f 9v > † These Jews I say must be Ezra & his companions because they were the only Jews who came up from Artaxerxes. < text from f 10r resumes > Thirdly because when the enemies of the Jews received the Kings answer that the City should not be built till he gave another commandment, they went up in hast to Ierusalem unto these Jews & made them cease by force & power, that is by force of arms, & by consequence demolished the wall they had been building. And this happened <11r> after Ezra's return from captivity, about the nineteenth year of Artaxerxes. For in the twentieth year of the King near the beginning of the year the news came first to the ears of Nehemiah in Shushan the Palace that the remnant of the captivity in Iudea were in great affliction & reproach & the wall of Ierusalem broken down & the gates thereof burnt with fire. Nehem. 1. This news coming ‡ < insertion from f 11v > ‡ coming fresh at this time to the ears of Nehemiah makes it certain that the Jews who came up with Ezra did attempt to repair the city & were hindred by their enemies & brought into affliction & reproach & the walls broken down & the gates burnt with fire & of these things we have no other account then in that fragment. < text from f 11r resumes >

So then this fragment should have been added to the end of the book of Ezra as a conclusion of his government & an introduction to that of Nehemiah & perhaps it was, broken of from thence in the reign of Antiochus Epihanes.. But if any man think otherwise, he may take the book of Ezra as now is & only put upon it this interpretation that Ezra relates in the 4<sup>th</sup> chapter first how the building of the Temple was hindred all the days of Cyrus untill the reign of Darius Hystaspis in whose reign it was built, & how so soon as this king who favoured the Jews, was dead, their enemies conspired against them afresh to hinder the building of the city & for that end wrote against them first in the beginning of the reign of his son & successor Ahashuerus, (that is Achsweros, Axeres or Xerxes) & then in the reign of his sucessor Artaxerxes Longimanus when the Jews who came up from this King to Ierusalem as the letter mentions (that is Ezra & those who came up with him) were building the walls, & that Ezra so soon as he has related these things returns back to relate how the Temple was built & finished in the reign of Darius Hystaspis by the prophesying of Haggai & Zecchary. This interpretation clears up the whole history & makes it consistent with the history of the Persian monarchy recorded by the Greeks.

These Observations being premised, I now affirm that the Temple was built in the reign of Darius Hystaspis & that Ezra & Nehemiah came to Ierusalem in the reign of <12r> Artaxerxes Longimanus & that for these reasons.

First because they that refer these things to the reigns of Darius Nothus & Artaxerxes Mnemon do generally agree that by Ahashuerus & Artaxerxes in the above mentioned fragment are to be understood Xerxes & Artaxerxes Longimanus: & we have already proved that it was in the reign of this Artaxerxes that Ezra & Nehemiah came up to Ierusalem. Tis certain out of that fragment that in the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus there came up a body of Jews from the King to Ierusalem & attempted to build the walls of the City & were forcibly hindred by an armed power of their enemies, & the walls demolished. Tis certain also that all these things happened in the reign of that Artaxerxes from / whom Ezra & Nehemiah came up. And why we should make the very same things happen in the reigns of more then one Artaxerxes, I do not understand.

Secondly the second year of that Darius in whose reign the temple was built from the ground & finished (Hagg. 2.15, 18), was the seventieth of Zedekiahs captivity (Zech. 1. 12 & 7.5) & at that time there were men living who had seen the first temple, Haggai 2.3, & this cannot be applied to the reign of Darius Nothus, but agrees well to the reigne of Darius Hystaspis. For his second year was the 70<sup>th</sup> from the final captivity of Iudea & burning of the Temple.

Thirdly if the Temple was not finished till the reign of Darius Nothus, then Zerubbabel must have continued captain of the Jews, & Ieshua their high Priest, from the first year of Cyrus to the sixt of this Darius, that is 112 years together, which is incredible, & most certainly false. For the High Priesthood of Ieshua was but of an ordinary length as you may know by comparing it & that of his son Iojakim with the contemporary Priesthoods of the other Priests. For the Chei Priests which went up from captivity with Zerubbabel & <13r> Ieshua were Serajah, Ieremiah, Ezra, Amariah, Malluch or Melicu, Hattush, Shechaniah or Shebaniah, Rehum or Harim, Meremoth or Merajoth, Iddo, Ginnetho, Abijah, Miamin or Miniamin, Maadiah, Belgah, Shemajah, Iojarib, Iedajah, Sallu or Sallai, Amok, Hilkihah, Iedajah. Nehem. 12.1 And in the days of Iojakim the son of Ieshua that is in the days of his High Priesthood the chief Priests were all the eldest sons of all the chief Priests now named, videlicet, Merajah the son of Serajah, Hananiah the son of Ieremiah, Meshullam the son of Ezra, Iehohanan the son of Amariah, Jonathan the son of Melicu, Ioseph the son of Shebaniah, Adnach the son of Harim Helkai the son of Merajoth, Zechariah the son of Iddo Meshullam the son of Ginnethon, Zichri the son of Abijah, &c. Nehem 12.12. This synchronising of the High-Priesthood of Ieshua with the Priesthood of all the fathers & of the high Priesthood of his son Iojakim with the high Priesthood of all their eldest sons is a demonstration that the High Priesthood of Ieshua was but of an ordinary & therefore could not possibly reach down to the reign of Darius Nothus.

Fourthly Chronologers reckon from the return of the Iewish captivity in the first year of Cyrus to the death of Alexander the great 208 years: & in all this time the Jews had six High Priests succeeding from father to son, namely Ieshua Iojakim, Eliashib, Iojada, Jonathan, Iaddua, the last of which saith Iosephus died about the same time with Alexander or soon after. Let the Priesthood of each by an equal division of the whole time among them be reckoned about 35 years in length & the & the Priesthood of Eliashib will begin with the 5<sup>th</sup> year of Artaxerxes Longimanus & end with the 39<sup>th</sup> of the same King : And this agrees well with the truth. For Eliashib was high Priest in the 20<sup>th</sup> year of this Artaxerxes Nehem. 3.1 & continued High Priest for some time after his 32<sup>th</sup> year Nehem 13.7, 28. & Nehemiah was governour all this time. But if you make Nehemiah Governour <14r> in the reign of Artaxerxes Mnemon; the High Priesthood of Eliashib will reach some time beyond the 32<sup>th</sup> year of that king & so the Priesthood of the three first High Priests will take up 160 years & those of the five last but 50 years which is too unequal a division. For as the high Priesthood of Ieshua was contemporary to the Priesthoods of the fathers who came up with him out of Captivity & the high Priesthood of his son Iojakim with the Priesthoods of there eldest sons so the high Priesthood of his grandson Eliashib was contemporary to the Priesthoods of their eldest grandsons & therefore they were all but of an ordinary length. For Zechariah the son of Jonathan the son of Shemaiah was one of the chief Priests at with dedication of the wall Nehem 12.35 , & so was contemporary to Eliashib; & his father Jonathan was chief Priest in the days of Iojakim & his grandfather Shemaiah in the days of Ieshua Nehem 12.6, 18. So far were the Priesthoods of these men from being of an extraordinary length that in the seventh year of Artaxerxes when Ezra came up to Ierusalem he found there the eldest sons of those who came up with Zerubbabel in the reign of Cyrus & were then chief fathers of their houses. For when he came up to Ierusalem Iozaiah the son of Ieshua & Noadiah the son of Binnui were chief among the Levites, Ezra 8.33 & when Zerubbabel came up their fathers Ieshua & Binnui were chief fathers of their houses Ezra 2.40 & 3.9. Nehem 12.8.

Thus you see the reasons for placing Ezra & Nehemiah in the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus & the building of the Temple in that of Darius Hystaspis are exceeding strong & convincing. And now I will shew you that the reasons to the contrary are as weak. For there are only these two of any moment. First say they Ezra in his fourth & fifth chapters names the Kings of Persia in this order Cyrus, Darius, Ahashuerus, Artaxerxes, Darius, Artaxerxes & refers the building of the temple to the Darius between the two Artaxerxes, & Darius Nothus say they was the only Darius between the two Artaxerxes. This argument is the foundation of their Hypothesis, & yet has nothing in it. For I have already proved that the last Darius here named is the same with the first & the last Artaxerxes the same with the first. The other reason is that Sanballat with his daughter & son in law mentioned Nehem 13.28 were alive in the reigns of Darius Codomannus <16r> <15v> & Alexander the great as Iosephus relates which could not well have been, had they flourished in the reigns of Artaxerxes Longimanus.. But this I take to be a mistake of the Jews founded upon their erroneous chronology.. They read in Nehemiah that after the 32<sup>th</sup> year of Artaxerxes Nehemiah chased from him the son of Iehojada the son of Eliashib the High Priest. because he had married the daughter of Sanballat. They had also a tradition that Sanballat to retain his son in law with his daughter & requite him for the loss of the Priesthood promised to get leave of the king of Persia to build a new Temple for him on mount Gerazim. And whilst they made Darius Hystaspis, Artaxerxes, Darius Nothus & Darius Codomannus to be one & the same king reigning but 36 years (as we told you above) they were necessitated to refer these things to the two or three last years of Darius Codomannus wherein Alexander the great made war upon him, & by consequence to mix this story with the wars of Alexander & make the Temple of the Samaritans on mount Gerazim built by Alexanders consent For Iosephus tells us that Sanballat was sent by the last Darius (him whom Alexander vanquished) to be governour of Samaria, & therefore with the erring Jews referred the whole story of Nehemiah & Sanballat to the reign of this Darius.

If this answer do not satisfy, I shall back it with another. A learned Prelate has observed that the Sanballat mentioned by Nehemiah was a Horomite, that is, a Moabite of the city Horonaim (Ier. 48.3, 5, 34) but he mentioned by Iosephus was a Cuthean as Io < insertion from f 16r > sephus affirms) < text from f 15v resumes > that is a Samaritan from Cutha or Susiana beyond Euphrates: & that Iaddus, & the son in law of the latter his brother. If these were not the Same Sanballats the objection is at an end. But if you think strange there should be more Sanballats then one, I presume you will be more unwilling to allow two Ezra's both of them Priests & scribes & two Nehemiah's both of them sons of Hachaliah & governors of the Jews. And yet without allowing this you must make one & the same Ezra Priest & scribe from the first & second years of Cyrus when he returned from captivity (Nehem < insertion from f 16r > .12.1) & < text from f 15v resumes > read the law to all the people (Nehem 8) untill the 28<sup>th</sup> year of Artaxerxes Mnemon, when (according to your hypothesis) he was at the dedication of the wall (Nehem 12.36) that is for 160 years together & one & the same Nehemiah Governor by fits from the same first & second year of Cyrus when he returned from the captivity, was Tirshatha or Governor & signed the covenant (Ezra 2. 2, 63, 1 Esdr. 5.40, till after with 32<sup>th</sup> year of the same Artaxerxes, (Ezra 13.) that is for above 164 years together. So you see your objection is answered with a greater against you.

<17r>

## Chap 2. The Chronology of the Books of Ezra & Nehemiah with respect to the Persian Monarchy.

The Jews know nothing more of the Babylonian & Persian Monarchies then what they have out of the books of the old Testament therefore own no more Kings nor years of Kings then they can find in these books. The Kings they reckon are only Darius the Mede, Nebuchadnezzar, Evilmerodach, Belshazar, Cyrus, Ahashuerus & Darius the Persian. This Darius they reckon to be the Artaxerxes in whose reign Ezra & Nehemiah came to Ierusalem, accounting Artaxerxes a common name of the Persian Kings. Nebuchadnezzar, they say, reigned 45 years (2 King. 25.27) Ier. 25.1 Belshazar three (Dan 8.1) & thence Evilmerodach 23 to make up 70 the first year of Nebuchadnezzar in which the prophesy of the 70 years was given. For they reckon that it was fulfilled by Darius the Mede seizing the Kingdome. To this Darius they assigne but one year or at most but two (Dan 9.1) To Cyrus three years incomplete (Dan 10.1,) Ahashuerus 14 years till the casting of Pur (Esth 3.7) one year more till the Jews smote their enemies (ch. 9.1) & one year more till Esther & Mordecai wrote the second letter for the keeping of Purim (ch. 9.29.) in all 14 years, & to Darius they allot 32 or rather 36 years Nehem. 13.6. so that the Persian Empire during the second Temple flourished according to their

reckoning only 34 years until Alexander the great overthrew it. Thus the Jews reckon in their greater Chronicle called Seder Olam Rabba ~ ~ ~

Iosephus out of the sacred & other books reckons only these kings of Persia Cyrus Cambyses, Darius Hystaspis, Xerxes, Artaxerxes & Darius, making but one King of Artaxerxes Longimanus, Artaxerxes Mnemon & Artaxerxes Ochus & another of Darius Nothus & Darius Codomannus. For supplying the defects of these accounts we must have recourse to the records of the Greeks. For by them it is certain that the Persian Kings reigned as in the following Table

Nebuchadnezzar & his successors in Iudea	winter an. 1 Olymp 43	70 years
2 in Persia	Their reigns began	Their reigns continued
Cyrus { 1 in Babylon & Iudea ---	spring. fi. an. 1 Olymp. 55 finiente summer an 4 Olymp. 60 ineunte	30 years 7 years & some months
Cambyses –	spring. fi. an. 3 Olymp. 62	8 years
Darius Hystaspis –	spring. fi. an. 3 Olymp. 64	36 years
Xerxes –	spring. fi. an. 3 Olymp. 73	21 years
Artaxerxes Longimanus }	summer or. ineunte an. 4 Olymp. 79	41
Darius Nothus –	summer ineunte an. 2 Olymp. 9	19 years
Artaxerxes Mnemon –	June finiente an. 4 Olymp 93	43 years
Artaxerxes Ochus –	an 3 Olymp 104	23 years
Arses –	an 2 Olymp. 110	3 years
Darius Codomannus –	an 1 Olymp. 111	5 years
Alexander the great –	Octob 2. an Olymp 112	

<17v>

In the third year of Iehojakim King of Iudah came Nebuchadnezzar against Ierusalem & in the beginning of his fourth year in the ninth month took it & reduced the Kingdom into servitude & took away part of the holy vessels. Dan 1.1 2 King 24.1 Whence a fast was kept the next year in the ninth month Ier 36.6, 9, 22, & the year of Iehojakim is by Ieremy reckoned the first of Nebuchadnezzar, Ier 25. 1 that is the first year of his reign over Iudea. In this first year Ieremy Ieremiah predicted that Iudea should serve the Kings of Babylon 70 years & that at the end of 70 years God should punish the King of Babylon & lay waste the land of the Chaldeans Ier. 25. 1, 11, 12. And This came to pass in the beginning of the 22<sup>th</sup> year of Cyrus & end of the 17<sup>th</sup> of Nabonnedus or Darius Medus when Cyrus invaded Chaldea & put Nabonnedus to flight, & besieged Babylon. Ptolomy in his Canon ascribes 9 years to Cyrus over Babylonia & Xenophon but 7

<18r>

⊙ Cyrus by the consent of all Chronologers ancient & modern began his reign in Persia an 1 Olymp 55, an. Iul. Per 4155 in spring. He reigned full 30 years & was slain by Tomyris in spring an. I.P. 4185. Cambyses reigned eight years including the seven months reign {of S}merdes the Magician who succeeded him. Darius Hystaspis {be}gan his reign in spring, I.P. 4193, reigned 36 years, & died in spring I.P. 4229. Xerxes reigned almost 21 years & was slain by Artabanus in winter ineunte an. I.P. 4250. Artabanus reigned 7 months & then upon suspicion of treason was slain in autumn or towards the end of Summer by Artaxerxes Longimanus the

son of Xerxes. Artaxerxes therefore began his reign in autumn I.P. 4250. He reigned 40 years & died in winter before the end of the Roman year I.P. 4289. Then reigned Xerxes II two months & Sogdian 7 months Their short reign is included in the 40 years reign of Artaxerxes. Some reckon his reign 41 years, including also the reign of Artabanus. Darius Nothus began his reign in Autumn I.P. 4290, reigned 19 years, & died in Summer I.P. 4309. Then reigned Artaxerxes Mnemon about 43 years, Artaxerxes Ochus about 23 years, Arsaces between 3 & 4 years & Darius Nothus almost 5 years unto the Battle of Arbela whereby the Persian Monarchy fell, Kal. Octob. I.P. 4383.

This Chronology of the Persian Empire is so fully determined by eclipses mentioned by Ptolemy Thucydides & others & so fully asserted by Ptolemy Canon & the testimonies of Diodorus Siculus, Thucydides Iulius Africanus, Eusebius, Clemens Tatian, Alexandrinus, Ierom Sulpitius & other ancient authors cited by them & so well agreed upon by Chronologers, that I do not think it needful to enter into any dispute about it.

To adjust the reigns of the Persian kings &c

<19r>

Cyrus in with beginning of the 22<sup>th</sup> year of his reign & end of with 17 year of

Darius Medus invaded	began to reign over Iudea	& reigned
Nebuchadnezzar	in summer in the 1 <sup>st</sup> Olympiad	44 years 9 months
Evilmerodach –	in spring in the 54 <sup>th</sup> Olympiad	3
Belshazzar –		5 years
Darius Medus		17 1/2
Cyrus	in summer in the 60 <sup>th</sup> Olympiad	9

<19v>

but the first reckons from the flight of Nabonnedus, the second from the taking of Babylon which was a year after (Jer 51.46.). While Cyrus besieged Babylon Nabonnedus lay shut up in Borsippa & by reason of the great strength of both places, the impatient Jews during the siege used this Proverb: Babylon & Borsippa signum malum legi. whence they were not released from captivity till the spring after the city was taken & Cyrus after their release reigned seven years.

In the reign of Cambyses is included the seven months' reign of his successor Smerdes, In that of Xerxes the seven months' reign of his successor Artabanus, & in that of Artaxerxes Longimanus the reigns of his successors Xerxes II & Sogdian, the first of which reigned a year the other seven months. Some reckon for the reign of this Xerxes but two months, & so put 140 years for the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus. But Diodorus assigns a year to Xerxes & Ptolemy, Clemens Alexandrinus the Chronicum Alexandrinum Nicephorus & Abulpharrius allot 41 years to Artaxerxes Xerxes & Sogdian together & unless this be done the {re} will not be 20 1/2 years between the death of Artaxerxes & that of Darius {as} there ought to be. Eusebius takes 3 years from the reign of Artaxerxes Mnemon & gives them to Ochus. The Monarchy was translated to the Greeks by the battle at Arbela Octob. 2. an 2. Olympiad 112. But Darius was not slain till a year & some months after. And {illeg} hence Agathias reckons that the Monarchy stood 238 years & Africanus 230

The beginning of Cyrus in Persia & the length of his reign & those of Cambyses Darius & Xerxes is agreed on by all chronologers ancient & modern the years of Cambyses & Darius are fully determined by three eclipses made at Babylon & recorded by Ptolemy: those of Xerxes by the battle of Marathon five years & some months before the death of Darius, , & by the transit of Xerxes in the beginning of his sixth year in the time of the Olympic games an 1 Olympiad 75. Those of Artaxerxes Longimanus by the coincidence of his 20<sup>th</sup> year with an. 4 Olympiad. 83, as Africanus informs us & by the news of his death coming to Athens in winter in the seventh year of the Peloponnesian war as Thucydides relates. Those of Darius Nothus by the coincidence

of his 13<sup>th</sup> year with the 20<sup>th</sup> of the Peloponnesian war as Thucydides mentions & those of Artaxerxes Mnemon by his beginning a little after the end of that war in the same Olympic year as Diodorus relates. For the war began in April an 1 Olymp 87 lasted 27 whole years & ended Apr. 14 An. 4 Olymp. 93. All these things are so well determined by eclipses & other records of good credit & so far agreed upon by Chronologers that I do not think it material to enter into any dispute about them.

<20r>

### **The Chronology of the Gospel.**

Artaxerxes king of Persia in the seventh year of his reign sent Ezra & the Jews from Babylon to Ierusalem with a commission to restore the worship of God & teach the people his law & to set magistrates & Iudges over Iudea with power to punish by death or banishment or confiscation of goods or imprisonment: And by this commission the Jews in Iudea were incorporated into a People & Holy City (Ezra 7.) And from the erecting this corporation to the finishing of transgression & making an end of sins & making reconciliation for iniquity & bringing in everlasting righteousness [by the sacrifice of the Lamb of God] & the sealing the vision & Prophet & anointing the most Holy [by the & resurrection of Christ & the giving him a name above every name & making him king of Kings & Lord of Lords the Messiah the Prince] were seventy weeks of years (Dan. 9.24.) & therefore Jesus Christ died A.C. 34, in a sabbatical year, the seventy weeks ending each of them with sabbatical years, as was the manner of reckoning among the Jews, & the preceeding year having 13 months that the passion may fall on a friday.

It was the practise of Christ to draw Parables from all things which were before the eyes of his hearers: & accordingly in allusion to the Jews making their servants free in the feast of the seventh month which next preceded his passion he tells the Jews that the truth shall make them free & the Jews replying that they were Abrahams seeds & never were in bondage he tells them that whoever commits sin is the servant of sin & if the son shall make them free they shall be free indeed. Whence I conclude that this was the year in which the Jews released their servants or sabbatical year A.C. 34.

In the 15<sup>th</sup> year of Tiberius Iohn began to baptize, suppose in spring when the summer was before him A.C. 29 & when his baptism was noised abroad Iesus also came to be baptized being about 30 years old when he began to manifest himself, suppose in autumn following. For Iohn was six months older then Christ & 30 years was thought a fit age for Priests to enter upon their ministry. Iesus after his baptism went to Cana in Galilee & to Capernaum where he spent some time & then went to Iudea, was tempted, kept the first Passover, went into the land of Iudea baptizing & learned there till Iohn was cast into prison, & then departed through Samaria into Galilee four months before the harvest, ( that is in December or Ianuary) & began to preach, & went thence to the next Feast (Iohn 4. Mat 4.) This was the second Passover. Then he preached his sermon in the mount when the Lilies were in the field suppose in May & conversed afterwards in Galilee & in winter following pass over the sea of Galilee into the Country of the Gergesens was in a great tempest, & returning back to his own city preached still in Galilee, & sent his twelve disciples to preach in the cities of the Jews went also himself about their cities preaching till the next passover & on the chief sabbath of the second Passover of this year or passover of the second month he went through the corn (Mat 12.) & in seed time following he put forth the Parable of the sower & another Parable of sowing good seed & tares & a third parable of sowing mustard seed, & in that winter heard that Iohn was beheaded in prison & his disciples returned to him & in the end of winter walked on the sea to his disciples who were in a ship tossed with a tempest (Matt 14) This was a little before the next Passover (Iohn 7.1, 2) & suffered in the Passover following which being the fift Passover after his baptism, was in spring A.C. 34. All this I gather by comparing the Gospels of Matthew & Iohn who wrote in due order of time having seen almost all they wrote.

<21r>

Luke tells us that when in circumcising Christ & purifying the virgin they had performed all things according to the law, which was within 40 days they returned into Galilee to their own city Nazareth But Matthew acquaints us that they went first into Egypt & upon the death of Herod went from Egypt into Galilee to the city Nazareth Whence I gather that the time between the birth of Christ & death of Herod was very short, perhaps not above three or four months. The Magi came to worship Christ while his parents staid at Bethlehem in an Inn & by consequence soon after his birth, & Herod slew the children as soon as he found himself mocked of

the wise men: all which might be done within two months after the birth of the child. Herod indeed killed all the children under two yearlings, that is all that were a year old or under, but he might do it to make sure work. Now the Jews in their Calender place the death of Herod about the time of the winter solstice or a few days before. I have forgotten the day of their Month. He died a lingering death & when his disease began to be thought incurable some of the Jews for throwing down a golden eagle from the Temple were slain by his command upon a day on which the Moon was Eclipsed. Such an Eclips happened in the night between Feb. 3 & Feb 4 a year & 11 months before the vulgar Æra & the summer following was spent by Herod in languishing under his distemper going to the hot bath beyond Iordan sending for one out of every family of the Jews & doing other things mentioned by Iosephus. Now Iosephus tells us both in his Antiquities & in his Book of the Jewish war that Herod reigned 37 years from the time that he was made king by the Roman Senate & 34 from the time that he killed Antipater, & took Ierusalem. These years end in Iuly five or six months after the above mentioned eclips & there were four or five months more to Herods death which Iosephus in reconning by round numbers of years neglects. And Luke saith that when Christ was twelve years old he disputed in the temple at the Passover & only that he was about 30 years old when he was baptized, to suppose him born in spring about eight months before the death of Herod, & a year & three quarters before the vulgar Æra, will answer perfectly well to the scriptures & to Iosephus. Then might shepherds be able to watch their flocks all night in the fields, & Then might the Jews go conveniently out of all Iudæa to Ierusalem to be taxed it being neither seed time nor harvest & the season being convenient for travelling. If any man had ] had rather suppose that Christ was born at Christmas preceding; I might reply that Christmas was instituted in the room of a heathen festival & so is of no authority for determining the time: but I had rather say that the difference of three months in time is a nicety not worth disputing about.

Now when Nehemiah came from Artaxerxes to Ierusalem the first week of years after his coming be set apart for repairing the wall cutting & seasoning of timber setting up the gates & building so much of the city as was necessary for the Governour & inhabitants: the street & the wall will have continued built. sixty & two weeks of years unto the coming of the Messiah the Prince or birth of Iesus Christ. Nehemiah writes that the wall was finished in 52 days: but this time if reckoned from Nehemiah's coming to Ierusalem is much too short for the whole performance & therefore must be reckoned from some later period. Nehemiah tells us that after the wall was built & no breaches left therein but the doors were not yet set upon the gates, Sanballet & Gesheru sent unto him five times thinking to weaken the hands of the Jews from the work so that it should not be done & then adds: So the wall was finished in the 22<sup>th</sup> day of the month Elul in 52 days, meaning I conceive, that the remainder of the work of the wall was finished by setting up the doors in 52 days. . For he describes the making up of the breaches to be a work of time, & that when they were half made up the enemies of the <22r> Jews conspired against them & plotted to invade & disturb them with an armed force. Whereupon the Jews armed themselves & continued the one half in arms the other half in the work till it was finished. And Nehemias giving an account of the things he did during his 12 years government of Iudea saith that he continued in the work of the wall & bought no land. And Iosephus saith that after they were in arms they continued in the work of the walls two years & four months & finished it in the 28<sup>th</sup> year of Artaxerxes in the 9<sup>th</sup> month: from which time to the birth of Christ there were just threescore & two Iudaic weeks, reconning every week to end with a sabbatic year.

When the Apostle Paul was newly converted he went into Arabia & returned to Damascus & three years after his conversion went to Ierusalem to see Peter (Gal 1) & went thence through Cæsarea to Tarsus. Then ceased the persecution of the Christians & Cornelius was converted & the Apostles sent Barnabas to promote the gospel at Antioch & Barnabas went from Antioch to Tarsus & brought Paul from thence to Antioch where they remained a year & then the brethren at Antioch sent relief to those at Ierusalem about which time Herod Agrippa killed James the brother of Iohn & imprisoned Peter. This was at the time of the Passover. And about the time that Paul & Barnabas returned from Antioch Herod died. Iosephus tells us that he reigned seven years, four with Caius & three with Claudius & therefore he died in spring A.C. 44, & Paul & Barnabas came from Tarsus to Antioch in the end of winter A.C. 43. ‡/‡ And if wee allow about four years from the death of Christ for the preaching of the Gospel till the martyrdom of Stephen & for the ensuing persecution carried on by Saul till his conversion & three years more till Saul began his journey to Ierusalem & after two years And if we allow & about two years more for his journey from Damascus to Ierusalem & thence to Tarsus & for his stay at Tarsus & journey to Antioch & a year for his stay at Antioch the Conversion of Cornelius & calling of the Gentiles which happened wh{illeg} Paul was newly arrived at Tarsus will be about seven years after the death of Christ. And So long did the Messiah keep his covenant with his people the Jews.

After the death of Herod Paul & Barnabas were sent abroad from Antioch to preach the Gospel to both Jews & Gentiles & went to the cities of Cyprus Pamphylia Pisidia Lycaonia & returned thence to Antioch where they abode a long time & upon some Jews contending that the Gentiles ought to be circumcised were sent to Ierusalem to know the opinion of the Apostles about this matter The did Paul & Barnabas communicate to the Apostles assembled in Council the Gospel which they preached to the Gentiles, & oppose the circumcision of Titus, & then did the Apostles see that the Gospel of the uncircumcision was committed to Paul as that of the circumcision was to Peter; & this was 14 years after the conversion of Paul (Gal. 2. Act 15) & by consequence A.C. 52, & his conversion was in spring.

After Paul & Barnabas returned to Antioch with the sentence of the Apostles, he went with Silas through Syria & Cilicia confirming the Churches & through Prygia & Galatia & then they passed from Troas into Macedonia & preached the Gospel in Philippi, Thessalonica, Berea, Athens & Corinth writing from Athens his two Epistles to the Thessalonians & staying in Corinth 18 months & then returned from thence to Ierusalem at the time of the feast having a vow, & touched at Ephesus in his return. Then from Ierusalem he went to Antioch & thence through Galatia & Prygia strengthening the disciples & coming to Ephesus preached three months in the Synagogue ‡ < insertion from f 22v > ‡ & two years more in the school of Tyrannus sending from thence his first Epistle to the Corinthians. And leaving Ephesus at Pentecost he went into Macedonia & there wrote his second Epistle to the Corinthians, & then spent the three winter months in Greece & wrote his epistle to the Romans in the end of winter. And hasting to be at Ierusalem with alms at the day of the Pentecost with a designe to go from thence to Rome & from Rome into Spain he returned into Macedonia & sailed thence after the days of unleavened bread & landed at Tyre & went thence to Ierusalem where he was apprehended.

Now if for these two journeys of Paul through Asia Macedonia & Greece we allow seven years, the imprisonment of Paul will fall upon Pentecost A.C. 59. Sooner it could not be because the second journey took up four years & the first could not take up less then three: nor later because < text from f 22r resumes > nor later because he was a prisoner two years before Felix delivered him to Festus & spent the autumn & winter following in his voyage to Rome arriving there in spring & spent two whole years more at Rome in his own hired house teaching with all confidence, no man forbidding him. And this was done before that sharp persecution <23r> of the Christians at Rome which was occasioned by the burning of that City in Iune in the Consulship of Lecanius Bassus & Licinius Cressus in the 10<sup>th</sup> year of Nero A.C. 64. This Persecution therefore put an end to Pauls teaching freely & to the writing of the Acts of the Apostles, it being unsafe for Luke to describe what was then done by Nero

Iosephus in the end of his Antiquities saith that 56 year of this age was the 13 year of Domitian & in his own life written by himself that he was born in the first year of Caius Cæsar & that after the 26<sup>t</sup> year of his own age he sailed to Rome to sollicit the cause of some Priests of his acquaintance whom Felix governour of Iudea had sent prisoners thither. He went to Rome therefore in the end of summer A.C. 63: For the first year of Caius began in March A.C. 37. & the 13 of Domitian in August A.C. 93.‡‡& in his voyage he suffered shipwrack. Before he went he heard that the prisoners lived an abstemious & religious life at Rome & therefore they went thither a year or two before him. If two years before him then Felix was succeeded by Festus A.C. 61 as above & sent the Prisoners to Rome in the very end of his government, They might go to Rome in autumn & be some of those Prisoners who went in the same ship with Paul. Iosephus returned from Rome before the burning of that city A.C. 64, because he makes no mention of that fire. When Iosephus returned to Ierusalem he found the ☉ < insertion from f 23v > ☉ When Iosephus returned to Ierusalem he found the Jews inclining to make a defection from the Romans, & endeavoured to dissuade them from sedition but without success. Wherefor fearing least they should take him for an enemy & kill him & seing the castle Antonia in their possession he retired into the inner Temple till the death of Manahem (Ioseph. in vita.) The Jews were not pleased with the government of Albinus, but continued quied till his successor Florus by his exceeding great cruelty & injustice exasperated them beyond measure: yet they complained not of him till Cestius Gallus Governour of Syria came to the Passover A.C. 65. In the days of Felix the Jews & Gentiles had a controversy about the city Cæserea each claiming a right to it, & Felix in the end of his government referred the matter to Nero & about the time of this Passover Nero gave judgment for the Gentiles & letters arrived certifying the decree: which much inflamed the Jews against the Romans. In the beginning of May Florus came with an armed force against them & slew many of them. In August they seized the Castle of Antonia & in September Menahem was slain. This was in the first year of Florus & 11<sup>th</sup>



of Nero A.C. 65. & in the following spring the war began. From all which it may be gathered that the time between the government of Felix & that of Florus was short & that the return of Iosephus from Rome suits best with the year 64 & could not be sooner. < text from f 23r resumes >

< insertion from f 22v >

⚡ After the death of Herod Agrippa, his kingdom was reduced into a province & Cuspius Fadus made Procurator thereof. Fadus was succeeded by Tiberius Alexander & he by Cumanus in the 8<sup>th</sup> year of Claudius & Cumanus by Felix in the 11<sup>th</sup> (Ioseph. Antiq. l. 20) & Paul was brought before Felix when he had been governour there may years (Act. ) & two years after Felix was succeeded by Festus A.C. 61, & by consequence in the 7<sup>th</sup> year of Nero being governour ten years. When Paul was sent by Festus to Rome the Iews who had laid wait for his life, being disappointed of their hope converted their rage against Iames the brother of our Lord & Bishop of Ierusalem & at the passover, Festus being newly dead, threw him down from a pinnacle of the Temple & slew him (Euseb. Hist l. 2. c. 23) He was slain therefore at the Passover in the 8<sup>th</sup> year of Nero Albinus succeeded Festus before summer & was succeeded by Florus in the 11<sup>th</sup> year of Nero A.C. 65. Iosephus telling that in this war there were 97000 Iews taken & 1100000 slain adds that most of these were Iews of foreign regions. For coming from all regions to the feast of unleavened bread, they were suddenly detained by the war & at first by the straitness of the city occasioned a plague & soon after a famin. The war therefore commenced at the Passover A.C. 66 & it ended with the taking of Ierusalem Sept 8 in the second year of Vespasian A.C. 69 in the end of the Sabbatic year & so lasted half a Iewish week of years.

< text from f 23r resumes >

⚡

The gospel of the circumcision being committed to Peter, he & the other Apostles of the circumcision continued in Iudæa & the neighbouring regions, taking care of the Churches of the converted Iews (as was their duty) till those Churches fled from the Iewish war, & by it were dispersed into all the world.

Iustin Martyr & Irenæus say that Simon Magus came to Rome in the reign of Claudius & exercised juggling tricks there. Pseudo Clemens adds that he endeavoured there to fly & brake his neck by the prayers of Peter. Whence Eusebius or rather his interpolator Ierom has recorded that Peter came to Rome in the second year of Claudius. But Peter was in the Council of the Apostles at Ierusalem in the 12 year of Claus & soon after was reprehended by Paul at Antioch & about that time Claudius banished all Iews from Rome; & Cyril bishop of Ierusalem, Philastrius, Sulpitius, Prosper, Maximus Taurinensis, & Hegesippus junior place that victory of Peter in the reign of Nero. For the ancients tradition was that Peter came to Rome in the reign of this Emperor as you may see in Lacatantius. † < insertion from f 22v >

† When Paul wrote his Epistle to the Romans, which was in March Ierusalem A.C. 59, he saluted above 20 of the chief Christians at Rome by name without naming Peter. After the burning of Rome Paul was brought before Nero & after that, he wrote his second Epistle to Timothy desiring him to come to Rome before winter & bring Mark with him & tells him that Demas had forsaken him & was gone to Thessalonica, Crescens to Galatia, Titus to Dalmatia, Tychicus to Ephesus [with an Epistle] & only Luke was with him: and therefore this Epistle to Timothy was writ in spring & in the year 65, & Mark & Peter were not yet arrived at Rome & the first epistle of Peter in which Mark is mentioned was written after this year. Eusebius<sup>[10]</sup> tells us of a tradition that after the martyrdom of Iames the brother of our Lord & the taking of Ierusalem which presently followed the Apostles & disciples which survived came together from all places & with one consent made Symeon the son of Cleopas Bishop of Ierusalem in the room of Iames. He should have put this election four years before the war began. For Iames was martyred at that time, & the Apostles were so dispersed by the war that they could not come together afterward. < text from f 23r resumes > Chrysostom tells us that the Apostles continued long in Iudea & the being driven out by the Iews went to the Gentiles. This dispersion was in the year before the Iewish war began when the Iews as Iosephus tells us, began to be tumultuous & violent in all places & Florus coming with an armed force to Ierusalem slew many of them & the Gentiles at Cæsarea & in all Syria & divers cities of Phœnicia & at Alexandria in Egypt slew them in great multitudes as public enemies. For at the same time they suspected also the Iudaizing Gentiles & tho they did not kill them rashly yet they were afraid of them. I suppose Iosephus means the Christians. All All ages agree that the

Apostles were dispersed into several regions at once, & Origen has set down the time, telling us that in the beginning of the Iudaic war the Apostles & disciples of our Lord were scattered into all nations, Thomas into Parthia, Andrew into Scythia, Iohn into Asia, & Peter first into Asia where he preacht to the dispersion & thence into Italy; And Dionysius Corinthius saith that Peter went from Asia by Corinth to Rome; & all antiquity agree that Peter & Paul were martyred at Rome in the end of Nero's reign. Mark went with Timothy to Rome (2 Tim 4.11 & Colos. 4.10.) & Sylvanus was Paul's assistant, & by these companions of Peter mentioned in his first Epistle you may know that he wrote from Rome: & even all antiquity agree that in this Epistle he understood Rome by Babylon. This Epistle was written to the strangers <24r> strangers scattered throughout Pontus Galatia Cappadocia Asia & Bithynia & exhorts them to endure with constancy & chearfulness the fiery trial or persecution which they were under. And therefore it was written after the converted Iews under the care & charge of Peter were fled from the troubles in Iudea & Syria & escaping into those provinces of Asia, were there in affliction under the Gentiles who at this time looked upon all the Iews as public enemies The second Epistle of Peter was written to the same dispersed strangers with the first (2 Pet. 3.1) & therein he saith that Paul had writ of the same things [in his Epistle] to them & also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things (2 Pet. 3.15, 16.) Paul did therefore write an Epistle to these strangers. And as there is no other Epistle to them, besides that inscribed to the Hebrews so in this epistle (Chap. 10, 11, 12) you will find at large all those things which Peter had been speaking of & refers unto, & particularly the passing away of the old heaven & earth & establishing an inheritance immoveable with an exhortation to grace because God (to the wicked) is a consuming fire. Heb. 12.25, 26, 28, 29. In this Epistle Paul exhorts the Hebrews (as Peter does in his epistles) to endure the chastening they lay under & tells them that they had not yet resisted unto blood, & that the brother Timothy was set at liberty with whom, if he came shortly to them from Italy, he would also come & see them. Whence I gather that these Hebrews were the strangers in the Provinces of Asia to whome Peter wrote, the Hebrews in Iudea having no concern nor acquaintance with Timothy, & that this epistle was written one or two years later then the second Epistle to Timothy, & that Paul as well as Timothy was set at liberty before he wrote it.

It seems to me therefore that in spring in the 19<sup>th</sup> year of Nero the year before the Iewish war began when the Iews in Iudea began to be very seditious & turbulent & Florus brought his army against Ierusalem † † & the troubles in Syria were not yet broke out. the Apostles & their disciples being admonished from above fled from Iudea into all parts & Peter & Iohn came with the greatest part of their Churches through Syria into the Provinces of Asia where the Gospel had been spread. That in autumn following, the Romans to prevent such seditions in Asia as were then made secured by the Iews in Iudea & Syria secured the Leaders of the converted Iews & Christians & banished Iohn into Patmus & treated the converted Iews with the more hardship because they endeavoured by preaching the Gospel to bring over the heathens to their party. That & wrote his first Epistle before winter or in summer following That in this time of affliction the Apocalypse was given to Iohn & sent to the seven Churches in the beginning of his banishment A.C. 65 as a reward & consolation for their sufferings. And that Peter went on to Corinth & thence to Rome before winter & sent his first Epistle the next summer & his second Epistle the summer following. And that about the time that Peter wrote these Epistles Paul & Timothy were set at liberty & Paul wrote his Epistle to the Hebrews. And soon after, he & Peter were martyred either in the 13<sup>th</sup> or 14<sup>th</sup> year of Nero.

<24v>

<25r>

were martyred either in the 13 or 14<sup>th</sup> year of Nero.

Irenæus tells us that the Apostles made Linus Bishop [of Rome] & that Linus was succeeded by Anacletus & he by Clemens who had seen the Apostles & was their contemporary. And thence Epiphanius writes that in Rome Peter & Paul were the first both Apostles & Bishops, then Linus, then Cletus, then Clemens. And some later writers by leaving out Paul have made Peter the first Bishop of Rome & Linus the second. Whereas Irenæus meant that the Apostles (Peter & Paul or one of them) made Linus bishop under them. Pope Damasus writes that Peter ordeined two Bishops of Rome Linus & Cletus & appointed Clemens to succeed him. Whence some make Linus & Cletus coadjutors of Peter & Clemens his first successor. The truth is that the Apostles had a general unlimited power over all cities by which they were able to ordein bishops & Presbyters of single cities, and Bishops had a limited power of governing only theie own citys & the territories of those cities, & Linus was the first bishop of Rome properly so called. And Linus being the

disciple of Paul & an Italian its probable that he was ordeined Bishop before Peter came to Rome. For why should Rome want a Bishop so long? Peter was an Apostle of the circumcision & therefore no Bishop of the uncircumcision: for why should he leave his own charge to interfere with Paul? If he was Bishop of Rome, pray, who ordeined him? & what universal authority did the ordination give him or what authority which he had not before? ? If he was not ordeined bishop of Rome but acted there as an Apostle, how was he bishop of Rome more then of any other city? & how can the Bishops of Rome claim to be his successors without claiming to succeed him in his Apostleship, & by consequence to be Apostles. The Bishops of the whole world succeeded the Apostles as truly as Linus did, but not in their Apostolic authority The Apostles gave them a limited power over their several cities, & Linus might succeed them without having a greater power then in proportion to his city. Tu es Petrus respected Peter not as a Bishop but as an Apostle. If it relates to bishops it belongs to all bishops & if any have the preeminence they are the Churches originally erected by the preaching of Peter in Phenicia & Syria 31 years together & then translated into Asia minor, especially the seven Churches chosen by Christ to represent the Church catholic under the type of the seven Candlesticks of the Temple, whose Lamps illuminate the whole Temple. This is the Church which was built upon a rock by the preaching of Peter & the Gates of Hell (the Elders in the Gates of great Babylon of the Presbytery of the synagogue of Satan) shall not prevail against the remnant of her seed. This Church is the glorious woman in heaven ‡

< insertion from f 24v >

‡ This church is the glorious woman in the Temple of heaven at Ierusalem; Rome is the seven hilled city in the wilderness of Babylon, reigning over the kings of the earth & these two differed from one another till the woman, by flying from the Temple into the wilderness, changed her seat, & for the future sat upon the seven hills. Paul opposed Peter & therefore was not under his government. Much less was Iohn under the government of Linus Cletus & Clemens. nore were the Churches of Asia under the government of those bishops while they were under the government of Iohn. nor did Iohn teach his churches to submit to the Bishop of Rome after his death: for if he had, they would have submitted; & therefore he knew nothing of the Popes supremacy. Vpon a dispute arising between the Churches <25v> of Asia & those of Italy about the keeping of Easter. Polycarp a very ancient man who had conversed with several that had seen Christ & who was one of the disciples of Iohn the Apostle came to Rome & upon discoursing the matter with Anicetus Bishop of Rome Polycarp did not yeild, but both parties acquiesced in the tradition & practise of their own Churches & communicated with one another their own way without contending further about it. This was towards the end of the reign of Antoninus Pius, about the year of Christ 198. Afterwards when Victor bishop of Rome revived the controversy & threatned to excommunicate the Churches of Asia, the Bishops of Egypt & the west generally certified that their churches by immemorial tradition kept Easter on the same day with the Church of & yet upon being put in mind of what passed between Polycarp & Anicetus, they perswaded Victor to desist & not disturb the peace of the Church of about a ceremony. All which appears by a part of a letter of Irenæus conscribed by Eusebius<sup>[11]</sup> Cum beate Polycarpus – – – inter se fruebatur. Henceforward therefore the Churches of Asia continued to keep Easter on the 14<sup>th</sup> day of the Iewish month till the western Bishops revived the controversy & in the Council of Arles convened by Constantine the great A.C. 314 decreed that Easter should be kept on one & the same day throughout all the world & that the Bishop of Rome by his letters should signify the day to all as was usual, & the Council of Nice by the influence of Constantine the great A.C. 325 made the same decree, & referred it to the Bishop of Alexandria to determin the day & signify it to the Churches. And because the ablest Astronomers were in Egypt, he signified the day also to the Bishop of Rome that the eastern & western churches might keep Easter on the same day. In all this time the Churches of Asia did not submit to the Bishop of Rome: On the contrary the Western Bishops told Victor that he ought not to molest the Churches of Asia about this matter; Polycarp & Anycetus parted good friends upon equal terms; & Iohn the Apostle was above all Bishops & governed the Bishops of the Churches of Asia immediately. The Apocalyps was given by God to Christ who sent his Messenger with it to Iohn & Iohn by divine inspiration sent it to the seven Churches. Here's a continual subordination of powers without the intervention of the Church of Rome. The Churches of Asia were so far from allowing themselves subordinate to the powers of the Bishops of Rome that the Bishops of Rome themselves so far as I can find, did not begin to pretend any power over the eastern churches till after the death of Constantine the great

< text from f 25r resumes >

Irenæus has set on foot an opinion that the Apocalyps was writ in the reign of Domitian ————— Nero) & died before Iohn.

[1] a apud Euseb. Pr. l. 9

[2] aBerosus apud Iosephū l 9 Antiq. c. 11 & l 1 cont. App. & apud Euseb l 9 Præp. p 267.

[3] a

[4] a Ex antiquis monumentis colligerunt hoc Diodorus Siculus, Thallus, Castor, Polybius, Phlegon alijque apud Tatianum scriptorē perantiquum et doctissimum nec non apud Africanum ut refert Eusebius l 10 de Præp. Evang. Item Clemens Alexandr. 1 Strom. Cyril lib 1 cont. Iudæos Euseb. in Chron. Hieron in Dan 9.

[5] b Apud Hieron. in Dan. 9.

[6] a Beros. apud Iosephum cont Appion. p. 1045 See also Ier. 51.30, 31, 32.

[7] b Herodot.

[8] a Tacitus l 15

[9] Ioseph. Bell. Iud. l. 7. c. 12.

[10] Hist. l. 3. c. 11

[11] Hist. l. 5. c. 24.

---