

THE CERTAIN TRUTH,  
THE SCIENCE, AND THE AUTHORITY  
OF THE  
SCRIPTURAL CHRONOLOGY.  
IN THREE PARTS.

I.—A VINDICATION OF THE AUTHENTIC DATE OF THE  
PASSION,

IN REPLY TO TWO ARTICLES IN THE "CHURCHMAN'S MONTHLY REVIEW;"  
AND AN  
ASTRONOMICAL DEMONSTRATION OF THE TRUE ERA  
OF THE SEVENTY WEEKS.  
SECOND EDITION, CORRECTED AND ENLARGED.

II.—PROVING THAT THE NATIVITY AND PASSION OF OUR  
LORD AND SAVIOUR  
ARE THE CHRONOLOGICAL FOCI OR CON-CENTRAL PIVOTS OF  
MUNDANE TIMES.

III.—AFFIRMING, AGAINST THE CHEVALIER BUNSEN'S  
WORK ON EGYPT,  
THAT THE CHRONOGRAPHY OF THE BIBLE IS OF DIVINE ORIGINAL.

With Appendices and Tables.

BY WILLIAM CUNINGHAME, ESQ.,  
OF LAINSHAW, IN THE COUNTY OF AYR.

—————  
*Ὀρισας προτεταγμένους καιρούς.*

"Having determined the times before set in order."—*Acts xvii. 26.*

LONDON:  
SEELEY'S, 54, FLEET STREET, AND 2, HANOVER STREET.  
M DCCC XLIX.

ALEX. MACINTOSH,  
PRINTER,  
GREAT NEW-STREET, LONDON.



## P R E F A C E.

---

IN February, 1795, about four months after my arrival in Bengal, having been appointed by Sir John Shore, afterwards Lord Teignmouth, Assistant to the Collector of the Zillah \* of Jessore, before proceeding to my station, I met, in a large Europe-shop,† with a copy of Bishop Newton's "Dissertations on the Prophecies," in two volumes, which I eagerly purchased, and perhaps at that time another copy of that work might not have been found in British India. I carried it with me to my station, and began the study of the work with as much attention as official duties and hard reading in Persian would permit. To that date I trace the first dawning of my inquiries into Chronology and Prophecy, which were quickened and stimulated by very frequent argumentative discussions in defence of Revelation, the belief of which scarcely existed at that time in the Bengal Civil Service. By the figures still inscribed on the blank pages of these two volumes of Newton,—which I yet have in my possession,—it appears that my first and juvenile essays at calculation were directed towards the solution of Daniel's 2300 and 1260 years, and that I had even then come to the conclusion that these two numbers conterminate. I calculated the 1260 from the Decree of Phocas in 606, giving to the Pope the title of Universal Bishop, and

\* District.

† The term used for warehouses where every kind of articles from Europe were exposed for sale.

placed its termination in 1866, which is two years only beyond the date now held by Mr. Faber. From 606 I reckoned back 1040 years, or rather two periods of 606 + 434, equal to that number, and placed the beginning of the 1260 years in b.c. 434, without having found apparently any event to signalize that year.

I had then no knowledge of general Chronology, nor were materials and books then to be found in India, nor did leisure and opportunity exist for such a study.

Having in the following year, 1796, been appointed by Sir J. Shore to a higher office in the Zillah of Dinagepore, I, during the five years that I held it, continued to apply my leisure hours from arduous official duties and reading in the languages, chiefly to religious and metaphysical inquiries, in the second of which the works of Reid were my principal guide, though, on the other side of the question, Edwards on the Will was also read with deep attention, and even Hume not left unread. It was at this time that I first happily formed the friendship of spiritual men, in the persons of Carey and Thomas, the first Baptist Missionaries in Bengal, who occasionally preached at Dinagepore, and afterwards of Ward and Marshman. As my discussions with very able men who denied Revelation were still frequent, I was led to draw up my juvenile work, "Letters on the Evidences of Christianity," and on leaving Dinagepore I formed also the friendship of Dr. Claudius Buchanan, which continued till his lamented decease.

At the end of the year 1802, I was most reluctantly, and with the deepest regret, compelled to sacrifice my rapidly opening prospects in the Bengal Service, and to return home, by family affairs of a pressing nature urgently requiring my presence in this country.

After my arrival in Scotland,—from which I had been almost wholly absent since my very infancy, and to which I returned as to a foreign country, knowing none and known to none,—I continued to apply my leisure moments to the prosecution of theological and prophetic studies, the last having been directed chiefly to the elucidation of the dates of the great numbers of Daniel, the 2300 and 1260 years. It was not, however, till November, 1806, that I was, by a change in family arrangements, enabled to devote nearly my whole winter nights to the prosecution of these studies. During that winter and the following summer I prepared a series of essays on these subjects, the substance of which was, in a very compressed form, sent to the “Christian Observer,” in two papers, which appeared in November and December, 1807.\* This was followed by a long argumentative discussion in the “Christian Observer” with my learned friend, Mr. Faber, which continued at intervals till the year 1811. We have both, as to the dates at least, continued to hold nearly our original opinions; but our differences have not been permitted to touch the bonds of Christian friendship, formed, as I fondly trust, for an eternal duration.

It was during these discussions that two things occurred which have exercised an important influence on my subsequent inquiries. In the arguments respecting the true reading of the number in Dan. viii. 14, which Mr. Faber then held to be 2400, though he has since receded from it, while I upheld that of the actual Hebrew text, 2300, Mr. Faber was led to cite the reading of the Samaritan text in Gen. xi. 13, which is 303 years, whereas that of

\* Under the signature of “Talib.”

the Hebrew is 403, to prove the facility with which **שְׁלִשָּׁה**, *three*, might by mistake be substituted for **אַרְבָּעָה**, *four*, by Hebrew Scribes. It was in examining the differences between the Hebrew and Samaritan generations in that chapter that I first saw, that “they are of such a nature as to exclude the possibility of their having arisen from the errors of transcribers: they have plainly originated in *design*. For while the sum total of the years of each patriarch is the same both in the Hebrew and Samaritan, the particulars of which that sum total is made up differ in the two copies.” The passage now cited is from my paper in the “Christian Observer” for May, 1811.\*

My inquiries on these points were not then carried further, and my predilection remained wholly in favour of the Hebrew; nor had I extended my investigations to the text of the LXX.

In the same year, however, I was, by the kindness of my excellent friend, George Ross, Esq., of Edinburgh, furnished with a passage from the French writer, M. Count de Gebelin, *viz.*, “Extrait du Caractère de Daniel,” wherein he gives a succinct account of the remarkable discovery of M. Cheseaux, a Swiss astronomer, about the middle of the eighteenth century, that the 2300 and 1260 years of Daniel are Cycles in Astronomy. This extract I sent, with some remarks of my own, to the “Christian Observer,” in the July number of which it appeared.†

In 1813 the first edition of my “Dissertation on the Apocalypse” was given to the public, and the second in 1817; but in neither of them did I enter, or was I prepared to enter, into the general Chronology of the

\* “Christian Observer,” for 1811, p. 281.

† *Ibid.*, pp. 404, 405.

World, further than to give an approximation to the dates of the first six Seals and the Trumpets. In the last of these years, however, I sent a paper to the "Jewish Expositor" upon the Vision of Zechariah, in his first and second chapters, wherein I conjectured that the **SEVENTY YEARS**, mentioned by the angel in ver. 12, has, besides its literal reference to the period from the ninth year of Zedekiah, when Nebuchadnezzar besieged Jerusalem, to the second year of Darius Hystaspes, when the foundation was laid, a **MYSTICAL** signification representing the whole periods of the captivities and dispersions of Judah until their final redemption. But I did not then venture to conjecture what the period was, or to offer any calculation of it. Indeed, in my own mind, I placed it among the secret things known to God only.

After this paper appeared, I paused for a period of thirteen years, quite undecided as to the questions between the Hebrew, Samaritan, and Greek numbers in the Patriarchal Generations. I have never, indeed, found it difficult to suspend my judgment where evidence was not presented to it to warrant a decision; nor have I ever advanced a single step in chronological inquiries, placing my foot on the quicksands of human conjecture without evidence. It was not till the year 1830 that, by the perusal of the first volume of Russell's "Connection of Sacred and Profane History," and the work of Hales, of which the second and 8vo. edition appeared that year, I became convinced that the evidence wholly preponderated in favour of the Greek and against the Hebrew and Samaritan, and accordingly I embraced the Greek as the original and authentic Chronology. As to Hales' rejection of the Second Cainan, I remained in a state of doubt

which, as I advanced in the knowledge of the subject, ended in the rejection of this part of his scheme and the reception of the generation of this patriarch, as no less a genuine part of the Chronology than all the others, and confirmed equally by the Esoteric and authentic scheme of Josephus, by Demetrius, the Paschal Chronicle, Syncellus, Nicephorus, and the inspired text of St. Luke, and subsequently demonstrated in my works by the great periods of scientific time, of which it forms a necessary element; so that if the generation of the Second Cainan were obliterated, they would fall at once to the ground. I shall produce one example of this. From the death of Adam, b.c. 4548, to the birth of Eber is the cube of  $12 = 1728$ , and from the former event to the finishing of the second Temple, in the 6th of Darius Hystaspes, are 4 Weeks of 144, the square of 12. The whole period from Adam's death to the French Revolution of 1789 is moreover 44 periods of 144. But if we subtract 130 years, the amount of the generation of Cainan, the whole of these scientific periods vanish at once. If, then, it were possible to suppose the generation of the Second Cainan to be an interpolation, we should be driven to the result that *falsehood* produces the most stupendous harmony of times between distant ages, and *truth* banishes that harmony.

In the same year, 1830, two papers by the learned Mr. Cullimore having appeared in the "Morning Watch," "*Criteria for determining in which version of the Scriptures the original Hebrew computation of time is contained*," wherein an attempt was made to establish the generations of the Hebrew text as genuine, and to fix upon the Greek translators the charge of corrupting

them,—on carefully examining the reasoning of Mr. Cullimore, it appeared to me to rest upon principles essentially unsound. I therefore drew up a reply to it, which was inserted in the “Morning Watch” for June, 1831. My paper (to which Mr. Cullimore began a reply which, so far as I know, he never completed) has since been republished as Appendix II. to my “Chronology of Israel and the Jews, from the Exodus to the Destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans.”

In the year 1833, my nephew, Dr. Handyside, who was completing his studies at the University of Heidelberg, succeeded, after a double search, in procuring for me from the library of the University of Lausanne a MS. copy of the work of M. Cheseaux, which I had been in search of without success for twenty-two years. This gave a new impulse to my inquiries. In the following year I was also led to the discovery that, counting from the Exodus, b. c. 1639, to the fall of the French Monarchy in 1792, which had, in my work on the Apocalypse, been laid down as the date of the sounding of the Seventh Trumpet, are exactly 70 Jubilees, which are equal to one Week of Daniel’s period of 70 Weeks, or 490 years. I gave this stupendous fact, as it still appears to me, to the public in my “Tract on the Jubilean Chronology of the Seventh Trumpet of the Apocalypse.” I do not, however, wish to lose the recollection of my mistakes, or to lead the public to do so,—and, therefore, I must recall to mind that in that tract I ventured to anticipate the second appearance of our Lord during the last septenary of the Jubilee, commencing in 1792 and ending in 1841. I need not tell the reader that this anticipation was, by the event, proved to be utterly wrong. Nevertheless, though our

Lord did not appear, He, exactly in the anticipated year 1841, did give us an unequivocal sign of his personal approach in that which I have always accounted to be the most remarkable ecclesiastical event of our own times,— the establishment of the Protestant Bishopric of Jerusalem, which took place at the termination of the great Astronomical Cycle of 7318 years from Creation, the Moon being, at the end of it, behind the Sun 13h. 15m.; also, 149 Jubilees = 7301 years from the Fall. It is also remarkable, that the epoch of the first Gentile Bishopric of Jerusalem, a.c. 139, is, as mentioned in these pages, from Creation 39 squares of 12. From the Fall, b.c. 5461, it is measured by a series. First, computing 893 years, or 47 Cycles of 19, we arrive at b.c. 4568, when Adam was 91, the trinal of  $9 \times 10 = 910$  years of age, 20 years before his death; \* thence 2353 years, the trinal of 48, terminate at the birth of Terah, b.c. 2215, whence a second multiple of that number brings us to a.c. 139.†

In the year 1835, I published my “Chronology of Israel

\* This period of 910 years is the first of a series of  $910 \times 8$ , terminating at the last great War of the French Revolution of 1803; and  $910 \times 8 = 1040 \times 7 = 7280$ . It is, therefore, equal to the Week of the perfect Cycle of 1040 years. Moreover, the whole period is bisected by the death of Jacob, b.c. 1838, which was the termination of the Patriarchal Age, even as 1803 may be considered as the termination of the Political System of Europe. This is one of the multiplied examples of wheels within wheels in the Sacred Chronology; and this series was quite unknown to me till I began to pen the present paragraph.

† I shall here, in a note, show that from 139, the date of the first Gentile Bishopric, to 1841, that of the Protestant, are 1702 years, which thus divide themselves:—1st. 1261, the trinal of 35, terminates in 1400, when Huss was made Chaplain to the Queen of Bohemia; and, 2d. 9 Jubilees = 441, terminate in 1841.

and the Jews, from the Exodus to the Destruction by Titus," and in the Preface gave an outline up to Creation, which, as now, I placed in b.c. 5478.

One of the earliest results of an encouraging nature which flowed from that work was, that the late Dr. Olinthus Gregory, of Woolwich, with whom it was my privilege to spend an afternoon in the summer of that year, assured me that it had set his mind at rest as to the truth of the Septuagint Chronology. He expressed himself as particularly struck with the fact which is established in it, that the Jewish Scribes had, in order to maintain the scientific character of their shorter scheme, curtailed the Chronology from the Exodus to the destruction of the first Temple, by a period of Weeks or Shemittahs.\* I recollect his words were, that *it marked the deepest design.* To the deep scientific attainments of Dr. Gregory the public were, and still are, no strangers. In how eminent a degree he added to them the simplicity of the little child in Christ Jesus, they who had the happiness of his acquaintance well knew. I shall here offer to the reader an extract from one of different letters I had the privilege to receive from him. It is dated in the year before the publication of my Chronology of Israel, and, therefore, before he gave the verbal testimony above mentioned :—

“*Royal Military Academy, Woolwich,*  
“*28th May, 1834.*

“I feel very much grieved, and, if the fault lay with me, should be truly ashamed that your many kind attentions to me should have remained thus long unacknowledged. In addition to my indifferent state of

\* See the Work, p. 61.

health, which makes me at best but a poor correspondent, I have during the last six months had much more than my usual load of official occupation." "Pray receive this as my apology for a long silence which I have greatly regretted."

"Be assured, however, my dear Sir, that the ever-interesting subjects of your various publications do not pass from my thoughts. I had, indeed, your little work on 'The Pre-Millennial Advent of Messiah' in my hand when your kind note arrived. The little time I can find for reading is divided in nearly equal portions between that which is strictly professional and scientific, and works on religion and theology. Still I feel that there is not sufficient consecration in my progress to enable me to do justice to the momentous subject of unfulfilled prophecy; and probably I am an unapt, though, I hope, not a stubborn scholar. My mind goes with yours almost entirely in your refutations of Irving, Wardlaw, and others; and I think you clearly point out how wrong "... 'they are in their speculations. Yet I am not quite sure that I could fully receive *your* views; although I certainly am not either disposed or prepared to reject them. I am, indeed, confident that, in many respects, the principles you have developed are more worthy of acceptance than those of any other writer since the days of Mede; and I, therefore, the more deeply regret my inability at present so quietly, calmly, and uninterruptedly to pursue the subject as to decide whether or not I can fully become your disciple or whether I should adopt some scheme of interpretation which, while it embraces most of your leading principles, should still vary occasionally in the detail of application."

In the spring of the following year, 1836, I published my “Fulness of the Times,” and in November following the “Supplementary Dissertation,” or Second Part, wherein I, for the first time, gave a full analysis of the System of Josephus, and by cross-examination established the whole outlines of his Chronology. These works were also sent by me to Dr. Gregory, but by that time his health was rapidly giving way. The last note I received from him was dated 5th June, 1837:—“My health has for full twelve months past been seriously declining, and about six months ago, indeed, I thought myself on the borders of the eternal world. Through God’s mercy I am now greatly better than I was then, but still my health is so greatly impaired, and my official duties here so much more than usually heavy, that it is with the utmost difficulty that I struggle onwards.

“I ought long ago to have thanked you for the books and pamphlets which you have so kindly sent to me during the last 9 or 12 months. But, in truth, writing is often so irksome to me that I scarcely write at all, and, in consequence, sadly neglect all my friends. As for my reading, it is, for the same reason, now confined to what is strictly speaking professional, or to the Holy Scriptures, and such books as, by Divine grace, tend to facilitate the intercourse between my Heavenly Father and my soul. My fondest bent in religious reading has for many years been towards devotional works; and, as the infirmities of life increase upon me that tendency increases and strengthens. Every now and then, however, I feel a desire to go through some of your recent researches with your help, but the state of my head, which has been principally affected by my late

disorders, warns me to desist and to wait for better health here or the regions of perfect life hereafter."

These extracts cannot but be deeply interesting to the Christian reader, as being clearly indicative of that state of meetness for the inheritance of the saints in light to which this eminent individual had now arrived, and to which all who believe would desire to arrive.

For my own part, I cannot but acknowledge that I prefer the qualified and guarded approbation of my works on Prophecy by such a person as Dr. Olinthus Gregory, to that popular applause, which would carry off one edition after another, faster than they could issue from the press, from the table of my publishers.

I now resume the narrative of my remaining works on Chronology in the briefest manner.

In the year 1837, I published the first edition of my "Synopsis," with a Table of Chronology, intended for the use chiefly of the students of Prophecy, and brought down to the year 1837; in the second and enlarged edition it is brought to 1845. In 1838 was given to the public my Tract "The Septuagint and Hebrew Chronologies tried by the test of their Internal Scientific Evidence," which has not been answered, and, I believe, is unanswerable; also on the Great Periods, &c., which mark the year 1838 as the point of time which concentrates as in a focus the Chronology of all past ages. I had in my "Fulness of the Times," in 1836, laid down the year 1837 as one of *finishing*, and that of 1838 as a year of *beginning* and *restitution*. Now, I certainly believe that the institution of Christian worship in Hebrew in congregations of Christian Israelites in London and Jerusalem,

which marked 1837, was the foreshadow of the actual end of the Gentile Dispensation, and that the purchase of the land on Mount Zion, which is the actual site of the Cathedral or Episcopal Church, was the sign of *beginning, restitution, and re-creation*. Admitting, as I at once do, that the things thus done were smaller than what I expected, yet he must be little read in the ways of God, whether in the economies of nature or grace, who despises the day of small things.

On the 11th December, 1838, or 24-5 of Chislev, and the perfect Cycle of 2357 years from the very day of the foundation of the Second Temple, I discovered the trinal fraction, which has since thrown such a flood of light on the structure of the Mundane Times, appearing to be, as it were, the universal number which cements and binds together the whole.

My Tracts on the Scientific Chronology of the year 1839, and "Season of the End," of which the titles will be found in the list of my works appended to this volume, followed in 1839 and 1840, and, in the Supplement to the former, that which was attempted with no success by the illustrious Joseph Mede, namely, the discovery of the root of the Apocalyptic number 666, is placed before the reader. It is 111 the trinal of  $10 \times 6$ .

My two latest Tracts are "The Fulfilling of the Times of the Gentiles, a conspicuous Sign of the End," published in September, 1847, and "The Angel with the Measuring Rod to Measure Jerusalem," in March, 1848. The anticipations formed in both these Tracts that, before the termination of the Scriptural Sacred year parallel with 1847, that is before the 3-5 of April, 1848, the breaking in pieces of the nations would begin; and in the last, that

about the 20th March, 1848, when the Sun entered Aries on the Meridian of Rome itself, the judgment of Rome would begin, have been remarkably verified.

It is due to the learned and eloquent late Master of the Temple, the Rev. C. Benson, now Prebendary of Worcester, that, before closing this Preface, I should state that, when the former edition of the first Part of this Volume was sent forth, I had not seen his Treatise on the Chronology of our Saviour's life, and as it is out of print, I should not even now have been acquainted with it, but for the great kindness of Mr. Benson himself in sending me a copy; and, as I have not the privilege of a personal acquaintance with him, this circumstance doubly enhances this act of kindness. It has, indeed, been the case that I have not seldom seen him in the pulpit, and have eagerly sought to hear him, but from the great calamity of deafness, which I have learnt is common to us both, I have sought it in vain.

It is impossible, I think, to read the Treatise without cherishing the deepest respect for its distinguished author. Extensive and varied learning, candour, and extreme modesty are equally seen in its pages. In his line of argument, however, in favour of his own dates, which are for the Nativity, B.C. 5, and the Passion A.C. 30, he goes over the same ground as I have already done in my "Fulness of the Times," my "Synopsis," and "Reply to the Reviewer." With respect to the true time of Herod's death, upon which he acknowledges that the whole question turns, he reasons from the Eclipse of March, B.C. 4, which is founded upon by Usher and I have given full reasons for rejecting, while he appears not to have known of the one in January, B.C. 1, which I, (as Scaliger

had before me, though I was ignorant of the fact) have fixed upon as that which preceded the death of Herod. It seemed to me, therefore, that to enter into the reasoning of Mr. Benson would be a supererogatory work; and I have judged it better not to enlarge the already overgrown limits of the discussion in Part I. of this volume by any reference to it, seeing that if my argument be, as I believe, quite conclusive against the Reviewer, it is no less so against the reasoning of Mr. Benson, who, I hope, will at least see, that disrespect to him has been the furthest from my thoughts, in my determination not to enter into controversy with him.

To the learned author of the "Horæ Apocalypticæ," who may, perhaps, not altogether have lost the recollection of the fact, that I had many years ago, the high honor of receiving him in this house, when, if I err not, he was a stranger to Prophetic studies, I must offer a short explanation of the reason of my having made no reply to his attack upon me. Soon after the "Horæ" appeared, a Christian gentleman, in a letter equally honourable to his head and heart, filled also with the praise of Mr. Elliott's work, deprecated my entering into controversy with him, and offered, though not, I think, conclusive, yet certainly very plausible reasons, to dissuade me from it, prefacing them with the words, "I have not a word to say, in defence of the tone, in which Mr. E. combats your view of the Seals, wanting, as it most certainly is, in courtesy." As the name of the writer has been communicated to no one, he will, I am certain, not disapprove of it that I place his words before Mr. Elliott, seeing they may have a salutary effect. It is not, let me be permitted to say, because I apprehended any difficulty in repelling Mr. Elliott's

attack that I have forborne to repel it. His view of the Seals, did I wish to retaliate, I should characterize in terms not less strong, and not more courteous than in a note in Appendix to vol. i. of his first edition, page 12, and in vol. iv. p. 588 of his second edition, he applies to my Diagram. But I forbear. Even when to the maturity of middle age I added the yet remaining strength and activity of youth, controversy with Christian brethren was always hateful to me. My controversial tracts against Mr. Faber, Dr. Wardlaw, and Mr. Irving were written not from any inclination to contend with these eminent persons, but with the strongest aversion, but under the strong and irresistible impulse of duty. The same impulse would now, certainly, lead me to controvert the interpretation of the Seals in the "Horæ," utterly careless of my having to encounter at once their learned author and his eloquent disciple, Dr. Cumming; but I have so entirely occupied my remaining strength and my *one talent* with the question of the Sacred Chronology (of which Mr. Elliott will forgive me for saying, that he yet knows too little for an Expositor of the Apocalypse), a question not less important in all its bearings than that of Prophecy itself, as to have left me without leisure for it. And now, while I have been putting the finishing hand to this, I believe, my **LAST VOLUME**, the dial of mortal life, to me, casts its shadow on **LXXIII.**, and **THE HOUR HAS STRUCK**. It is surely a **WARNING SOUND**, and, Mr. Elliott himself being the judge, I may, without incurring even on his part, any suspicion of inability to meet him, ay, and Dr. Cumming to boot, in the tented field, be permitted to plead the weariness and *vis inertiae* of declining years, and to hang up my armour in the hall, and to talk of the battles of

former days, and to long for that blessed Sabbathism when controversy shall be swallowed up in love.

There is, however, a writer totally unknown to me even by name, who has inserted two papers on the Seals, in the "Christian Observer," more able and matured, *I confess willingly*, than anything I have myself written, and more able and matured, *I think*, than anything Mr. Elliott has written; and I hope that neither Mr. Elliott nor Dr. Cumming will be offended or count me an enemy, if I venture to recommend to them both, to sit down at the feet of the author of these papers. His signature is "Christophilus," and they are to be found in the volumes of that work for July, 1843, and May, 1846.

LAINSHAW, *July 6.*

*Thamuz 5, 1849.*



## CONTENTS.

---

	Page
PREFACE . . . . .	iii

### PART I.

#### A VINDICATION OF THE AUTHENTIC DATE OF THE PASSION.

##### SECTION I.

Introductory Remarks.—Elements of the Question.—Summary of Opinions, Ancient and Modern.—Estimate of Ancient Opinions. — Mr. Clinton. — The Reviewer's Estimate.—Eusebius.—Mr. Browne's Dates of the Passovers of the years 29 and 33.—Lunar Elements of the Passover.—Testimonies of Philo,—Josephus.—Dates of Mr. Gresswell,—Mr. Browne. — Limits of the Question, the years 29, 30, and 33.—Reasons for Mr. Browne's Date answered.—Testimonies of Josephus, Philo,—Aristobulus.—Anatolius considered.—Astronomical Arguments. — Jewish Calendar. — Paschal Chronicle of Hippolytus.—Council of Nice.—Arguments from the Times of Barley Harvest.—Maimonides.—Final rejection of 18th March, 29, Mr. Browne's Date.—The Paschal Date of Mr. Gresswell considered. — Astronomical Argument of the Reviewer in favour of it overthrown by the detection of an error in calculation in the times of New Moon.—View of Reasons for placing the Passion on 3d April, 33.—Miscellaneous Observations and Summary of the whole Argument for the year 33 as the certain Date.—New Arguments of the Reviewer for Mr. Gresswell's Date considered and answered . . . . .	1—92
---	------

	Page
SECTION II.	
THE SEVENTY WEEKS OF DANIEL.	
Originality in calculating the New Moon of March 33, awarded to Mr. Whiston, Mr. Bedford, and Mr. Kennedy, writers of the Eighteenth Century.—A digression as to the exact date of the Accession of Artaxerxes Longimanus, and in refutation of the Dates of Usher, Vitringa, and Hengstenberg.— Testimonies of Ancient Chronologers.—Modems.—Rejection of the Authority of the Canon of Ptolemy by these three writers unwarranted.—It rests on the testimony of Thucydides. —Uncertainty of the dates of Grecian Affairs in this period. —Diodorus.—Analysis of his Dates.—Anachronisms.— Chronological silence of Thucydides.—His testimony cannot shake our confidence in the Canon.—Confirmation of this date from the Scientific Chronology.—Seven different Astro- nomical Calculations of the New Moon and 1st of Nisan, B.C. 458.—The exact number of days in 490 Tropical years, shewing that they came out at the hour when our Lord was nailed to the Cross.—The Evidence of the date of the Passion amounts to demonstration.—Profound skill of the Rabbis in corrupting the Chronology.—Sin of the Churches of the Reformation in rejecting the testimony of the Apostolic Churches.—The Church of Rome still gives partial testimony to the true Chronology.—The Churches of the East unanimous in receiving it.—Fall of the Hebrew Scheme at hand.—The Author's Scheme one not of innovation, but restoration.—He has not altered one established date.—HE DARES NOT DO IT.—Conclusion, showing the arrangement of the Subdivision of the Seventy Weeks.—Final Remark on the Triumphant Establishment of the Date of the Passion 93—129	

## PART II.

THE NATIVITY AND PASSION, THE CHRONOLOGICAL FOCI OF  
MUNDANE TIMES.

## SECTION I.

In the Record of Redemption, the Nativity and Passion are the  
events first in order.—They form the basis of the present

Argument.—Their dates.—Five other great dates enumerated with the dates of the whole.—Evidence of the date of the Nativity.—It was in Summer.—Reasons for this.—The INCARNATION probably on the Great Day of Atonement.—Probable date of the Nativity thence deduced.—Shown to be the Tropical date of Ezekiel's first Vision.—Waving the fact of the actual establishment of these dates, they are thrown into the form of two Chronological Theorems.—Three other Old Testament dates brought into the Second Proposition.—Various measures of Scientific Time in the Chronology.—The number SEVEN and its Multiples.—The CYCLES OF ASTRONOMY.—The number TWELVE and Multiples.—Numbers of GEOMETRICAL PROGRESSION.—SQUARES,—CUBES,—PRIMES.—The TRINAL FRACTION.—Illustrations of, by Professor Wallace . . . . .	130—140
---	---------

## SECTION II.

## THE EVIDENCE FOR PROPOSITION I. FROM THE PRE-CHRISTIAN TIMES.

Analytical Series of Great Periods, terminating at A and B.—Summary Recapitulation.—Final Conclusion.—A and B are the Foci or Concentral Points of the Ages before the Manifestation of the Eternal Word . . . . .	140—160
--	---------

## SECTION III.

## THE EVIDENCE FOR PROPOSITION I. FROM THE POST-CHRISTIAN TIMES.

Introductory Remarks.—Analytical Series of Great Periods computed from A and B.—Summary and Recapitulatory View and Conclusion that A and B are the Foci or Concentrical Points of the Ages posterior to the Manifestation of the Eternal Word . . . . .	161—191
--	---------

## SECTION IV.

PROPOSITION II.—Introductory Remarks explanatory of the principles on which the dates were fixed.—Great Series of Time which demonstrate the dates.—Series from Creation to C, and thence to 1846.—From Creation to D.—From Creation to E.—From h to F.—From Creation to F.—From h to G.—From h, i, and k.—Conclusion from the whole evidence.—Summary and Final Remarks . . . . .	191—219
--	---------

Page

**PART III.**

**THE CHRONOGRAPHY OF THE BIBLE OF DIVINE ORIGINAL..**

**SECTION I.**

Introductory Remarks.—Deep personal respect due to the Chevalier Bunsen.—Reservation of liberty in treating the subject.—M. Bunsen's View of the Notes of Time in the Old Testament.—Accuracy of his terms controverted.—His use of the term "Hypothesis"—Limitations to the employment of hypothesis.—His reasons against the principle that Chronology is a matter of Revelation.—His terms inaccurate.—If Chronology be a part of what God has spoken it must be true.—Remark by the Chevalier as to the difference between the kernel of truth and its shell.—Animadversions on this.—Four points laid down.—The rejection of Chronology as revealed includes the rejection of Revelation itself.—Arguments for rejecting his system.—Acts xvii. 26. The words imply a scientific order.—This order well known to the Ancient Synagogue.—Deep devices of the Rabbis for preserving this order in their curtailed system exemplified.—Galatians iv. 4.—Daniel's Seventy Weeks.—By time God regulates the events of his Moral Administration.—Scriptural exemplifications of this.—Corollary from all that has been offered.—Has God REVEALED the Times?—This discussion forced upon us by the Chevalier's negation, and his reference to Egyptian records.—Character of Egypt, brutish Idolatry.—Testimony of Diodorus.—M. Bunsen's grounds for rejecting Chronology as revealed.—Remarks on the danger of familiarity with images of Idolatry.—The knowledge of time essential to Creation.—Incredibility of M. Bunsen's hypothesis.—If no Chronology of the First Ages, whence the belief of Christ's Advent in the fifty-fifth century from Creation?—Suetonius.—Tacitus.—Conclusion . 220—247

**SECTION II.**

Examination of M. Bunsen's sketches of Scriptural Chronology in Book I., sect. iii.—The title of sect. iii. objectionable.—It gives to Egypt a wrong place in Scriptural Chronology.—The cessation of Scriptural narrative from the Dedication

	Page
upwards controverted.—His Table from Moses to the Foundation formed on an unsound principle.—The Author's Table, remarks in reference to it.—Evidence internal and external for filling up two chasms.—M. Bunsen's inference from the artificial character of the numbers 40 and 20.—Answered by the exhibition of still more perfect series.—Wheels within wheels, as in the Cherubic Vision.—M. Bunsen on the period from Moses to Joseph, or the sojourn in Egypt.—Assertion that the 400 years of Gen. xv. have no historical precision, and that the period of 430 years in Exod. xii. 40, is not chronological, considered and answered.—The assertion that it is unhistorical charges the Scriptures with falsehood.—Is opposed to the universal sentiments of Chronologers and the Jewish and Christian Churches.—The period of 430 was exactly fulfilled.—It is the measure of other great periods.—Series from Sacred History.—From Profane.—In connexion with the eras of Troy and Foundation of Rome.—Conclusion.—The Chevalier's assertion crumbles to powder.—The exact Chronology of the 400 years shown from the Scriptures.—M. Bunsen sweeps away the whole Chronology of Genesis, by negativing the Patriarchal Generations from Adam to Noah and Noah to Abram as referring to individual persons, and by applying them to nations and tribes.—Revelation, by this hypothesis, blown into the air, and the whole received Chronology of the Church of God.—The question as to the difference between the Greek and Hebrew systems dismissed by M. Bunsen almost in silent contempt.—Closing remark . . . . .	247—286

## SECTION III.

The Chevalier Bunsen's View of the Chronology of Josephus.—The Exoteric and Esoteric Systems of the Jewish Historian.—The difference between them shown to be exactly equal to the sum of the curtailments effected by the Scribes in the Patriarchal Generations.—His Esoteric Scheme demonstrated to be identical with that deduced from the Scriptures by the Author, and embodied in his Tables . . . . .	286—304
---	---------

## SECTION IV.

The Remarks of M. Bunsen on Chronology among the Apostles	
---	--

and Fathers of the Eastern Church during the first and second centuries considered.—Analytical review of the great Mundane periods of Clemens of Alexandria, which are left wholly unnoticed by the Chevalier, shewing the corrections whereby they are brought into entire harmony with the Tables of the Author . . . . .	Page
	305—317

## SECTION V.

The Chevalier Bunsen's Remarks on the Chronology of Julius Africanus.—The key to this writer's aberrations from the received Chronology shown to be his rejection of the Second Cainan, and another minute error in the birth of Arphaxad.—M. Bunsen's assertion that the exact era of the Incarnation is beyond the province of the Scientific Chronology considered.—The science of numbers in his own pages unobserved by him.—Argument from the scientific structure of Antediluvian Chronology.—The testimony of the Paschal Chronicle.—Concluding Remarks.—Corruption of the numbers of the children of Israel at the Exodus proved . . . .	317—341
---	---------

## APPENDIX I.

Introductory Remarks.—Table of Chronology from Creation to the Epoch of the Gentile Bishopric of Jerusalem.	
---	--

## APPENDIX II.

A Table of Trinal Fractions.	
------------------------------	--

## APPENDIX III.

On the Date of the Death of Joshua.	
-------------------------------------	--

## APPENDIX IV.

Reasons for receiving the Greek Chronology.	
---	--



## ERRATA.

Page 60 line 10 from top, after 3d. place a ).  
" " " 1 " bot. Note, for *tab es*, read *tables*.  
" 106 " 16 " top " *those*, " *that*.  
" 108 " 9 " bot. after 30, place a comma.  
" 114 " 3 " Note † for *subtracting*, read *subtracting*.  
" 117 " 14 " top Note \* " 3,675,400, " 2,675,400.  
" 174 " 17 " " after *connecting*, insert *it*.  
" 193 " .2 " " for *Hale's*, read *Hales'*.  
" 196 " 2 " bot. " 18, " 180.  
" 197 " 16 " top "  $70 \times 4$ , "  $70 \times 7 \times 4$ .  
" 273 " 14 " bot. " *Zedekiah*, " *Josiah*.  
" 298 " 2 " top " 13, " 15.  
" 301 " 6 " " " 3451, " 4451.  
" " 8 " " " 3452, " 4452.  
" 309 " 1 " bot. Note † after *Antony*, insert *and*.  
" 321 " 6 " top for 5666, read 5686.  
" 342 " 9 " " " *Hyesos*, " *Hycos*.

---

## ADDENDA.

Page 178, at the end of line 8 from top, insert, *1561 is also the trinal of 39*.

Page 178, line 6 from bottom, after *Period* insert, *This date is from Creation 53 Weeks of the Cycle of 19*.

Page 325, line 10 from bottom, after *years* insert, *from Creation*.

---

## NOTICE TO THE READER.

The note A, which is referred to at the bottom of p. 95, has by mistake been placed at the end of Section ii. of Part II., instead of that of Part I. It will be found in p. 161.

# THE CERTAIN TRUTH,

ETC.

---

## PART I.

### A VINDICATION.

---

#### SECTION I.

Introductory Remarks.—Elements of the Question.—Summary of Opinions Ancient and Modern.—Estimate of Ancient Opinions.—Mr. Clinton.—The Reviewer's Estimate.—Eusebius.—Mr. Browne's Dates of the Passovers of the years 29 and 33.—Lunar Elements of the Passover.—Testimonies of Philo,—Josephus.—Dates of Mr. Gresswell,—Mr. Browne.—Limits of the Question, the years 29, 30, and 33.—Reasons for Mr. Browne's Date answered.—Testimonies of Josephus,—Philo,—Aristobulus.—Anatolius considered.—Astronomical Arguments.—Jewish Calendar.—Paschal Chronicle of Hippolytus.—Council of Nice.—Arguments from the times of Barley Harvest.—Maimonides.—Final Rejection of 18th March, 29, Mr. Browne's Date.—The Paschal Date of Mr. Gresswell considered.—Astronomical argument of the Reviewer in favour of it overthrown by the detection of an error of calculation in the hours of New Moon.—View of reasons for placing the Passion on 3d April, 33.—Miscellaneous Observations and Summary of the whole argument for the year 33 as the certain date.—New arguments of Reviewer for Mr. Gresswell's date considered and answered.

AN article on Works of Sacred Chronology, which appeared in the “Churchman's Monthly Review” for August, 1846, contains various allegations as to the reason-

ing and conclusions in the fourth chapter of my "Synopsis of Chronology," respecting the date of the Passion of our Lord and Saviour, in the truth of which I cannot acquiesce. It also appears to me to contain much false reasoning as to the principles which are to guide us in fixing this great era. I have, therefore, seen it to be the path of duty to bring its statements and arguments to the test of a close and strict examination.

In entering into this investigation, I shall make some brief remarks upon the great and awful solemnity of the inquiry, and the stupendous importance of the point to be treated. We are assured in the Scriptures that God hath *determined the times before appointed*, or rather (*προταργενεῖς*) before *arranged* or *set in order*, and also that there was an appointed fulness of the times for our Lord's first appearance. Now, since all God's works shall show forth his glory, it may be certainly inferred, even *a priori*, that the regulation of the *times and the seasons* of the Moral Universe, which is a work requiring in a transcendent degree the superintendence of infinite wisdom and almighty power, will not form an exception to this; but, on the contrary, when its true principles and order are established, they will contain such evidences of his Divine perfections as to draw forth new ascriptions of glory to Him who is the Creator of all Worlds. Let us further remember that his peculiar title is that of the GOD OF TRUTH, and that all truth is *his property*. In this inquiry we therefore tread on sacred ground. It is the mount that may not be touched with unsanctified hearts and unclean hands. Either to give to the public, or to uphold by unsound reasoning, a false date of that greatest of all events in the Moral History of Creation—that point of deepest

blackness of darkness on the one hand — and of highest effulgence and splendour of light on the other hand—the Passion of our Lord—to give, we say, or to uphold even in ignorance, a false date of this great event, is at the least a sin of ignorance to be atoned for by that blood which was then shed. Let us then carefully examine our hearts in approaching this inquiry, purging them from all self-will, all secret preference to a date because it may form a part of our own scheme, or may help us to overthrow a rival system, all desires to detract from the fair arguments or the evidence of an opponent. These are to the understanding as *the gift that blindeth the wise, and perverteth the words of the righteous.*\* Let us finally remember, that even to give aid to the reception by the public of a false date is as truly to rob God, and we fear in a higher and more sinful degree than they who in the days of old robbed him of tithes and offerings.† Let us then inscribe upon all our discussions—**HOLINESS TO THE LORD.**

As it will very much conduce to the accuracy of our reasoning in treating this high subject, and will also make the points at issue more clearly intelligible to common readers, I shall begin by laying down the elements of the question in a brief series of propositions, premising that the *Day* is here the Jewish day from sunset to sunset.

I. Our Lord was crucified upon a Friday, and at the time of the Jewish Passover.

II. The Passover comprehended various acts and ceremonial observances. 1. The first was the *search for Leaven*, which was made upon the evening between the end of the 13th and beginning of the 14th of Nisan,

\* Exod. xxiii. 8.

† Malachi iii. 8.

and, as it will be shown, the 14th Nisan always began to run before the Full Moon ; it hence follows, that *before the Full the feast had invariably commenced.*\* On the morning of the 14th they might eat Leaven till the end of the fourth or fifth hour, but, at the sixth hour, they must burn or otherwise destroy it.† 2. The second act was the *slaying of the Paschal Lamb* upon the same day, viz., the 14th Nisan, about two or three in the afternoon. 3. The third act was the *Eating of the Lamb* or *Paschal Supper*, which was on the night of the 15th Nisan.

I shall pass over the offering of the first fruits of the Barley harvest, on the 16th of Nisan, as not being a part of this inquiry.

III. The beginning or *first evening* of Nisan and every Jewish month was at the first visible phase or appearance of the New Moon, which in Judea might usually, in clear weather, be when she was *eighteen hours old*. To supply the want of an actual observation, the rule called by the Jewish scribes **ט'ן** or eighteen was applied, “and they began their month from the sixth hour at evening, that is, at Sunset next after the eighteenth hour from the conjunction.”‡

IV. The result was, that though the Passover was not regulated by the Full Moon, but by the first appearance of

\* This important circumstance of the *search for Leaven*, as the first act of the Feast, is entirely lost sight of or kept out of view by the Reviewer, who stumbles upon a fancied inconsistency of a *whole day* between Philo's rule, that the feast was observed on the *fourteenth of Nisan*, and *before the Full*, and the same Philo's rule as to the *beginning of the month from the Phasis*. The inconsistency exists only in the hallucinations of the Reviewer.

† For the Rules of the Passover see “Lightfoot's Works,” vol. i., pp. 951—971.

‡ Sir Isaac Newton on Daniel. P. 161.

the New; yet, as will be proved below, the Lamb was always slain either on the Jewish day of the Mean Full Moon, or if on the day before, within four hours of the opposition.

V. Consequently at the Passover when our Lord suffered, the Full Moon must have occurred either on Friday or early on the evening of the Jewish Saturday; and this at once excludes every year when it did not so happen from the possibility of its being that of the Passion.

VI. To determine with certainty the exact day, the application of the rule from the Phasis which includes the calculation of the New Moon is usually necessary.

VII. Our Lord was crucified in the Procuratorship of Pontius Pilate, and in the reign of Tiberius, who died on March 16, a.c. 37. Any date subsequent to a.c. 36 is therefore not to be even mentioned in this inquiry.

I shall next state the various years which have been fixed upon as the date of the Passion, and the writers who have espoused each date, with the time and day of the week of the Paschal Full Moon in each.

Paschal Full Moon.				
Years after Christ.	Day of the Week.	Month, Day, and Hour in Jerusalem time.	Writers who have held each date.	
28	Monday	March, 19d. 6h. Aft.	Dr. Jarvis.	
29	Friday, <i>Jewish</i> <i>Saturday.</i>	March, 18d. 9h. 16m.	ANCIENT WRITERS. Clemens of Alexandria—Tertullian—Lactantius — Sulpicius — Augustine.	
			But they differ as to the date from x. Kal. April, March 23, to viii. and vii. Kal. April, March 25 and 26.	
			MODERN WRITERS. Benson.	

Years after Christ.	Day of the Week.	Pachal Full Moon.		Writers who have held each date.
		Month, Day, and Hour, in Jerusalem time.		
				Browne.
				Clinton.
				Mann.
				Ideler.
				Bianchini.
				Sanclementi.
30	Thursday,	April, 6 D. 10 h.		ANCIENT WRITERS.
	<i>Jewish</i>			Africanus.
	<i>Friday.</i>			MODERN WRITERS.
31	Tuesday.	March, 27 D. 2 h. Morn.		Gresswell.
				ANCIENT WRITERS.
				Epiphanius.
				Prosper.
				MODERN WRITERS.
				Hales.
				Petavius, who makes the Passion on March 23d.
32	Monday.	April, 14 D. 11 h. Morn.		ANCIENT WRITERS.
				The Paschal Chronicle.
33	Friday.	April, 3 D. 5 h. Aftern.		ANCIENT WRITERS.
				Eusebius in the Chro- nicon.*

\* I have verified the testimonies of Clemens, Sulpicius, the Paschal Chronicle, and Eusebius. The other names I find in Mr. Clinton. The Reviewer, in his second article,\* raises a doubt whether Eusebius' date of the Passion be not A.C. 32, instead of 33, and gives the following reasons for it:—First, it is affirmed, that Eusebius places it in the fourth year of Oly. 202. Petavius, it is said, has shown that Eusebius antedates the Olympiads to the October previous to the beginning of each, and therefore that Oly. 202-4 is A.C. 32, and not 33. The reply to this is, that in my Armenian copy the Passion is placed in Oly. 203-1, which assuredly answers to A.C. 33, even on the Eusebian scheme. It is further said, that Eusebius makes it in the 18th or 19th Tiberius, and that the 18th from the true date, or the 19th if antedated from the beginning of the year (14), will equally give 32. The reply to this is, that Eusebius either loses 1 year in the reign of Augustus, (probably by oversight, for from the death of Cæsar, B.C. 44,

\* Churchman's Review, 1847, p. 180.

Paschal Full Moon.			Writers who have held each date.
Years after Christ.	Day of the Week.	Month, Day, and Hour, in Jerusalem time.	
MODERN WRITERS.			
Usher.			
Scaliger.			
Calvisius.			
Vossius.			
Whiston.			
Prideaux.			
Kennedy.			
Lloyd.			
Calmet.			

to that of Augustus, A.C. 14, are 57 years complete, and about 5 months. Now Eusebius makes the death of Caesar in the year of Abraham 1973, and that of Augustus 2029, an interval of 56 years only;) or rather, he brings the death of Caesar a year too low. The proof of this is, that the death of Philip and the accession of Alexander the Great to the throne of Macedon were in B.C. 336\*, and the death of Caesar in B.C. 44, the interval is 292 years. Now Eusebius places the death of Philip in the year of Abraham 1680, whence 292 years would give Y. A.B. 1972 as the date of Caesar's death. But Eusebius places it in 1973,† a year too late, and answering to B.C. 43. He places the Passion in Y. A.B. 2048, or 75 years after the death of Caesar, which, computed from B.C. 43, brings out the Passion in A.C. 33. The Reviewer next says, that the Consuls were Furius Camillus and Cn. Domitius; but in the Armenian copy no names of Consuls are given for the year of the Passion. Mr. Clinton, however, gives the year A.C. 33, and the Consuls Sulpicius Galba and Cornelius Sulla, as the Eusebian date. It will also be observed, that the death of Philip being B.C. 336 and the Passion A.C. 33, the interval is exactly 368 years. Now, as the Eusebian date of the death of Philip we have seen to be Y. A.B. 1680, and of the Passion, Y. A.B. 2048, the interval is quite correct, being 368 years.

Moreover, the first year of Cambyses of Persia, being B.C. 529, and the Passion, A.C. 33, the interval is 561 years. Now Eusebius gives for the first of Cambyses . . . . . Y. A.B. 1487 and of the Passion . . . . . " 2048

the interval is exactly true . . . . . 561

The objection of the Reviewer, therefore, falls to the ground.

\* See Clinton, vol. ii., p. 150. Year B.C. 336.

† Olymp. 184.2, B.C. 34.

## Paschal Full Moon.

Years after Christ.	Day of the Week.	Month, Day, and Hour, in Jerusalem time.	Writers who have held each date.
			Marshall.
			Bedford.
			Helvicus.
			Du Fresnoy.
			L'Art de Verifier les Dates.
			Faber.
			Blair, &c.
34	Thursday.	April, 20D.	MODERN WRITERS. Sir Isaac Newton.

As to the testimony of the Fathers, which this Reviewer chiefly leans upon in support of the earlier date A. C. 29, if it were consistent with itself, and did it evince on their part a knowledge of the correct principles of investigation, we do not deny that it would be of very great value in the present inquiry. But the opinions of these writers are so loose and contradictory as to possess, in reality, no higher character than what is vulgarly called by us *hearsay evidence*. They evince an utter ignorance of the astronomical elements of the question, both as it respects *the days of the week* in which their various dates of the Passion fall, and their harmony with the *Lunar times* of the Passover. Of such computations the Fathers were utterly ignorant, and, accordingly, they place the Passion at dates which fell neither at the Full Moon nor upon Friday. Thus the x. Calend. April, of the year 29, March 23, fell upon Wednesday, five days after the Full Moon; and though the viii. Calends, or 25th, was upon Friday, the Full Moon having been upon the Friday before, the 18th, this date of the Passover falls at the *third quarter* of the Moon.

The opinion of many of them as to the date of the

Passion, was also closely linked with a view of the length of our Lord's personal ministry which, with, I believe, the exception of Mr. Browne, has found no advocates in modern times. They rightly placed his baptism in the 15th of Tiberius, a.c. 28; but they compressed all the mighty acts of his ministry within the space of *one year*, counted from his first Passover. Now, in consistency with this view, they also necessarily fixed the Passion in March, a.c. 29.

If, however, as all our ablest writers on the Gospel history are now agreed, this opinion as to the length of our Lord's ministry be totally unsound, the date of the Passion which emanates from, and is indissolubly connected with it, and is moreover not only without support, as we have seen it to be, from the astronomical elements, but totally contradictory to them, must be at once rejected.

Mr. Clinton, though he adopts the year 29 as the true date of the Passion,\* is too candid a writer to suppress or conceal the circumstances, which tend to invalidate the credibility of the Patristic testimonies. He tells us, "This date was assumed by some because they confounded the date of the Baptism with the date of the Passion; by others because they supposed both to have happened in

\* Mr. Clinton (see his "Fasti Romani," p. 14) promises, in the Appendix not yet published, to give his reasons for rejecting "the date of Usher, Blair, Du Fresnoy, and Mr. Cunningham, who all assign the Passion to the year 33." I shall, therefore, for the present, refrain from touching Mr. Clinton's reasons, already offered in pp. 13 and 14 of the above work, for receiving the year 29 as that of the Passion, but without stating the *month* or the *day*; and unless this learned writer shall find an answer to the conclusive arguments directed against his own date in these pages, it will be unnecessary for me to reply to him at all.

one year; by others because they transcribed from their predecessors without examination."

Their testimony as to the date of our Lord's *baptism* is, on the other hand, entitled to great weight, because it is the simple interpretation of the scriptural record as to what year was the 15th of the reign of Tiberius. On a point of this nature they were quite as competent witnesses as we of this generation are, that George III. ascended the throne of these kingdoms in the year 1760.

But as there is no direct scriptural testimony respecting the date of our Lord's *Passion*, unless by a laborious analysis and harmony of the Gospel narrative, the results of which are to be checked by astronomical calculations of the lunar times, the testimonies of the earlier Fathers in reference to it are, in truth, no better than vague guesses.

In stating the Patristic testimonies, while the Reviewer carefully notes their agreement with his own view of the probable *year* of the Passion, he no less carefully abstains from drawing the attention of his readers to the fact, that they altogether disagree among themselves, and differ from him, as to the *day* of the Passion.

The Reviewer affirms, that "*early tradition through four centuries points UNIFORMLY* to a date A. D. 28—30, and commonly to the middle of those years, A. D. 29, or J. P. 4742. The astronomical argument from the Passover-day is insufficient to decide the question. It proves only that three years are inadmissible, A. D. 28, 31, 32, and that three are admissible, March 18, A. D. 29; April 7, A. D. 30; and April 3, A. D. 33. The correspondence with the history of the Last Supper is doubly striking, if we refer it to the second of those years. Hence, we infer that Usher's date, however respectable its patrons, has the

lowest external evidence of the three, and is not superior on astronomical grounds. On the contrary, the year A.D. 29, *has the fullest support of early tradition*, and the following year the most remarkable accordance with the Gospel narrative.”\*

Now *it is not true* that early tradition through four centuries points *uniformly* to a date, A.D. 28—30, and commonly to the middle of these years, A.D. 29, or that 29 has the *fullest support* of early tradition. The year 31 is the date of Epiphanius and Prosper. That of 32 is embraced by the Paschal Chronicle, and 33 by Eusebius, whose testimony is worth more than all the former put together, according to the opinion of Scaliger, whose intimate knowledge of the Fathers cannot be questioned. After a review of the contradictory testimonies of some of them, he arrives at a conclusion which is expressed in the following words:—“Quare vides non convenisse inter illos veteres, quos utique omnes fugit ratio præter unum Eusebium virum Christianorum in sæcularibus literis illius ævi doctissimum, qui recte et iv. anno (ccii.) Olympiadis passum notat, et obtenebrationem Solis a Phlegonte proditam, non aliam esse ab ea, quam in morte Domini contigisse Evangelistæ scribunt.”

“ You therefore see that there is no harmony among those ancients, all of whom sound sense negatives (abhors) except only Eusebius, the most learned person of the Christians of that age in secular knowledge, who rightly notes that (Christ) suffered in the fourth year of the (202d) Olympiad, and that the darkening of the sun, related by Phlegon, was no other than that which the

\* “Churchman’s Monthly Review,” August, 1846, p. 583.

Evangelists declare to have happened at the death of the Lord."

Such, then, is the opinion of this learned person, as to the value of the testimony of the ancients generally,\* on this difficult question.

He next mentions the idle boast of the *τεσσαρεσκαιδεκατηται* (*quarto-decimani*)—who professed from the Acts of Pilate to celebrate the true day of the Passion on the viii. Kal. of April, or 25th March, and he then speaks rather unceremoniously of this date, which is the one specially patronised by this Reviewer, in the following words:—“*Alia rursus Acta Pilati se reperisse scribit Epiphanius, quæ Christum passum dicent xv. Kal. Aprilis (xviii. Martii), qui erat stupor asininus.*” “Epiphanius again writes, that he had found other copies of the Acts of Pilate, which said that Christ had suffered on the xv. Kal. of April (18th March), which was *asinine stupidity*.”

The language is too gross for the delicate sensibilities of modern controversy, but the error which he reprehends will possibly be shown in these pages to merit very severe terms of reprobation.

As the Reviewer honours me with a much larger share of his notice than any of the other writers whose works are placed at the beginning of his article, it becomes necessary for me, in order to the elucidation of the truth, to follow him step by step, although the exigencies of a sound argumentation may oblige me to diverge from the exact order of his reasoning.

He affirms that, in my statement as to the limits of the

\* The section of his “*Emend. Tempor.*,” in which he treats this point, has the title, *Veterum Velitationes de Die Passionis Dominicæ. The SKIRMISHINGS of the Ancients about the Day of the Passion.*

Passover, there is an evident ambiguity, inasmuch as it is left quite indifferent whether the Full Moon be on Friday or Saturday, in order that Friday may be Passover day. Now, for the answer to this objection, which, to a limited extent, is by myself already, in Proposition V. p. 5, admitted to be true, I must refer to the brief syllabus of Lunar times, in reference to the Passover, which will be given below. I also generally use the word **DAY** in this discussion in the sense of the *Jewish day*, from *sunset* to *sunset*. It will be seen below, that the day of the Full Moon was, taking the mean between the extremes of a very early or very late appearance of the New Moon, generally divided almost equally between the 14th and 15th of Nisan, so that the *usual case* was, that the Passover was upon the very day of the Full Moon, and the *exception*, in years when the month of Nisan began very early, was, that the Passover was slain on the day *before* the Full.

The Reviewer, however, next proceeds to lay down *three premises*, which he pronounces will be required to make my general argument good. His first, which I utterly reject, is as follows: *First, that the Full Moon in the proposed year shall fall between sunset of Friday and Saturday.* I hope to prove below that this premise is quite erroneous. In the two last, viz., that the rule of Philo and Josephus gives the real Passover, and that the Crucifixion was on the 14th Nisan, I freely acquiesce. Our Lord ate the Passover on the evening of our **THURSDAY**, but of the Jewish **FRIDAY**, the 14th Nisan, by anticipation, as Scaliger holds, and suffered on the following day, still the 14th, and expired at three o'clock, about the hour of the slaying the Paschal Lamb, whereby

the Type and Antitype met together in the harmony of God's purposes and wise arrangements.

I shall, as first in the order of the argument, briefly consider what he offers with respect to my remarks on Mr. Browne's date of the Passover for the year 33, wrongly placed on Thursday the 2d April, instead of Friday the 3d. Mr. Browne's alleged ground for this is, that the Full Moon, which fell at about two hours before sunset on Friday afternoon, belonged to the *vvχθημερον*, (evening and morning,) Jewish day, Friday; and, adopting the principle, which will be more clearly proved below to be utterly erroneous, that the Passover must *always* be celebrated on the day *before* the Full Moon, and adopting as the *invariable rule* that which will be proved to have been the *exception*, he carries back the Passover of 33 to *Thursday* the 2d April, and thus makes the 15th of Nisan, which, on the true principles of the Jewish calendar, can never begin sooner than *one hour* before the Mean Full Moon, to begin *twenty-two hours before* it. By consequence also, the 14th Nisan is made to begin *forty-six hours*, and the Paschal Lamb to be slain *twenty-six hours*, before the Full. On the other hand, in March a. c. 29, his own supposed date of the Passover, the Full Moon of which was on *Friday*, the 18th, at nine o'clock in the afternoon, which brought it into the *Jewish Saturday*, Mr. Browne places the Passover upon *Friday* (and, be it observed, I do not censure him for this, if this date could, consistently with the Lunar phenomena, be made the 14th of the Jewish month, and that month Nisan); but, on calculation, the New Moon of March 29 comes out on 3 d. 13 h. 54 m. Astronomical time, or the 4th at 1 h. 54 m. in the morning, Civil. The Phasis was not there-

fore till the following evening, the 5th, and the 1st of Nisan, if Mr. Browne were right as to the *month*, on the 6th. This gives not the 18th, but the 19th March, which was *Saturday*, as the Jewish 14th, precluding the possibility, even if it had been the month *Nisan*, of its being the date of the Passion. Mr. Browne, therefore, errs by anticipation *a whole day* in placing the 14th of the Jewish month on Friday the 18th March; and it will be shown below that he errs no less in the month than the day, and that the 19th March, A. C. 29, was the 14th, *not* of the month *Nisan*, but of the intercalary or embolismic month *Ve-Adar*.

In the next place, a difference of only *four hours* in the times of the Full Moons of March 18th, A. C. 29, and April 3d, 33, is made by him, without any reference to the Phasis, the ground of a difference of *twenty-four hours* in the relative times of the Passover. I shall place the two years according to his theory in juxtaposition.

Year A. C.	Date and Hour of Full Moon.	Mr. Browne's Date of the Passover.
29	Friday, March, 18 d. 9 h. 16 m. Aft.	Friday, March 18.
33	Friday, April, 3 d. 4 h. Aft.	Thursday, April 2.

The incongruity here may not at once appear to the reader, but it consists in carrying back the Passover of 33 to *Thursday* the 2d, whereby the slaying of the Lamb would be (as already said) 26 hours before the Full, which will in the next page be proved to be impossible, instead of placing it on its true date, *Friday*; and this inconsistency is itself of such magnitude as to show at once the unsoundness of his principle, although it does

not, without the calculation of the Phasis, clearly appear where the fallacy originates.

The Reviewer's animadversions on my former reasoning are as follows:—"Mr. Cunningham, however, objects that Mr. Browne has here changed his ground in order to exclude the later date." "The objection in *this form* has no real warrant." I have just shown that it has in *another form*. "Such a result," he continues, "must follow the strict adherence to any astronomical rule whatever. Thus if Easter Sunday were to be held the Sunday after the first actual Full Moon after the 21st March, the difference of one hour, or even ten minutes in longitude, might require it to be celebrated either a whole week earlier or four weeks later at London than at Rome or Jerusalem."

Now my whole argument, from the beginning to the end, was as to the times of the Passover at *Jerusalem*, and nowhere else. The Reviewer, who raises a difficulty from a possible difference between the times at Jerusalem and other places, might as well object to the accuracy of the calculation of the time of New Moon at Jerusalem because the time in London may in certain cases fall out on the day before.

It would, however, I now admit, have been better, if, in animadverting upon Mr. Browne's date of the Passover of the year 33,\* I had said, that he reasons from false principles, than that he reasons inconsistently with his principles; for in reality it is the false principle laid down in his preceding page, and more particularly in his Appendix,† that the 15th of the Jewish month was always identical

\* See my Synopsis of Chronology, p. 133.

† P. 468, § 411.

with the *νυχθημερον*, or 24 hours *from sunset to sunset* in which the Moon is at Full, which has led him to the erroneous conclusion that the 15th Nisan of the year 33 began in the evening of the 2d April. That this conclusion is wrong, I have unanswerably proved in the paragraph of my Synopsis which follows,\* and that Mr. Browne should have fallen into it is the more remarkable, seeing that † he also acknowledges the very principle from which I argue, viz., that the Hebrew months began from the first phasis or visible appearance of the New Moon, which could not be sooner than eighteen hours after the conjunction. Now if he had calculated the time of the New Moon in March 33, he must have at once seen that its phasis was not till the evening of the 19th, and consequently, that the 14th of Nisan, and not the 15th, began on the evening of April 2d, *our time*, but the 3d *Jewish time*.

Moreover, that both these principles of Mr. Browne cannot stand, or, in other words, that one of them must give way, I shall now prove, by placing before the reader an analytical view of the Lunar times of the Passover.

The Mean length of a Lunation being 29 d. 12 h. 44 m., the half of it, 14 d. 18 h. 22 m., gives the Mean age of the Moon at the moment she is full.

1. Now the earliest usual phasis or appearance of the Moon being 18 hours after the conjunction at New Moon gives

\* Synopsis, pp. 133, 134.

† Appendix, p. 466, § 408.

	Age of the Moon.		
	D.	H.	M.
the earliest beginning of the 1st of Nisan			
in the Lunation . . . . .	0	18	0
Adding 13 days complete . . . . .	13	0	0
It gives the beginning of the 14th Nisan at	13	18	0
Being before the Full Moon . . . . .	1	0	22
Full Moon . . . . .	14	18	22

It is, therefore, evident that when the 1st of Nisan happened at the earliest possible time in the Lunation, the whole of the 14th Nisan was expired, and also 22 minutes of the 15th before the Full Moon. The Passover in this case was on the Jewish day before the Full, but the same civil day; the Paschal Lamb was slain 4 hours before the Full, which was the earliest Mean time it could in any case fall, and the 15th of Nisan, except the first 22 minutes, belonged wholly to the Jewish day of the Full Moon.

This at once overthrows Mr. Browne's date of the Passover of the year 33, which makes the slaying of the Lamb 26 hours before the Full.\*

	Age of the Moon.		
	D.	H.	M.
2. The latest appearance of the New Moon was when she set at about 17 hours old, being then invisible . . . . .	0	17	0
To this we must add a complete day . . .	1	0	0
And we arrive at her phasis at the age of .	1	17	0

\* *Supra*, p. 15.

	Age of the Moon.		
	D.	H.	M.
Add 13 days . . . . .	13	0	0
The 14th Nisan begins at . . . . .	14	17	0
Being before the Full Moon . . . . .	0	1	22
	14	18	22

Consequently, in this case, the whole day of the Full Moon except the last 1 hour and 22 minutes, belongs to the 14th, and the 15th only begins 22 hours and 38 minutes after the Full; and the Passover falls on the Jewish day of the Full Moon, but the civil day after, and the Paschal Lamb is killed 19 hours after the Full.

3. If we take the mean between these two extremes we shall find, that about  $11\frac{1}{2}$  hours of the day of Full Moon belong to the 14th of Nisan, and  $12\frac{1}{2}$  to the 15th, on the average of years, and the result is, that the Passover nearly always happened on the Jewish day of the Full, and that Mr. Browne's canon placing it on the *νυχθημερον*, evening and morning day *before*, is not the *rule*, but the *exception*. His canon then falls to the ground, and with it the charge against me of inconsistent and inconclusive reasoning. For it is manifest that I place the 1st of Nisan in March, 33, at the very time that a rigid adherence to the rule of Philo requires. First, Philo tells us that the new month was after the conjunction *μετα συνοδον*; and again, *Νουμηνιᾳ γαρ αρχεται φωτιζειν αισθητῳ φεγγει σεληνην ἡλιος*;<sup>\*</sup> “At the new month the sun begins to illumine the moon with a sensible splendor.”

Again, as to the Passover, he informs us, that it was on

\* Philo, Oper. vol. ii. p. 292. London, 1742.

the 14th of Nisan, *Τῷ δῃ μηνὶ τουτῷ, περὶ τεσταρεσκαιδεκατην ἡμέραν μελλοντος του σεληνιακου κυκλου γινεσθαι πλησιφασις, αγεται τα διαβατηρια δημοφανης ἔορτη.*\*  
 “In this month, at the 14th day, the moon being about to be full, the public feast of the Passover is kept.”

It has been shown accordingly, that when the phasis or appearance of the moon happened at the earliest possible hour after the conjunction, the whole of the 14th of Nisan, and 22 minutes of the 15th, did, in fact, expire before the Full Moon, so that the Lamb was slain also before it. But the application of this rule being necessarily subject to the lunar variations, when the appearance of the New Moon was very late, although even then the 14th of Nisan and the *beginning of the Feast* by the search for leaven always arrived *before the Full Moon*, yet the Paschal Lamb was not slain in such cases till after the Full. Now the words of Philo require no more.

Josephus says, in harmony with the testimony of Philo, that the Passover was, by the law, appointed to be on the 14th day of the Lunar month Nisan, when the Sun was in Aries, *τεσταρεσκαιδεκατη κατα σεληνην, εν κριῳ του ἡλιου καθεστωτος.*†

Interpreting these words in their strict and natural sense, I charge it upon Mr. Gresswell as a contradiction to this sense, that he, in effect, affirms, on the authority of Bucherius, that the Passover might be held *before* the Sun had entered Aries. The Reviewer vindicates him by asserting, that I have adopted a like contradiction. “Mr. Browne,” you say, “might reply with equal truth, ‘Philo

\* Philo, Oper. vol. ii. p. 169. These passages are both cited by Mr. Gresswell. I have, however, referred also to the volume of Philo.

† Ant. iii. 10. 5.

declares that the Passover is celebrated when the Moon is about to be full.' Mr. C. asserts, that this must be taken with some latitude, which amounts to this; that the Moon's being about to be full may signify that she is some hours past the full, which is a direct contradiction." I have not asserted this. I refer the reader to what is said in the last and a former page, to prove that I hold the direct contrary. I have shown that the 14th Nisan and the festival always began before the Full.

The Reviewer next says (p. 578), that "if the words of Philo and Josephus be turned into a precise rule for the Passover *day*, the year 33 will be excluded." I affirm, on the contrary, as will be unanswerably proved in the subsequent pages, that the year 33 is the *only one* that will satisfy the conditions contained in the rules of Philo and Josephus, with respect both to the day and the month of the Passion, *to the total and absolute exclusion of every other year*.

The next charge against me is, that, in vindicating Mr. Browne's exclusion of Mr. Gresswell's date of April, A. D. 30, on the one hand, and in rejecting, on the other hand, as utterly erroneous, Mr. Browne's date of the Passover of April, 33, I am betrayed into a direct inversion of my own reasoning.—My reply is: that I have demonstrated, by the time of the first appearance of the New Moon of March, 33, that the 1st of Nisan, and consequently the 14th, were both a complete day later than Mr. Browne has placed them; and consequently, that in making the Passover of that year upon Thursday, the 2d April, he errs *a complete day*.—I have further demonstrated, by a similar calculation of the times of the New Moon in March, A. C. 30, which will be given in a future

page, and will throw back upon the Reviewer the charge and the demonstration of error, that, following Mr. Gresswell, he has made the 14th of Nisan of that year, a complete day too late, and consequently both have erred *a full day* as to the Passover, which they place on Friday, the 7th, whereas it was the day before. Whatever defects, therefore, may exist in the *order of my reasoning*, my *conclusion* is astronomically true.

With the view of shortening the present discussion, I shall now state that, as it is admitted that the years 28, 31, and 32, are absolutely excluded by the application of the astronomical test, and as no one now holds A. C. 34, the date of Sir Isaac Newton, against which a conclusive reason will be seen in my Synopsis,\* the only years that remain, as within the arena of controversy, are A. C. 29, the date of Mr. Browne; 30, that of Mr. Gresswell; and 33, that of Usher, Prideaux, and the general body of Chronologers. I shall proceed to sum up the argument as to each of these years as briefly as I can, and to show that the year 33 is the true and certain date of the Passion of our Lord and Saviour.

The date of Mr. Browne, Friday, 18th March, 29, has already been rejected.† *First*, it is proved not to be the 14th of the Jewish month, but only the 13th, and, therefore, could not, even if the month had been Nisan, be the Passover. *Secondly*, the following day, the 14th, even if it were the Passover, being Saturday, could not be the Passion. *Thirdly*, it will be shown that the month was not *Nisan*, but *Ve-Adar*. Each of the three reasons, therefore, negatives its being the possible day of the Passion.

We have already seen that the testimony of Josephus

\* Page 102.

† See *supra*, p. 15.

upon this point is quite decisive. He tells us that *the Sun must have entered Aries, εν κριψ του ἡλιου καθεστωτος.*\* To this the Reviewer replies, that the words are not to be strictly interpreted; that is, the meaning may be, *the Sun being yet in Pisces and not in Aries.* Does this gloss really satisfy the understanding of the intelligent reader? If language may be thus turned aside from its plain and obvious meaning, on what foundation can we reason in combating the Sceptical conclusions of the Chevalier Bunsen as to the Scriptural times? If we may thus turn aside the plain and unequivocal testimony of Josephus, that the Passover was celebrated when the Sun was in Aries, why may not the German Rationalists just as well except the whole Chronology of the Bible from Paul's declaration, that all Scripture is given by inspiration from God? Reasoning like this removes the landmarks between truth and error, and shakes the very foundations of truth.

I have referred also to a passage of Philo, cited by Mr. Gresswell, to prove that the Sun must be in Aries when the Passover is kept. "The sun completes two equinoxes each year, *one in Aries and the other in Libra*, and shows a clear proof of the excellence of the number *seven*, for each equinox occurs in the seventh month, and in them it is appointed by law to celebrate the greatest and most notable feasts." I have taken the Reviewer's own translation, and now I shall give his reasoning from it. (P. 586.) "Such a passage is as unlike as possible to a scientific rule for the exact limits of the Passover. Taken strictly, it would prove the opposite to that for which it has been

\* I ask the Greek scholar whether this word in the participle perfect does not mean the Sun's having already set himself down in Aries, i. e., fully entered it?

alleged.' Philo does not assert, as Mr. C. appears to suppose, that the Passover feast was held when the Sun was somewhere in Aries, but at the equinox, and *this would be strictly true, only if the Passover-day were to lie between the 15th and 22d March.*"

My reply to this reasoning is, that the Greek verb *αποτελεω*, the participle *αποτελων* of which is fitly rendered "*completes*," signifies *to bring quite to an end*.\* The Sun does not, however, *bring to an end* or *complete* the equinox, till he is exactly at the equinoctial point of Aries in the spring and Libra in autumn; but it is when he has *completed* the former Equinox that the feast of the Passover is kept, therefore it is not till the Sun has entered Aries. The Reviewer's argument completely wrests the words on which it professes to rest. It in effect affirms, either that the Sun completes the Equinox between the 15th and 22d March, that is before he enters Aries, and is yet in Pisces; or, on the other hand, that the feast is kept before he completes the Equinox, both of which assertions are directly contrary,—the latter to the words of Philo, and the former to the astronomical fact, that in the time of our Lord the Equinox fell on the 23d.

I am next charged with an incorrect rendering of the testimony of Aristobulus. I shall therefore quote the words:—

*'Ο δε Αριστοβουλος προστιθησιν, ώς ειη εξ αναγκης τη των διαβατηριων ἔορτη μη μονον τον ἥλιον το ισημερινον διαπορευεσθαι τμῆμα, και την σεληνην δε.*†

My rendering of these words is, "But Aristobulus adds, that it is necessary for the Feast of the Passover not only

\* Liddel and Scott's Greek Lexicon.

† Euseb. Hist. Eccles., Lib. vii., p. 231, Paris, 1678.

that the Sun should *have passed* the Equinoctial points, but the Moon also." The Reviewer, on the other hand, affirms as follows:—"His (viz. Aristobulus') real statement is, that IN the Feast of the Exodus, not only the Sun but also the Moon must *pass* the Equinoctial points; in other words, the Sun must be at the vernal, and the Moon at the autumnal equinox."

"The alleged proofs of the rule are thus quite indecisive. The exact time of the Equinox in the first century would be between the noon of March 22 and March 23. The Jews, however, might account it sufficient that it should occur before the middle of the feast,\* which would bring its limit to March 18, as in the canon of Hippolytus; or, as Mr. Benson observes, even if they adopted the rule that the Passover should follow the Equinox, it does not follow that it never would precede it as determined by the accuracy of modern days, unless their mode of ascertaining it were equally accurate."

In reply to the foregoing remarks let it be observed, that the mere fact of the use of the Metonic Cycle as an element of the Jewish Sacred Times and Scriptural Chronology proves, that they had reached the true length of the Solar Year, or very nearly approximated to it, and also of the Lunation, which necessarily supposes a knowledge of the true times of the Equinoxes. Further, the use of the Sun Dial as early as the reign of Ahaz,

\* We have, in the narrative of John's Gospel, mention of an event which happened *in the midst of the feast*, c. vii. 14, and there the expression is quite different from what this gloss of the reviewer would suppose. Ηδη δε της εορτης μεσουσης ανεβη ὁ Ιησος. Is it not necessary to suppose that if Aristobulus had meant what the Reviewer represents him to have meant, there would have been a similar form of expression to that employed by John?

B. C. 742, includes in it a knowledge approaching to accuracy of the length of the Day, and hours of Sun rising and setting. Now the error, which is in the passage now quoted imputed to them, being not less than *four days* as to the times of the Sun, or four degrees of the Ecliptic in his Longitude, and 10 or 11 minutes of an hour in the times of his rising and setting, or 20 minutes in the length of the day, that is, when, on the 18th o.s., he rose about 15 minutes after 6, they counted his rising 11 minutes earlier, with corresponding variations as to the true cardinal points of East and West where he rises and sets at the Equinox.

But with respect to the Lunar times the error imputed to the Jews is much greater. The Moon in her Synodical Revolution of  $29\frac{1}{2}$  days traverses rather more than the whole Ecliptic, and consequently in each month passes both the Equinoctial points of Aries and Libra. But it is only once in the 12 Lunations\* that her passage of the Equinoctial point of Libra constitutes her the Paschal Moon, and it is when she first arrives at Full after the Sun has passed the Vernal Equinoctial point, or entered Aries. Now on the 18th March, o.s., or 16th, n.s., at about 10 o'clock evening at Jerusalem, A. C. 29, she was at Full, and was, as appears by the Tables,† about entering Libra, but upon the 20th, n.s., at Noon, the date of the Equinox, she had gone as far as 17 degrees of Scorpio, more than a Sign and a half, or one Eighth part of the whole Ecliptic, from her Place on the 16th.

\* In the Embolismic year 13 Lunations.

† White's Ephemeris, 1832, when the Sun and Moon were nearly in the same places as 1803 years before.

Now, what is the evidence upon which this Reviewer rests, in charging upon the Jews, who, above all the nations of the Earth, were, by their Sacred Institution of the Passover, to be held at the Full Moon, when the Barley harvest was ripe, furnished with a basis on which to rest a most perfect chronology, so as to render it absolutely impossible that they should fall into the errors of the Roman Calendar, in which, before the Reformation by Julius Cæsar, the month of May had gone back into March, so that the Equinox fell on the 15th May; or even into the smaller error of the Christian Calendar, wherein, in 1582, the year of the introduction of the New Style by Pope Gregory XIII., the Equinox had fallen back to the 11th March; or that of the Egyptian or Babylonian year of 365 days, the basis of the Sothiac period; —we ask, what is the *evidence* on which he charges on the Jews the congeries of errors which have now been placed before the reader as the result of a deviation of four days from the true date of the Equinox? I ask for *evidence*, and I find, as already seen, the *vague surmise* —“the Jews, however, might account it sufficient that it should occur before the middle of the feast, which would bring it to March 18;” in other words, by a glaring *petitio principii*, he in effect states that either the gross ignorance of the Jews, or their carelessness, did in reality nullify their own canon. He, however, takes very good care that the imputed error shall fall on his own side of the argument, and seems utterly insensible to the fact that, if an error of 4 days be supposable at all, it is just as likely to be *against* as *for* him, to be *plus* as *minus*, or that the Passover should have been deferred till 4 days after, as anticipated 4 days before the Equinox; and if so, the pre-

umption of a very improbable error *minus*, balanced by the like presumption of an equal error *plus*, just amounts to the presumption of no error or perfect correctness. But I must here remind him that an error of 4 days *plus*, the probability of which he must, on his own principles, (unless he has the candour or good sense to abandon them,) at once admit, brings him, the Reviewer, exactly to the limit of the Modern Jewish Calendar; for the 22d March, the time of the Equinox in the first century *plus* 4 days = March 26, the very limit which, when brought forward from that calendar, as will be seen in a subsequent page, he pronounces to be utterly absurd.\*

Before closing this argument I shall observe, that the only fact brought by the Reviewer to bear upon this particular point in his second Review is, that Sosigenes, the Astronomer of Julius Cæsar, erred *two days* as to the date of the Civil Equinox. Hales, however, tells us that his error was specially as to the date of the *Winter Solstice*, which he made to be Dec. 25,† and if so, it may be observed, that an error of computation at the *Winter Solstice* was much more facile than one at the *Equinox*, and yet, from an error of *two days* *then* the Reviewer infers one of *four days* at the Equinox to have been fallen into by the Jews. Reasoning so little exact as this does not seem calculated to make a favourable impression on the minds of serious inquirers into truth.

Next, as to the foregoing passage of Eusebius, the controversy is not really about the strict rendering of the verb *διατρέπεσθαι*, which I am willing to concede to him

\* Second Review, April, 1847, p. 195.

† Hales, vol. i. p. 50. Note.

to have a present *form*, but as to the force of the Dative case in the words *τη των διαβατηριων ἑορτη*. He supplies the Preposition *εν*, and renders it as referring to *time*, “It is necessary *in* or *during* the feast of the Passover, that not only the sun,” &c. But where is the authority for this? There is no reason for thinking any preposition to be understood, as the clause admits of a closer translation without any. I presume the strict rendering is as follows:—“Aristobulus also adds, that it is necessary *to* (in order to) the feast of the Exodus, that not only the sun but the moon also should pass the equinoctial point.” In other words, there could be *no feast held* till both luminaries had passed the Equator. Now that this is the real meaning, I shall prove, by giving the whole passage from the English translation of the “History of Eusebius.”

Anatolius was Bishop of Laodicea in the reign of Diocletian, and Eusebius thus testifies of his qualifications:—“But for his learning and skill in the Greek philosophy, he was superior to any of the most distinguished men of our day, as he had attained unto the highest eminence in Arithmetic, Geometry, and Astronomy, besides his proficiency in Dialectics and Physics and Rhetoric.”\*

Eusebius afterwards gives the following extracts from the Canons of Anatolius, on the Paschal Festival:—

“ You have, therefore, in the first year, the new moon of the first month, which is the beginning of every Cycle of 19 years, on the 26th of the Egyptian month, Phamenoth; but, according to the months of the Macedonians, the 22d of Dystrus;—but, as the Romans would say,

\* Euseb. Eccles. Hist., B. vii. ch. xxxii.

before the 11th of the Calends of April. But the sun is found on the said 26th day of the month Phamenoth, entering the first segment (of the Zodiac), but on the 4th day is already found passing through it. But this segment they call the first dodecatemorium and the equinox, and the *beginning of the months*, and the head of the Cycle, and the head of the planetary course. But that segment before this, they call the *last of the months*, the twelfth segment, and the last dodecatemorium, and the end of the planetary revolution. *Hence also, those that place the first month in it, and that fix the fourteenth of the month by it, commit, as we think, no common blunder.* But neither is this our opinion only, but it was known to the Jews anciently, and before Christ, and was chiefly observed by them, as we may learn from Philo, Josephus, and Musæus; and not only from these, but also from those more ancient, i.e., the two Agathobuli, commonly called the Masters, and from Aristobulus, that most distinguished scholar, who was one of the seventy that translated the Holy Scriptures from the Hebrew for Ptolemy Philadelphus and his father, and dedicated his 'Exposition of the Law of Moses' to the same Kings. *These, when they resolve inquiries on the Exodus, say that all ought to sacrifice the Passover alike AFTER THE VERNAL EQUINOX, in the middle of the first month.* But this is found to be when the sun passes through the first segment of the solar, or as some call it, the Zodiacial Circle. *But this Aristobulus also adds, it was requisite that not only the sun SHOULD HAVE PASSED the equinoctial segment for the feast of Passover, but the moon also.\*\**

\* Cruse's "Translation of Euseb. Eccles. Hist.," B. vii. ch. xxxii. pp. 287, 288.

Now, who is it, I or the Reviewer, who has given a wrong version, and an equally wrong interpretation, of the words of Aristobulus? If he declines answering this question, I shall endeavour to do it.

By affirming that Mr. Browne's date of the Passover, *viz.* March 18th, A. c. 29, is astronomically possible, he in effect asserts that the Moon of that year,—of which the *New*, the *first Quarter*, and *Full*, and 20 days of the whole Lunation, fell when the Sun was in *PISCES*,—was the Moon of Nisan and of the Passover, in absolute opposition to, and defiance of, all authentic records of Jewish times, and the whole testimonies which have been cited. He, therefore, to use the words of Anatolius, is guilty of *no common BLUNDER*. His error is this: he counts the Moon of the Jewish Embolismic month *Ve-Adar*, which March, A. c. 29, *certainly was*, as that of *Nisan*: and in evidence of this I shall now state that the periods of 1822 and 1841 years being both Cycles in Astronomy, the Moon slow at the end of the former about 13 h. 53 m., and of the latter 15 h. 57 m., I carry them forward, the former from A. c. 29 to 1851, and the latter to 1870, and I find that both these years in the Jewish Calendar in my possession are Embolismic with *Ve-Adar*; and in 1851 the 18th March, the Reviewer's 14th Nisan, is marked as the 14th of *Ve-Adar*; and in 1870 the 17th March is that Jewish date. It hence must be inferred that the year 29 was Embolismic also, and the March Moon that of *Ve-Adar*. The error is thus one of *a whole month*.

I shall now briefly consider the reply of the Reviewer, in his second article,\* to my arguments from the passage

\* "Churchman's Monthly Review," March, 1847, pp. 191—193.

given in English translation from Anatolius, in the former page. If the reader will turn back to it he will see, that the end for which the quotation is given by me is simply to prove, that the Passover could not, according to the Jewish Canons, be till after the Equinox; and the words on which I chiefly ground my reasoning *are in the last nine lines.*

The Reviewer, on the other hand, seizes upon the introductory sentence from which I have not argued. He offers, first, a corrected rendering, which I am not disposed to question, and then animadverts on the fact that, to make sense of this very passage which so many have mistaken, has forced Petavius upon two expedients. The first, a conjectural reading in the second sentence of the 29th of Phamenoth, instead of the 26th; and the other, a forced and intolerable construction that *Neomenia* here denotes the Paschal *Full Moon*, both of which, I think, the Reviewer very properly rejects.

He next proceeds boldly (with what success we shall see afterwards) to take possession of the whole passage as his own, and to turn it against my argument. I shall place his words before the reader. “The translation of the clause is the only one the Greek will allow. In other words, the Sun enters Aries, according to Anatolius, March 19. Let us combine this statement with the words of Josephus and the general rule of the Paschal limit, and then March 18 will be the earliest Passover-day. Now our argument rested on either of two alternatives, that the Jews did not bind themselves strictly to an Astronomical rule which should make the first of Aries the Paschal limit, or else that they might err in fixing its place three or four days.” Anatolius (he says) excludes

the first alternative; but his example, which is of more importance, justifies the second. "Indeed, strictly speaking, it is not an error, but a difference of conventional usage then common, in fixing the commencement of such sign. If, in the third century, he could fix the first of Aries three days before the true Equinox, it can hardly be shown to be historically impossible, or even highly improbable, that the Sanhedrim in the first century might depart as far from the Equinox in their actual limit."

Now there are errors here of no common magnitude. Even admitting, for argument's sake, the soundness of his inference from the words of Anatolius, and supposing the passage to have been accurately recorded by Eusebius, as to which, for reasons to be given below, there is considerable doubt, still the mistake of Anatolius, even if he did intend to place the Equinox on the 19th March, was not one of *three* days, but only *two*; for the true date of the Equinox had gone back, in the year 277 when he wrote, from March 23d, its place at the Passion, to March 21st, being two full days, or, in other words, it fell two days earlier in the Julian month than in A. C. 33.

Kennedy, in his Astronomical Chronology,\* computes that the Sun entered Aries in March 325, the year of the Council of Nice, in Jerusalem time, on the 20 d. 10 h. 42 m. Adding the difference between the tropical and Julian year = 671 seconds for 292 years from 325 to 33, it gives 2 days 6 hours 25 minutes, shewing that the Sun entered Aries in the year 33 at Jerusalem, on March 22d. 17 h. 7 m., or the 23d civil time, at 5 h. 7 m. morning. In March 29, the year we are discussing, it would be within a few minutes of the same time.

\* P. 359.

On the same principles it appears, that in the year 277, the beginning of the Cycle of Anatolius, the Vernal Equinox at Jerusalem fell on March 21st, at 7h. 38m. in the morning.

But the argument of the Reviewer now before us suppresses the important fact of this difference of two days in the times of the Equinox in the years 29 and 277. Even, therefore, if we were against the whole body of ancient testimonies, to admit his false principle, that reckoning the Equinox of 277 on March 19th, it would give as the Passover the 18th March, yet this principle, when applied to the time of the Equinox in A.C. 29, being March 23, would give us the earliest possible Paschal date of that year, not March 18th, but March 22d, thus negativing the date of Mr. Browne, and turning the argument of the Reviewer against himself.

Accustomed though I have been, during controversial discussions in defence of the truth which have filled half a century, to deal with false reasoning, I confess that I do not recollect to have met with any example of it more glaring than that which I have now been obliged to notice; and I deeply regret it for the Reviewer's sake, than whom few writers can reason with more power and beauty and eloquence in defence of the truth. Must I add, few also with greater plausibility against it?

In this case, however, charity must lead us to suppose, that the error of the Reviewer arises from an oversight, not unlike that into which I fell in a passage in p. 46 of the former edition of this Tract, from confounding the time of the Moon-setting at Full Moon with that of the New.

Having, as I think, effectually overthrown the Re-

viewer's reasoning from this passage of Anatolius, I shall now offer some remarks tending to the elucidation of the passage itself, which seems to have eluded the grasp of all our writers, for they unite in pronouncing it unintelligible.

We are informed by Prideaux,\* that it was in the year 46 that the Christian Church first began to compute by the Cycle of 84 years, which they borrowed from the Jews, and applied for the settlement of the times of Easter. Their first Cycle was reckoned from that year.

Now I have found, by computing from the Tables, the time of Mean New Moon in March, 46, that it fell on the 25th d. 9h. 4m. o.s., which answers to the 23d n.s.† On that day, the Sun was exactly in the 4th day after entering Aries, and the Moon was at the conjunction, and had entered Libra. The astronomical characters of this date therefore exactly correspond with those given in the passage from Anatolius, but the date of the *Neomenia* differs.

Prideaux further tells us, that all the Cycles hitherto in use in the Church having been found faulty, Anatolius, Bishop of Laodicea, did, in the year 276, propose another way. What it was does not appear, only it is said, "All that was commendable in it was, that he first intro-

\* Part II., book iv., vol. iii., p. 315.

† Mean New Moon according to Fergusson's Tables in

	D.	H.	M.
March, 1746 . . . . .	10	13	56
+ 1 Lunation . . . . .	29	12	44
	<hr/>		
	40	2	40
— 1700 years . . . . .	14	17	36
	<hr/>		
Mean New Moon, March, 46 . .	25	9	4

duced the use of the Cycle of 19 years for this purpose, but he applied it so wrong, that it was in his method by no means useful to the end intended." \*

I have discovered, in computing the time of New Moon in March 277, that it was on the 21st o.s.;† and, as the two Styles were then in accordance, or nearly so, it was the same date n.s. The Moon and the Sun were both exactly at, or only one day from having arrived at, the Equinoctial points. Moreover, this date was exactly 277 years, a Cycle in Astronomy from the year b.c. 1; which afterwards became the Epoch of the Paschal Cycle of Victorius and Dionysius—the Moon being fast at the end of the Cycle 7 h. 8 m. 57 s. Lastly, it is from Creation 5754 years, a Cycle in Astronomy, at the end of which the Moon is fast 6 h. 30 m. Thus it was for all these Astronomical reasons, worthy of becoming the commencing point of the new reckoning of Anatolius.

It appears to be probable, therefore, that, either in the mind of Anatolius himself there was some confusion between the Novi Lunar eras of March 46 and 277, which led him, while he correctly gave the *Astronomical Characters* of the *former* one, to insert the *true date* of the *latter* in the passage cited by Eusebius; or, what is still

\* Part II., Book iv., vol. iii., p. 318.

† Mean New Moon, March, 277.

	D.	H.	M.
Mean New Moon, March 1777 .	27	7	51
— 1500 years . . . .	6	1	14

Mean New Moon, March 277 . 21 6 37

My Assistant has since calculated the Equations, which bring out the true New Moon on the 22d, at 12 h. 42 m. in the morning, the exact date of Anatolius' 22d of Dystrus.

more likely, that Eusebius himself, or his transcribers, not correctly apprehending the difference, have, in copying the original passage, perhaps, abridged it, not knowing that they thereby made it nonsense, so as to perplex the minds of all future Chronologers.

Leaving to the reader's consideration what has now been offered on the passage from Anatolius, I shall state that, in reference to the scientific periods which I have shown to be embosomed in the Greek Scriptural Chronology measured by the Cycle of 19 years and its square, it has sometimes been, most strangely, I think, denied (and this, too, by a clergyman of that Church whose Calendar rests on it, and in the very face of the fact that the lives of Seth, Methuselah, and Noah, form multiples of 19 years) that the Cycle of 19 at all enters into the Scriptural Chronology. I shall now, however, mention a fact recently discerned by me, that the modern Jewish Chronology of the Synagogue is also constructed upon the basis of this period of 19.\* Their Calendar is regulated according to the calculations of Rabbi Ada, born in the year A. C. 188.

	D. H. M. S.
His calculation of the Solar Year is . . .	365 5 55 $25\frac{5}{7}$
_____ of the Lunation is . . .	29 12 44 $3\frac{1}{4}$
_____ of 235 Lunations con-	
	tained in the Cycle of 19, 6939 16 33 $3\frac{1}{7}$

The year exceeds modern calculations between six and seven minutes, which in 1800 years, would make an error of nearly seven days; but as it is the Moon which regulates their months and years, the error, as to the exact length of the tropical year is merely speculative, and has no practical effect on their calendar; for the Lunation,

\* Lindo's "Jewish Calendar," pp. 5—9.

upon which the calendar rests, is surprisingly near the truth. The Cycle of 19, or 235 Lunations, contain, according to Mayer, 6,939 d. 16 h. 31 m. 17<sup>35</sup> sec., being only about 1 minute 45 seconds less than the Jewish calculation.

The Jewish Calendar is formed of a series of Cycles of 19, in each of which there are 12 ordinary years of 12 months, and 7 Embolismic years of 13 months, the following years of the Cycle being Embolismic:—

3d

6th

8th

11th

14th

17th

19th

Now, in the Jewish Calendar their sacred years terminating April 8th, 1853; April 9th, 1872; April 9th, 1891, are all embolismic, with a *Ve-Adar* in each, and they are the 8th year of the 296th, 297th, and 298th Cycles of their Calendar, which is calculated from their era of Creation, B.c. 3760. Next, computing back from each of these years to A.c. 29, we shall find an exact number of 96, 97, and 98 Cycles of 19, which fixes the year 29 as the 8th of their 200th Cycle, and embolismic.

I need not say, that the whole of this evidence establishes, in the most triumphant manner, that the 18th March, A.c. 29, which the Reviewer, following Mr. Browne, erroneously affirms to have been the 14th of *Nisan*, was the 14th of *Ve-Adar*: but it scarcely establishes it more triumphantly than the place of the Sun at that time, being about 25° of Pisces, had previously done; for,

according to his view, as already said, that Jewish sacred year ended with the Moon of the sign Aquarius, and the new year began with the New Moon which occurred on the 2d March N. S., when the Sun was about the 12th deg. of Pisces, a result which is in open defiance of the voice of all history. It is this result which, doubtless, called forth, and perhaps apologizes for, the somewhat coarse expression of Scaliger, cited in a former page.\*

The Reviewer here pretends ignorance of what I mean by the Moon of Pisces, and quotes a passage from the Benedictines, without naming the work, to show that, according to their nomenclature, the Moon of which the New, first quarter, and Full with 4 days of the next quarter fell when the Sun was in *Pisces*, was the Moon of *Aries*! I have no concern with the Benedictine nomenclature, but I refer the Reviewer to the authority which I presume he has sworn subjection to, that of his own Church, the Canons of which declare the Moon, of which the *Full* falls next after the Sun has entered Aries, to be the Moon of Aries;—the **FULL** Moon being its **PERFECTION**, as the **SATELLITE** of the **EARTH** is that which constitutes the relation to the **SIGN** of the **ZODIAC** of the **LUNATION** to which it belongs.

The existence of this series of the Cycle of 19, in the modern Chronology of the Synagogue, suggests to us a further inquiry. It is not probable that the series itself was changed with the corruption of the Chronology; but, on the contrary, it is to be presumed, that the Rabbis would carefully adjust their corruptions

\* Page 12.

so as not to disturb the course of the Calendar existing at the time they were effected. If, then, we ascend upwards from our own times in the stream of the National Chronology, from the year 1846, which is the first year of their 296th Cycle, to the original date from which the series is calculated, we shall find that its beginning is exactly 57 years below the authentic date of the birth of Noah in the Greek Chronology, b.c. 3817, from which 3 Metonic Cycles of 19 bring us to the Mundane Era of the Synagogue b.c. 3760.

The series, therefore, will be found to touch the following great Eras of the Greek, and one of Modern Chronology.

Great Eras.	Dates b.c.	Number of the Cycles of the present Jewish Calendar commencing at each Date.
3 Cycles of 19 from the Birth of Noah	3760	1
Death of Noah . . . . .	2867	48
Death of Shem . . . . .	2715	56
Death of Arphaxad . . . . .	2677	58
Death of Cainan II. . . . .	2620	61
Birth of Abraham . . . . .	2145	86
Abraham arrives at Shechem . . .	2069	90
Death of Joseph . . . . .	1784	105
Birth of David . . . . .	1100	141
First year of the Captivity of the Tribes beyond Jordan (reckoned from the 1st Nisan after they were led captive) . . . . .	739	160
First year of the Captivity of Samaria	720	161
Captivity in Babylon . . . . .	606	167
First year after the Destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar . . .	587	168
The French Revolution, A.C. . . . .	1789*	293

\* The French Revolution is from the death of Noah in the true Chronology b.c. 2867, the perfect period of 245 Metonic Cycles = 95 Jubilees,

Thus we establish, in the most unanswerable manner, that the present Cyclical Series of the Synagogue is perfectly authentic, and is connected with the great series of time which, computed from the birth of Noah in the original Greek Chronology, gives to the year 1846, the period of  $19 \times 298$ ; and from his death that of  $19 \times 31$  (the trinal of 5)  $\times 8$ . From the death of Shem 240 (or  $12 \times 20$ ) Cycles of 19. From that of Arphaxad 34 weeks = 238 of that Cycle. From the birth of Abraham 30 weeks,—besides other great periods, which, for brevity's sake, I omit.

In the Chronology of Usher, however, as well as that of the Synagogue, the Mundane Era of which is 244 years less than in the former, these results utterly fail, which is one of the abounding proofs that both the Chronology of the present Hebrew text, with which that of Usher harmonizes, and that of the modern Synagogue, still further curtailed, are false and spurious; while that of the Greek is marked with such indelible evidences of authenticity, that even the schemes of time set up in opposition to it are, reluctantly as it were, compelled to bear witness to them, and to do homage to the truth.

The only other reason which remains yet to be considered for Mr. Browne's early date of the Passover of A. C. 29 is, that he affirms, from the Paschal Chronicle of Hippolytus, that the 18th of March was, prior to the Council of Nice, the Paschal limit of the Western

or 931 the trinal of  $30 \times 5$ . This number is also the multiple of the Jubilee 49 by the Cycle of 19 = 931.

The French Revolution is moreover from the death of Adam,  $12^2 = 144$   $\times 44 = 6336$  years, a period of stupendous perfection.

Churches for the festival of Easter, which, as already observed, admits of no intercalary month, whereby the Passover is often thrown a whole Lunation later than Easter. Moreover, it is not denied that, on the question as to the proper times of Easter being brought before the Nicene Council, this Cycle was *condemned as erroneous*, and the earliest possible New Moon of Easter was fixed upon March 8, which would make the Full Moon on the 22d.

How then does the Reviewer meet this incontrovertible fact? He says, that "since the Paschal limit of the Christians by its very nature was borrowed from that of the Jewish Passover, the certain fact that March 18th was accounted the limit in A.D. 222 must surely be a better guide to the early practice of the Jews than a contrary decision of the Council a whole century later.

The question is one not of astronomical skill or moral duty, but of actual observance; and the canon of Hippolytus must have more weight to prove March 18 the Paschal limit once in use, than modern astronomy or the Nicene canons to prove the reverse."

Suppose that this respectable Reviewer were in the situation of a tutor in one of the Universities, whose duty it would be to train up the youth, not only in the paths of knowledge, but of holiness and virtue, teaching them that all sophistry in argument is hateful to God; suppose, then, that one of the youth were to bring to him for examination as a part of an argument of his own, the identical passage from his Review which I have now given;—I ask, how he would receive it? Would he not feel it to be his duty to tell him that it is filled with false reasoning? Would he not show

him that the first fallacy is, that it virtually represents what was the Paschal limit of only that section of the Church the least acquainted with the ancient Jewish times and ritual, namely, the Churches of the West, as if it had been the Paschal limit of "*the Christians*," that is the Church *generally*.\* Would he not next show him that the point to be established is not the Paschal limit of the Jews in the year 222, when they had ceased to be the Church of God, and their bitter animosity to the Christian Church led them to opposition to it in the times of celebrating that ordinance, and to shun even the most sacred ordinances of Moses at the season when they had crucified the Lord;—but that what is to be established is the true limits of the Passover according to the original institutions of Moses, which were still observed when our Lord appeared; and that to show, what is not in fact denied, that in 222 they celebrated the Passover before the Equinox, can have no effect in proving the former? Would he not point out to him, in the third place, that this clause studiously confounds (and this with the effect of perplexing the reader) these two questions, as to *actual usage* in a later age and in a different dispensation, with *original usage* under the authority of God, and that it no less carefully avoids the question whether the decision of the Council of Nice was *right or wrong*? The argument (it may now be added) would require the latter conclusion, and fasten upon that Council the charge of gross error; for if it decided right, then that which was right in 325 must have been right in 222, and the Jews and Western Churches wrong.

\* The Reviewer represents this word "*generally*" as if it had been "*universally*." It is not just to use exaggeration in relation to the terms of an opponent.

Yet the writer of the passage dare not *assert* the Council to have been wrong, for he would thereby come into direct collision with his own Church, and ought, if a parish minister, to keep Easter before the Equinox ; and not only with his own Church, but with all Christendom, as well as all authentic antiquity, and the modern Jewish Synagogue. Therefore he blinks these questions, and his undiscerning readers, bewildered in the mazes of his false reasoning, are left to find their way out and discover the light of truth as they best can.\*

The second reason which renders March 18, A. C. 29, Mr. Browne's date of the Passion, utterly impossible is, that there could not be ripe barley for the feast of the first-

\* The Reviewer affirms the whole of this reasoning to be an "*unhappy and unchristian style of discussion*," and thinks it strange that a Dissenter from the Scotch Presbyterian Church, as he terms me, should contend for the *jure divino* authority of Pope Gregory's calendar for the exact observance of Easter day. Now I said not a syllable about a *jure divino* authority as to Easter, but only stated the *fact* of the testimony of the Christian Church as to the true time of the former *jure divino* festival of the Passover. Did I think my style of discussion to be unhappy or unchristian, I should in this Edition, cancel the whole passage. But as I think it is neither, and as I cannot leave it out without injury to my own argument, I must refer the Reader to the Reviewer's reply to it. (Churchman's Review, April, 1847, pp. 196, 197.)

As to his charge against me of being a Dissenter from the Scottish Church, as I presume the Reviewer is not invested with *spiritual authority* over me, I shall remain silent with only one remark : Were the Parochial Vestries of the Church of England invested with the power of spiritual discipline, and were a Vestry to deny access to the Lord's Table to any person not under a charge of immoral conduct, but for confessing the Scriptural doctrine that "Christ gave himself a Ransom for all," the person thus debarred would, if he joined another body of Christians, be rather one excluded from the Church than in the proper sense of the word a Dissenter.

fruits ready at that time. How then does the Reviewer meet this insuperable and fatal difficulty? He *overlooks* my evidence, and substitutes for its refutation, which his argument requires, the following paragraph:—

“One doubt only remains,—whether the first-fruits could be ready to be offered at that time. Mr. Cuninghame attaches great weight to this difficulty in Mr. Browne’s view. The Passover, however, by the rule which he himself adopts, might be as early as March 22, and hence there is little difficulty in supposing that the first-fruits might be ready, four days earlier still, in a forward season.”

Why, then, does he not tell his readers what evidence I have brought forward?

First, I refer to a passage in Sozomen (*himself born in Palestine*, at Gazah or Bethulia), cited by Mr. Gresswell, which I now verify from the text of Sozomen. In treating of the Paschal practices of Sabbatius, Presbyter of the Novatians, wherein he conformed to the Jews, he expresses his surprise that he should thus have innovated, “since formerly the Hebrews, as Eusebius relates from the testimony of Philo, Josephus, Aristobulus, and many others, killed the Passover *after the Vernal Equinox*, μετὰ εαρινῆς ισημεριαν, while the Sun was passing through the segment of the first sign of the Zodiac, called by the Greeks *Aries*, ἥλιον το πρωτον δωδεκατημοριον τμῆμα ὁδευοντος ὁ κριον ἐλληνες ονομαζουσιν—and opposite to him the Moon was in her fourteenth day.” (Lib. vii. 18.)

He afterwards adds, “Moreover the Samaritans, who are very zealous for the law of Moses, never allow themselves to keep the feast before the new corn is ripe, for they say that the law names this as the feast of the *New Fruits*, wherefore it is not lawful to keep it till these appear. It

is, therefore, necessary that the Vernal Equinox should precede it." The reason of this is plain, that there could be no ripe corn before the Equinox.

Surely this testimony of a native of Palestine must be judged quite conclusive, as to the time of barley harvest there. But I have brought forward further evidence. First, that of Dr. Robinson, who, in his researches on Palestine, tells us that barley is a week before wheat harvest, and the earliest date he assigns to this is May. On the 4th June, wheat harvest was beginning at Hebron; on the 11th and 12th, the threshing-floors on the Mount of Olives were in full operation; while at Jericho, on the 12th of May, the threshing-floors had nearly completed their work.

On the 23d of May, 1838, Mr. Nicolayson writes from Jerusalem, *the barley harvest is all over*. If it was only over then, it is utterly impossible that there should have been ripe barley before the Equinox.

Now, I ask, is it fair reasoning, and just towards his opponent in argument, to dismiss this evidence by saying only, that "Mr. Cunningham attaches great weight to this difficulty in Mr. Browne's view"?—He next asserts that the Passover, according to the rule which I myself adopt, might be as early as March 22. I have nowhere said this, nor do I admit that the Passover, in the age of our Lord's appearance, ever was as early as March 22; although, as will be seen below, Maimonides seems to say it might be on the day of the Equinox, which was then the 23d March. It is one thing to affirm that the limit of the *Christian* festival of *Easter* is the 22d March, and another to affirm this of the *Jewish Passover*. I, of course, except the irregular practices of the Jews of the third century, against which contemporary

writers protest, as being a departure from the ancient Hebrew canons. But, with that exception, I apprehend that, though in *theory*, according to Maimonides, there might be a Passover on March 23, yet in fact, as often as the Full Moon happens so early, the year is embolismic with *Ve-Adar*.\* That it is so at least in the Modern Calendar is undeniable, as will be seen from the following examples:—

Year of Christ.		Easter Sunday.	Passover.
1837.	Full Moon, March 22.	March 26.	April 20.
1845.	Full Moon, March 23.	March 23.	April 22.
1853.	Full Moon, March 25.	March 27.	April 23.
1856.	Full Moon, March 22.	March 23.	April 20.
1864.	Full Moon, March 23.	March 27.	April 21.

It is needless for me to carry the table further; but a reference to "Lindo's Jewish Calendar" will show that in 63 years, from 1839 to 1902, no Passover occurs earlier than March 26-27; and as it has been shown that the Jewish Calendar consists of a continually recurring series of Cycles of 19, regulating all its times, it may be laid down as a certain principle, that no Passover can *now occur* earlier than the dates last mentioned. Let me remark, however, that the controversy is not here as to a Passover in our Lord's time on the 21st March n.s., or 23d o.s., but on the 16th n.s., or 18th o.s. The Reviewer apparently desires to shift the argument to the former ground, but I repudiate it by admitting in theory the 23d o.s. to be a possible date.

On the ground that the Passover might be as early as the 22d March, the Reviewer affirms, "And hence, there is little difficulty in supposing that the first-fruits might be

\* *Ve-Adar* is the Jewish intercalary, or embolismic month.

ready four days earlier still, in a forward season." Now I ask does he mean to offer such things as being of the nature of *reasoning or evidence?* or would he, as a College tutor, receive them as such? What he here says, is as if he were to discover in the national annals a record of the earliest harvest ever known in England, and were forthwith to affirm, that there is little difficulty in supposing an earlier harvest by four days.

Mr. Browne, feeling himself pressed by the same difficulty, cuts the knot he cannot untie, by saying, on the testimony of travellers, whose names he withholds from us, that the barley becomes fully ripe, in the plains about Jericho, by the beginning of our April. He then says, that the 15th of Nisan must not be placed earlier than a week before the Equinox, and adds, "After a mild winter the barley may be sufficiently ripe for an omer of **GREEN EARS** by that time, but not earlier."\*

When I published my "Synopsis," I had not seen this passage, and I erroneously charged Mr. Browne with passing over the difficulty. The learned writer will, I am sure, acquit me of the charge of wilfully misrepresenting him. I now ask, does either his solution or that of the Reviewer remove the difficulty? † I shall meet what Mr. Browne offers upon it by stating from Lightfoot and Gill, both great authorities on all matters of the Jewish Ritual,

\* *Ordo Sæcl.*, page 466. The word **אַבְנִים** rendered **GREEN EARS** certainly does not mean *unripe ears*, but only that they were not yet *hardened* or *dried*, and, therefore, required to be *roasted by the fire*.

† The Reviewer, in his reply, fills three pages with reasoning to show the inconclusiveness of the whole testimonies produced by me, and to prove that harvest might *possibly*, though, as he admits, *not probably*, be as early as March 16. He, in fine, knows more about it than Sozomen and all the travellers put together.

that the first-fruits of the barley were not reaped from the plains of Jericho, but “from the ashes-valley of the brook Kidron,”\* near Jerusalem. And as to the contingency of the barley not being ripe, or the Equinox not arrived, I cite the following words of Lightfoot † :—

“But if, when the just time of the Passover was come, the barley were not ripe, the intercalary month was added to that year, and they waited until it ripened. For, for three things they intercalated the year ; for the Equinox, for the new corn, and for the fruit of the trees. *For the Elders of the Sanhedrim do compute and observe, if the Vernal Equinox will fall out on the SIXTEENTH day of the month Nisan, or beyond that, then they intercalate that year, and they make that Nisan the second Adar: so that the Passover might happen at the time of new corn; or if they observe that there is no new corn, and that the trees sprouted not when they were wont to sprout, then they intercalate the year.*”—Maimon. in Kiddush Hodesh.

It would appear from this passage of Maimonides that the Embolismic year, even if it occurred in a regular and fixed order, as it does in the Modern Calendar, must have been occasionally anticipated in the ancient Jewish Church, when the exigencies of a backward season required it. To exemplify this, there are in the Calendar from 1839 to 1902, being 63 years, only three years in which the Passover falls so early as the 26th-27th March, viz., the years 1842, 1861, and 1899. Now, let it be supposed that the Jews, being in their own land, and that ordinance revived by the year 1861, should the first-fruits of the barley not

\* The same as Cedron. Dr. Lightfoot, vol. ii., page 38. London, 1684.

† Ibid. page 185.

be ripe on the 26th March that year, it will become Embolismic, instead of the year 1862. It is further manifest, from the words of Maimonides, that if the 16th day of the Jewish month occurred as late as the Equinox; or, in other words, if at the 15th the Equinox was not arrived, the month was made Ve-Adar, and the year Embolismic. Now, I have already said, that the last rule, as understood by Maimonides, while it absolutely negatives the 18th of March, yet does admit the 23d of March, which was the date of the Equinox in the year after Christ 29, as being the Paschal limit, if the other condition of the ripeness of the corn had also been obtained. In that year, however, the Full Moon of March having fallen on the 18th, five days before the Equinox, it was for this reason clearly Embolismic, and the Passover Full Moon was on Sunday, the 17th April, which excludes it from being the possible date of the Passion: and had the year not been Embolismic for the *one reason*, viz., the position of the Equinox, it would certainly have been so for the *other*, viz., the unripeness of the barley at so early a date.

In reply to my argument from the Modern Calendar, to show that the year 29 was Embolismic, the Reviewer in his second article\* holds that it is a fallacy of the purest kind, asserting, that which I do not deny, that this Calendar was introduced by Rabbis Samuel and Hillel in the third and fourth centuries, and further, that they had an ancient Cycle, of which he asserts, *but without evidence*, that its (Paschal) limit was some days before the Equinox. Be it observed, however, that the argument from this Calendar is used by me not as a *primary* one but

\* "Churchman's Review" for April, 1847, p. 195.

as *confirmatory* of the whole testimonies previously produced from Philo, Josephus, and Aristobulus, that the Equinox always preceded the Passover. In arguing from this Cycle I only assume the principle that the Modern Synagogue, which is on this question disinterested, and has not any motive for perverting the truth, is a competent witness as to the ancient limits of its greatest and most fundamental institution. It is the Reviewer, on the other hand, who, without a particle of evidence, *assumes* that their ancient limit was *before* the Equinox. I can show innumerable Passovers celebrated after the Equinox. Let the Reviewer produce from history *one example* of a Passover observed by the Jews *while they were yet the Church of God*, or even prior to the destruction of their temple by the Romans, before the Equinox, and the controversy is ended. But while he is confessedly unable to do this, to charge me as assuming that to be the true limit which the highest Jewish authorities declare to be the limit, includes in it an extravagance of literary dogmatism and pretension of authority which I must resist utterly.

As, however, the whole evidence in favour of the Post-equinoctial celebration of the Passover has not yet been produced, I shall now from the text of Philo insert a further portion of the passage which was cited in a former page,\* so far only as Mr. Gresswell gives it. It contains his definition of the first month Nisan:—

την αρχην της εαρινης ισημηριας πρωτον αναγραφει μηνα Μωϋσης εν τοις των ενιαυτων περιοδοις, αναθεις, ουχ ώσπερ ενιοι, χρονῳ τα πρεσβεια μαλλον, ἡ ταις της φυσεως χαρισιν ἀσ ανατειλεν ανθρωποις. Κατα γαρ ταυτην, τα μεν

\* *Supra*, p. 23.

*σπαρτα, ἡ αναγκαια τροφη, τελειογονειται· ὁ δε των δενδρων καρπος ἡβωτων αρτι γενναται, δευτεραν εχων ταξιν· οθεν και οψιγονος εστιν· αει γαρ εν τη φυσει τα μη λιαν αναγκαια των σφοδρα αναγκαιων δευτερα.\**

“ Moses sets down the beginning of the Vernal Equinox as the first month, giving it precedence in the periods of the year, not as some do (on account of) the priority in time, but for the gifts of nature which it produces for man, since in this month the sown grain, which is the necessary food, is matured : also the fruit of the trees with blossom is now formed, being second in order, wherefore it is later produced ; for always in nature that which is not very necessary is second to that which is necessary.”

From the pages of Mr. Gresswell† I also borrow, comparing it with the text, the following passage of Epiphanius to the like effect:—*προ γαρ ισημηριαν ον πληρωθησεται το ετος ουδε πληρουνται τον κυκλον του δρομου εκ Θεου τοις ανθρωποις τεταγμενου ὁ ενιαυτος εαν μη παρελθη ισημηρια.* “ Before the Equinox the year is not completed, nor does the annual revolution finish the circle of its course appointed by God for man, till the Equinox arrives.”

Now if after these, added to all the former testimonies, this respectable Reviewer still persists in maintaining that the Passover might be held or begun before the Equinox, however much we may grieve for it, we must leave him in undisturbed possession of his own imaginations ; he is not to be convinced.

I shall, however, add yet one other testimony, being that of Mr. Lindo, author of the Jewish Calendar for 64 years.

\* Philo, “ Life of Moses,” vol. ii., p. 169. (London, 1742.)

† “ Harm. of Gospels,” vol. iv., p. 641.

“The reason of the introduction of that period, viz., the month Ve-Adar is, that the Passover may be kept in its proper season, which is the Full Moon of the Vernal Equinox, or after the Sun hath entered Aries.” \*

We must still further confirm this body of Jewish evidence by the collective testimony of the Christian Church, whose festival of Easter, in commemoration of the death and resurrection of our Lord, is, as to its original times, necessarily identical with that Passover at which our Lord suffered. After much controversy,—the essential consequence of imperfect knowledge in the Gentile converts,—it was at length fixed by the Council of Nice, in harmony with the authentic principles of the Jews, that the first Sunday after the Full Moon which occurred on the Equinox, viz., March 21, or the next Full Moon after it, should be kept as Easter-day, in commemoration of our Lord’s Resurrection, and the Friday before, of his death on the Cross. There are here two exceptions in reference to the Jewish rule. *First*, the festival was not determined by the exact date of 14th of Nisan, although that had been the former rule of the Eastern Churches.† *Secondly*, since there is no Christian offering of *first-fruits*, it was never necessary to put off Easter because of the lateness of the season; and as the Christian year is not Luni-solar; but a near approximation to the Tropical, there is no Embolismic Easter month. With these facts before his eyes, the Reviewer strangely makes it a ground of objection to the modern Jewish Cycle, that its Paschal

\* Lindo’s “Jewish Calendar,” p. 6. (London, 1838.)

† Hence called “Quarto decimani.”

limit is fixed on the 26th March, being *later* than that of Easter by only *four days*. Now we have reason to believe that most frequently, when a Paschal Full Moon occurred immediately after the Equinox, the backwardness of the harvest must have occasioned a *Ve-Adar*, and if so, the limit of the Passover in the modern Calendar only does that by astronomical science, which the course of the seasons would have done in Palestine, and therefore, as nearly as human science can effect, it has brought back their sacred year to its original limits.

But, finally, the point at issue, on the present occasion, is not whether there might have been a Passover in our Lord's time as early as the 21st March, n.s., or 23d o.s.; for, seeing that this date falls within the rule of Philo, subject only to the *probability* of a *Ve-Adar*, I should have offered no other objection to it. The real question is respecting the *possibility* of Mr. Browne's earlier date of 18th March, o.s., or 16th n.s. Now, although it be quite true that, in stating the actual limit, of the Modern Synagogue, viz., the 26th March, I hold by it as nearly, or quite identical, with the usual course of the seasons, yet I only mean to apply it *absolutely*, as far as the point at issue requires, that is, to the exclusion and negation of Mr. Browne's date of March 18. The Reviewer, however, with the skill of an accomplished dialectician for a wordly prize, seizes hold of that part of the Cycle which is beyond the proper scope of my argument, to turn it against me.

I remark, lastly, before quitting the subject of this Cycle, that its connexion with the great line of Scriptural time computed from the authentic date of the birth of Noah in the Greek Chronology, demonstrates at once its

fundamental truth and antiquity. The Reform by Rabbis Samuel and Hillel did, therefore, certainly connect itself with the records of the Church in her earliest ages, as to the source from which the series of Metonic Cycles sprang, and their limit of the 26th March may have resulted from the fact that there was, in the national annals, no record of an earlier Passover. It is, at any rate, a vain and utterly futile attempt for this Reviewer to argue for a Passover on the 16th March n. s., six days before the Equinox and limit of Easter, when he cannot, from the history of the Church of God, produce an actual example of one even upon the Equinox, or a canon from any authentic Jewish writer of authority confirming it. To prove the point in dispute from the point of dispute itself is sophistry of the most glaring nature.

But what is to be said of the fact that, after thus rejecting the limit of the 26th March as applicable to the date of the Passover, in his argument for Mr. Browne's date of the 18th March, 29, this Reviewer does, in a subsequent paper, with admirable regard to consistency, himself state it as a possible fact, that the Passover of 31, which was on 27th March, o.s., might, as it was very near the Equinox, have been delayed a month,\* and he thereby gives to the winds the whole principles of his former reasoning, and actually adopts that limit as his own, thereby in effect throwing new elements of uncertainty into the whole inquiry, by bringing into the category of the possible dates of the

\* "Churchman's Monthly Review" for May, 1847, page 395.

Passion two years, viz., 31 and 34, which he had before excluded!

Having thus demonstrated that the 18th of March, 29, is utterly inadmissible as the Passover day of that year, and the date of the Passion, since it was the 14th day, not of *Nisan*, but of *Ve-Adar*, and having thus overthrown the whole reasoning of the Reviewer, I proceed next to the consideration of the Paschal date chosen by Mr. Gresswell, viz., April 7, a.c. 30, as that of the Passion, which he espouses as next in the order of probability to Mr. Browne's, for there are indications in his paper of a *very peculiar desire* (for what reason is not *revealed*) to get quit of the date of Usher. Indeed, it would seem a matter of little moment in his eyes, if only he could overthrow the year 33 as the era of the Passion, which of the other dates were embraced by his readers; and that I do not exaggerate this anxiety to negative Usher's date, will, I think, be made manifest by his words in various places. Thus, in the second paragraph of page 578, there is a double attempt to exclude the year 33, by arguments wrongly deduced from the words of Philo and Josephus, as to the Passover day and month. In page 579 he again anxiously points out to us, but fallaciously, as will be shown, that the demonstration of the late date (33) falls to the ground as before. In page 583, he once more says that Usher's date has the lowest external evidence of the three, and is not superior on astronomical grounds. The Reviewer, in his second article, denies the truth of this allegation. Now, I attribute to him no other desire to get quit of that date than is apparent in a certain Chronological Table appended to Mr. Bickersteth's "Guide," in

the first edition of which the year 34, with a note of interrogation, is laid down as the date of the Passion ; and, in a late edition, the year 30, with a similar note of interrogation, dexterously leaping over the intermediate year 33.

His argument, or calculation, to prove that April 7, A. C. 30, is admissible, on astronomical grounds, as the date of the Passion, is as follows :—“ If the Moon was Full April 6, A. D. 30, at ten in the evening, her age would be just 18 hours at the same time on Thursday evening, a fortnight earlier, or March 23. She would then have been set several hours, and her first visible phase would be on Friday evening, the 24th, which would begin the 1st of Nisan ; and the Passover day, or the 14th of Nisan, would clearly be on Friday, April 7. *The demonstration of the later date falls, then, to the ground as before.*”

Yes, if his calculation be *right*—but if it be *wrong*, then the possibility of the *earlier date* falls to the ground, and the demonstration of the *later* stands untouched. Now, as he has not taken into account the Lunar anomalies, of which he himself is perfectly aware, his calculation is worth nothing ; and I find, that there is in it an error of 7 hours, which, being rectified, overthrows his whole argument.

Three calculations have been made of the time of true New Moon at Jerusalem in March, A. C. 30 ; the first by myself, from the tables in Brewster’s Edition of Fergusson ; the second from the tables in the “ Encyclopædia Britannica ;” and the third from another set of tables of Fergusson,—both by my assistant. The results are as follows ; and I place the elements of the first at the bottom

of the page, that the Reviewer may, if he can, detect any material error.\*

D. H. M. S.

1. True New Moon at Jerusalem, in  
March, A. C. 30 . . . . . 22 8 31 28
2. Do. from tables of "Encyclopædia" 22 8 4 33
3. Do. from Fergusson . . . . . 22 8 36 0

It appears, then, that on Thursday, the 23d March, at 10 in the evening, her age, instead of being, as he affirms, only 18 hours, was no less than 1 day, 1 hour, 24 minutes, consequently *he errs a whole day* in stating her first visible phase, which was not, as he affirms, so late as Friday evening, the 24th, but on the evening before of Thursday, the 23d. She set that evening 22 hours old, and was consequently visible; and that evening being thus the 1st of Nisan, the 14th began upon Wednesday evening, the 5th

\* ELEMENTS OF THE TRUE NEW MOON, AT JERUSALEM, A.C. 30.

	Mean New Moon.	Sun's Mean Anomaly.	Moon's Mean Anomaly.	Sun's Mean Distance from Node.
	D. H. M. S.	S. O. ' "	S. O. ' "	S. O. ' "
New Moon, March, A.C. 1730 . . . . .	7 12 34 16	8 18 4 31	9 0 32 17	1 23 17 16
Add 1 Lunation . . . . .	29 12 44 3	0 29 6 19	0 25 49 0	1 0 40 14
Subtract 17 Centuries . . . . .	37 1 18 19	9 17 10 50	9 26 21 17	2 23 57 30
Mean New Moon, March, A.C. 30 . . . . .	14 17 36 42	11 28 46 0	10 29 36 0	4 29 23 0
1st Equation + 3 56 33				
2d Equation — 5 28 42	— 1 32 9			
True New Moon, March, A.C. 30 . . . . .	22 6 9 28			
Add for Jerusalem time	2 22 0			
True New Moon at Jerusalem, March, A.C. 30 . . . . .	22 8 31 28			

April, and Thursday, the 6th, was the Passover, as is justly stated by Mr. Browne, and not, as the Reviewer erroneously affirms, Friday, the 7th. His argument, then, with his calculation, falls to the ground, and the year 30 is absolutely and astronomically excluded from the possible dates of the Passion.

Having thus demonstrated the impossibility of either the 18th March, A. C. 29, or the 7th April, 30, being the date of our Lord's Passion, it may not be superfluous for me to sum up briefly the reasons for placing that greatest of all events on the 3d April, o. s., A. C. 33, as the only possible date, and, therefore, as the unquestionable and real date.

The calculation of this New Moon in my "Synopsis," p. 172, contains an error of about  $8\frac{1}{2}$  hours, arising from the omission of a figure in taking out the Lunar Anomalies; but, happily, the error is not so great as to affect my reckoning of the date the 1st of Nisan in that month.\* I now place at the bottom of the page the corrected calculation which has been checked by two others from

\* It appears to require some explanation why an error of  $8\frac{1}{2}$  hours in my own calculation of the time of New Moon, of March, A.C. 33, does not affect my reckoning of the 1st of Nisan, whereas an error of 7 hours in the Reviewer's calculation of the New Moon of March, A.C. 30, is fatal to his reckoning of the 1st of Nisan. Now, this difference depends entirely on the position of the Moon at the conjunction, and when she first sets after the conjunction. If, at the first setting of the New Moon, she be, as in March 30, 22 hours old, then an error of computation, making her 5 hours later in time, will put off the 1st of Nisan to the evening following. The Reviewer's error is 7 hours. On the other hand, if she first sets only 5 hours old, as in March, A.C. 33, it would require an error of 13 hours of acceleration in her time to bring out the 1st of Nisan on the same evening.

different tables by my assistant, which make it about 50 minutes earlier.\*

The conjunction of the New Moon of March, 33, was at 19 d. 1 h., astronomical time, or the 19th civil time, at about 1 afternoon; and, therefore, the first appearance of the Moon, and the beginning of the 1st of Nisan were not till the evening of the 20th, whereby the evening of the 14th comes out upon *Thursday*, April the 2d, our reckoning, (but, according to the Scriptural reckoning, the evening of *Friday*, 3d, and the Passover was on the *Scriptural morning* of the 3d, being, according to our reckoning, the *following day*: and, as the Moon was at Full about 5 o'clock the same afternoon, it satisfies the rule of Philo and Josephus, taken in the strictest sense,

\* ELEMENTS OF TRUE NEW MOON, MARCH, A.C. 33, AT JERUSALEM.

		Sun's Mean Anomaly.	Moon's Mean Anomaly.	Sun's Mean Distance from the Node.
		D. H. M. S.	S. O. ' "	S. O. ' "
New Moon, March, 1733		4 3 44 9	8 14 58 26	3 18 5 51
+ 1 Lunation . . . .		29 12 44 3	0 29 6 19	1 0 40 14
— 1700 years . . . .		33 16 28 12	9 14 4 45	4 18 46 5
		14 17 36 42	11 28 46 0	4 29 23 0
		18 22 51 30	9 15 18 45	11 19 23 5
	H. M. S.			
1st Equation + 4 0 29				1 31 10
2d Equation — 3 38 0		+ 0 22 29		6 23 29 43
True New Moon, March, A.C. 33 . . . .		18 23 13 59		
Add for Jerusalem time		2 22 0		
True New Moon, March, A.C. 33, at Jerusalem.		19 1 35 59		

The two other calculations by my assistant give the hour of the true New Moon as follows:—

1. That from the tables in the "Encyclopædia," 19 d. 0 h. 46 m. 11 s.
2. From Fergusson's tables, 19 d. 0 h. 51 m. 0 s.

that the Passover was held while the Moon was approaching the Full, and when the Sun was in Aries. It is, moreover, the only date which comes within the astronomical and historical principles which are to fix the exact point of time when our Lord suffered, viz., that it was on a Passover Friday, and at the Full Moon.\*

\* Let us, in this note, see the bearing of this result on some of the great eras of prophecy.

The year 33 is from the year B.C. 458, the date of the Decree of Artaxerxes, in the 7th of his reign, the exact period of the 70 weeks, or 10 Jubilees, or . . . . . Years 490

Thence to the Edict of Constantine, A.C. 313, are 40 weeks, or the exact period of the gestation of the mystic woman, Rev. xii., being 280 prophetic days . . . . . 280

To the return of Arius from banishment, and the beginning of the great controversies in the Church, A.C. 327, are 42 weeks, or 6 Jubilees . . . . . 294

To the Crusade against the Albigenses, A.C. 1209, the beginning of the great slaughters of the saints by Papal Rome, are, from 33, 168 weeks, or 24 Jubilees . . . . . 1176

To the Peace of Passau, or, as it is termed by historians, the Peace of Religion, whereby the Protestants of the Empire were exalted to the political heaven, A.C. 1552, there are, from 33,  $31 \times 7 = 217$  weeks, or 31 Jubilees—(31 being  $\frac{5 + 5^2 + 5^3}{5}$  the trinal fraction of 5) equal to . . . . . 1519

From 33 to the present year 1846, are 269 weeks, or 37 Jubilees . . . . . 1813

Moreover, as the period from the Passion to the Peace of Religion, by the treaty of Passau consists, as we have seen, of 31 Jubilees, or 1519 years, so the period from the return of Arius to the present year 1846, consists of an equal period of 1519 years; and this analogy of numbers leads, I think, to the belief, that we now stand on the very brink of some new and mighty dispensation of God, towards the Church and the world.—1st Edit.

[Writing now, on March 5, 1849, I need scarcely add, that the stupendous events of the past year have altogether justified the foregoing anticipation. These events are still in rapid progress.]

I shall now make some miscellaneous observations. The Reviewer appears in different parts of his paper to reason upon principles so opposite and discordant, that I am persuaded that, when he began his review, he had no matured acquaintance with the subject he was to treat, and knew not where he would be led. In pages 576 and 577, he apparently holds, with Mr. Browne, that it is the Full Moon that exclusively decides the day of the Passover, which, he affirms, must be on the day before the *νυχθημερον* of the Full Moon. Such is certainly his meaning when he affirms, that it is necessary that the Full Moon in the proposed year, *viz.*, that of the Passion, shall fall between *sunset of Friday and Saturday*. Yet this rule he annuls, with respect to the year 30, wherein the Paschal Full Moon fell between sunset of *Thursday and Friday*; and, nevertheless, he pronounces Friday, and not Thursday, to have been the Passover day.\* The rule itself he afterwards explicitly abandons; for, in page 581, he holds with me on this point, notwithstanding his former charges of inconclusive and contradictory reasoning. His words, to the truth of which I willingly subscribe, are, "Now, it is far clearer from the law of Moses that the month must begin after the *New Moon*, than that the Passover is before the *Full Moon*. This is confirmed by all those traditions which mention the phase of the Moon as the actual mode by which the Calendar was determined."

As the Reviewer, in his second Article, grounds upon the foregoing passage a charge of my having misrepresented his meaning, I have thought it right to reprint it almost without alteration in the present Edition. His words are, "We have never seen a more complete misre-

\* Page 579.

presentation than in the respected writer's words compared with our own statement. What he says was plainly our meaning, is most plainly *not* our meaning; and when we say that a principle is necessary to an argument that we refute, we are held to affirm its necessary truth."

Now I at once admit that I did misconceive, and therefore have unintentionally misrepresented, his meaning. But, on again reading the passages which I have unhappily misrepresented, I confess that I should not even now, but for his present explanation, clearly discern their meaning. I think, were the Reviewer to place his whole article in the hands of any able and disinterested friend for his opinion, he would meet with some such remark as, "I must candidly tell you that I often feel it difficult to follow you, and see the connexion and harmony in the different parts of your reasoning." Such, it must be acknowledged, is the intricacy of the whole subject, that it is difficult, with the utmost care, to steer clear of all mistakes. But if to this intricacy be added the fact, that the various and discordant views and opinions are not always placed before the reader by this writer in the most lucid and perspicuous form and order, it ought not to be matter of wonder if the confusion in the mind of the reader become overwhelming. Moreover, even the admirers of this Reviewer, among whom, *when he wields the weapons of truth*, I with great sincerity number myself, must, I think, admit, that clear perspicuity of style is not always one of his excellences.

It is next said, that the words of Philo, *μελλοντος του σεληνιακου κυκλου γινεσθαι πλησιφανς*, "will be satisfied if the Moon was not yet Full when she *set* before the Passover. Thus modified, the rule would imply, that the

Passover was held on the evening of that day, reckoned from sunrise to sunrise, on which the Moon came to opposition."—(Page 582.)

It is indeed the case, as already shown,\* that, even in the latest phasis of the Moon, the Jewish day of the Passover, viz., the 14th of Nisan, did always begin before the Full, and also the first act of the festival, the casting out of the leaven; and this fulfils the rule of Philo. But it is not true that the Moon always (*for the last time*, which seems to be the Reviewer's meaning) set not full *before* the 14th. On the contrary, at a very early phasis, she set not full on the 14th itself. Nor is it true that the Passover was always held on the day counted from sunrise to sunrise, when the Moon came into opposition; for in cases when the phasis was latest, though the Paschal Lamb was slain on the same *Jewish day* from *sunset* to *sunset* as the Full Moon, yet it was not till the *civil day*, and also the day counted from *sunset* to *sunset* after the Full.†

In his next paragraph, the Reviewer, in effect, more explicitly than before, adopts my rule for the opening of the month from the first visible phase of the New Moon, supporting it on the authority of Ideler and Maimonides (he might have added of Philo; ) and he then rightly affirms, that it differs 22 hours from that which Mr. Browne and Mr. Gresswell have followed. What is this but a tacit acknowledgment that my whole argument and computations, as to the rules which are to determine the day of the Passover, and my charges against Mr. Gresswell and Mr. Browne are *right*, and the charges against me, of contradictory and inconsistent reasoning, *utterly*

\* Page 3.

† Page 19.

*wrong?* I have, from the beginning, reasoned upon the very principles which are here admitted to be true.

Yet in the paragraph which follows, at the bottom of the same page, the Reviewer spoils the whole of that which he had arrived at of truth in the immediately preceding one, and obscures his own light by inventing a distinction between the true Passover, and the apparent Passover, which is altogether original and no less gratuitous; and he thereby makes the *true Passover* of April, A. C. 33, to be on *Friday the 3d*, but the *apparent Passover* upon *Saturday the 4th*, as he had before affirmed,\* equally without evidence, that on the supposed rule from Philo, Mr. Browne was clearly right in placing it on *Thursday, the 2d April!*

Now, the question may well be asked, What human understanding can steer its way through such a mass of contradictions? I confess I know not what the Reviewer would be at in these conflicting statements; and I suspect he does not well know himself what he would be at—unless it be to involve the question in hopeless confusion:—this end he effectually attains.

It is certain, and I am confident it will be felt by every intelligent and impartial reader, that, instead of reflecting new light upon the great and important question of the true date of our Lord's Passion, this review has, so far as obscure and contradictory reasoning can do it, involved it in greater darkness and scepticism than before. But happily the light of truth cannot be extinguished. The limits of this inquiry lie within 7 years, from A. C. 28 to A. C. 34. The only three years within this limit, which, as admitted by the Reviewer himself, lie within the

\* First Review, p. 578.

category of astronomical possibility, are A. C. 29, 30, and 33. The 18th, March 29, is excluded, 1st. By the simple fact, that it was not the 14th, but only the 13th of the Jewish month. 2d. Because the Full Moon of that date was that of Pisces,\* and that the New Sacred Year is, on that view, made to begin when the Sun had not passed through more than 10° of Pisces, while all antiquity testifies that the Full Moon of Nisan was that of Aries. 3d. By the further indisputable fact, according to every credible testimony, that there could be no ripe barley for the first-fruits before the Equinox. 4th. Because the 18th of March was not within the Paschal limits of the Jewish, or even the Christian Church.

The year 30 is excluded, because the 14th of Nisan of that year fell demonstrably upon *Thursday*, the 6th of April, which was the Passover.

Friday, the 3d April, o.s., and 14th Nisan of the year A. C. 33, only remains then as the CERTAIN DATE OF THE PASSION OF OUR LORD.

In drawing to a close this momentous discussion, I must be permitted to express my great and unfeigned respect for the Reviewer himself personally, and, on this account, it is to me doubly a matter of regret, that, in his paper on the Chronology, he has endeavoured to throw such a veil of obscurity and dark scepticism upon that which is as assuredly established as any date in history. The current of the public mind in our own day is manifestly towards universal scepticism, and I cannot but apprehend that his reasoning has a tendency to accelerate the progress of this torrent of evil, by "mischievously unsettling the faith of Christians," (I use his own words,

\* That is, when the Sun was in Pisces.

see p. 572,) as to the date, almost universally received for more than two centuries, of the sealing event of God's dispensations. I believe, however, that the discussion of the question in these pages will have placed it in so clear a light, that good will be brought out of the evil, and the current of scepticism checked.

He closes his Paper by professing his inability yet to settle the question between the three years, 29, 30, and 33, although he does not conceal his wish to exclude the last. Is it, then, so, that the Church of God is to wait in breathless expectation for *his decision*, before she presumes to form even an opinion as to *her own age* and the date of the origin of this Dispensation? Truly, he, in perhaps not quite so favourable a sense as the Apostle, *magnifies his office*, and claims a degree of importance for the results of his investigations, which some, at least, of his readers may not be altogether willing to concede to them. I must, accordingly, be numbered among the *contumacious* who refuse to wait for his decision. For the reasons already given, I embrace, as the *assured date* of our Lord's death on the cross, the very one of the three which is least in favour with him, viz., the 3d of April, a. c. 33, o.s. —And I feel myself strengthened as to the truth of my conclusions respecting the dates, both of the Nativity in b. c. 3, and the Passion in a. c. 33, by finding that Scaliger, in his learned book already quoted in a former page, “*De Emendatione Temporum*,” but which I never had it in my power to consult till I very recently purchased a copy of it, adopts both of these dates, and also my date of the death of Herod in the year b. c. 1; and his work was written about two centuries and a half ago. There is among the learned of the present day, I am well

aware, a propensity to think that *wisdom was born with themselves*, and, therefore, to estimate at a very low rate the conclusions arrived at by their forerunners of former ages in the path of knowledge, and to this high opinion of their own merits is probably to be traced that itching desire to unsettle received dates of Chronology, of which the existence and influence are so discernible in some writers of the greatest learning in the present century. The learned, however, of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, had at least the power of concentrating their undivided energies and their profound and varied learning upon the subjects which they studied, undistracted by the numberless varieties of Magazines, Newspapers, Reviews, Societies, and Public Meetings, which fill the lives of men in our own days with continued hurry and bustle, like the days of battle of contending armies; nor do they, as some of the most learned moderns, offer their learning as a substitute for the homely but sound principles of common sense.

Finally, while I accord with the Reviewer in condemning the scepticism of the German School, and in lamenting that a person of so high a standard of Christian excellence as the Chevalier Bunsen has sent out a work, denying the inspiration of the Old Testament, and impugning the whole record of the Scriptural times, yet I cannot but express my apprehension, that his reasoning as a reviewer will place in the hands of the German Rationalists a weapon of great power, against any arguments he may address to them in defence of the Chronology of the Bible. Does this Journalist, they may justly say, tell us that an inspired record of the times was delivered in the Scriptures to the Church of God, and yet plainly

confess that this record is so vague and obscure, that he cannot attain to confidence on any one of the great eras of the Creation, the Deluge, the Exodus, the reign of David or of Solomon, the Nativity or the Passion? Whére, then, is the benefit to us of a system which conducts, not to confidence, but to scepticism—not to certainty, but to doubtful disputation?

There are, also, not to mention the Samaritan text, two different versions of the Chronology—that of the Greek, and that of the Hebrew text. If he should, as I fear he intends to do, offer the last as the truth to the German sceptics, he will be encumbered with additional difficulties, so great that they will be as a mill-stone tied about his neck to plunge him into the very bottom of the sea.

Unless, then, abandoning the Hebrew Chronology as a mass of fables, and, adopting the Greek, he shall clothe himself with the panoply of truth, his task in contending with the sceptical school of Germany will be a hopeless one; and, it may be added, that, even if it were possible that he should convince a few of them, it would be only the substitution of one complicated tissue of falsehood for another.

As it would have broken the thread and connexion of my reasoning, in the former edition of this Tract against Mr. Gresswell's date of the Passion, and also in refutation of the Reviewer's arguments for that date, to have introduced in the midst of it the discussion of the reply to my reasoning contained in the second Review, I have thought it better, first, to give my former arguments almost without alteration, and to reserve for this place the

consideration of what he has in his second Paper offered against them.

He admits the error of 7 hours in the time of the New Moon of March 30, which I have brought home to him, and introduces the admission by saying, "Here the respected author triumphs exceedingly;" but adds, "this tone of premature triumph is, under the actual circumstances of the case, rather unnatural and out of place."

If I have been guilty of triumphing over the Reviewer personally, of which I am not aware, then I have sinned against God, and broken his holy law, commanding me to love my neighbour as myself. If, on the other hand, I have only triumphed in the discomfiture of false reasoning, opposing itself to the knowledge and establishment of the Divine system of time revealed in the Scriptures, and especially the true date of the greatest event in the Moral Dispensations of the Godhead, the Passion of the Lord of Glory, then is my triumph in accordance with the Royal law of liberty. Let me here, therefore, redeem myself from the imputation of the former triumph, by acknowledging that, in the laborious and painful task imposed upon me in these pages by a strong sense of duty, I have felt the deepest sorrow and regret in observing the high talents of this Reviewer, so often directed, not to the elucidation, but the obscuration of truth and evidence, by the adoption of false principles of reasoning, tending to universal scepticism. I marvel if, in passing through the University, he may not sometimes have been affectionately warned by some holy Christian father, that there is a tendency in the minds of young men of talent—and it is a tendency pregnant with danger—towards sophistical reasoning, having for its object rather the overthrow of

their opponent than the establishment of the truth. And has he no venerable Christian counsellor near at hand, with discernment to see and faithfulness to tell him to beware of this danger ?

Returning now to the argument, let it be observed, that the Reviewer himself, in his former Article, had not only admitted the Rule which receives 18 hours after the conjunction as the limit of the Phasis, the first evening after which was the beginning of the New Month, but in fixing the 1st of Nisan of the year 30 had himself reasoned from this principle, and by the false calculation already detected, had made the Moon set about 14 hours old and invisible, on the 23d March, and her Phasis on the following evening, whereby the 14th Nisan and Passover fell upon Friday, the 7th April.

Having now, by the demonstration of his error in computation, been driven from this ground, and compelled to admit that the Phasis comes out a day sooner, he endeavours to evade the fair and legitimate consequence of the detection of his mistake, which is, that the Passover of 30 was, as maintained by Mr. Browne and myself, on Thursday the 6th April, thereby negativing the possibility of its being the date of the Passion.

In very briefly following him in his reasoning, I shall first acknowledge an error of my own. In the former edition of this Tract, I laid down 18 hours as the limit of the Phasis *in clear weather*. All knowledge in man is, however, progressive, and it especially becomes men of *half-knowledge*, as the Reviewer *not unjustly* terms me, diligently to avail ourselves of every opportunity of adding to our scanty stock. And let me here remind this learned Reviewer that the mysteries of the kingdom, and among

these mysteries the times and the seasons rank not amongst the *lowest*, but, as I hope to show in these pages, among the *very highest*, are not always revealed to the wise and prudent, but sometimes, by the will of the Father, even to babes; and his word who declares this and gives thanks to the Father for it, this Reviewer will, we are confident, not presume to gainsay. To that high source I, therefore, humbly look, in the diligent use of the means, for the increase of my very scanty stock of half-knowledge.

To resume, when I limited the Phasis to 18 hours only in *clear weather*, I was not aware of the existence of the rule  $\pi$  or 18, whereby, when, from cloudy weather, no observation could be had, the Sanhedrim fixed the Phasis on the first evening, after 18 hours from the conjunction. It is from Sir Isaac Newton's "Observations on Daniel" that I have since learned this important fact, which so closely bears upon the point at issue respecting the Passover of the year 30, and the general principles of the Synagogue in fixing that festival.

In his hard and determined struggle to extricate himself from the consequences of his error of computation, the Reviewer is compelled, first, to admit that the New Moon of March, A. C. 30, set on the evening of the 23d at 6 h. 42 m., which, he tells us, is equivalent to 2 hours and 3 quarters beyond the limit of 18 hours. He affirms, however, that this limit of 18 hours is not *free from doubt*. Are we, then, to limit our faith to things free from doubt? If so, what is the value of the great principles of reasoning of Bishop Butler in the *Analogy*?

There are, says the Reviewer, three ways of estimating the Lunar month. 1st. From the conjunction itself. 2d. From the Phasis or second day. 3d. That of the Arabs from the

horned appearance. 4th. We are told that  $27\frac{1}{2}$  hours is the limit of the Jews themselves, after which there must be a Phasis. He infers from the whole of this, that 18 hours is the limit under the most favourable circumstances, or when the horary motion is greatest, (whereas, Sir Isaac Newton says it was the *usual one*)\* which will be equivalent to 21 h. 40m. age with the mean horary motion, and it exceeds by nearly an hour the actual distance of the Moon from the Sun in the case before us.

Then he introduces a new series of doubts. *First*, he supposes that the Passion may have been transferred from its natural day, Thursday, to Friday, according to the rule of the Modern Jews to transfer it from the *first, third, and fifth* days. 'Now, as this objection points to something **TANGIBLE**, I shall return to it, and, in the mean time, I shall simply state his remaining doubts. Returning again to the rule of 18 hours, he says, "Secondly, it may have been the minimum, the very earliest hour at which the Moon could be seen. If so, her distance from the Sun on Thursday evening (March 23d, 30) would leave her invisible. Thirdly, Eighteen hours may have been the limit in *clear weather*. Supposing the air on Thursday evening to have been only *one seventh* less transparent than its greatest clearness" (and this, be it observed, is supposed in PALESTINE at the VERNAL EQUINOX when even in this *Northern Latitude* we have usually *clear weather*) "the Moon would be invisible and the Passover on Friday the 7th. Fourthly. Either the sky might be clouded an hour before sunset, or some other reason might have hindered the

\* On Daniel, p. 160.

Phase being observed that evening ; " and then he tells us " the Sanhedrim would be guided by the Moon of the previous month Adar, of which the natural length would be 30 days " (now, except in Embolismic years, which 30 was not, the length of Adar is invariably only 29 days.) He thus makes it out that " the 1st of Nisan would be March 24, and the 15th Nisan, April 7th, each on Friday evening."

The accuracy of the last conclusion will be brought to the test ; but I ask here two questions. 1st. What is become of the rule  $\text{נ}^\circ$  or 18 in the foregoing reasoning ? Was the Reviewer ignorant of its existence, or did he suppress the fact of its existence and its exact applicability to the cases which he supposes ?

I now ask the judicious and impartial reader to decide in his own mind whether the foregoing reasoning be that of an humble inquirer into truth or of a disputer of this world ? I am, I confess, weary in transcribing these endless refinements of scepticism and doubts and adverse possibilities.

They forcibly remind me of the controversy of Mede with a Mr. Hayn, who resisted all the arguments of the illustrious writer to prove the Fourth Empire of Daniel to be the Roman. At length, Mede, wearied out, addressed him in the following words :—" Mr. Hayn, — The wit of man is able, where it is persuaded, to find shifts and answers until the day of doom, as appears in so many differing opinions held amongst Christians with so much and so endless pertinacity on both sides. It is sufficient for a man, therefore, to propound his opinion with the strongest evidence he can, and so leave it. Truth will be justified of her children. But of these reciprocations of discourse in writing, wherein you place so much

benefit for discovery of truth, I have often seen truth lost thereby, but seldom or never found." \*

As, however, judicious readers always ask not only what are the arguments, but what is the *spirit*, and what the relative measures of *artlessness* and *candour* manifested by opposing intellectual combatants, a regard to the interests of truth demands of me to exhibit as fully and fairly as I can the arguments of the Reviewer, and to avoid most sedulously the course pursued by him in his *second article*,† wherein he *silently passes over* the great astronomical calculations, whereby I demonstrate the fact as to the exact date of Ezra's commission, and also the scientific relations between the year 33 and the greatest periods of Mundane history, and eagerly seizes secondary or subsidiary or illustrative arguments as the subjects of animadversion : all his subterfuges and artificial difficulties, being, in the particular argument now before us, intended to negative the plain and demonstrated facts that the 1st of Nisan 30, whether determined by an actual Lunar observation or the rule 18, was upon Friday, the 24th March, and the 14th or Passover upon Thursday, 6th April, which, therefore, is excluded from the category of possibility as to its being the date of the Passion.

We now return to his argument from the Moon of February, or Adar 30, the accuracy of which, as promised above, I shall bring to the test of the Astronomical elements of the question, as it is my intention to follow him *closely* wherever his reasoning touches *facts* that are *tangible*.

\* Mede's Works. Book iv. Letter x.

† "Churchman's Review" for March, 1847.

In order to ascertain the exact length of the Jewish months from January to April 30, I have made the calculations, of which the results are as follows of the Lunations of these four months:—

	Mean New Moon At Jerusalem.	True New Moon	Evening of the Phasis, and of the 1st of the Jewish Month.
	D. H. M.	D. H. M.	
January .	22 8 33	22 2 3	23 1st Shebet
February .	20 21 19	20 17 19	22 „ Adar
March . .	22 10 3	22 8 31	23 „ Nisan
April . .	20 22 47	21 0 24	22 „ Ijar

The length of each of the three first months is as follows:—

Jewish Months.	Length of Lunations.	Length of Month from Phasis to Phasis.
	D. H. M.	
Shebet	29 15 14	30 Days
Adar	29 15 11	29 „
Nisan	29 15 53	30 „

Now the argument and the date of the Reviewer require that 30 days should be counted to Adar, the shortest of the three months, and only 29 to Nisan, which, though in Lunar time the *longest* of the three, is thus made by him the *shortest*. His date also no less contradicts the principles of the Jewish Calendar than the Lunar times, for, by the Calendar, Nisan has always 30 days,\* and Adar, except in Embolismic years as already said, only 29. The Calendar must, however, yield to the Reviewer's authority, as well as the seasons in Palestine.

The next question which offers itself for consideration is as to the nature of the alleged rule of the Modern Synagogue for transferring the Passover from the first,

\* Lindo, ubi supra.

third, and fifth days of the week to other days. Now, let it be first observed, that in the Modern Calendars the 14th of Nisan is not marked as the Passover; for, since they have no lamb, the only celebration of the 14th is for putting away the leaven. The 14th is, therefore, only distinguished as the evening of the Passover. It is the 15th which is marked as the *פָּסָחָה* *festival* along with the 16th, and the former is kept as a Sabbath with the greatest strictness.

Lindo, in his Hebrew Calendar, affirms accordingly that in order to prevent the Passover (i.e. the 15th Nisan) happening on Monday, Wednesday, or Friday, a day is sometimes added to the month Chesleu. The reasons stated for it by Sir Isaac Newton, in his "Observations on the Prophecies of the Book of Daniel," are that the 15th and 21st of Nisan and certain days of Pentecost, and the 10th, 15th, and 22d, of Tisri, were always Sabbatical days of rest, and it was inconvenient for them for two days together to be prevented from burying their dead, and making ready fresh meat. The reasons given in the Calendar of Lindo are not dissimilar, though more general.

The institutions of Moses, however, are of such a character as to overthrow all the principles here contended for. What could more completely contradict all such maxims of human expediency than the law of the Sabbath year and the Jubilee, which ordained that, in two successive years the seventh Sabbath and following year the Jubilee, the land should remain untilled and unsown? The difficulty is not met, as by the modern Synagogue in the former case, by the relaxation of a divine ordinance, but by a reference to the power and goodness of the

Lawgiver, who promised so to bless the sixth year that it should bear fruit for itself and the two following. What were the inconveniences of two following *days* kept as Sabbaths, as often as the 15th Nisan happened upon Friday or Sunday, when compared with those of two successive *years* when the lands remained unsown? The whole institutions of Moses, while they abounded in the richest temporal promises to obedience, were in fact ordained for constantly mortifying in the hearts of the people the principles of covetousness, and to this end the frequent interruption of all secular employments, as well by the extraordinary as weekly Sabbaths, was powerfully subservient.

For these reasons, and because this rule must often have violated the commandment, that the Passover was to be slain on the 14th Nisan, we conclude that it is of later origin than the age of the Prophets and the time when the Jews constituted the Church of God, and must be rejected.

But as I deem it necessary to sift to its very foundation, every tangible argument and allegation of the Reviewer in this momentous controversy, I have, in the most rigid manner, examined the Jewish Calendar, in order to ascertain how the modern Synagogue would have applied this rule to the Passover of the year 30, and to determine whether the effect of it would have been, as the Reviewer imagines, to throw the 14th Nisan and the Passover of that year from Thursday the 6th to Friday the 7th April; and I shall exhibit the result in the following Table of nine different Passovers as ascertained from the Calendar.

No.	Year.	Month.	Astronomical Time of True New Moon at Jerusalem.	THE 1ST OF NISAN according to		THE 14TH OF NISAN according to	
				The Ancient Rule of the Phasis.	The Modern Jewish Calendar.	The Ancient Rule.	The Jewish Calendar.
1	1837	April	4 21 42 Wednesday.	Friday, April 7.	Thursday, April 6.	Thursday, April 20.	Wednesday, April 19.
2	1838	March	25 12 7 Monday.	Tuesday, March 27.	Tuesday, March 27.	Monday, April 9.	Monday, April 9.
3	1839	March	15 4 35 Friday.	Sunday, March 17.	Saturday, March 16.	Saturday, March 30.	Friday, March 29.
4	1840	April	2 5 43 Thursday.	Saturday, April 4.	Saturday, April 4.	Friday, April 17.	Friday, April 17.
5	1841	March	23 4 58 Tuesday.	Thursday, March 25.	Tuesday, March 23.	Wednesday, April 7.	Monday, April 5.
6	1842	March	11 20 51 Saturday.	Monday, March 14.	Saturday, March 12.	Sunday, March 27.	Friday, March 25.
7	1843	March	30 14 11 Friday.	Sunday, April 2.	Saturday, April 1.	Saturday, April 15.	Friday, April 14.
8	1844	March	19 2 39 Tuesday.	Thursday, March 21.	Thursday, March 21.	Wednesday, April 8.	Wednesday, April 3.
9	1857	March	25 12 54 Wednesday.	Friday, March 28.	Thursday, March 27.*	Thursday, April 10.	Wednesday, April 9.†

The result of the comparative dates of these nine Passovers, as computed according to the ancient principles of the Jewish Church and those of the Modern Synagogue, is this:—in three of them, viz., Nos. 2, 4, and 8, the modern dates accord exactly with the ancient rule. In No. 3 the Modern Calendar anticipates the Ancient *one day*, apparently for the purpose of throwing the 15th Nisan, which is kept as a Sabbath, on their own weekly Sabbath. In Nos. 5 and 6 they anticipate *two days*, the former for what purpose does not appear; the latter, in order that the 15th Nisan may not fall on Monday. In No. 7 *one day* is anticipated.

But I now would draw the special attention of the reader to the *two remaining Passovers*, viz., No. 1, that of the year 1837, and No. 9, that of 1857, because they

\* In Mr. Lindo's Calendar the day of the week is here given correctly, but that of the month is wrong, being given as the 26th.

† The same remark applies here. Mr. Lindo gives the 14th Nisan on Wednesday, April 8. Both dates have been calculated by me.

both are identical in limits and character with the *one in dispute*, viz., that of the year 30. In this year, see above,\* the New Moon of March fell on Wednesday, the 22d; the Phasis was on the Thursday evening, the 23d; the 1st Nisan on Friday, the 24th; and the 14th, or Passover, on Thursday, April 6, negativing the fact or possibility of its being the date of the Passion. But the Reviewer affirms that, according to the rule *Bachu* of the Modern Synagogue, they would transfer it to the following day, making Friday, the 7th April, the 14th Nisan, and Saturday, the 8th, the 15th. Now, what is the *fact* as to the practice of the Modern Synagogue as now ascertained by the foregoing examples? In the year 1837, the Paschal New Moon fell on April 5 and on Wednesday, the Phasis on Thursday evening, the 1st Nisan on Friday, and the 14th Nisan, according to the ancient rule, upon Thursday the 20th. This, however, would cause the 15th to fall on Friday, the 21st, which would be contrary to the modern rule, and therefore must be avoided. How, then, does the Synagogue obviate the difficulty? Is it, as the Reviewer would fain have it, by *putting off* the Passover till the day following? It is the direct reverse. They here, as in every case where they deviate from the ancient rule, *anticipate* the true date, making the 14th of Nisan a day *earlier*, viz., on Wednesday, the 19th April, instead of Thursday, the 20th, in 1837. In like manner in 1857. So that in the disputed year 30, had their modern rule been then in existence, of which there is no evidence, the Passover would clearly have been upon Wednesday, the 5th April.

It also appears, that the mode in which they effect this

\* Page 58.

is, by counting the 1st of Nisan, not according to the ancient rule of the *Phasis*, their perfect acquaintance with which the foregoing examples, Nos. 2, 4, and 8, demonstrate,—but by carrying it back to the day of the *conjunction*, or the day after. I have not yet found a single example in their Calendar of a Passover placed at a *later* date than the ancient rule of the Phasis. Wherever they deviate from it, it is by *anticipation*.

Thus the Reviewer's argument crumbles to dust. Does it, then, follow that I triumph over him? This would be a great sin against God. What I desire for him is, that he may, by the Spirit of Christ, be endued more with the spirit of a little child, and may be led to confess before the public that he has erred. I believe that in doing this he will consult his own lasting reputation, as well as act in obedience to the commandments of God.

It appears, however, evident, that as often as we can pin him down to *tangible matters of fact* his reasoning is scattered. His refuge is in doubts and difficulties and conflicting possibilities, heaped together after the manner of an ingenious lawyer, whereby the minds of his readers become perplexed by a cloud of artificial darkness, so dense, as effectually to hide from their view, or obscure the evidences of the truth.

I proceed, therefore, to ask, where does the whole mass of doubts and adverse possibilities, placed before the reader in a former page, lead the Journalist himself? In the first place, it completely sets aside and tramples under foot the principles of the immortal Work on the • Analogy, of the great Master of Moral Reasoning, Bishop Butler, which teach us that, in the absence of

certainty, we are bound to decide by the greatest attainable probability, and that the least preponderance of the probable ought always to guide our judgment,—and that the special trial of some men may be, whether they will submit to such probability. In opposition to this principle, though the Reviewer has once and again and a third time\* admitted Mr. Browne's date of March 18, 29, to be less probable, he still continues to hesitate between the three, and we must admit he has in his intellectual locker a plentiful store of other and conflicting improbabilities to excuse his hesitation, and the result is, that his understanding and judgment appear to be overwhelmed with the darkness he himself creates, and he ends in a state of utter Pyrrhonism between the years 29, 30, and 33, as the dates of the Passion, labouring always hard however to exclude the last. Now, if he can find any reader of ordinary capacity who will affirm that he can clearly comprehend the chain of argument in his second Article, from p. 206 to the end of 209, I will at once acknowledge that I have here charged him unjustly.

It would swell these remarks to an unreasonable length to follow him through the 24 heads in which he in these pages sums up his argument. I must, therefore, endeavour to seize some of his leading principles. He begins by the gratuitous assumption of a difference of a whole day between the rule of Philo and Josephus from the place of the Moon, and that of the Talmudists from the Phasis: †—the utter groundlessness of which may be deduced from the fact, already proved by the words of Philo, cited in a former page, that he himself held the

\* See his Second Review, April, 1847, pp. 182, 188, 195.

† Churchman's Monthly Review for March, 1847, p. 208.

rule from the Phasis in settling the beginning of the Jewish month, no less than that which placed the 14th Nisan and beginning of the Passover before the Full Moon, and, consequently, this position of the Reviewer includes in it the supposition that Philo, the Jewish writer most deeply acquainted with the Hebrew Philosophy, flatly contradicts himself, and lays down two rules, altogether inconsistent with each other, for the celebration of the primary festival of the Mosaic Ritual. Now, let the judicious and impartial reader decide, whether it be not most probable, that the ignorance and mistake are rather on the side of this Modern Reviewer, than of the Jewish philosopher.

He is forced to acknowledge that the year 33 is admissible as the date of the Passover by the rule of the Phasis, —by the other rule of Philo from the Moon's place, if (as he affirms) partially relaxed, or, as I affirm, by both rules strictly interpreted, and Philo himself by the adoption of both rules virtually affirms; for as he has said nothing to reconcile the two rules, we infer that no inconsistency between them could have offered itself to his own mind, or to the mind of any one uninitiated in the false refinements of modern dialecticians. The Reviewer is further forced to acknowledge, that the year 33 is consistent with the usual reckoning of the years of Tiberius.

But he says that there is no historical testimony for it. By historical testimony we usually mean the testimony of those who have written and left a record of the events of which they make mention. In this primary sense of the words, certainly there is not any historical testimony for the date of our Lord's Passion, whether in the year 33 or

any other, since the Evangelists, who alone have left historical accounts of the fact and circumstances of the Passion, are silent as to the year when it was accomplished. Nevertheless their records, when compared with the authentic rules of the times of the Passover, and the Astronomical data, and the Prophecy of the Seventy Weeks, enable us to fix its time on the basis of absolute certainty.

On the other hand, as to the vague assertions of the former Fathers, which are by this Reviewer dignified with the title of historical testimony, we have in a former page \* formed some estimate of them. They are worthless, till we come down to Eusebius, who was the author of the earliest systematic Work on Chronology which is yet extant; and by comparing his various dates, we have already seen, that his testimony is in favour of the year 33. It is true that Africanus, who lived earlier than Eusebius, gives the year 30, but the fragments of his works which have come down to us are too scanty to enable us to form any correct estimate of the grounds upon which he fixes it, if they were any other than the preconceived hypothesis that our Lord was to be born about the year of the World 5500, which probably was derived from early or prophetic tradition, and is not far from the truth, and as three years was their estimated length of his ministry, and as we know he was thirty at his Baptism, in the 15th of Tiberius, a. c. 28, it brought out his Passion in 31. The error was this, that from the Gospel narrative it clearly appears, that there was some considerable interval between the Baptism of our Lord

\* *Supra*, pp. 8, 9.

and John's imprisonment, after which, not before, our Lord's Ministry of three years properly began.

His other reasons against this date involve a charge, without a shadow of evidence, against Usher, Sir Isaac Newton, Whiston, Prideaux, Macknight, Calmet, Helvicus, and the authors of *L'Art de Verifier les Dates*, of doing violence to the narrative and marks of time in the Gospel Narrative, and there is as much modesty as truth in bringing such a charge against men who have, as Whiston and Macknight, left elaborate works of deepest research into the New Testament times.

He passes over in silent contempt the whole reasoning in my "Fulness of the Times" on the Chronology of the death of Herod and the Nativity, comprehending more than eighty pages of print, and supported by the evidence of a total and central eclipse of the Moon on January 9 B.C. 1, wherein I charge Josephus with corrupting the whole Chronology of the reigns of Herod and Archelaus, wherein I also, and especially in my "Season of the End," meet the argument from the Coins, as Cellarius had (without my being aware of the fact) done before me, by supposing that they may have been antedated, for which solid reasons are given. In like manner he leaves unnoticed the Analysis of the Chronology of Josephus, in my "Synopsis," wherein I unravel his whole scheme, both exoteric and esoteric, and prove its entire though hidden harmony with my Tables, and show that the banishment of Archelaus, in his 17th Book, comes out not in A.C. 6, but two years later, viz. in 8,—and that this is his esoteric date is manifest, from his own Chronological testimony in the *Antiquities*,—whereof I shall now give an *ascending* analysis, as the former was a *descending* one.

At the beginning of Book xx. it is said to contain the interval of 22 years from Fadus to Gessius Florus, whose government began in the 11th year of Nero current from Oct. 14th, 64; for Josephus informs us, Ant. xx. 11, 1, that the war began in the second year of the administration of Florus, and in "Jewish War," ii. 14, 4, fixes it in the 12th of Nero, in the month Artemissus, (Ijar), April or May 66. Florus arrived therefore at his government at the end of 64, or very early in 65. Now computing back 22 years from A.C. 64, it would give the year 42 as the date of the Administration of Fadus, which is 2 years too early,—for Fadus was, after some interval, appointed to succeed Herod Agrippa, whose death, recorded in Acts xii. 20—23, was some time after the Passover, and is pinned down by the testimony of Josephus, Ant. xix. 8, 2, to the year 44. We must, therefore, suppose either that the 22 years of B. xx. of the Antiquities are *current*, and, reducing them to 21, compute back from the first Passover of the government of Florus, 65, or rather that Josephus computed them down to the *last fact* mentioned in the foregoing passage and therefore the end of the Antiquities, viz., *the beginning of the War*, in the second year of Florus 66, whence reckoning back 22 years we arrive at 44.

In B. xix., the period of  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years is given for the interval from the departure of the Jews from Babylon to Fadus, which computed back from the death of Agrippa in 44, will bring out the latter part of the year 40 as the date of the former event.

In B. xviii. he assigns 32 years as the time from the banishment of Archelaus to the departure of the Jews from Babylon, and this period measured back from 40,

brings out A. C. 8 as the end of the reign of Archelaus. Again, computing back from A. C. 8, 9 years *current*, we are brought to the death of Herod B. C. 1, which gives 9 years *current* for the reign of Archelaus, to which Josephus in Ant. xvii. 13, 2, assigns 10 years *current*, but in "Jewish War," ii. 7, 3, only 9 years. That the last is the true period and the years *current* is manifest from the fact of a total Eclipse of the Moon, visible at Jerusalem on January 9th, B. C. 1, which exactly answers to the one recorded by Josephus as having occurred on the night of the burning of the Rabbis, who had during the last illness of Herod, and on a report of his death, demolished the Golden Eagle on the Gate of the Temple. Moreover, that the Lunar Eclipse fixed upon by Usher, viz., that of March 13, B. C. 4, does not correspond with the one mentioned in Ant. xvii. 6, 4, has been demonstrated by me in my "Fulness of the Times;"\* and, in addition to the irrefragable reasons there given, it may now be stated that to place the death of Herod in that year would lengthen out the reign of Archelaus, whose banishment has now, from the foregoing ascending analysis of the Chronology of Josephus, been pinned down to the year A. C. 8, from 9 years *current* to 12, which is quite inconsistent with the testimony of the Jewish historian and of the ancient Chronographers. Eusebius, the Paschal Chronicle, and Syncellus equally give to him 9 years.

We may also infer from what has now been deduced from the Chronology of the three last Books of the Antiquities, that Josephus diverges a year from the truth in placing the disposal of the property of Archelaus by Crenius in the 37th year after the battle of Actium,

\* Pp. 87—91.

Ant. xviii. 2, 1. The period of 37 years complete after that battle, b.c. 31, comes out in September, a.c. 7.— Josephus has therefore written 37 for 38.

There is, however, another reason for this date of the death of Herod, viz., b.c. 1, founded on the fact mentioned by Josephus, that at the meeting called by Augustus of his friends, to consider the application of Archelaus after the death of Herod for the succession of his father's kingdom, Caius, the son of Agrippa, and adopted son of Augustus, was not only present but was placed first in the Council. Caius was at this time at Rome previous to his departure for his military command in Armenia. Mr. Clinton places his departure for Asia in b.c. 1; but this seems doubtful, for Dio, lv. 11, makes Tiberius visit him at Chios in u.c. 755, a.c. 2, and it appears very improbable that he would continue so long as two years on his march to Armenia. He was, however, certainly at Rome in b.c. 1, and was designated for the government of the East at the early age of 19. In this fact we see the probability of his being placed first in the Council. Mr. Clinton, indeed, informs us, that in the year b.c. 5 Caius assumed the Toga virilis, and was brought into the Council-chamber, but it appears scarcely credible that at the age of 15 he would be placed first in Council, in deliberating on the affairs of Judæa; nor do the testimonies quoted bear that it was so. Mr. Clinton has not, moreover, cited any authorities to show that Caius was at Rome in the following year, b.c. 4. Petavius, indeed, quotes Kepler as placing the first presence of Caius in the Council and designation for the Consulship in this year, affirming that he immediately afterwards departed on a tour through the Provinces, which occupied

the remainder of the same and the following year, and his return to Rome was not till the Julian year 44, b. c. 2.\* Now if Mr. Clinton has rightly dated his assumption of the Toga, and first presence in the Council, in b. c. 5, and if Kepler be right as to his departure for the Provinces in the same year that he assumed the Toga, it will follow that he was not at Rome at all in b. c. 4, and consequently that the death of Herod and visit of Archelaus to Rome to solicit his Father's Kingdom was not in b. c. 4, but in 1, as placed in my Tables, and brought out in the foregoing analysis of the text of the Jewish Historian.

I shall now offer some concluding remarks on the Reviewer's Article.

In his 22d head of argument, there are a series of assumptions without evidence, in favour of the years 29 and 30, against each of which I simply would write a negative. One of them, however, is so singular that I must place it before the reader. In order to show that the word *ὑγεμονία*, used by St. Luke iii. 1, to express the reign of Tiberius, may refer to a joint administration with Augustus over the Provinces, he says that "it belongs to a class of words everywhere else used in the New Testament, not for *supreme*, but for *deputed power*." Why then does he not tell his readers, that it is the very word used by Josephus to signify the accession of Tiberius to the *Empire* on the death of Augustus; first, in his *Ant.* xviii. 2, 2; secondly, in *J. W.* ii. 9. 1? The passages are quoted by me in Appendix to chapter iv. of my "Synopsis," which is referred to in his Review, and therefore he could not be ignorant of the fact. Another word, viz., *ἀρχή*, is used by Josephus to express the whole duration (57 years) of

\* Petavius, *De Doctr. Temp.* lib. xi. cap. iii.

the power of Augustus, apparently because for fourteen years Antony ruled jointly with him. Why also are we not told what other word could have been employed by the Evangelist? To have used *βασιλεῖα* would have been to give the abhorred title of *βασιλεὺς* to the Emperor, which would have been an offence against the Roman Laws. I accordingly turn up in Hederick the word *Imperator*, and I find it expressed by *ηγεμῶν*; whereas Joseph was in Egypt made *Αρχῶν*, Gen. xlvi. 8, as was Sisera to Jabin, Judges iv. 2, 7.

In the 23d head, the Reviewer pronounces the reasons of his 22d as almost, or quite, decisive in favour of 29 or 30, but he cannot determine which.

In his 24th and final head, he locks up the Prophecy of the **SEVENTY WEEKS** in the same condition of utter Pyrrhonism, and informs us, that **IT OUGHT TO BE APPEALED TO AND INTERPRETED ONLY WHEN THE GOSPEL CHRONOLOGY HAS BEEN FIXED BY ITS OWN PROPER EVIDENCE.** Or, in other words, until *he* shall be pleased to make up his mind and declare himself satisfied upon that, as to which the great body of the *ablest writers* of the Church of God have been nearly unanimous for more than two centuries, namely, the date of the Passion of our Lord, we are **ACTUALLY FORBIDDEN EITHER TO APPEAL TO OR INTERPRET THE PROPHECY OF DANIEL.** There is certainly a peculiar degree of modesty in a writer, not, I conjecture, of a very mature age, venturing thus, as it were, to fulminate a **BULL OF LITERARY AND ECCLESIASTICAL INHIBITION** against a person so eminent for learning, and piety, and acuteness of dialectical powers, and venerable in age, as my learned friend Mr. Faber, who has presumed to publish a very erudite Dissertation on the Seventy

Weeks of Daniel grounded on the authentic date of the Passion. What will my learned friend say to it, if the familiar of this new Literary Inquisitor shall knock at his door, and demand that his volume be delivered up to be consigned to the flames ?

But it is easy to see that the Inhibitory Writ must include the whole **SEALED BOOK OF THE APOCALYPSE** no less than the Prophecies of Daniel ; for, without a demonstrated Apocalyptic Chronology, every scheme of interpretation becomes a series of crude guesses. But a demonstrated Apocalyptic Chronology must be dovetailed into that of Daniel's weeks, and both must be dovetailed into the great *foci* of the stupendous Chronological Ellipse, to use analogical language, of Providence and Redemption, which are confessedly the **NATIVITY** and **PASSION** of the **LORD OF GLORY**.

The whole of my scheme of Apocalyptic interpretation and my Chronological works accordingly rest on these great events, and the kindred one of his baptism, (which was, as it were, his Spiritual Nativity in his office of Prophet,) and on their demonstrated dates. This the Reviewer full well knows, and is no less aware of the fact, that if he can throw a smoke of doubt and dark perplexity on these fundamental dates, he will, by a *side wind*, overthrow my humble labours on Prophecy and Chronology, which now extend through the period of nearly half a century, as I have lately found the first sketch of my first six Letters on the Evidences of Christianity, penned in Bengal, in the year 1800.\* Does the Christian reader marvel that I offer the

\* I may here mention that in a similar way an attempt was made in the year 1836 to overthrow the whole reasoning and conclusions of the 250 pages of my "Fulness of the Times," by a *side wind* from Usher's

most strenuous resistance to such an assault—or condemn me for it?

In my “Dissertation on the Seals,” the Passion in the year 33 is the Concentrical Date between the decree of the 7th of Artaxerxes in favour of Ezra, b.c. 458, and the going forth of the Rider of the Black Horse of the 3d Seal, in 523, and is equidistant 490 years, or 10 Jubilees, or 70 weeks from both, as it is also four periods of 70 from the Charter of Liberty promulgated in favour of the Church by Constantine in 313, and if the reader will consult my Diagram, facing the title-page of the 4th edition of my “Dissertation,” he will at once perceive that my whole arrangement hangs on that fundamental date.

Is it, then, by a system of Chronological tergiversation, in its commencement a question asked in a former edition whether 34 be the true date of the Passion? changed in a subsequent edition to the question is 30 the date? a system ending in an acknowledgment of total inability to solve the problem—that the cause of truth is to be upheld? Is it, we ask, thus invested *cap-a-pie* with the armour of perfect Pyrrhonism dark as Erebus, that this Reviewer is to go forth to encounter the giants of German literature and German scepticism?

perverted view of the generation of Terah making him 130 when he had Abraham—a view sanctioned neither by Josephus nor any one of the Ancient Chronographers, though certainly intended by the Rabbis, who corrupted the Chronology. In the Preface to my “Supplementary Dissertation,” published a few months afterwards, the objection was laid prostrate, and the circumstance of its having been made was *eminently beneficial to me* by advancing my knowledge of the system of Josephus.

## SECTION II.

## THE SEVENTY WEEKS OF DANIEL.

Originality in calculating the New Moon of March, 33, awarded to Mr. Whiston, Mr. Bedford, and Mr. Kennedy, writers of the Eighteenth Century.—A Digression as to the exact Date of the Accession of Artaxerxes Longimanus, and in Refutation of the Date of Usher, Vitringa, and Hengstenberg.—Testimonies of Ancient Chronologers.—Moderns.—Rejection of the Authority of the Canon of Ptolemy by these three Writers unwarranted.—It rests on the Testimony of Thucydides.—Uncertainty of the Dates of Grecian Affairs in this Period.—Diodorus.—Analysis of his Dates.—Anachronisms.—Chronological Silence of Thucydides.—His Testimony cannot shake our Confidence in the Canon.—Confirmation of this Date from the Scientific Chronology.—Seven different Astronomical Calculations of the New Moon and 1st of Nisan, B.C. 458.—The exact number of Days in 490 tropical Years, shewing that they come out at the Hour when our Lord was nailed to the Cross.—The Evidence of the Date of the Passion amounts to Demonstration.—Profound skill of the Rabbis in corrupting the Chronology.—Sin of the Churches of the Reformation in rejecting the Testimony of the Apostolic Churches.—The Church of Rome still gives a partial Testimony to the true Chronology.—The Churches of the East unanimous in receiving it.—Fall of the Hebrew Scheme at hand.—The Author's Scheme one not of innovation, but restoration.—He has not altered one established Date; HE DARES NOT DO IT.—Conclusion, showing the Arrangement of the Subdivisions of the Seventy Weeks.—Final Remark on the triumphant Establishment of the Date of the Passion.

WHEN the former sheets were sent to the Press, I was disposed to take credit to myself as being the first writer who had calculated the time of the NEW Moon of March, A.C. 33, and its first phasis, and had thence deduced the true beginning of the 1st of Nisan in that year. But as I should account it to be no less a violation of the holy

commandments of God, to withhold from writers who have preceded me, and especially the laborious students of a former age, the honour due to their discoveries, than to rob my neighbour of his purse, I hasten to divest myself of my fancied honours in this respect, by informing the Reviewer and my readers that no less than three writers of the 18th century have preceded me in the calculation of the above New Moon, and have one and each arrived at the same conclusion as myself, that its first phasis was on March 20th, and have therefore placed the crucifixion on the 3d April, to the utter overthrow of the calculation of Mr. Browne, and of the Reviewer's reasoning. There is a difference between them, however, which will be noticed, as to the rule for deciding the beginning of the 1st of Nisan.

1. Mr. Whiston, in his "Harmony of the Gospels,"\* gives the time of that New Moon on March 19th, 13 h. 30 m., only 5 minutes earlier than my own calculation, and places its phasis on the following evening. But he quotes a passage from Selden, that when on the second evening the Moon appeared for two or three hours before sunset, the former evening, though she had not then been visible, was yet counted the 1st of the month. He therefore makes the 19th March, 33, the 1st of Nisan, and the crucifixion he places on the 15th. In this I conceive he utterly errs, as the rule of Philo, for the beginning of the month not before the Phasis,† is clear and unequi-

\* Page 196. London, 1702.

† The rule of Selden probably held good when, on the second evening, owing to the state of the weather, the Moon happened not to be seen. Those who have been in the East, as I was in early life, will not forget the noise of the drums and instruments of sound which

vocal. Moreover, it is no less evident that the Passover was on the 14th Nisan, and not the 15th.

Whiston further dwells upon the well-known passage of Phlegon, cited by Origen, Eusebius, and the Chronicum Alexandrinum of an Eclipse of the Sun,—the greatest ever known,—in the 3d year of the 202d Olympiad, viz., b. c. 33, as confirmatory of the fact of our Lord's Passion in that year. In the Catalogue in “*L'Art de Verifier les Dates*,” I find no Solar Eclipse between June a. c. 32 and 33, being that Olympic year. The Eclipse of Phlegon was, then, supernatural, as was that of the Passion.\*

2. The second of these writers is Mr. Bedford, Rector of Newton St. Loe, who, in his elaborate folio on Scripture Chronology, printed in 1730, has two calculations of the difference of the Oblique Declination of the Sun and Moon, on the evenings of the 19th and 20th of March, a. c. 33.† The difference on the former evening at the time of visibility, he makes only  $3^{\circ} 28'$ ; but on the 20th, at the same time, he makes the difference  $20^{\circ} 9'$ . He also makes the difference in the Right Ascension of the two luminaries on the 19th, to be not much more than  $3^{\circ}$ ; but on the 20th, he reckons it  $16^{\circ} 48'$ . This shows that the Moon, on the evening of that day, set not much more than one hour later than the sun, which negatives Whiston's argument from the rule of Selden to prove that the 1st of Nisan was on the 19th. Moreover, as it requires about  $9^{\circ}$  of difference in longitude between the

ushered in the Mahomedan festivals when the Moon was seen on her first day, and the silent departure to their homes of the disappointed crowds when she did not appear.

\* See Note A, at the end of this Section.

† See his Vol., pp. 743 and 744.

Sun and Moon for the latter to be visible, and since on the 19th March the difference was little above  $3^{\circ}$ , this proves the accuracy of Mr. Bedford's computation, and the conclusion he draws from it, that on the 19th the Moon set invisible. It entirely confirms my calculations given above, showing that the Moon was invisible on the evening of the 19th, but visible on the 20th; and therefore, that the 21st of March was the 1st of Nisan, and Friday, the 3d of April, the 14th, when our Lord was crucified.

3. The third writer is Mr. Kennedy, Rector of Bradley. In his "Complete System of Astronomical Chronology,"\* he computes, first, that the New Moon of Nisan, b.c. 458,—the 7th of Artaxerxes, when Ezra went out of Babylon,—fell upon April 7th, o.s., and upon Friday, at 2 h. 31 m. afternoon; and that the 1st of Nisan was on Saturday (Sabbath) the 8th. He makes a distinction, however, between the *astronomical* and *political* 1st of Nisan; and the last he supposes to be three days later: and he makes Ezra leave Babylon on the Tuesday following. I do not see what are his grounds for that distinction; and his calculations appear to deviate from the truth, both as to the day of the month, and of the week, and also the hour of the New Moon; nevertheless I owe to them the more exact views at which I have myself arrived. After giving the calculation of the date of the Phasis of the New Moon when our Lord suffered, he thus sums up the result:—"It appears from this calculation, that A.D. 33, æra v. A. M. 4040, the Paschal New Moon was visible on the evening of the 20th day of March; and the Passover month of Nisan began on the 21st of March, in the year of our Saviour's Passion."†

\* P. 681. Lond. 1762.

† Ibid. p. 688.

I here, however, find myself arrested in the current of my reasoning, by the necessity imposed upon me of considering an attempt of three writers, confessedly of great learning and authority, to disturb the chronology of the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus, as given not only in the Canon of Ptolemy, but nearly, if not without exception, by every ancient chronologer and historian to whose works I myself have an opportunity of referring, including the names of Eusebius, Clemens of Alexandria, Diodorus, Sulpicius Severus, Syncellus, and the learned Abul Pharagi, who all give to the reign of Xerxes 21 years, and of Artaxerxes 41, or 40, including in the former the short reigns of Xerxes II., 2 months, and Sogdianus, 7 months. To these names must be added that of Africanus, as quoted by Syncellus, p. 75. The whole body of modern chronologers also follow the ancients, with the exception, I think, of Petavius, who endeavours to reconcile both systems by making Artaxerxes reign conjunctly with his father for 10 years.

The three writers here alluded to are, Usher; Vitrunga, in his "Observationes Sacræ," lib. vi., de lxx Hebdomadis Danielis; and Dr. Hengstenberg, of Berlin, in his "Christology of the Old Testament." The scheme of these writers is, that the reign of Xerxes, instead of 21 years, was only 11; that his death and the succession of Artaxerxes were not, as the received Chronology places them, in the year b.c. 464, but ten years earlier, viz., 474; and that the Commission of Nehemiah in the 20th of Artaxerxes, which they consequently place in the year b.c. 455, is the epoch, or *terminus a quo*,\* of Daniel's Seventy Weeks, whereby the 69 weeks, = 483 years, are

\* Point of commencement.

made to terminate in the year 29, at the beginning of our Lord's personal ministry,—the half week at his Passion, and the remaining half three years and a half later.

It is easy to see that these learned persons are not altogether free from bias and partiality in this question of chronology, for, were they quite impartial, it is utterly impossible that they should have undervalued the general authority of that treasure of inestimable value, the Astronomical Canon of Ptolemy, as the following quotations of their words will show them to have done. Vitringa observes, in anticipation of an objection being offered to his conclusions from this high authority: “It will be said, that the Canon attributed to Ptolemy opposes (my scheme), by giving 21 years to Xerxes,—only the Thoth of the 21st year exceeding,—I answer, that I do not undervalue the authority of the Canon where it is supported by Astronomical Observations from Ptolemy, as, for example, in the years of Cambyses and Darius Hystaspes, but none of these happen in those times which join to the Chronology of Xerxes. Then I certainly more highly esteem the authority of the Canon (especially in the Median times) in respect to the *whole sum of years* which it gives to the duration of that empire, from the first of Cyrus in Babylon to Alexander, afterwards confirmed by Ptolemy himself, than in defining the years of each of the Persian kings, especially those posterior to Darius Hystaspes, whose times are not (*adstruuntur*) confirmed by astronomical observations. In other matters the author of that Canon, whoever he is, does not deserve greater confidence than the *best* historians of after times.”\*

\* Vitringa, *Observ. Sacr.*, p. 278.

In like manner, Dr. Hengstenberg affirms, that "the Canon has high authority only where it rests on astronomical observations, which is not the case here. Otherwise, it stands on the same ground as all other historical sources."

I think that impartial reasoners will arrive at directly an opposite conclusion to that of these learned divines, namely, that the fact of the confirmation of the chronology of the Canon by astronomical observations, as often as the record of them could be referred to, affords such evidence of the laborious diligence and integrity of its author, as to stamp upon it, as a whole, the indelible seal of authenticity and exact truth. Such, accordingly, has been the judgment of the ablest and most judicious chronologers in later times. Moreover, nothing can be more inconsistent and unjust than to admit its truth as to the whole sum of years, and, without the clearest evidence, to question that of the particulars. It is impossible, therefore, to banish from our minds the suspicion that, had not the Canon (to which we owe all assured and authentic knowledge of the times of Daniel's three first kingdoms after the close of the Canon of the Old Testament) opposed the scheme of these writers, their judgment of its merits would have been the very opposite of that which is expressed in the foregoing passages.

Upon what foundation, then, we are immediately led to ask, is the authority of the Canon questioned? It is solely on that of a passage in Thucydides, in which he affirms that Themistocles, on his flight from Greece and arrival in Persia, found Artaxerxes newly come to the kingdom.\* Now these writers endeavour to show that

\* Thuc. i. 137.

the flight of Themistocles cannot be placed later than the year b. c. 473;\* and they hence conclude, that Artaxerxes began to reign in b. c. 474, and that the reign of Xerxes was not 21, but 11 years. “The whole error was committed as soon as an *ιά* in an ancient authority was confounded with a *κά*.† Certainly no one will deny that *ιά* is 11, and *κά* 21, but the fact remains to be proved that the error was committed.

There is so much doubt and uncertainty as to dates in Grecian affairs at this period, as to render it a matter of great difficulty to settle the chronology. This is, indeed, not denied by Dr. Hengstenberg, who terms it “a chronologically confused period of Grecian history.”‡ Diodorus is the only writer who narrates the events in chronological order, and gives the years of each, and yet there are in his narrative such palpable anachronisms, as is largely shown by Mr. Clinton, that he cannot be implicitly trusted. I shall, from the text of Wesseling’s edition, which lies open before me, give some of the principal dates between the year b. c. 479, in the summer of which Mardonius a second time occupied Athens, ten months after it had been occupied by Xerxes in the year before,§ and the death of Xerxes, placed by Diodorus in b. c. 465.

The taking of Byzantium by the  
combined Grecian fleet under  
Pausanias.

Pausanias negotiates with the  
Persian Satrap Artabazus for

\* Hengstenberg, by Arnold, p. 446.

† Ibid., p. 445. ‡ Ibid., p. 444.

§ Mr. Clinton, year b. c. 479, p. 30, 2d Ed.

betraying to Xerxes the cause of Greece . . . . .	Ol. LXXV. 4, B.C. 477.
He is recalled and put to death.	— —
Themistocles, banished from Athens by Ostracism, takes refuge in Argos, whence he flies by a circuitous route into Persia. He is received by Xerxes with great favour and magnificent generosity. . . .	Ol. LXXVII. 2, B.C. 471.
Victories of Cimon by sea and land on the Eurymedon . . .	Ol. LXXVII. 3, B.C. 470.
Death of Xerxes . . . . .	Ol. LXXVIII. 4, B.C. 465.

That there are anachronisms in these dates is undeniable, for it appears, as is justly inferred by Mr. Clinton, from the narratives of Thucydides and Plutarch, that the residence of Themistocles at Argos must have been of some duration, for they represent him as making excursions, *επιφοιτῶν*, to other parts of Peloponnesus, and that, while at Argos, Pausanias imparted to him his treasonable designs, and that it was after the death of Pausanias that his participation in his counsels having come out, Themistocles was compelled to fly. If, therefore, his Ostracism be rightly placed by Diodorus in B.C. 471, it seems impossible to date his flight into Persia earlier than a year or two afterwards. Moreover, if that date be right, the condemnation and death of Pausanias, placed as above by Diodorus in B.C. 477, must be predicated not less than 7 or 8 years. Still, however, this would bring him to the Court of Persia according to the received Chronology, not as Thucydides affirms, after the accession of Artaxerxes, but

during the reign of Xerxes, in harmony not only as we have seen with the testimony of Diodorus, but also that of other writers mentioned by Plutarch, viz., Ephorus, Dinon, Clitarchus, and Heraclides,\* to whom may be added Eusebius.

It is worthy of particular notice, that Thucydides is wholly silent as to the Chronology of the whole period, which he defines as 50 years, between the retreat of Xerxes and the Peloponnesian War,† excepting that he states afterwards,‡ that the sending of the Athenian Colony of 10,000 persons to take possession of Amphipolis, at the time of the revolt and siege of Thasos, happened 32 years after Aristagoras was cut off in the same region. Now the death of Aristagoras was, according to Usher, in the Y. J. P. § 4216, B. C. 498, and, according to Clinton, in the year after, whence computing 32 years, we arrive at B. C. 466 or 465 as the date of the revolt and siege of Thasos. Thucydides narrates its revolt in the same chapter as the victories on the Eurymedon,|| with no interval of time mentioned, excepting the expression, *χρονῳ δε νοτερον ξυνεβη Θασιοις δε αυτων αποστηματι*, “later in time it happened that the Thasians rebelled against them.” But why is it that Thucydides, who so carefully narrates the dates of all events during the Peloponnesian War, is silent thus as to the chronology of the intermediate period in Greece?—The taking of Eion, the conquest of the island of Scyros, the war with the Caristians, that of Naxos, and the great victories on the Eurymedon are all narrated without the mention of a single date. The

\* Plutarch in Themistocles.

† B. i. 118.

‡ B. iv. 102.

§ Year of the Julian Period.

|| B. i. 101.

lengths of the reigns of Xerxes and Artaxerxes are in like manner untold by him, nor is there any date of the treason of Pausanias, or its final demonstration and his death, although it is quite apparent from the narrative of it, which occupies, with the consequent flight and end of Themistocles, no less than eleven chapters of his first book,\* that these events must have included a period of some years.

We repeat the question, what possible reason can be assigned for this silence of Thucydides as to dates, but that he was ignorant of the chronology of this confused period of Grecian history; for assuredly, had he known the dates he would have told them, and the confusion would have disappeared. And if so, what confidence can be placed in his statement as to the beginning of the reign of Artaxerxes in opposition to the Canon? How could he know accurately the dates of the Persian kings, when he thus manifests that he knows not the times of Greece in the period in question?

That which greatly strengthens this argument is the fact that Thucydides, iv. 50, specially mentions the death of Artaxerxes in the winter of B.C. 425-4, and yet does not say a syllable as to the length of his reign. Now only three words would, as in the text of Diodorus, *ἀρξας ετη τεσσαρακοντα*, have expressed it, and would have shed a flood of light on the whole chronology of the narrative of Thucydides himself, by fixing the dates of the death of Xerxes and of Pausanias, the flight of Themistocles, the siege of Naxos, the victories on the Eurymedon, and other great events of that period. Let it, moreover, be considered that Artaxerxes was the sovereign of the greater

\* Viz., from the 128th to the 138th inclusive.

part of the then known world, of that empire into which the affairs of Greece had, as it were, been intertwined by the whole course of events since the expulsion of the Pisistratidæ, also that he was the cotemporary of Thucydides, who was born in b.c. 470, only five years before his accession, according to the received Chronology, and yet the same Thucydides does not consider it a matter worth his while to record how long he had reigned. Now how is it possible to explain this omission but by the conclusion that Thucydides did not know the length of his reign ? and if so, what is the value of his statement that Themistocles, on his arrival in Persia, found Artaxerxes already on the throne, in settling the disputed chronology of the reign of Artaxerxes ?

Let it be further considered upon what different and discordant principles the three most learned writers against whose conclusions I am now contending, deal with the testimony of the Canon of Ptolemy and that of Thucydides. The Canon of Ptolemy is, they tell us, to be implicitly believed as often as its dates are confirmed by astronomical calculations. But where it is *not* thus confirmed (because, be it observed, *no recorded observations were in existence* which could confirm it), *there*, while we admit the accuracy of the whole *sum* of Chronology, we disbelieve the *particulars* which make up the sum. On the other hand, because Thucydides is a most accurate and philosophical historian of the events of the Peloponnesian war, during which he lived, and in which he acted a part, and which he was complete master of, therefore we conclude, that of the events of the kingdom of Persia, which occurred either before he was born or while he was yet an infant, and of the Chronology of which he tacitly admits his ignorance,

he is to be accounted so faithful and accurate a witness, that the cursory mention by him of the alleged arrival of Themistocles at the Court of Persia when Artaxerxes had newly arrived at the kingdom, is a sufficient authority for overthrowing, not the Canon of Ptolemy only, but nearly, without exception, the testimony of every ancient Chronographer whose works still remain.

It may, however, after all, be admitted that we cannot with certainty arrive at the true date of the flight of Themistocles; whether it was, as Diodorus affirms, in b. c. 471; or, as Mr. Clinton, the most learned Chronologer of our own times, concludes, in the year b. c. 465, the date of the death of Xerxes. In the former case, we should be obliged to place it, with those ancient writers named by Plutarch, in the reign of Xerxes, and this is the opinion of the learned and accurate Prideaux. In the latter case, his arrival at the Court of Persia dates at the beginning of the reign of Artaxerxes. It is objected to this conclusion, that it supposes the fact that Charon of Lampsacus, who accords with Thucydides, and who was already writing history in b. c. 504, must have continued to write as late as 464, or at least forty years. This, though acknowledged not to be impossible, is said to be very improbable. Now, an argument of this kind is very weak, as I now hope to demonstrate. In the year 1800, I myself held the office of Register of the Dewany Adawlut of Zillah Dinagepore, in Bengal, my removal from which, as I see by the Official Letter of the Secretary to the Bengal Government, to a superior office in another department of the Civil Service, was upon May 5, 1801. Now, before this date, my first three Letters on the Evidences of Christianity had appeared in the "Oriental Star," a Calcutta newspaper.

And in 1849, after forty-eight years, during which, through the marvellous goodness of God, I have not for ONE DAY been confined to bed by sickness, I am still writing on theological subjects; and I hope that these pages may bear witness to the fact that my faculties are not even yet altogether benumbed by the torpor of age.

To sum up the whole argument, it is quite impossible, consistently with all the principles of sound historical reasoning, to permit the single passage of Thucydides, which is built upon by Usher and Hengstenberg, unconfirmed as it is by any other testimony than that of Charon, and flatly contradicted as it is by so many ancient writers, and rendered even less credible by the manifest ignorance or, at least, most imperfect knowledge of Thucydides of the chronology of this period, to move our confidence in the testimony of the Astronomical Canon, as well as those of every ancient Chronologer, as to the length of the reigns of Xerxes and Artaxerxes, and the accession of the latter to the throne of Persia in the year B.C. 464.

I have yet, however, to add as to the testimony of Africanus, already enumerated among those who uphold this Chronology, that he places the 20th of Artaxerxes in the 115th year of the Kingdom of Persia.\* Now it is well known that all the ancient Christian Chronographers date the reign of Cyrus, not from the death of Darius the Mede, its Scriptural Era, but from that of Astyages of Media, in B.C. 559. Computing from which to the 20th of Artaxerxes in the received Chronology, B.C. 445, the difference is exactly 114 years complete, and the Commission of Nehemiah comes out, on the ancient scheme, in

\* Routh, Reliq. Sacr., vol. ii., pp. 187, 188.

the 115th year of the Kingdom of Persia ; whereas, according to the Chronology of the learned writers which I am now opposing, it is only the 105th year of that kingdom. Africanus, therefore, not only gives the true length of the two reigns of Xerxes and Artaxerxes in harmony with every other ancient Chronologer of note, but he carries it into the computation of that great Era of Prophecy, the LXX. weeks of Daniel, the true application of which is the key to open the whole Chronological system of the Apocalypse. I do not indeed affirm that he has *rightly* applied it, for the reasons advanced by Prideaux and Mr. Faber are, I conceive, quite sufficient to prove that the decree of the 7th of Artaxerxes is the one contemplated in the Prophecy. In favour of Nehemiah there was, in the strict sense of the words, a commission only ; for no decree is recorded similar to that of Cyrus in his first year, or Darius, or Artaxerxes in his seventh year. And we must suppose that, had a formal decree been issued like the former, it would have been recorded by Nehemiah in like manner as they were in the text of Ezra.

I now proceed to lay before my readers evidence of another and higher kind than was contemplated by the three learned writers whose arrangement of the reign of Artaxerxes I have now been refuting. He whose pre-science reaches through all ages and includes all events, foreseeing a time when learning would be employed, not as the handmaid of truth, but of universal scepticism, when our men of books would play with the established dates and great landmarks of Universal Chronology in the wild and reckless wantonness and display of scholarship, and knock them about like the players at nine-pins, or as

at battledoor and shuttlecock, has, in the deeply scientific arrangement of all times, declared by St. Paul in the very citadel of Heathen Philosophy, placed the great leading dates of the dispensations of Providence and redemption on such a foundation as cannot be moved. This evidence will, from its novelty and strangeness and its apparent intricacy, at first, and for a time, perplex even good men who love and desire the truth, and it will prove a snare and a stumbling-block to those who, in the secret chambers of the heart, love their own reputation more than the truth ; but it must prevail in upholding the truth, and we affirm at least that the great facts it discloses must be accounted for.

Now, as Artaxerxes Longimanus of Persia is the last Heathen Sovereign whose name is recorded in the Old Testament as a favourer of the Church, and as Josephus places the close of the Hebrew Canon in his reign, it follows, that both his accession and death are great epochs, and accordingly they are marked with *adamantine characters* in the scientific chronology.

His death, b.c. 424, is, as shown in my Synopsis, from Creation 14 squares of 19 = 5054 years ; from the Deluge, 147 Cycles, or the Jubilee, 49, multiplied by the Cycle of 19 = 931, the trinal of 30 and the trinal of 11 and week of 19 = 133 multiplied by 7 and again by 3 ; for  $931 \times 3 = 19 \times 147 = 2793$  years. It is also from God's appearance to Moses at the Bush 8<sup>3</sup> = 64 Cycles of 19, being also the 7th term of a period of Geometrical Progression, 19 the first term and 2 the ratio = 1216. From this date, b.c. 424, to the Passion, 33, are 24 Cycles of 19 = 456 years.

The year b.c. 464, that of the Accession of Artaxerxes in the Canon, and the foundation on which our calculation

of his 7th year rests, is marked by the following great Series of time:—

I. Measured by the Jubilee.

From the death of Enos, b.c. 4139, it is the Jubilee, 49, multiplied by  $5^2 \times 3 = 75 = 3675$  years.

From God's appearance to Moses, 24 Jubilees = 1176 years. And the reader will not forget that, from the same date to the *death* of Artaxerxes, are 64 Cycles of 19 = 1216 years.

Thence to the beginning of the preaching of John the Baptist, in the two last months of the Jewish year, answering to a.c. 27, 70 weeks or 10 Jubilees = 490 years.

To the year 1791, the last of the Ancient Monarchy of the Bourbons, 46 Jubilees = 2254 years.

To 1840, when all Europe was shaken to its foundations, 47 Jubilees = 2303 years.

II. Measured by the Metonic Cycle.

From the 1st of Nisan after the birth of Enos, b.c. 5043 (which is before the Nativity  $1260 \times 4 = 35$ , the length of our Lord's life in the flesh,  $\times 144 = 5040$  years), to the year b.c. 464, are  $19 \times 241$ , the trinal of 15 = 4579 years.

From the Marriage of Abraham with Hagar, 12 weeks of 19 =  $133 \times 12 = 1596$  years.

From Jacob's departure for Padan-Aram and Vision of the Ladder, b.c. 1908, 76 Cycles, or 4 squares of 19 = 1444 years.

From Cyrus in Persia Proper, b.c. 559, 5 Cycles = 95 years.

From the siege of Babylon by Cyrus, b.c. 540, 4 Cycles = 76 years.

From the 1st of Darius Hystaspes, B.C. 521, 3 Cycles = 57 years.

From B.C. 464 to the Commission of Nehemiah, B.C. 445, 1 Cycle = 19 years.

Thence to the overthrow of Darius by Alexander the Great at Arbela, B.C. 331, 1 week of 19 = 133 years.

To the end of the Greek Kingdom of Syria and rise of the Roman Power, B.C. 65, 3 weeks of 19 = 399 years.

To the siege of Jerusalem by Titus, A.C. 69, 4 weeks of 19 = 532 years.

To the begun evacuation of France by the Allied Armies, and the publication of the Hebrew New Testament for the Jews, 1817, 120 Cycles = 2280 years.

I shall add, that there are two series of the Metonic Cycle measuring the times of the kingdom of Persia. The FIRST is the one now before us. It begins at the reign of Cyrus in Persia, B.C. 559, whence 12 Cycles of 19 = 228 years, terminate at the overthrow of Darius at Arbela, B.C. 331; and the date of Nehemiah's Commission, B.C. 445, *bisects the whole*, thus dovetailing the times of the Church with those of the Second Kingdom of Daniel, and especially our present date, 464.

The SECOND begins at the era of Nabonassar, B.C. 747, whence 11 Cycles = 209 years, end at the taking of Babylon and date of the Vision of Daniel, B.C. 538; whence other 209 end at the death of Bessus, B.C. 329, the taking of Babylon thus *bisecting the whole period*, and the times of the Church are, as in the former series, dovetailed into those of the First and Second Kingdoms of Daniel.

III. From Creation, b.c. 5478, to b.c. 464 are two trinal fractions :—

1st. That of  $47 = 2257$ , ends 4 years before the Deluge, when we may conclude the Ark was finishing, b.c. 3221.

2d. That of  $52 = 2757$ , in b.c. 464.

IV. From the death of Jacob, b.c. 1838, to 464, is a perfect Cycle in Astronomy, the Moon slow about 21m. 28s. = 1374 years.

From b.c. 464 to 1818, the Evacuation of France, are 2281 years, a Cycle, the Moon fast 12h. 49m.

V. From the Call of Abraham, b.c. 2070, to 464, is 73, the trinal of 8, multiplied by  $11 \times 2 = 1606$  years.

From b.c. 464 to 1873, which is from Creation 150 Jubilees, are 32 multiples of  $73 = 2336$  years.

VI. From the year after the death of Joshua, the first of the Elders, b.c. 1582, to 464, is 43 the trinal of  $6 \times 26 = 1118$  years.

From b.c. 464 the same trinal  $43 \times 53 = 2279$  years, end at the general Pacification of Europe, 1816.

VII. From the birth of Isaac, b.c. 2045, to 464, is the trinal of  $5 = 31 \times (17 \times 3 =) 51 = 1581$  years ; and

From b.c. 464,  $31 \times (5^3 \times 3 =) 75 = 2325$  years, end in 1862, which is a great Chronological Era, being from the Exodus 3500 years, or 20 multiples of the life of Abraham.

What impression may be made on the mind of Dr. Hengstenberg by these remarks and this evidence, should he ever see these pages, I know not. The impartial inquirer will, I am persuaded, discern in them, not only a demonstration of the exact truth of the Chronology of the reign of Artaxerxes in the Canon, which is thus confirmed by evidence exceeding, in the marvellous and

variegated harmony of the relations which it discovers to us between this date and the most distant ages and dispensations, even that derived from the Astronomical facts of Eclipses; but also of the depth of that Divine Science which is manifested in the times of the Moral Universe, the workmanship of Him by whom, the Apostle tells us, *δι οὐ καὶ τοὺς αἰώνας εποιῆσεν*, God formed or constituted the Ages.

To return now from this long digression, and having thus unansweredly, as I hope, and triumphantly vindicated the received Chronology of the accession of Artaxerxes in B.C. 464, whereby his 7th year is pinned down to B.C. 458, I proceed to observe, that I have calculated the New Moon of Nisan that year, FIRST, by the three Astronomical Cycles of 2300, 2281, and 2262 years, carried back from the time of Mean New Moon, in March 1843, 1824, and 1805, and the results of these calculations are, as will be seen in the note at the foot, that the New Moon of March, B.C. 458, was upon Thursday, the 30d. 14h. 57m. astronomical time, being the 31st civil time, at 2h. 57m. in the morning, n.s., or April 6th, o.s.\*

\* I shall here give the elements of these three Cycles.

	DAYs.	H.	M.	S.	TH.
That of 2300 years has days.....	840057	2	40		
28447 Lunations have ....	840056	15	55	2	11
The difference shows the amount the Moon is fast, or completes her Lunations in less time than the Sun		10	44	57	49
That of 2281 years .....	833117	12	12	48	
28212 Lunations.....	833116	23	23	44	36
Moon fast.....		12	49	3	24
That of 2262 years .....	826177	21	45	36	0
27977 Lunations.....	826177	6	52	27	
Moon fast.....		14	53	9	

Rules for applying the Cycles:—

1. In order to ascertain the point from which the Tropical Years of the Cycle

I have, in the second place, made three calculations of the same New Moon, from the tables for Eclipses. One

begin to run. If the fractional time over and above the last complete day of the Tropical Years be *less* than 12 hours, *subtract* the amount from the time of the given New Moon.

2. If the fractional time is *more* than 12 hours, then *add* the amount it is less than a complete day to the time of the given New Moon.

The result will, in either case, show the exact hour of the Sun at the commencement of the Tropical Years of the Cycle, computed back from the hour of the given New Moon.

3. If in the Cycle the Moon be *fast*, or complete her Lunation in *less* time than the Sun, then *add* the amount she is fast to the hour obtained for the beginning of the Tropical Years.

4. If the Moon be *slow*, then *subtract* the amount from the hour of the Sun at the beginning of the years.

The result will, in either case, show the time when the Lunations begin, or time of the Mean New Moon required.

I shall now apply these rules to the three Cycles:—

I. The Cycle of 2300 years, computed back from March, 1843.

	D.	H.	M.	S.
It was Mean New Moon in March, 1843, upon Thursday	30	6	52	5
Subtract the hours of the Sun over and above his last day in				
2300 years . . . . .	2	40		

The remainder is the exact time of the Sun at the beginning of the 2300 years, being Wednesday, March, B.C. 458, N.S. 30 4 12 5  
Add the amount the Moon is fast at the end of the Lunations 10 44 57

Mean New Moon on Thursday, March, B.C. 458, N.S. 30 14 57 2

II. The Cycle of 2281 years, computed back from March, 1824.	
Mean New Moon in March, 1824, deducting 1 day for leap-year, was on Tuesday	29 14 20 52
Add the amount the Sun is short of a complete day at the end of 2281 years . . . . .	11 47 12

The beginning of the 2281 years in March, B.C. 458 . . . . . 30 2 8 4  
Add the Moon fast . . . . . 12 49 3

New Moon in March, B.C. 458, N.S., Thursday . . . . . 30 14 57 7

III. The Cycle of 2262 years, computed back from the New Moon of March, 1805, being Saturday	29 21 49 37
Proceed as before, and the commencement of the Tropical Years was in March, B.C. 458 . . . . .	30 0 4 1
The time of Mean New Moon on Thursday, March . . . . .	30 14 57 10

The differences between these three calculations are, as will be seen, at the utmost only a few seconds.

of them is placed at the foot,\* after being examined by my assistant, and some slight errors in the equations rectified. It gives the New Moon upon April 5, o.s., or March 30th, n.s., at 14h. 48m. at Greenwich, differing only 9 minutes from the former cyclical calculations. At Babylon, it was on April 5th, 17h. 13m., or 5h. 13m. in the morning of April 6.†

\* ELEMENTS OF THE TRUE NEW MOON, AT BABYLON, IN APRIL, B.C. 458,  
O.S., OR MARCH, N.S.

(From the Tables in the 4th Edition of the "Encyclopædia Britannica.")

	Mean New Moon.	Moon's Mean Anomaly.	Sun's Mean Anomaly.				
January, 1843 .....							
2 Lunations .... Feb	D. H. M. S. 30 5 23 59 28 1 28 6	s. o. / / 4 10 55 5 1 21 38 2	s. o. / / 0 29 3 41 1 28 12 39				
March — 2300 years .....	30 6 52 5 6 8 13 24	6 2 33 7 11 16 30 42	2 27 16 20 1 10 2 9				
Mean N. M. B.C. 458, April, o.s. ....	5 15 5 29 — 2 55 11	5 19 3 49 + 5 13 56	4 7 18 29 — 14		i.	+	H. M. S. 1 3 20
Secular Equations ..					ii.	H. M. S. 3 18 3	
Equations .....	5 12 10 18 + 2 38 11	5 24 17 45	4 7 4 29		Secu. Varia.	11	
Add for Babylon time	5 14 48 29 2 25				iii.	6 4	
True New Moon, B.C. 458, April, o.s. ....	5 17 13 29				iv.	6 24	
Or April 6, civil time at 5h. 13m., A.M.; (being n.s., March 31, civil time at the same hour.)							3 41 31 1 3 20
						+	2 38 11

† So transcendent is the importance of this New Moon, of March, B.C. 458, that I have seen it right, over and above the six calculations mentioned above in the text, to subject it to yet another and seventh astronomical test. The Jubilee, being 49 years, is an imperfect Cycle, the Moon at the end of it 1D. 7h. 58m. 4s. 42th. fast, or before the Sun. This multiplied by 10, gives 490 years, the Moon fast 13d. 7h. 40m. 47s. Again, 1803 years is a Cycle, the Moon slow 9h. 45m. 14s. 40th., which, being subtracted from the epoch at the end of 490 years, shows that, at the end of  $490 + 1803 = 2293$  years, she is fast 12d. 21h. 55m. 32s. The Lunations of the whole period are 28,360, containing weeks of days 119,641 0d. 9h. 2m. If, then, the cyclical time of the Mean New Moon of March, B.C. 458, viz., that it was upon Thursday, the 30th, 14h. 57m. at Greenwich, be correct; subtracting from that hour the time she is before the Sun at the end of 2293 years, the result should be, within a few hours, the time of the true New Moon in March, 1836; and it ought to be upon Thursday.

Now, as the phasis of the New Moon could not be till the following evening of Friday, the 7th April, o.s., it is apparent that the 1st of Nisan fell upon the Sabbath, and that *on that very day* Ezra began his journey.\* When our Lord told his disciples to pray that their flight from Jerusalem might not be on the Sabbath, he sanctions its lawfulness, though its difficulty would be great. But the holy and glorious end of the journey of Ezra, assuredly sanctified its being begun on that day, which, as the 1st of Nisan, was the anniversary of the rearing of the Tabernacle by Moses 1180 years before. Moreover, the call to flee from Babylon had been given long before, by the Prophets Jeremiah and Zechariah. It may also be conjectured, that, after receiving the Royal decree, the invariable practice in such cases required his *immediate* departure for his Government. Perhaps, Ezra did no more on that day than go through the Gates of Babylon, and pitch his tents at the distance of a Sabbath-day's journey; so that the first day of the week was the first of his real journeying, and it was precisely 490 years (tropical) before our Lord, on the 3d April, n.s., arose triumphant from the dead.

	D.	H.	M.
Accordingly, from the time of Mean New Moon in March, B.C. 458	30	14	57
Subtract 12D. 21H. 55M. + 1 day for leap-year	. . .	. . .	13 21 55

It gives the New Moon upon *Thursday*, March, 1836 . . . . 16 17 2  
Or the 17th, 5H. 2M. Morning.

Now, by "White's Ephemeris," it was true New Moon upon *Thursday*, March 17, 1836, at 9H. 2M., being exactly 4 hours later than the calculation; and as the Lunations are in *Mean time*, this accounts for the difference; for on computing the same *Mean New Moon* from Fergusson's Tables, I find it was 16D. 17H. 4M., only 2 minutes later than my calculation.

The demonstration of the time of the New Moon of March, B.C. 458, is, by these various calculations, quite **COMPLETE**.

\* Ezra vii. 9.

The Seventy Weeks of Daniel began to run from the GOING FORTH OF THE COMMANDMENT, *מן-מציא דבר*, *to restore and build Jerusalem.*\* This took place at the moment when, the Royal decree was by the messengers of the King, placed in the hands of Ezra. Now, according to the usages of Oriental nations, the *last thing* which the governor of a province receives, before his departure for his seat of Government, is the Decree, or Commission, under the Seal Royal, containing his appointment. In like manner, with us, the Dispatches of a governor are the last thing which he receives. In harmony with this practice of all nations, we may therefore infer, that the Decree of Artaxerxes, which is recorded in Ezra vii. 12, received the Seal Royal on the afternoon before his departure, and, according to the hours of public business and Durbars, still usual in the East, we may, with very great probability, suppose that Ezra, having attended the Royal Durbar, received the Decree after it broke up, about *three, or four, or five o'clock*, upon Friday, the 7th April, o. s., or 1st April, n. s., b. c. 458. That, at least, it was issued on *that day* is *certain*, as it rests on the astronomical fact, that the New Moon of Nisan was on the day before, and the 1st of Nisan the day following—that is, Saturday, the 2d April, n. s.

Having thus pinned down the issuing of the Decree to Friday, the 1st April, n. s., and *probably* about 3, or 4, or 5 o'clock, let us now endeavour to bring out the precise terminating point of 490 tropical years, counted from 4 o'clock that day.

Four hundred and ninety tropical years contain 178,968 days, 16 hours, and 32 minutes, which, divided by 7, give

\* Daniel ix. 25.

weeks, 25,566, 6 days, 16 hours, 32 minutes; that is, 25,567 weeks complete, minus 7 hours, 28 minutes. Now, computing this period from 4 o'clock in the afternoon of Friday, the 1st April, N.S., B.C. 458, it comes out upon Friday, the 1st April, N.S.,\* or 3d, o.s., of the year 33, at

\* One great difficulty in these calculations consists in adjusting the difference of Old and New Styles, or Julian and Gregorian time, and in harmonizing the last with Tropical time. The difference between the Julian and Tropical years being 365 d. 6 h. minus 365 d. 5 h. 48 m. 49 s., is equal to 671 seconds; and in nearly 128 $\frac{7}{64}$  years, it amounts to a complete day. Consequently, if once in 128 $\frac{8}{9}$ , or practically 129 years, a leap-year be omitted, the two styles are kept very nearly in harmony. Now the Gregorian is the nearest approximation to this which has yet been effected.

In order, however, that Gregorian should exactly harmonize with Tropical time in any year, the Sun should enter Aries in it, at the same moment as in the era of the Creation, B.C. 5478.

Now, in my Tract, "The Angel with the Measuring Line to Measure Jerusalem," there is the calculation of a great Solar Cycle of 7325 years, comprehending, according to the Newtonian Tables, 3,675,400 d. 0 h. 58 m. 45 s., or 382,200 weeks, which comes out from Monday, March 20, the second day of Creation, upon Monday, March 20, 1848, when the Sun, on entering Aries, was on the Meridian of 12° 27' 6" of East Longitude, which is within 1' 54" of the Meridian of Rome, and, therefore, within the limits of the Ancient City. Now from this perfect Cycle, I deduce the inference that on the second day of Creation he was also on entering Aries nearly on the same Meridian.

In confirmation of this result, that in March, 1803, which is the perfect Cycle of 1040 years  $\times 7 = 7280$  years from Creation, comprehending 379,852 weeks, 3 hours, and 16 minutes, the Sun was, according to White's "Ephemeris," at noon Greenwich time of Monday, March 21st, in Pisces 29° 56' 41", that is, within 3' 19", or less than one hour and 20m. of time of entering Aries.

At the Council of Nice, A.C. 325 also, he was in Aries on the 21st of March, having entered it the evening before. The 21st was therefore adopted as the standard of Easter.

The difference between the two styles will be found to amount to 11 days about the year 1741, and in 1869 to 12 days. The Gregorian adjustment which introduced 11 days in the year 1700, and a 12th day in 1800, though it somewhat anticipated these dates, yet is practically very near the truth. Nevertheless, in calculating back the great Cycles of Astronomy from the Gregorian dates of New Moons towards the close of the eighteenth century, and checking them by parallel calculations from the Lunar times of the nineteenth century, I have found an equation of 1 day added to the former to be usually necessary, to harmonize both with Tropical dates in the earlier ages. But the point is too intricate to be treated in this Note.

I shall add, that as the Cycles are calculated in Mean Tropical time, whereas the Old Style is founded on the Julian year, when Cycles are computed from dates according to Old Style, they will not lead to correct results without a second calculation of the differences between the Julian and tropical years. I refer the reader for an illustration of this to the Preface of my "Synopsis." \*

\* Pp. xxxii., xxxiii.

32 minutes past 8 in the morning, *the very hour when our Lord was affixed to the cross.*\* If, moreover, we carry the computation to the end of the weeks of days, or 7 hours, 28 minutes further, it terminates at 4 o'clock in the afternoon, *the very hour when the dead body of our Lord was probably committed to the tomb of Joseph of Arimathea.*

Thus we find that the period of 70 weeks of years, revealed to Daniel, contains in it also, by adding only 7 hours and 28 minutes, an exact period of weeks of days; and that, from the hour when the Decree of Artaxerxes was placed in the hands of Ezra, 490 tropical years terminate at the very hour when our Lord was nailed to the cross, and the 25,567 weeks of days, when he was committed to the tomb.—When the former sheets were sent to the press, I must confess that I had no expectation of reaching conclusions, which are so calculated to fill us with wonder and admiration at the minute fulfilment of the prophetic vision; and I must acknowledge that it is to the Reviewer's opposition that I, incidentally, am indebted for them, since it is this which has rendered it necessary for me to sift the subject to the very foundation.

I cannot but hope, that he will himself have the candour to acknowledge, that the whole of what has been offered

As the difference between the Astronomical and Civil times of the Moon, which arises from the Astronomical day being counted from noon, and the Civil 12 hours later, or from midnight, is another great source of perplexity to common readers, I now add a table calculated in *Civil time*, of the dates connected with Ezra's commission:—

New Moon of Nisan, before Christ 458	Thursday	March 31 <sup>d.</sup> 2 <sup>h.</sup> 57 <sup>m.</sup>	April 6 <sup>d.</sup> 2 <sup>h.</sup> 57 <sup>m.</sup>
EZRA receives the Decree of Artaxerxes.		Morning, New Style.	Morning, Old Style.
The first appearance or Phasis of the Moon.	Friday	April 1 <sup>st</sup> , New Style.	April 7 <sup>th</sup> , Old Style.
Beginning of 490 years			
First of Nisan. Ezra leaves Babylon . . .	Saturday (Sabbath)	April 2 <sup>d</sup> , New Style.	April 8 <sup>th</sup> , Old Style.

\* See M'Knight's "Harmony of the Gospels," vol. ii, sec. 14.

amounts to an absolute demonstration, not only of our Lord's Passion on the 1st of April, n. s., or 3d, o.s., of the year a.c. 33, but also of the exact and minute fulfilment of Daniel's 70 weeks of years, and the 25,567 weeks of days, which are now shown to be included in that prophetic period. By this acknowledgment he will not only bear witness to the truth, but will achieve the greatest and noblest of all victories—victory over himself. In whatever way this may be decided—and the decision is with himself—he has, however little he may have contemplated it, conferred the most extensive benefits on me, and I thank him for them.

I have yet one or two remarks to make with respect to the Series of Metonic Cycles, which is reckoned from the modern Jewish era of Creation, b. c. 3760, as stated in a former page.\* Although I have there said, that the results given from the Greek Chronology utterly fail in that of the present Hebrew text, yet I must so far correct and modify that expression, as to apprise the reader that the Rabbis have, with profound skill, contrived to introduce also some very important patriarchal eras into this Series of Metonic Cycles. The following dates in the Hebrew Chronology belong to it.

Events.	Hebrew Dates.	Explanatory Remarks.
The death of Seth . . . .	b. c. 2962	This date is 45 Cycles of 19 from the true date of the birth of Noah.
The death of Jared . . . .	2582	65 Cycles from Noah.
The birth of Terah . . . .	2126	89 Cycles from Noah.
The death of Serug . . . .	1955	98 Cycles, or 38 Jubilees from Noah.

The mode in which they have done this is stated in my

\* Pp. 40, 41.

“Septuagint and Hebrew Chronologies, tried by the Test of their Internal Scientific Evidence,”\* to which I must refer, as it would too much enlarge the limits of these pages to enter into it. I shall, however, state, that each of these Hebrew dates really belongs to the Greek Chronology, as laid down in my tables, and has been stolen from that Chronology by the scribes.

Their date of the death of Seth, as given above, belongs to the series of 112 Jubilees from b.c. 5461, (when I place the Fall,) to our Lord’s Baptism, a.c. 28. It is before the Exodus, b.c. 1639, 27 Jubilees; before the birth of David, it is the Jubilee multiplied by the Cycle of  $19 = 931$  (which is also the trinal fraction of 30) multiplied by  $2 = 1862$  years. It is also before the release of Jehoiachin from prison, a great Chronological era, precisely the square of the Jubilee = 2401 years.

Their date of the death of Jared forms a link in the chain of Jubilean Chronology in the Greek, consisting of 15 weeks of the Jubilee from the birth of Japheth, b.c. 3317 to the year 1829, when, by the passing of the Act called that of Catholic Emancipation, England fell from her high standing as a Protestant kingdom.†

These various tricks of Chronological legerdemain of the Rabbis, although, at first view, they occasion perplexity, do really, when the sifting process of a sound and searching analysis is applied to them, recoil on their own heads, and furnish new and irrefragable evidence of the truth of the Chronology held by the ancient Churches of Christ, viz., that of the Greek text. They also con-

\* Pp. 48, 52, 53, of that work.

† See my “Septuagint and Hebrew Chronologies,” postscript to preface, p. xi.

vince us, that the Hebrew scheme has been concocted, with a subtilty and consummate skill worthy of the great enemy of man himself.

To give one more example of this, the Scribes place the birth of Methuselah at the exact date in the Greek of the birth of Japheth, and the death of Jared 15 Jubilees below it. But the fraud is detected by their series failing to bring out two other important dates which are found in the Greek series, viz., the administration of Deborah and Barak, b. c. 1406, and the taking of Jerusalem by David, b. c. 1063; and also by its failing to bring out, in cyclical time, the great dates of the birth of Enoch, 1040 years before it in the Greek, b. c. 4357, and the birth of Aaron 1260 + 334 after it, being b. c. 1723.

It is to be feared, therefore, that, in rejecting the whole testimony of the Apostolic Churches, and of the copy of the Old Testament which we received from them, and in adopting, instead of it, the Chronology of the present Hebrew text, which we did not receive from the Churches of God, but from the bitter enemies of the Lord, the Jews of the third century, the Churches of the Reformation have greatly sinned against God.

Their only witnesses for the integrity of the actual Hebrew text are parties who have themselves, by the testimony of even the advocates of the Hebrew Chronology, been guilty of forgery, by introducing the false number of 480 years into the text of 1 Kings vi. 1,\* and by further, in the Chronology of the Synagogue, striking off 244 years from the times of the world, even of the actual Hebrew text.

\* This number is quite inconsistent with the testimony of St. Paul himself, in the synagogue of Antioch of Pisidia. Acts xiii. 20.

Yet the testimony of witnesses thus perjured, who, according to Irenæus, “if they had foreseen that the Christians would have made use of the testimonies contained in them, would have *burned their own Scriptures*,”\* is actually, by the Churches of the Reformation, preferred to that of the whole Churches of Christ, down to the fourth century. “Eusebius, in the middle of the fourth century, who was well aware of the discrepancies between the Hebrew and Septuagint, in the matter of Chronology, still writes as follows:—‘On all sides, therefore, the version of the Seventy being demonstrated to have been translated from an ancient, as it appears, and a correct copy of the Hebrew, we have with reason made use of it in the present Chronography, and the more especially, since the Church of Christ, spread through the whole world, adheres to it alone, the apostles and disciples of our Saviour having from the beginning delivered that it is to be used.’”†

To the same learned work, from which I have taken the foregoing passage, I owe the knowledge of the fact, that even the Church of Rome has not, upon this point, erred so widely as the Protestant Churches, or, at least, has not so entirely lost sight of the truth. There is a statement, read in all the Churches on the 25th December every year, from the Roman Martyrology, under the authority of two Popes, Gregory XIII. and Urban VIII., that the birth of our Saviour was in the 5199th year from Creation, the 2957th after the Deluge, the 2015th from the birth of Abraham, &c.‡

\* Iren. Oper., lib. iii. cap. xxiv.

† See Professor Wallace’s learned Dissertation on “The True Age of the World,” from which I have taken this passage, page 192.

‡ “The True Age of the World,” by Professor Wallace, pp. 97, 98.

The whole Churches of the East, of Greece and Russia also, are unanimous in favour of the Greek Chronology, and know nothing of that of the Hebrew text; so that the Protestant Churches stand quite alone; and not only so, but they are opposed by the great body of the most learned men of their own communions who have turned their attention to the subject.

There are now, however, many indications of the spread of the light of truth. Two things are probably wanting to give it an *equal chance*, as we, the *unlearned*, say in our vulgar phraseology. The one is, that the heads of the Church shall leave it as an open question, and shall frown upon no young clergyman who embraces the Greek Chronology; and that it shall be *understood* to be so. The other is, that the University Press shall be *equally accessible* to the advocates of the Greek and Hebrew.

Finally, a system of time which actually puts to the rack and tortures, the whole historical testimony of the Book of Genesis, by making Shem, Arphaxad, Salah, and Eber survive the call of Abraham; thus also falsifying the testimony of Joshua, ch. xxiv. 2, which clearly implies that Terah only was alive of the ancestry of Abraham when he left Ur of the Chaldees, a system which, moreover by the testimony of the Targum of Jonathan Ben Uzziel, as to the age of Adam when Seth was born, stands self-convicted of forgery,\* such a system cannot long, in these days of shaking of all old opinions, hold the minds of serious inquirers into truth.

To conclude, should the Reviewer again honour me with his notice, I hope he will bear testimony to one fact which is indisputable, viz., that my own scheme of Chrono-

\* See my "Synopsis," p. 90.

nology is not one of *destruction and innovation*, but of *conservation and restoration*. Its result is to prove the truth of the most ancient Chronological Summary which is now extant, that of Denetrius, as stated by Eusebius.\* It also completely confirms the truth of another testimony, viz., that of Eupolemus, that there were from Adam to a certain point in Chronology, which he affirms to have been the 5th of Demetrius, and 12th or 10th of Ptolemy, b.c. 296, 5150 years current, or 5149 complete,—but it is shown, that there is an error of 33 years in the terminating point of this period, which I have accounted for and corrected.† I have proved that this number, consisting of 271 Cycles of 19 from Creation, 8 squares of 19 from the Deluge, and 1 square of 19 before the Passion, arrives at a great era of Chronology —the end of the Persian Empire.

In the whole of my Chronological works, I have not removed a single established date a single year, and even in bringing down that of the Nativity from December, b.c. 4, Prideaux's and Usher's date, to b.c. 3, I had consumed myself with labour before I dared to make the change of only some months.

Believing that all true Chronology is the record of the times ordained of God for his glory, and that, after the close of the Old Testament Canon, He, in his holy Providence, raised up fit instruments to record the times, (as may be especially shown in that most precious work, the Canon of Ptolemy,) I dare far less remove *a single date*, except on the strongest evidence, than I should dare to remove my neighbour's *land-mark* :—and, being totally

\* *Præpar. Evang.* Lib. ix. 21. See my “Synopsis,” p. 10.

† *Ibid.*, pp. 119—122.

unable to swallow the monstrous proposition, virtually offered to our acceptance in works of the present day, Chronological as well as Prophetical, that wisdom has descended from heaven and become incarnate in their authors, I must still, having tasted the old wine and drank of it, refuse the new unfermented *stuff* which is presented in its stead, and would burst the old vessel of my understanding.

I hope that, if my works are to be controverted, my opponents will look me in the face,\* and that they will be opposed in a way worthy of the cause of truth, and not in the manner of *Chronological special pleading*; such as the selection of a *particular date*, and an endeavour thereby *indirectly* to overthrow a system which comprehends all earthly times, and connects together all ages, by periods of exact science. Such a mode of dealing with this great question were more like that of those youthful Dialecticians who contend for University honours, than of men who have grown up into the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.

I shall now, in a short Conclusion, complete my interpretation of the Seventy Weeks of Daniel, by showing the arrangement of the subdivisions of that period. My view is nearly the same as that of Dr. Prideaux, in his Connection.

The first *Seven Weeks*, or one Jubilee, ended at the final act of Nehemiah's administration, when he purified the people from strange marriages, by the expulsion of the Son of Joiada, the High Priest. This, with Prideaux

\* 2 Kings xiv. 8.

and Mr. Faber,\* I place in b. c. 409, being four years after the accession of Joiada to the Priesthood.

The *Sixty-two Weeks* end at the beginning of the last week of our Lord's life, wherein he was publicly manifested in his Prophetic office, and suffered upon the cross. They may be subdivided into three periods. The first is 8 Jubilees, which end when Herod began to rebuild the Temple, after two years' preparation, (whence to our Lord's first Passover are 46 years, John ii. 20,) and it includes . . . . . 56 weeks to b. c. 17  
 To the Birth of our Lord . . . . . 2 weeks, ending 3  
 To his last week . . . . . 4 weeks, a. c. 26  
 The sum is Daniel's . . . . . 62 weeks.

Thence to the Imprisonment of  
 John, and the beginning of our  
 Lord's Ministry . . . . .  $\frac{1}{2}$  week  
 To the Passion . . . . .  $\frac{1}{2}$  week a. c. 33

The only difficulty which remains is to explain how the *cutting off* of Messiah can be shown to have taken place from the *beginning* of the last week, seeing that the crucifixion was undeniably at the *end* of it. Now, I must here confess my very great obligations to Mr. Gresswell, for his solution of this difficulty. I should be happy, did my limits permit it, to transfer to my own pages a passage from his work on this clause,† but must content myself with a reference to the place, and with stating that his solution is substantially this:—

He views the expression *כָּרֶת מִשְׁיחָה*, as really including in it *our Lord's rejection and excommunication by his own*

\* "Dissertation on the Seventy Weeks," p. 329.

† See his "Harmony of the Gospels," vol. iv. p. 374.

people, during the whole of his ministry, and ending with his *crucifixion*; and it may be considered to have begun with the rejection of the testimony of his forerunner, John —thus including the whole week.

The next clause, *וְאַיִן לְוָיָה*, which, in our version, is rendered “*but not for himself*,” Mr. Gresswell renders “*and none shall be with, or for, him* ;” and he thinks it was specially fulfilled in the abandonment of our Lord at his last hour, even by his own disciples.

I shall also give my reasons for being unable to acquiesce in Mr. Faber’s view of this clause. He gives to the verb, *יכרת*, an active sense, and explains it as fulfilled by our Lord’s *cutting off the Jewish Church and people by divorce*. Now, this gloss is not confirmed, so far as I know, by any version, ancient or modern. All the versions in the Polyglott negative it, taking *יכרת* in a passive sense. Castalio also renders it “*perimetur*.” I do not myself possess Poole’s “*Synopsis*;” but my assistant tells me, that he has referred to it, and that Arius Montanus, Piscator, Munster, Pagninus, Junius, and Tremellius, Grasserus and Ludovicus Capellus, all maintain the passive sense; and the two last appear to have anticipated Mr. Gresswell’s view, by considering the rejection of our Lord in his ministry as the begun fulfilment of his cutting off.

But further, Mr. Faber’s view appears totally to exclude any *express mention of our Lord’s Passion* from the prophecy. Nor does it remove a single difficulty; for it is as hard to explain how our Lord divorced the Jewish Church at the beginning of his ministry, as to make out, how he himself was then beginning to be cut off.

I must yet add a word upon another point. Seeing that

I use such strong language in reference to the fraudulent corruption of the existing Hebrew text by the Rabbis, *in the matter of the Chronology*, it may be asked, whether I extend this charge to the *whole Hebrew Bible*? I shall here again refer to a learned work, cited above, wherein there will be found a brief summary of the corruptions and omissions in the Hebrew text with which the Scribes stand charged.\* They are few in number, but some of them (as the words in Ps. xxii. 17, where, instead of “they pierced my hands and my feet,” as in the Septuagint, the actual Hebrew text reads, “*as a lion my hands and my feet*,” which is absolute nonsense) are of vital importance. With these exceptions, and some other corruptions of *numbers*, I view the Hebrew text as the original, and therefore the authentic record of God’s revelation to man before our Lord’s appearance, greatly to be preferred to the Septuagint.

I also wish those readers unacquainted with my former writings, to be aware of the *motive* to which is to be ascribed the corruption of the Chronology. It was, to prove that JESUS OF NAZARETH had appeared nearly 15 centuries before the time fixed by ancient and universal tradition for Messiah’s coming, and was, therefore, **AN IMPOSTOR.**

Finally, the vision of the 70 Weeks was given to Daniel in the year **b. c. 538**, the era of the taking of Babylon, and first of Darius the Mede ; whence to **a. c. 33** are 30 Cycles of 19, or 570 years. We have, therefore, one perfect series of 30 Metonic Cycles from the *giving of the Prophecy*, and a second perfect series of 70 weeks of years, or 10

\* Professor Wallace’s “True Age of the World,” pp. 179—186.

Jubilees or squares of 7, from the *begun accomplishment of the Prophecy*, which meet and concentrate in the year A. C. 33, and mark it WITH ADAMANTINE PEN as the date of the CONSUMMATION OF THE PROPHECY, and the PASSION OF THE LORD OF GLORY.

*1st Edition, December 7, 1846.*

*Chislev 18th.*

*2d Edition, March 17, 1849.*

*Adar 21.*

## PART II.

### THE NATIVITY, ETC.

---

#### SECTION I.

In the Record of Redemption, the NATIVITY and PASSION are the events the first in order.—They form the basis of the present Argument.—Their dates.—Five other great events enumerated with the dates of the whole.—Evidence of the date of the Nativity.—It was in Summer.—Reasons for this.—The INCARNATION probably on the Great Day of Atonement.—Probable Date of the Nativity thence deduced.—Shown to be the tropical date of Ezekiel's first Vision.—Waving the fact of the actual establishment of these dates, they are thrown into the form of two Chronological Theorems.—Three other Old Testament dates brought into the Second Proposition.—Various measures of Scientific Time in the Chronology.—The number SEVEN and its multiples.—The CYCLES OF ASTRONOMY.—The number TWELVE, and multiples.—Numbers of GEOMETRICAL PROGRESSION.—SQUARES—CUBES—PRIMES—The TRINAL FRACTION.—Illustrations of it by Professor Wallace.

IN the great Work of Redemption effected by the ETERNAL WORD, the SECOND PERSON OF THE GODHEAD, during his tabernacling in the flesh, his NATIVITY and PASSION must be placed first in order,—the former being the beginning of his Manifestation and subjection to the Law, and the latter its termination and the finishing of his spotless obedience and atoning sacrifice for fallen man. These two great events form, therefore, the groundwork of

our present argument, and are distinguished in these pages by the letters A and B, the date of A being B.C. 3, and of B, A.C. 33.

There are, however, five other events in the Record of the great Work effected for man, of which the first is necessarily prior in time to the Nativity, but is placed *third* in the *order of our inquiries*, because its date can only be established by computing back from the Nativity, and it is the DESCENT FROM HEAVEN OF THE ETERNAL WORD, and his INCARNATION in the WOMB OF THE VIRGIN. It is distinguished by the letter C, and its date is B.C. 4.

The remaining four events are, fourth, D, the APPEARANCE OF THE CHILD JESUS IN THE TEMPLE, and among the Doctors of the Law, at the age of TWELVE, and in the year 10. The fifth, E, his FOURTEENTH YEAR, A.C. 11, when he appeared as subject to all the ordinances, and no longer as the child of Joseph and Mary, but in his own person. The sixth, F, was his BAPTISM, A.C. 28, when he entered on his PROPHETIC OFFICE. The seventh, G, was his TRANSFIGURATION, when he was seen in the type of his Second Advent in glory, which, following the Harmony of Dr. M'Knight, I place in A.C. 31.

I shall now recapitulate the whole of these events and dates.

	Dates.
A. The Nativity . . . . .	B.C. 3
B. The Passion . . . . .	A.C. 33
C. The Incarnation of the Eternal Word .	B.C. 4
D. The child Jesus appears in the Temple among the Doctors . . . . .	A.C. 10
E. The 14th year of our Lord, when he ap- peared in his own person . . . . .	A.C. 11
F. His Baptism . . . . .	A.C. 28
G. His Transfiguration . . . . .	A.C. 31

I assume the year b. c. 3 as having been unanswerably demonstrated in my former works as that of the Nativity, and it will now only be necessary for me briefly to review its Scriptural evidence.

St. Luke informs us that the preaching of John the Baptist began in the 15th of the reign of Tiberius, which being reckoned from the death of Augustus, on the 18th August, a. c. 14, was current strictly from the same date of the year 28. Or, if the principle of the Canon of Ptolemy were adopted, it would count from the 1st of Thoth, August 20. Or, if the Jewish principle of reckoning from the 1st of Nisan was that of the Evangelist Luke, the 15th of Tiberius would be reckoned from that date, which fell in that year on March 16. Or, it is possible or probable that the principle of the Canon might be applied to the Roman Calendar, the effect of which would be to reckon the 1st of Tiberius from the 1st of January, 14; and that this is the principle of computation of some of the ancient Chronographers may be proved by the testimony of Eusebius. In his Chronicon the 1st of Tiberius is placed in the year of Abraham, 2030, and the destruction of Jerusalem in y. ab. 2086, the interval being 56 years; and the last date being confessedly and without dispute a. c. 70, the 1st of Tiberius in the Eusebian Chronology comes out in 14, which year is all reckoned to this Emperor. His 15th year and the Baptism of our Lord are, therefore, pinned down to a. c. 28, and we place our Lord's Baptism, without hesitation, at the Feast of Pentecost, when the Law was given from Sinai, and the Holy Ghost came down on his Apostles.

We are further informed by St. Luke, that our Lord was then about *thirty years* of age, by which expression

we understand that he was within a month or two either before or past thirty, and on either supposition his Nativity comes out in B.C. 3.

This date, thus directly deduced from St. Luke's testimony, is confirmed by the fact of a total Lunar Eclipse on the 9th January, B.C. 1, fixing the death of Herod near the Passover of that year; also by the date of the banishment of Archelaus, as mentioned in a former page,\* A.C. 8, to which the Chronology of the three last books of the Antiquities bears decided and unequivocal testimony. It is also that of several of the Fathers, Clemens and Cassiodorus, according to Mr. Clinton, and perhaps of Irenæus and Tertullian.†

Placing our Lord's Nativity in the summer, the Vulgar date being totally incredible, as it supposes the Registration recorded by St. Luke to have been in the dead of winter, a season alike inconvenient for the Roman Magistrates, and impracticable for the subjects of the Empire to travel each to his native city, and quite as unsuitable for the journey of the Magi: and supposing the Incarnation to have been at the Great Day of Atonement (which, in B.C. 4, fell on September 28-29), on which day the High Priest stripped himself of his glorious apparel, a type of the humiliation of the Eternal Word in taking flesh, and harmonizing with St. Luke's words, that the Angel Gabriel was sent to the Virgin in the sixth month,‡ Ewul, the Nativity will be brought out on July 5th,

\* Pp. 85—87. † Browne, *Ordo Sæcl.*, pp. 37—39.

‡ Luke i. 26. If the Annunciation was in Ewul, we may probably fix the appearance of Gabriel to Zacharias six or seven months before, which will bring it into the last two months of the Jewish Sacred Year, B.C. 5.

b. c. 3.\* Now I find that the *tropical date* of the 5th of the 4th month, Thamuz, in the year b. c. 594, when the Prophet Ezekiel saw the vision of the **Lord** coming between the **CHERUBIM**,† *fell exactly on the 5th of July*. And although the circumstances of that vision were the *very reverse of humiliation*, yet let it be considered that, in *reality*, our Lord's *humiliation in the flesh* was the *brightest manifestation of the glory of God* yet made in this lower world. That these two events should be placed on the same date of the Tropical year would, therefore, be a new demonstration of the deep analogies which exist in the Divine order of the Times of the Universe.

I shall add further that as Pentecost, in the year 28, fell about the 17th May, if, as already supposed, our Lord was then baptized, it was when he was within six weeks of the age of 30 complete.

The year b. c. 3 being thus proved to be the date of the Nativity, his appearance at Jerusalem at the age of 12 is pinned down to the year 10, and his 14th year to the summer of the year 11, at the feast of Tabernacles of which he first appeared in his own person, and no longer as the child of Joseph and Mary.

The year 33, as that of the Passion, has, I presume, been sufficiently vindicated in the first part of this volume.

The date of the Transfiguration is, then, the only one that remains undefined, and it depends upon the establishment of the true harmony of the Gospel narrative, which I accept from Dr. McKnight, who places this great event in the interval between our Lord's third Passover in 31, and the fourth. I accordingly place it in 31.

\* For from September 28, b. c. 4, to July 5, b. c. 3, are 280 days.

† Ezek. i.

Having thus stated the grounds upon which I proceed in laying down these seven great eras, I next observe that, in this discussion, I shall waive\* the fact of their having been established, and shall reduce the great question to be treated into the form of two Abstract Chronological Theorems. There are also three Old Testament dates to which we can only arrive at near approximations from the Sacred Narrative, but which, on data furnished by the Chronological order, I have laid down in my Tables, and I shall here bring them into the *Second Theorem*. These dates are, *First*, the **FALL**, which I place when Adam was 17 years old. *Second*, the **FOUNDATION OF BABEL**. And *Third*, the **CONFUSION OF TONGUES** and **DISPERSION**. The first I shall distinguish by the letter *h*, the second by *i*, and the third by *k*. These great events being brought into the same form as the former will stand as follows:—

h . . . . .	B.C.	5461
i . . . . .	„	2400
k . . . . .	„	2398

I now lay down the following propositions:—

I. Let it be supposed that A and B were in the years already specified, then their relations to the great leading Eras of the Divine dispensations in the Church and the World shall be such as to prove them to be the great Foci or Con-central Pivots of Mundane Times.

II. *Let it be supposed that  $C, D, E, F, G$ , and also  $h, i, k$ ,*

- This word is, in modern usage, spelt *waive*, but as I dislike this sort of innovation, as well as the use of words unknown to our best writers; for example, the word *prayerful*, as if the devotion of this generation were of so heavenly a character that no genuine English word could come up to its sublime standard; and *hermeneutical*, as if our plain English *interpretative* would pollute the lips of such profound Grecians;—I shall avoid both modern spelling and modern affectation of piety and Greek.

*were at the dates specified, then their scientific relations to the former, A and B, and to the great eras of the world, shall be such as to demonstrate that they belong to a scheme of time arranged by the Omniscient Mind, and, consequently, are exactly true.*

I shall next state the various measures of Scientific time which are found in the Chronology. They are,—

1. The sacred number 7, its square 49 the Jubilee, its cube 343, its biquadrate 2,401, also with other multiples, as 10 or 12, and especially the Trinal fraction.—**SEVEN**, as it is the **ORIGINAL**, so it is the **BASIS** of all times.

2. The **CYCLES OF ASTRONOMY**. These Cycles are Revolutions founded on the Astronomical Fact that the Sun completes his Tropical Revolution in 365 d. 5 h. 48 m. 48 s., whereas the Moon completes her Lunation in 29 d. 12 h. 44 m. 2 s. 53 th. Therefore, 12 Lunations contain 354 d. 8 h. 48 m. 34 s. 36 th., which being the length of the *Lunar year*, and being subtracted from the amount of the *Tropical year*, the difference, 10 d. 21 h. 0 m. 13 s. 24 th., shows how much the Moon is faster than the Sun, or how much earlier she arrives at the point from which she set out than the Sun, at the end of 1 Tropical year. Now, the Astronomical Cycles are the periods at the end of which the Sun and the Moon come again nearly into conjunction, if they were in conjunction at the commencement of each Cycle, or otherwise nearly into the same relative positions in the heavens. Or, let it be supposed that two clocks vary at the end of a year 4 hours and 2 minutes of an hour, the calculation of how many years must pass before they again agree within a few minutes in time, will be the calculation of the cycles of these clocks; and it will be found that the faster-going clock is about 6 minutes before the slower at the end of three years.

Now our Astronomers tell us that there can be no absolutely perfect Cycle, and, therefore, that the most exact are only relatively perfect. The following table gives the four primary Cycles, which form the bases of the larger ones:—

Years.	No. of Lunations.	Moon slow.					Moon fast.				
		D.	H.	M.	S.	TH.	D.	H.	M.	S.	TH.
3	37						3	2	16	37	19
8	99	1	14	10	21	27					
11	136						1	12	6	15	52
19	235	0	2	4	5	35					

The time which the Sun and Moon vary at the end of the Cycle is called the **ERROR** of the Cycle. Therefore, the error of 19 years, the Metonic Cycle and Golden number is, as above, 2h. 4m. 5s. 35th.

I must refer the reader for a more full account of these Cycles, and the effect of the Lunar acceleration in disturbing the accuracy of calculations from them in remote ages, to my "Synopsis."\* I shall, in the meanwhile, observe that of these Cycles that of Meton 19 years is the one most frequently or constantly found in the Sacred Chronology. It measures the lives of Seth, Methuselah, and Noah, and is the basis of the Ecclesiastical Calendars of the Christian and Jewish Churches.

3. The number 12 with its multiples, especially by 7 and the Trinal fractions; also its Square, 144, and its Cube, 1728.

4. Numbers of **GEOMETRICAL PROGRESSION**.

5. The **SQUARES** and **CUBES** of other numbers: also **PRIMES**.

6. The **TRINAL FRACTION**, or the Root plus the Square, plus the Cube of each Integer, divided by the Root, or

\* 2d Edit. Preface, pp. xxxiii—xxxvi, also pp. 6, 7.

$$\frac{5 + 5^3 + 5^5}{5} = 31$$
. The properties of this form of numbers

and a Table will be placed in the Appendix. I shall in the meanwhile state that it was discovered by me in the Chronology, and not mathematically. But I shall prepare the reader for what will be stated in the Appendix by giving in this place an extract from Professor Wallace's learned "Dissertation on the True Age of the World."

In a Review of the application of Scientific numbers to the Chronology in my works, Professor Wallace, who is a distinguished Mathematician, thus writes:—

"The author was led by circumstances detailed in the Scientific Chronology,\* pp. 5—8, to give the name of *Trinal fraction* to the general term of a series of numbers, of which each is composed of the root, its square, and unity, that is, in Algebraic language,  $n^3 + n^2 + n$ ; an expression in which  $n$  may be zero, unity, or any whole number whatever, and giving by substitution of 0, 1, 2, 3, &c., as roots, the series itself, namely, 1, 3, 7, 13, 21, 31, 43, 57, 73, &c. To the discovery of this series, as *new in mathematics*, of course he makes no claim; because a mere tyro in that science could write out a hundred of such in as many minutes: see 'Dissertation on the Apocalypse,' fourth edition, pp. 522, 523; but to the discovery of its application to the cyclical character of the mundane times he has a decided claim, and we think he has fully substantiated it by a reference to chronological facts.

"As to the formula itself, its most general form is  $\frac{n^3 + n^2 + n}{n}$  as originally discovered by the author; and in

\* Viz., my "Season of the End; or, Scientific Times of the Year 1840."

this form it is manifestly more simple and general than any of the formulæ of the *figurate numbers*; for if  $n$  be taken equal to zero, in any of the latter, the value of the vanishing fraction is always equal to *zero*; but in the former it is equal to *unity*, the first term of the series, and the basis of all numerical calculation. Let us take some other examples of its application. The *sacred* number 3 is the trinal fraction of unity, and although it includes the higher powers of the root, is only the sum of *three* units, mysteriously indicating a trinity in unity. The *sacred* number 7 is the trinal fraction of 2, which is the basis of the binary system of numeration, so natural to man. The number 13 is the trinal fraction of 3, and is a lunisolar cycle of years the hebdomadal measure of the seasons of the year, and the actual number of the tribes of Israel. The number 21 is the trinal fraction of 4, and the product of the sacred numbers 3 and 7, the trinal fractions of 1 and 2. The number 31 is the trinal fraction of 5, the basis of the Quinary scale so incorporated with the human frame, and is the measure of the life of the *first man*. The number 57 is the trinal fraction of the sacred number 7, and three times the Metonic Cycle of *nineteen* years. Lastly, the number 73 is the trinal fraction of 8, a lunisolar cycle of years, and gives, when multiplied by 5, the number of days in the Solar Cycle.

“The trinal fraction has been compared also with the formula  $n^3 - n + 1$  which is only a particular case of it, namely, where  $n$  is negative. It is true, that if in this formula — 1 — 2 — 3, &c., be taken for values of  $n$ , it will still give the series of trinal fractions; but it does not therefore follow that the two formulæ are the same; for if in the latter,  $n$  be taken equal to zero, it will give the same

result as when  $n$  is taken equal to—1! The definition given by Mr. Cunningham is, therefore, the most accurate, simple, and general, and one which can be easily comprehended without any reference to the formulæ of the *Figurate numbers*. Moreover, the author has shown, in the works last referred to, that the series of trinal fractions possess higher properties of science, mathematically, astronomically, and chronologically, than the triangular numbers.” \*

---

## SECTION II.

The Evidence for Proposition I. from the Prechristian Times.—Analytical Series of Great Periods, terminating at A and B.—Summary Recapitulation.—Final Conclusion.—A and B are the Foci or Con-centrical points of the Ages before the Manifestation of the Eternal Word.

I now proceed, in the first place, to state the Evidence for Proposition I. from the Prechristian Chronology; and in the following brief analysis of it I shall only place the great leading Eras, among which are confessedly to be ranked the births and deaths of the Patriarchs, the reigns and administrations of the Church and nations connected with it.

I must apprise readers who seek for amusement and matters of an exciting character, that it will be better for them at once to lay down this volume, if they shall have even proceeded so far in it as the present page. On the

\* Professor Wallace on “The True Age of the World.” Smith and Elder. 1844. Pp. 116—118.

other hand, those readers who eagerly seek for truth, will, we hope, find themselves richly compensated by the discovery of such a body of evidence for the Scriptural Chronology, as will tend powerfully to strengthen their faith amidst the dashing of the waves of infidelity in this sceptical age. The author must for himself testify, that the discovery of the complete system of science contained in the arrangement of the Mundane times as recorded in the Scriptures has powerfully fixed in his own mind a conviction of the completeness of the inspiration of the Historical Books of the Old Testament; for, although there is evidence of the fact that the sacred text has been fraudulently meddled with in various passages, and especially in the *numbers*, yet the providence of God has so watched over it, that the means are left to us of completely restoring the chronology; and, when restored, it demonstrates itself as his handywork by intrinsical evidence of symmetry and complex order, above the invention of created wisdom, or execution of created power.

The application of the various scientific periods laid down in the former Section, to the great series of time terminating at A and B discovers to us the stupendous results which will now be laid before the reader.

\* The Sothic year consists of 365 days, without the fractional time of the Tropical 5 h. 48 m. 48 s., and without the 6 hours of the Julian year.

Years.

Cycles of 19, or 2755 years, terminates from Creation in the year b.c. 2723, from which to A is also a perfectly scientific period ( $16^3 + 16$ )  $= 272 \times 10$  being also the cube of 8  $= 512 \times 5$   $= 2560 + (4^3 \times 10) = 160 = . . . . . 2720$   
 Thus in this marvellous concatenation of time, not only are A and B linked to Creation by perfect chains of years, but by the bisection of the second chain a cross-band of perfect time is formed, linking together A and B. We demand from opponents an answer to the question, By what wisdom of the creature was this effected?

## II. THE BIRTH OF SETH, b.c. 5249.

Thence to A are 122 multiples of 43, the trinal of 6, which is bisected by the 60th year of Peleg, in whose administration the earth was divided . 5246

## III. THE BIRTH OF CAINAN, b.c. 4854.

Thence to A are 99 Jubilees or 693 Weeks = . 4851  
 And to B are 349, a Prime multiplied by 2 = 698 weeks . . . . . 4886

Again bisecting the last number, as in period I., it is equal to 2443 years, which brought down from the birth of Cainan, or carried back from B, arrives at b.c. 2411, from which to A are 2408 years, equal to 8 weeks, or 56 multiples of 43, the trinal of 6; thus, as in period I., linking together A and B by a cross-band of scientific time. Moreover, this cross-band connects also B in this series with period II. immediately before, since the year b.c. 2411, the point of bisection, is from the birth of Seth 66 multiples of 43 = 2838 years.

## Years

#### IV. THE DEATH OF ADAM, B.C. 4548.

Thence to A are 101, a Prime multiplied by 9 and

And it contains the following Series :—

1. The Cube of  $12 = 1728$  ends at the birth of Eber : . . . . B.C. 2820
2. The Trinal of  $6 = 43 \times 40 = 1720$  at the birth of David . . . . „ 1100
3. Thence a Cycle in Astronomy  $= 1097$  the Moon slow at the end of it 7h. 30m. ends at A . . . „ 3

The death of Adam will, however, be brought in a subsequent page into connexion with Periods D and F of Proposition II. A second perfect Series to A will also come before us in the period from the birth of Arphaxad.

## V. THE BIRTH OF ENOCH, B.C. 4357.

Thence to A are 622 weeks of years, or 2 weeks of

311 a Prime . . . . . 4354

And to B are 133, the Week of 19 and triad of 11 multiplied by 33, or 3 times its root =  $11 + 11^2 + 11^3 = 1463$  years  $\times 3$ , a period of stupendous perfection . . . . .

## VI. THE TRANSLATION OF ENOCH, B.C. 3992,

When Methuselah received the government of the Earth, which he held probably till the death of Lamech, when Noah succeeded to it.

Thence to A is a Cycle in Astronomy, being  
 $334 \times 10 = 3340 + 630 + 19$ , the Moon fast at  
 the end of it 13 h. 23 m. . . . .

the end of it 13h. 23m. . . . . 3989

Years.

## VII. THE BIRTH OF SHEM, B.C. 3315.

Thence to A 144, the square of 12, multiplied by 23, (the sum of the trinal of 1, 2, and 3, or  $3+7+13$ ,) a period of stupendous perfection . . . . . 3312

## VIII. THE BIRTH OF HAM, B.C. 3314.

Thence to A are 43, the trinal of  $6 \times 7 = 301$ , multiplied by 11 =  $473 \times 7 = . . . . .$  3311

And to B are 478 Weeks of years = . . . . . 3346

Bisecting the last number, it is 1673 years; and carried back from B, it arrives at B.C. 1641, the year before the appearance of God to Moses in the Bush, whence to A are 6 multiples of 273, the trinal of 16, or 18 of 91, the trinal of 9 = 1638 years, a period most perfect, which thus forms a *cross-band* connecting in this Series also A with B, and both of them, by a double chain of time, with the birth of Ham.

## IX. THE DEATH OF LAMECH, B.C. 3252.

Thence to A are 9 squares of 19 = . . . . . 3249

## X. THE 1ST OF NISAN AFTER THE DEATH OF LAMECH, the beginning of the ADMINISTRATION OF NOAH, as Methuselah, from his great age, was incapable of the cares of Government, B.C. 3251.

Thence to A are 464 Weeks = . . . . . 3248

And to B are 469 Weeks or 67 Jubilee . . . . . 3283

## XI. THE DEATH OF METHUSELAH, B.C. 3223.

Thence to A are 460 Weeks = . . . . . 3220

To B are 465 Weeks equal to 651, the trinal of 25 multiplied by 5; and as 651 is the multiple of two trinals, 21 and 31, the whole period is equal

	Years.
to $5 + 5^2 + 5^3 = 155$ multiplied by 21, the trinal of 4, and it is reconditely perfect . . . . .	3255
<b>XII. THE FLOOD, B.C. 3217.</b>	
Thence to B are 9 squares of 19 = . . . . .	3249
<b>XIII. THE EGRESSIO N OF NOAH FROM THE ARK. THE EVERLASTING COVENANT OF GOD WITH HIM AND ALL FLESH, B.C. 3216.</b>	
Thence to A, 459 Weeks, or 17 multiplied by 27, the cube of 3 . . . . .	3213
And to B are 464 Weeks, or $29 \times 16$ , the square of 4	3248
Both periods are perfect, and the second is bisected by the year B.C. 1592, when the first division of the Promised Land was finished, and therefore a <i>Great Era</i> , but the type of a <i>greater</i> , when the NEW EARTH shall be divided amongst the JUST.	
<b>XIV. THE BIRTH OF ARPHAXAD, B.C. 3215.</b>	
Thence to A are $11 \times 4 = 44$ multiples of 73, the trinal of 8, being a part of the series of $73 \times 75$ from Creation to A, and this date being from Creation $73 \times 31$ (the trinal of 5), and from the death of Adam the trinals 31 and 43 multiplied into each other, and forming 1333, the trinal of 36, the whole series is one of most deep and recondite perfection, and is the connecting link of a most perfect series from the death of Adam to A, being 1333 to this date, and thence to A .	3212
<b>XV. THE DEATH OF ARPHAXAD, B.C. 2677.</b>	
Thence are 54 Jubilees to the Battle of Actium, the end of Daniel's Third Empire, B.C. 31 = 2646	
4 Weeks at A . . . . .	28
The whole period to A is 382 Weeks. —	2674

Years.

And to B are 43 (the trinal of 6) multiplied by 21  
 (the trinal of 4)  $\times$  3 being 9 Weeks of 43, a  
 period most perfect . . . . . 2709

**XVI. THE BIRTH OF SALAH, B.C. 2950.**

Thence to A are 421 Weeks of years, that number  
 being the trinal of 20, a period most perfect . . . 2947

And to B are 426 Weeks . . . . . 2982

This period also contains a cross-band of time as  
 follows:—

From Salah, 1807, the trinal of 42, ends  
 at the Capture of the Ark and the Death  
 of Eli . . . . . B.C. 1143

5 Weeks = 35 at the 3d year of Saul,  
 when he first established a standing army,  
 an epoch in the Hebrew annals\* . . . 1108

Whence to B are 60 Cycles of 19 . . . 1140

Again, carrying back the same number  
 of 60 Cycles of 19 from A, we are  
 brought, as before, to the Capture of the  
 Ark, B.C. 1143, which is thus the central  
 pivot connecting itself with the three  
 dates of Salah born, A, and B, and the  
 two last with each other.

**XVII. THE BIRTH OF SERUG, B.C. 2424.**

Thence to B are 307, the trinal of 17 multiplied  
 by 8 . . . . . 2456

**XVIII. THE DEATH OF EBER, B.C. 2416.**

Thence to A are 127 Cycles of 19 . . . . . 2413

And to B are 17 squares of 12 . . . . . 2448

\* See 1 Sam. xiii. 1, 2.

Years.

**XIX. THE BIRTH OF TERAH, B.C. 2215.**

Thence to A are 316 Weeks . . . . . 2212  
 And to B are 321 Weeks . . . . . 2247

**XX. THE BIRTH OF ABRAHAM, B.C. 2145.**

Thence to A are  $17 \times 18 = 17^2 + 17 = 306$  Weeks . . 2142  
 And to B are 311 Weeks, that number being a  
 prime . . . . . 2177

**XXI. THE COVENANT OF GOD WITH ABRAHAM, Gen. xv., B.C. 2061.**

Thence to A are 42 Jubilees, or 6 Weeks of the  
 Jubilee and cube of 7 = 343, which is also the  
 trinal of 18 . . . . . 2058

This period is stupendously perfect.

And to B are 299 Weeks, or 91, the trinal of 9,  
 multiplied by 23, the sum of the three trinals  
 of 1, 2, and 3, being 3, 7, and 13. This period  
 is also no less stupendously perfect . . . . . 2093

**XXII. THE BIRTH OF ISAAC, B.C. 2045.**

Thence to A a perfect Astronomical Cycle, the  
 Moon at the end of it fast or before the Sun,  
 1 h. 30 m. . . . . 2042

**XXIII. THE BIRTH OF JACOB, B.C. 1985.**

Thence to A is the following series :—  
 The trinal of 20 = 421 ends at Othniel, the  
 first of the Judges . . . . . B.C. 1564  
 Whence to A, the trinal of 39 (which is  
 equal to  $3+3^2+3^3$ ) = . . . . . 1561  
 —————— 1982

**XXIV. THE DEATH OF ABRAHAM, B.C. 1970.**

Thence to A are 281 Weeks . . . . . 1967  
 And to B  $286 = 13 \times 22$  . . . . . 2002

Years.

**XXV. JACOB'S DEPARTURE FOR PADAN ARAM,  
AND THE VISION OF THE LADDER, B.C. 1908,  
a great Era of the Church, since from that  
journey sprang the Twelve Tribes.**

Thence to A are  $381$ , the trinal of  $19 \times 5 =$  . . . . . 1905

**XXVI. THE BIRTH OF REUBEN, the begin-  
ning of the Twelve Tribes, B.C. 1907.**

Thence to A are  $17 \times 7 = 119 \times 4^2 = 16 =$  . . . . . 1904

This period as the multiple of  $17$  by  $16$  and  $7$  is  
perfect.

And to B are  $277 \times 7$  . . . . . 1939

And  $277$  is a Cycle in Astronomical, at the end of  
which the Moon is fast  $7$  h.  $8$  m.

**XXVII. THE BIRTH OF JUDAH, B.C. 1903.**

Thence to A  $100$  Cycles of  $19 =$  . . . . . 1900

**XXVIII. JACOB ARRIVES AT SHECHEM on his  
return from Padan Aram, B.C. 1887, from  
the Deluge  $70$  Cycles of  $19 = 1330$ .**

Thence to A are  $12 + 12^2 + 12^3 = 157 \times 12 =$  . . . . . 1884  
and  $157$  is the trinal of  $12$ .

And to B  $101$  Cycles of  $19$ :  $101$  being a *Prime* . . . . . 1919

**XXIX. THE DEATH OF ISAAC, B.C. 1865.**

Thence to A are  $38$  Jubilees, or the Jubilee and  
Metonic Cycle multiplied into each other =  $931$   
(the trinal of  $30$ )  $\times 2 =$  . . . . . 1862

The period is most reconditely perfect, being  
also  $14$  of the Week of  $19$  and trinal of  $11$   
=  $133$ .

And to B are  $271$  Weeks, which divide them-  
selves into  $7$  of the Cycle of  $201$  years, the Moon  
at the end of it  $15$  h.  $26$  m. fast; being also

Years.

the trinal of 37, and ending at the 7th of Artaxerxes, the date of Daniel's 70 Weeks, b.c. 458 = . . . . .	1407
Thence 70 Weeks at B = . . . . .	490
	— 1897

**XXX. THE FIRST YEAR OF PLENTY, B.C. 1863.**

Thence to A 31 the trinal of $5 \times 60$ = . . . .	1860
This period being twice the life of Adam is mysteriously perfect.	

**XXXI. JACOB DESCENDS INTO EGYPT, B.C. 1855.**

Thence to A is the trinal of $21 = 463 \times 4$ = . . . .	1852
And to B are 111, the trinal of 10 multiplied by 17 = . . . .	1887

**XXXII. THE END OF THE FAMINE, B.C. 1849.**

Thence the following Series :—

The trinal of 35 = 1261 ends at the destruction by Nebuchadnezzar, b.c. 588	1261
Thence the trinal of 5 = 31 multiplied by 20 ends at B . . . . .	620
	— 1881

**XXXIII. THE DEATH OF JOSEPH, B.C. 1784.**

To the birth of David, b.c. 1100, are 36 Cycles of 19 . . . . .	684
Thence to A, a Cycle in Astronomy, the Moon slow 7 h. 30 m. = . . . . .	1097
The whole period being . . . . .	— 1781

**XXXIV. LEVI DIES, B.C. 1767.**

To A 36 Jubilees . . . . .	1764
To B 257 Weeks . . . . .	1799

**XXXV. AARON BORN, B.C. 1723.**

Thence to A $430 \times 4$ = . . . . .	1720
XXXVI. MOSES BORN, B.C. 1720.	

Thence to B 73, the fraction of 8 multiplied by 24	1752
--	------

Years.

**XXXVII. GOD APPEARS TO MOSES IN THE  
BUSH, B.C. 1640.**

From Creation 202 Cycles of 19, and from this date		
to B are 88 Cycles of 19 . . . . .	1672	
<b>XXXVIII. ENTRANCE INTO CANAAN, B.C. 1599.</b>		
To A, 133 the Week of 19, and the trinal of 11		
multiplied by 12 . . . . .	1596	
To B, 233 Weeks of years . . . . .	1631	
<b>XXXIX. THE END OF THE ELDERS THAT SURVIVED JOSHUA, B.C. 1573.</b>		
Thence to A, 157, the trinal of 12, $\times 10$ . . . .	1570	
<b>XL. OTHNIEL, THE BEGINNING OF THE DIS- PENSATION OF THE JUDGES, B.C. 1564.</b>		
To A, the trinal of $39 = 223$ Weeks = . . . .	1561	
To B, $7 \times 12 = 84$ Cycles of 19 = 133 the trinal of		
11 and Week of 19 $\times 12$ (see Period XXXVIII.) =	1596	
<b>XLI. THE CAPTURE OF THE ARK AND DEATH OF ELI. THE END OF THE JUDGES, B.C. 1143.</b>		
Thence to A, 60 Cycles of 19 = . . . . .	1140	
<b>XLII. DAVID REIGNS IN HEBRON, B.C. 1070.</b>		
To B, 58 Cycles of 19 = . . . . .	1102	
<b>XLIII. HE TAKES JERUSALEM, B.C. 1063.</b>		
Thence to B, 73, the trinal of 8 multiplied by 5		
$= 365 \times 3$ , three years of years . . . . .	1095	
<b>XLIV. HIS FIRST PASSOVER IN JERUSALEM, B.C. 1062.</b>		
Thence to A, the Cycle of 1040 + 19, the Moon		
slow at the end of it 3h. 22m. . . . .	1059	
<b>XLV. HE PLACES THE ARK ON ZION, B.C. 1060.</b>		
Hence to A, 151 weeks, also the trinal of 32 =	1057	
To B, 7 (the trinal of 2) $\times 13$ (that of 3) = 91 (the		
trinal of 9) $\times 3 = 273$ (the trinal of 16) $\times 4 =$ .	1092	

This number is also the product of  $4 + 4^2 + 4^3 = 84 \times 13$  (the trinal of 3) = 1092; also of 21, the trinal of  $4 \times (13 \times 4) = 52$ . It possesses, therefore, characters of the deepest perfection, having for its factors the various trinals, 3, 7, 13, 21, 91, and 273, and the perfect number 12.

**XLVI. THE FOUNDATION OF THE TEMPLE,**  
B. C. 1027.

To A, the 11th term of the first period of Geometrical Progression, UNITY, the 1st Term, 2, the Ratio 1024  
To B, the Cycle of . . . . . 1059

**XLVII. THE DEDICATION OF THE TEMPLE,**  
B. C. 1019.

Thence the following two Series:—

**FIRST.**

To the first Foundation of the SECOND  
TEMPLE, Ezra iii. 8—13, b.c. 535, the  
square of 11 = 121 multiplied by 4 = 484

Thence to A, 133, the Week of 19 and  
trinal of  $11 \times 4 = . . . . .$  532

— 1016

**SECOND.**

To the FIRST PASSOVER of the SECOND  
TEMPLE, b.c. 515, are from b.c. 1019,  
the DEDICATION OF THE FIRST ( $7 \times 12$ )  
 $= 84 \times 6 = 21$  (the Trinal of 4)  $\times 24 = 36$   
(the Square of 6)  $\times 14$ , or 2 Weeks of  
that Square = . . . . . 504

This number has at least 15 different  
factors,\* and is reconditely perfect;  
and this date, b. c. 515, bisects equally

\* They are 252, 126, 84, 63, 36, 28, 24, 21, 18, 12, 7, 6, 4, 3, 2.

Years.

the whole period from the FOUNDATION  
OF THE FIRST TEMPLE, B. C. 1027 to A.

Thence to A, the 10th term of the Geo-  
metrical Progression of Period XLVI. 512

— 1016

The Chronology from the FOUNDATION and  
DEDICATION by SOLOMON to the FOUNDATION  
and FIRST PASSOVER of the SECOND TEMPLE,  
and thence to A, is thus marked by characters of  
deepest as well as variegated perfection, showing  
forth the skill of the Architect of the Universe.  
For, as its arrangement could not be without the  
exercise of *unerring prescience*, his incommuni-  
cable attribute, its contrivance and origin can be  
attributed to no other.

XLVIII. DEATH OF SOLOMON. REHOBOAM  
REIGNS. THE TEN TRIBES REBEL, B.C. 990.

To A 141 Weeks . . . . . 987

And to B 146 Weeks, or 2 Weeks of 73, the  
trinal of 8 = . . . . . 1022

XLIX. THE RESTORATION OF THE HOUSE  
OF DAVID on the Death of Queen Athaliah.  
JOASH REIGNS IN JUDAH, B.C. 891.

Thence to A 111, the trinal of 10 multiplied by 8 = 888

L. PUL OF ASSYRIA INVADES ISRAEL, B.C. 771.

Thence to A 12, multiplied by  $8^2 = 64$  . . . . . 768

And to B 73, the trinal of  $8 \times 11$  . . . . . 803

LI. THE FOUNDATION OF ROME,\* B.C. 753.

Thence to A 6 cubes of 5 . . . . . 750

And to B 157, the trinal of 12 multiplied by 5 = . . . . . 785

\* The relation of this great event to the Mundane Ages will be  
more largely shown in Part. III. of this volume.

### Years.

## LII. The first year of the CAPTIVITY OF SAMARIA BY SHALMANESER of Assyria, B.C. 720.

Thence to A the following series:—

73, the trinal of 8, multiplied by 9,  
ends at Jerusalem taken by Pompey, b.c.

The trials of 1 and 7 being 3 and 57,  
equal to 12 multiplied by 5, at A . . . . 60

717

## LIII. THE SEVENTY YEARS' CAPTIVITY, B.C. 606.

Thence to A 31 Cycles of 19, end at the beginning of the rebuilding of the Temple

by Herod, b.c. 17 = . . . . . 589

To A 2 Weeks . . . . . 14

603

The whole period of 603 is the Astronomical Cycle of  $201 \times 3$ .

To B, from B.C. 17, 7 Weeks, or 1 Jubilee . 49

The whole period to B is a Cycle in Astronomy, composed of the Cycle of 630 plus that of 8

638

LIV. The FIRST YEAR OF NEBUCHADNEZZAR  
ALONE, the Political Epoch of his Kingdom,  
B.C. 604.

Thence to A the trial of 24 = . . . . . 601

LV. The CAPTIVITY OF JEHOIACHIN in Babylon, B.C. 598, whence, as he was the progenitor of Christ, Ezekiel counts.

Thence to A are  $7 \times 5 = 35$ , the life of Christ upon earth,  $\times 17 = 85$  Weeks = . . . . 595

	Years.
And to B is the Astronomical Cycle of 630 = 90 Weeks, the Moon fast at the end of it 6h. 1m..	630
LVI. THE RELEASE OF JEHOIACHIN FROM PRISON, B.C. 561.	
Thence to A are 31, the trinal of 5, multiplied by 18 =	558
LVII. BABYLON TAKEN BY THE MEDES AND PERSIANS, B.C. 538.	
To A the following series:—	
3, a Cycle, and the trinal of 1, ends b.c. 535, at the foundation of the Second Temple in the second year of Cyrus, whence 4 Weeks of 19, or 133, the trinal of 11, $\times 4 = 532$ , end at A	535
535 years, the whole period, form also a Cycle in Astronomy, the Moon fast 16h. 21m.	
To B are 30 Cycles of 19 = . . . . .	570
LVIII. THE TEMPLE FINISHED in Adar, b.c. 516.	
To A are $3^3 = 27$ Cycles of 19 . . . . .	513
The Chronology of the Seventy Weeks having been fully discussed in Part I. of this volume, is here passed over.	
LIX. The second year of the ADMINISTRATION OF NEHEMIAH IN JERUSALEM, and HIS FIRST PASSOVER (when it is probable his first Reforms were finished, as supposed by Prideaux), b.c. 444.	
Thence to A are 9 Jubilees, or 63 Weeks . . .	441
To B are $17 \times 4 = 68$ Weeks . . . . .	476
The Chronology of the death of Artaxerxes, b.c. 424, is here passed over for the same reason as that of the Seventy Weeks, having been fully treated before.	

And, for the same reason, that of the end of the Kingdom of Persia, b.c. 329, whence to B is 1 square of 19.

**LX. JERUSALEM TAKEN BY PTOLEMY LAGUS,  
B.C. 320.**

Thence to A 157, (the trinal of 12)  $\times 2$  ends at b.c. 6, the last year of the economy of Moses, the year before the appearance of Gabriel to Zacharias, which opened the Evangelical dispensation . . . . . 314  
3, the trinal of 1, at A . . . . . 3  
— 317

And to B, the sixth term of a period of Geometrical Progression, 11 the first term and 2 the ratio 352

**LXI. THE BATTLE OF IPSUS. THE EMPIRE OF  
ALEXANDER DIVIDED INTO FOUR, B.C. 301.**

Thence to B 111, the trinal of 10  $\times$  3 = . . . 333

**LXII. SCOPAS, COMMANDING THE ARMY OF  
PTOLEMY EPIPHANES, TAKES JERUSALEM,  
B.C. 199, BEING 37 WEEKS OF DANIEL'S 70.**

Thence to A 4 Jubilees, or 28 Weeks . . . . . 196

And to B 33 Weeks . . . . . 231

**LXIII. ANTIOCHUS EPIPHANES REIGNS IN  
SYRIA, B.C. 175.**

Thence to A are 43, the trinal of 6,  $\times$  4 = . . . . . 172

**LXIV. HE RUINS JERUSALEM, AND HORRIBLY  
PROFANES THE TEMPLE, AND ERECTS A FORTRESS  
ON MOUNT ACRE, B.C. 168.**

The same year the Kingdom of Macedon, the first of the four kingdoms of Alexander, is ended by

Years.

the Romans = 23 Weeks = 161 years from the end of Persia.

To B are 2 Centuries . . . . . 200

**LXV. The ROMANS TAKE POSSESSION OF THE KINGDOM OF PERGAMUS**, the second of the four kingdoms of the Empire of Alexander, b.c. 132.

Thence to A are 43, trinal of 6,  $\times$  3 . . . . . 129

**LXVI. The END OF THE GREEK KINGDOM OF SYRIA**, the third of Alexander's kingdoms, by the dethronement of Antiochus Asiaticus by Pompey, b.c. 65; from the first of Nebuchadnezzar, in the Canon b.c. 604, which is the Political Epoch of his kingdom, 11 Jubilees, or 539 years.

Hence to A 2 multiples of 31, the trinal of 5 . . . . . 62

**LXVII. JERUSALEM TAKEN BY POMPEY**, b.c. 63, from Creation 15 squares of 19. From the entrance of Joshua into Canaan 1536 years, the 10th term of a period of Geometrical Progression, 3 the first term, and 2 the ratio.

From this date to B are 5 Cycles of 19 . . . . . 95

**LXVIII. DEATH OF CLEOPATRA OF EGYPT and ANTONY. END OF THE KINGDOM OF EGYPT**, the fourth of Alexander's Empire, b.c. 30. Egypt a Roman Province, from the 1st of Nebuchadnezzar, 82 Weeks, or 574 years.

Hence to B 31 multiplied by 2 . . . . . 62

**LXIX. HEROD AND SOSIUS BESIEGE JERUSALEM**, b.c. 38.

Thence to A are 5 Weeks = . . . . . 35

	Years.
And to B 10 Weeks, being one seventh of Daniel's period of 70 Weeks . . . . .	70
LXX. HEROD, after 2 years' preparation, BEGINS TO REBUILD THE TEMPLE, B.C. 17.	
Whence to A are 2 Weeks . . . . .	14
And to B 1 Jubilee, one tenth of Daniel's 70 Weeks . . . . .	49

I shall now, as briefly as I can, state the conclusion to be arrived at from the whole Chronological facts placed before the reader in this Section, giving first a summary of them.

It will be seen that the foregoing great Series of dates comprehends the greater part of the leading eras of the Church, from the Creation to the Advent of our Lord, and that there is scarcely a single event which does not merit this character. I have very scantily admitted eras from earlier Profane History, because, in the first place, they do not possess the certain truth of the scriptural dates; and, in the second, they are not, in a way discernible by us, connected with the development of the Divine purposes as to the Church.

There are in this Series 23 great periods, whereof the sacred number 7 is the basis, and which apply both to A and B. *The most remarkable, as well as most exact and comprehensively and complexly scientific periods, are those also which belong to the greatest eras,—as, for example, the birth of Cainan, the fourth from Adam, Period III. ; that of Enoch, V. ; the death of Methuselah, the last before the Flood, XI. ; that of Arphaxad, the firstborn of the present Earth, XV. ; the birth of Abraham, XX. ; the*

Covenant of God with him (Gen. xv.), XXI.; the death of Isaac, XXIX.; the entrance into Canaan, XXXVIII.; the Ark on Mount Zion, the type of Christ's Reign on the throne of his Father David, XLV.; the Dedication of the Temple, XLVII.; the death of Solomon, XLVIII.; the captivity of Jehoiachin, LV. Of these XLVII. is the only one not measured by 7.

There are **SEVEN** periods measured to A by the Metonic Cycle of 19:—the death of Lamech, the last-born Antediluvian, IX.; that of Eber, the last Patriarch of the **UNITED HUMAN FAMILY**, XVIII.; the birth of Judah, XXVII.; the death of Isaac, the special child of promise, XXIX., and this period unites the Jubilee, or 7<sup>2</sup>, and Cycle of 19; the Entrance into Canaan, XXXVIII., this period unites the numbers 7, 21, 133, which are trinals, and the perfect number 12; the end of the Judges and taking of the Ark, XLI.; the finishing of the Second Temple, LVIII.

There are to B **NINE** periods measured by the same Cycle of 19:—Creation, I.; the birth of Enoch, V.; the Deluge, XII.; Jacob's arrival at Shechem, XXVIII.; God appears to Moses in the Bush, XXXVII.; Othniel, the first of the Judges, and beginning of that Dispensation, XL., this period unites the three numbers 7, 12, and 19; David in Hebron, XLII.; Babylon taken by the Medes and Persians, LVII.; Jerusalem taken by Pompey, LXVII.

There are **two** periods to A which are multiples of 73, the trinal of 8 :—Creation, I.; the birth of Arphaxad, XIV.

**THREE** periods to B are measured by 73 :—the birth of Moses, XXXVI.; Jerusalem taken by David, XLIII.; Pul of Assyria invades Israel, L.

By 43, the Trinal of 6, **FOUR** Periods are measured to

A :—The birth of Seth, II. ; that of Ham, VIII. ; Aaron born, XXXV. ; Antiochus Epiphanes reigns in Syria, LXIII. By the same number, 43, one Period to B. The death of Arphaxad, XV. I shall here also point out to the reader the deep analogy that, as there is from the Flood to B 9 Squares of 19, so from the death of Arphaxad to B are 9 Weeks of 43, the difference between the two numbers being equal to 360 + 180, or ONE PROPHETIC TIME AND A-HALF, shows the interval between these two events to be 540 years, or  $12 \times 45$ , and affords further demonstration of the Divine skill and wisdom in the arrangement of the times of the Moral Universe.

TEN periods are measured by other Trinals—two by 31, that of 5 ; two by 111, the fraction of 10 ; two by 157, that of 12 ; ONE by 307, that of 17 ; ONE by 381, that of 19 ; ONE by 421, that of 20 ; ONE by 463, that of 21 ; ONE by 1057, the Trinal of 32 ; and ONE by 1561, that of 39. I shall not enumerate them, but refer the reader to the Table.

TWENTY-FIVE periods terminate at A, without extending to B, in the same Series. NINE periods also apply to B only, excluding A. But let it be observed that, in order to offer the evidence of the questions here treated in the simplest possible form, I have, with one exception, admitted into the Table only those Series of Scientific Time which do not contain a number exceeding two links. Had I gone beyond this number, it would not, I believe, have been difficult to connect every date in the Table both with A and B. To exemplify this, Period II., from the birth of Seth, consisting of 122 multiples of 43, (which may be subdivided into  $43 \times 5 = 215 \times 9 = 1935$ , terminating at the birth of Ham, the *last-born*, even as

Seth was the *first-born* of the Antediluvian family of Man, and from Ham to A  $43 \times 7 = 301 \times 11 = 3311$ , is the only simple series I have yet discovered from Seth to A; and I have not yet found a simple Series to B. But the following Series, every link of which is a number of perfect Science, ends at B:—

The 11th Term of the Geometrical Series, of  
 which **UNITY** is the **FIRST**, and **2** the Ratio, com-  
 puted from **b.c. 5249 = 1024**, ends at **211**, the  
 trinal of  $14 \times 20 = 4220$  years, before the ap-  
 pearance of Gabriel to Zacharias in **b.c. 5 . b.c. 4225**  
 One Week of **144**, the Square of **12 = 1008** years,  
 ends at the Flood . . . . . **3217**  
 Whence to B, are 9 Squares of 19.

I shall give a second example of a period terminating at B only, in my Table, being from **THE BIRTH OF MOSES**,  
**b.c. 1720**, to **B**  $73 \times 24 = 1752$ .

Now, computing from **b.c. 1720**, 3 Jubilees = 147,  
 we arrive at the end of the elders who overlived  
 Joshua . . . . . **b.c. 1573**  
 Whence 430 years terminate at the end of the  
 Judges and capture of the Ark . . . . . **1143**  
 Whence 60 Cycles of 19 = 1140 years end at A.

In conclusion, I affirm, that since it has been proved by all the evidence of which such a subject is capable that nearly the whole of the great Pre-Christian Eras of the Church, and of the world in connexion with the Church, converge and terminate in A and B, **THEY ARE DEMONSTRATED TO BE THE FOCI OR POINTS OF CONCENTRATION OF THE TIMES OF THE AGES PRECEDING THE MANIFESTATION IN THE FLESH OF THE ETERNAL WORD.**

In the next Section I shall proceed to the consideration

of the evidence afforded by the post-Christian times in favour of Proposition I.; but the demonstration will not be altogether complete till the evidence for Proposition II. be also laid before the reader.

NOTE A, p. 95.

The Reviewer affirms that all accurate inquirers are now agreed that the Eclipse of Phlegon was a real and total eclipse of the Sun in November, 29. Now I must here first acknowledge a mistake in page 95 of this volume. I there state Phlegon's Eclipse to have been in the *third* year of the 202 Olympiad; whereas, Eusebius in the Armenian Copy, Part ii., page 265, states it to have been in the *fourth* year. If this was his testimony, as affirmed by Eusebius, then Ol. 202-4 was not A. C. 29, but A. C. 33. Instead of an assertion that *all accurate inquirers now are agreed* that his eclipse was in Nov., 29, it would have been better if the Reviewer had given the names of his authorities.

---

### SECTION III.

#### THE EVIDENCE FOR PROPOSITION I. FROM THE POST-CHRISTIAN TIMES.

Introductory Remarks.—Analytical Series of Great Periods computed from A and B. Summary and recapitulatory view and conclusion that A and B are the Foci, or Concentrical Points, of the Ages posterior to the Manifestation of the Eternal Word.

IN introducing the subject of the evidence for Proposition I. from the post-Christian Chronology, I must request the intelligent reader, who is at all exercised in such inquiries, first to fix in his own mind what are the points in history which form the great landmarks of the Times between the Ascension of Christ into heaven in the year 33, and the present era. I think he will accord with me

that the following is an harmonious arrangement of the great moral and political and ecclesiastical subdivisions of these ages :—

1. The destruction of the Jewish State and Church, and final banishment of the nation from Judea, comprising from the beginning of the Jewish War, in 66, to the ordination, after the suppression of the rebellion of Barchochebas, of Marcus, the first Gentile Bishop of *Ælia Capitolina*, in 138, the sum of 72 years. This interval is comprehended in periods LXXI. and LXXII. of the table, and both are perfect, and the number of years is the same as from A to the destruction by Titus.

2. The overthrow of the Pagan Imperial Power of Rome and establishment of the Christian, and the beginning of the great controversies of the Church, comprehended in *nine* periods from LXXIII. to LXXXI., whereof *five* are applicable both to A and B, and *two* to A only, and *two* to B.

3. The overthrow of the Western Empire by the Goths and Vandals, comprehending from the reception of the Visigoths into the Empire by the Emperor Valens, 376, to Odoacer, the first Gothic King of Italy, 474, the interval of *2* Jubilees and *six* periods, LXXXII. to LXXXVII., which are all applicable to A and B.

4. From the rise of the Gothic kingdom of Italy to that of the temporal power of the Papacy, comprehending 280 years, from 474 to 754, and including in it the establishment of the spiritual power of the Popes,—that of the ten Gothic kingdoms on the platform of the Western Empire,—the reconquest of Italy and Rome by the arms of Justinian,—the Saxon Heptarchy,—the rise of the Mahomedan imposture and power,—and the Rebellion of Rome

and Italy against the Greek Emperor, Leo the Isaurian, and in defence of images.

From the events of this era I have only been able, consistently with the proposed limits of this work, to make a partial selection. Many most important dates have, therefore, been omitted, whereof I shall afford the evidence by one most conspicuous date, that of the taking of Rome by Genseric, 455. It is from A 457

years, a Prime, and forms also a series,  $\frac{19 + 19^3 + 19^4}{19}$

= 381, ending at the elevation of Theodosius to the throne of the East, 379, five months after the defeat and death of Valens by the Goths, and  $19 \times 4 = 76$ , at 455. I add, that 455 is from the birth of Lamech, 343, the week of the Jubilee, and also the trial of 18 multiplied by 13 = 4459; and that from this era to the beginning of the Reformation in England, 1533, are 22 Jubilees, or the Cycle of 1078 years, and thence to 1867, a great prophetic era, is the perfect Cycle of 334 years. Such, then, is one of the great dates which, in the overflowing abundance of materials, has been omitted in the table. Its introduction here, by demonstrating still further the superfluity, as it were, of evidence which crowds upon us, is not, therefore, without use.

This interval of 280 years, from the first Gothic kingdom in Italy to the cession of the ex-archate of Ravenna to Rome Papal, appears to bear a marked analogy,—not that of likeness, but of contrast,—to the 280 years from B to the Edict of Constantine.

This interval from LXXXVIII. to XCIX. includes twelve periods in number, whereof *five* are applicable to A only, *two* to B only, and the remaining *five* to both.

5. The next subdivision of the ages extends from the building of Bagdad by the Caliph Al Mansur, 763,\* to the first invasion of the territory of the Eastern Empire by the Ottoman Turks, 1302; but as this date counts from our Lord's baptism, it comes into the second Proposition in the next Section. The whole interval from 763 to 1302 is 11 Jubilees = 539 years, subdividing itself into two, viz., from the founding of Bagdad, 763, to the investiture of Togrul Beg with the Royal Diadem in that city, 1057, are 6 Jubilees = 294 years, and thence to 1302 are 5 Jubilees = 245 years. It comprises *seventeen* periods from C. to CXVI., and the mighty events of the rise and establishment of the Empire of the Seljuks, and the taking of Jerusalem by them (each of which is marked by perfect numbers of time); the accession of Pope Gregory VII.; the Crusades; the first Lateran Councils; the taking of Jerusalem by the Karismians; and of Bagdad by the Moghuls.

*Five* periods of this interval belong to A only, *three* to B only, and *nine* both to A and B.

6. The sixth subdivision of the ages comprehends the interval from the accession of Pope Julius II., 1503, Period CXVII., to the English Revolution, 1688, CXLIV., including *twenty-eight* great dates, and the mighty events of the fifth Lateran Council; the rise and progress of the Reformation; the Council of Trent; the Peace of Passau and Peace of Religion by the Recess of the Diet of Augsburg, whereby the Protestant faith was secured in Germany; the Religious Wars in France and the Netherlands, issuing in the independence of the Seven

\* This date being a year later than the commonly received one, 762, is vindicated in my fourth edition on the Apocalypse, p. 390.

United Provinces; the Thirty Years' War in Germany, ending with the Peace of Westphalia; the Peace of Nimeguen; the accession of Peter the Great in Russia.

Eleven dates in this period belong to A, only *five* to B, and twelve to both A and B.

7. The seventh great period from CXLV. to CLXI. comprehends 101 years and *seventeen* dates, whereof *twelve* belong both to A and B, *four* to A, and one to B only.

It includes in it the great events of the Peace of Carlowitz; of Utrecht; the accession of the House of Hanover; of Maria Theresa; the War of Austrian Succession; the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle; the Seven Years' War; the Peace of 1763; the American War and Peace of 1783; the first French Revolution, and the confiscation of the whole Ecclesiastic property of France.

8. The last subdivision includes in it from the Fall of the ancient French Monarchy, in 1792, to the fall of the Revolutionary Dynasty, in 1848, *nine* periods from CLXII. to CLXX., the whole of which belong both to A and B.

I have, however, here also only made a very scanty selection from the mighty events of these 56 years, which, from their magnitude, might have filled a half Millenary of years.

I shall now place before the reader the stupendous series to which the foregoing remarks are introductory.

## LXXI. THE DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM BY THE ROMANS, A.C. 70.

From A six twelves of years, or a half-square of

Years.

**LXXII. THE ORDINATION OF MARCUS,** the first Gentile Bishop of (Ælia Capitolina) Jerusalem, and therefore the Epoch of the final banishment of the Jews, A.C. 138.

From A, 20 Weeks =	. . . . .	140
From B, 15 Weeks =	. . . . .	105

This era is from Creation, B.C. 5478, 1123, the trinal of  $33 \times 5 = 165$  years.

**LXXIII. CONSTANTINE REIGNS IN BRITAIN,** A.C. 306.

From A, 44 Weeks, and 44 is the sum of the first four trinal fractions, $3+7+13+21 =$	. . . . .	308
---	-----------	-----

From B, the trinal of 3 = $13 \times 7 = 91$ (the trinal of 9) $\times 3 = 273$ , the trinal of 16; also 21, the trinal of $4 \times 13$ , the trinal of 3 =	. . . . .	273
--	-----------	-----

This period is, therefore, one of recondite perfection, its component numbers being the trinals 3, 7, 13, 21, and 91.

**LXXIV. CONSTANTINE DEFEATS MAXENTIUS,** who is drowned in the Tiber, Oct. 28, 312.

From A, 157, the trinal of $12 \times 2 =$	. . . . .	314
From B, 31, the trinal of $5 \times 9 =$	. . . . .	279

Both numbers are perfect.

**LXXV. CONSTANTINE ISSUES HIS EDICT LIBERATING THE CHURCH,** March, 313.

From A, the Astronomical Cycle of 315 years, the Moon fast 3 h. 0 m.; also $9 \times 5 = 45$ septenaries of years =	. . . . . . . . . .	315
From B, 40 septenaries, or $70 \times 4 =$	. . . . .	280

The numbers are, therefore, perfect.

Years.

**LXXVI. THE FINAL DEFEAT OF LICINIUS,  
323.**

From A,  $5^3 = 25 \times 13$ , the trinal of 3 = . . . . . 325

From B, the trinal of 11 = 133, ends at the Martyrdom of Polycarp, A. c. 166.

And that of 12 = 157 at 323. The whole period is one twentieth of the years from Creation, there being from B.C. 5478 to the Passion 19 periods of 290, and to this date 1 . . . . . 290

**LXXVII. FIRST GENERAL COUNCIL, the  
COUNCIL OF NICE, 325.**

From B, 73, the trinal of  $8 \times 4$ , a perfect number = . . . . . 292

**LXXVIII. ARIUS RECALLED FROM BANISHMENT, the beginning of the great Dissensions of the Church, 327.**

From A, 47 Weeks = . . . . . 329

From B, 6 Jubilees = . . . . . 294

**LXXIX. DEATH OF CONSTANTINE, 337.**

From B,  $19 \times 16$ , the square of 4 = . . . . . 304

**LXXX. JULIAN, THE APOSTATE, EMPEROR,  
361.**

From A,  $11^3 = 121 \times 3 = . . . . .$  363

**LXXXI. HE ATTEMPTS TO REBUILD THE  
TEMPLE OF JERUSALEM, but great balls of  
fire bursting from the earth drive away the  
workmen, 363.**

From A, 73, the trinal of  $8 \times 5$ , or a year of  
years = . . . . . 365

This date is from Creation, 73 the trinal of  $8 \times 80$   
= 5840 = 16 years of years.

From the birth of Arphaxad  $73 \times 49$ , the Jubilee.

Years.

**LXXXII. THE VISIGOTHS TRANSPORTED  
ACROSS THE DANUBE, and SETTLED IN THE  
EMPIRE BY THE EMPEROR VALENS, 376.**

They rise in arms before the end of the year.

From A $7 \times 3^3 = 27 \times 2$ , or 54 Weeks = . . . . .	378
From B, the cube of 7, or Week of the Jubilee = . . . . .	343

**LXXXIII. DEFEAT AND DEATH OF THE  
EMPEROR VALENS by the Goths at Adria-  
nople, 378.**

From A, 20 Cycles of 19 = . . . . .	380
-------------------------------------	-----

**LXXXIV. THEODOSIUS FOR THE LAST TIME  
UNITES THE WHOLE ROMAN EMPIRE, 394.**

From A, $12 \times 11 \times 3 = . . . . .$	396
From B, the square of 19 = . . . . .	361

**LXXXV. GENSERIC, KING OF THE VANDALS,  
TAKES CARTHAGE, 439.**

From A, 9 Jubilees = . . . . .	441
From B, 58 Weeks = . . . . .	406

**LXXXVI. DEATH OF ATTILA, 453.**

From A, 65 Weeks . . . . .	455
From B, 60 Weeks . . . . .	420

**LXXXVII. ODOACER, KING OF ITALY, 474.**

From A, 68 Weeks, or $7 \times 17 \times 4 = . . . . .$	476
From B, 63 Weeks, or 9 Jubilees = . . . . .	441

**LXXXVIII. DEATH OF POPE HORMISDAS,  
523.—He is succeeded by Pope John. The  
Emperor Justin issues an Edict command-  
ing the Manichees to be put to death where-  
ever they could be found; thus assuming to  
the secular power the authority exercised  
by the Apostle Peter, when Ananias and**

Years.

Sapphira were, at his word, struck dead for  
lying to the Holy Ghost.

From A, 75, or $25 \times 3$ Weeks = . . . .	525
From B, 70 Weeks, or 10 Jubilees = . . . .	490

Both numbers are, therefore, of perfect science.

**LXXXIX. NARSES DEFEATS AND SLAYS IN**

**BATTLE TEIA, KING OF THE OSTROGOths.**

End of the Kingdom of the Ostrogoths,  
553.

From A, 111, the trinal of $10 \times 5$ = . . . .	555
--	-----

**XC. The KINGDOM OF THE LOMBARDS**

**BEGINS IN ITALY.** Alboin the first king,  
568.

From A, 30 Cycles of 19, or 57, the trinal of $7 \times 10$ = . . . . . . . . . .	570
--	-----

**XCI. THE SAXON HEPTARCHY COMPLETED,**

586.

From A, $49 \times 12$ = . . . . . . . . . .	588
--	-----

From B, $7 \times 79$ , or the trinal of 23 = . . . .	553
---	-----

**XCII. BONIFACE III., POPE, dedicates the  
Pantheon to all the saints, 607.**

From A, $7 \times 87$ = . . . . . . . .	609
---	-----

From B, $7 \times 82$ = . . . . . . . .	574
---	-----

**XCIII. THE HEJIRAH, 622.**

From A, $12 \times 13$ , the trinal of $3 \times 4$ = 52 = .	624
--	-----

From B, $19 \times 31$ , the trinal of 5 = . . . .	589
--	-----

**XCIV. The MOSQUE OF OMAR BUILT ON THE  
SITE OF THE TEMPLE OF GOD, 643.**

From A, 43, the trinal of $6 \times 5$ = $215 \times 3$ = .	645
---	-----

**XCV. The IMAGES AT CONSTANTINOPLE  
BROKEN BY COMMAND OF THE EMPEROR**

Years.

LEO, THE ISAURIAN. Pope Gregory II. declares against the Emperor, and leagues himself with the Lombards, 726.	
From A, 104 Weeks of years, or $7 \times 8 \times 13$ , the trinal of 3 = . . . . .	728
From B, $11 \times 3^2 = 99$ Weeks = . . . . .	693
XCVI. PAUL, EXARCH OF RAVENNA, IS KILLED in a tumult raised by the defenders of Images. ITALY REBELS AGAINST THE EMPEROR LEO, 728.	
From A, 73, the trinal of $8 \times 10$ , being 2 years of years = . . . . .	730
From Creation, 73, the trinal of $8 \times 17 \times 5$ , or 17 years of years = 6205 years.	
XCVII. ROME FORMS ITSELF INTO A REPUB- LIC UNDER THE PROTECTION OF THE POPE, 730.	
From A, 183, the trinal of $13 \times 4$ = . . . . .	732
From the foundation of the City, b. c. 753, 13, the trinal of $3 \times 6 = 78$ Cycles of 19 = 1482 years.	
Both are perfect periods.	
XCVIII. PEPIN ENTERS ITALY WITH AN ARMY, raises the siege of Rome by the Lombards, and gives possession to the Pope of several towns in Lombardy, 755.	
From B, $19^2 \times 2 = . . . . .$	722
A period most perfect.	
XCIX. PEPIN CEDES THE EXARCHATE TO THE POPE, 756.	
From B, 241, the trinal of $15 \times 3 = . . . . .$	723

Years.

C. THE CITY OF BAGDAD BUILT BY THE  
CALIPH-AL-MANSUR, 763.

From B, 73, the trinal of  $8 \times 10 = 365 \times 2 =$  . . . . . 730

This great era of the Mahomedan dominion is thus  
connected with B by a most perfect number.  
This date being 15 Jubilees from the Baptism of  
our Lord, will come into Proposition II.

CI. DEATH OF THE CALIPH HARUN-UR-  
RASCHID. Begun decay of Caliphs, 808.

From B,  $5 + 5^3 + 5^3 = 155 \times 5 =$  . . . . . 775

CII. VIII. GENERAL COUNCIL AT CONSTAN-  
TINOPLE AGAINST PHOTIUS, 869.

From A, the trinal of 29 = . . . . . 871

CIII. TOGRUL BEG FOUNDS THE EMPIRE OF  
THE SELJUKS, 1038.

From A, the perfect Astronomical Cycle of . . . . . 1040

CIV. TOGRUL BEG CROWNED AT BAGDAD by  
command of the Caliph Bimrillah. The  
EPOCH OF THE EMPIRE OF THE TURKS,  
and the Euphratean horsemen (Rev. ix.),  
1057.

From A, the Astronomical Cycle of 1059 years,  
the Moon slow 3h. 22m. . . . . 1059

From B, a period of Geometrical Progression,  
being the 11th term, unity the first, and 2 the  
ratio . . . . . 1024

CV. GREGORY VII., HILDEBRAND, POPE,  
1073.

From A, 43, the trinal of 6, multiplied by 25, the  
square of 5 = . . . . . 1075

From B, the perfect Cycle of 1040, the Moon

Years.

slow 1 h. 18m. This Cycle nearly brings into coincidence not only the Tropical Year and Lunation, but also the diurnal revolution of the earth . . . . . 1040

Thus is this great era of Papal blasphemy connected with both the epochs of Redemption, by periods which mark it in the great Scheme of time as with a pen of adamant.

**CVI. JERUSALEM TAKEN BY THE SELJUKS,  
1076.**

From A, 22 Jubilees, also a perfect Cycle, the Moon slow 5h. 26m. . . . . 1078

From B, 149 Weeks, this number being a Prime . 1043  
How, it may be asked, can the intelligent reader, who seeks truth above all things, fail to see in the times of these great events the evidences of presiding intelligence and power above the reach of the Creature?

**CVII. THE CRUSADES.**

THE FIRST determined on at the Council of Clermont, 1095.

From A, the Cycle of 1040 + 57, the Moon slow 7h. 30m.. . . . . 1097

**CVIII. SOLYMAN, SULTAN OF ROUM, DEFEATED BY THE CRUSADES AT THE GREAT BATTLE OF DORYLÆUM, 1097.** He evacuates his kingdom.

From A, 1 Week of 157, the trinal of 12 = . 1099

From B, 133, the Week of 19 and the trinal of 11, multiplied by 8 = . . . . . 1064

This great event, which led to the establishment of

Years.

the so-called Christian Kingdom of Jerusalem two years afterwards, is also marked as a great era in Mundane Chronology, being from Creation, B.C. 5478, the great Cycle of 6164 years, the Moon slow 6h. 23m. From the end of the Deluge, B.C. 3216, it is 88 Jubilees, or the Cycle of  $1078 \times 4 = 4312$  years; and this period is bisected by the year B.C. 1060, when David placed the Ark of God on Mount Zion.

**CIX. THE FIRST LATERAN COUNCIL, 1123.**

It confirms the Concordat between the Emperor Henry V. and Pope Gregory as to Investitures.

From A, the Cube of 5 = 125 multiplied by the

Square of 3 = 9 . . . . . 1125

**CX. THE II. LATERAN COUNCIL, 1139.**

From A, 163 Weeks, that number being a Prime = 1141

From B, 158 Weeks = . . . . . 1106

**CXI. LOUIS VII. OF FRANCE TAKES THE CROSS, PREVIOUS TO SETTING OUT ON THE II. CRUSADE IN THE FOLLOWING YEAR,**  
1146.

From A, 164 Weeks = . . . . . 1148

From B, 159 Weeks = . . . . . 1113

**CXII. III. LATERAN COUNCIL, 1179.**

From B, the following Series:—

To the 1st Nicene Council as above,

73 the trihal of 8 multiplied by 4 = 292

To 1179, 122 Weeks = . . . . . 854

— 1146

The whole period 1146, is a Cycle, the Moon fast 24h. 28m.

Years.

## CXIII. THE III. CRUSADE, 1189.

From A, is the trinal of 34 =	1191
This is a great Chronological era, being from Creation 6666 years bisected by the birth of Abraham from Creation 3333 years. The former period consists of 360 Sari.	

## CXIV. THE CRUSADE AGAINST THE ALBIGENSES, 1209.

From A, 173 Weeks =	1211
From B, 24 Jubilees =	1176

## CXV. JERUSALEM TAKEN FROM THE CHRISTIANS BY THE KARISMIANS, 1244.

From A, 178 Weeks =	1246
From B, 173 Weeks =	1211

This great era, when Jerusalem finally fell into the hands of the Mahomedan powers, is marked by the following great periods, connecting with former ages.

It is from the birth of Ham, b.c. 3314, 4557 years, or the trinals  $31 \times 3 = 93$  Jubilees = 4557.

From the birth of Shem, b.c. 3315, it is 43, the trinal of 6 multiplied by 106 = 4558.

From Noah's egression from the Ark it is 4459 years, or 13 Weeks of the Jubilee, and from the accession of Saul, b.c. 1110, the trinal of 48 = 2353 years.

Since 1244, no Christian in arms has been permitted to enter the Holy City.

From 1244 to 1845, when the Firman of the Sultan was granted for the erection of a Church on Mount Zion, are 601 years, the trinal of 24.

Years.

## CXVI. BAGDAD TAKEN BY THE MOGHULS.—

## THE END OF THE CALIPHAT, 1258.

From A, the Cycle and Prophetic period of	1260
From B, 25 Jubilees =	1225

Both periods are of stupendous perfection.

## CXVII. JULIUS II. POPE, 1503.

From A, the Week of 43, the trinal of 6 = 301	
multiplied by 5 = . . . . .	1505
From B, 30 Jubilees = . . . . .	1470

Both periods, marking this period when the Papacy reached in the person of this wicked Pope the Climacterick of its atrocity, are transcendantly perfect.

In the same year, Maximilian I. assumed the title of Emperor of Germany, and, by his command, the grievances of the German nation against the Papacy were drawn up.

## CXVIII. V. LATERAN COUNCIL, CALLED BY JULIUS II., 1512.

It meets 10th May.

From A, the trinal of 27 = 757 multiplied by 2 =	1504
The period is bisected by Pepin entering Italy with an army, and delivering up several towns to the Pope, which was the origin of his temporal power.	

## CXIX. THE REFORMATION BEGINS IN GERMANY, 1517.

From A, 31 Jubilees = . . . . .	1519
From B, 212 Weeks = . . . . .	1484
The same year Jerusalem taken by the Ottomans, under Selim I.	

Years.

**CXX. LUTHER BURNS THE PAPAL BULL, AND  
DECLARIES THE POPE ANTICHRIST, 1520.**

From A,  $\frac{19+19^2+19^3}{19} = 381 \times 2 = 762 + (19 \times 40) =$

760 = . . . . . 1522

**CXXI. THE REFORMATION BEGUN IN ENGLAND, 1533.**

From A, 307, the trinal of  $17 \times 5$  = . . . . . 1535

From B . . . . . 1500

**CXXII. THE ACT OF PARLIAMENT ABOLISHING THE PAPAL JURISDICTION IN ENGLAND, 1534.**

From A,  $12 \times 128$  = . . . . . 1536

128 is the 8th term in Geometrical progression,  
unity being the 1st, and 2 the ratio.

From B, 79 Cycles of 19 = . . . . . 1501  
79 being a Prime.

These periods being both perfect, mark, as with a  
pen of iron, this date as an Era in Chronology.

The same year, Paul III. Pope of Rome.

**CXXIII. HE ISSUES A BULL OF DEPOSITION  
FROM HIS KINGDOM AGAINST HENRY VIII.**

—The Bible ordered to be had in all  
Churches in England, 1538.

From A,  $70 \times 11 \times 2$  = . . . . . 1540

From B, 301, the Week of 43, the trinal of  $6 \times 5$  = 1505  
Both periods are stupendously perfect.

**CXXIV. THE COUNCIL OF TRENT OPENED,  
1545.**

From A,  $7 \times 221$  = . . . . . 1547

Which subdivides itself

Years.

1st.  $7 \times 20 = 140$  ends at the ordination of Mark,  
the first Gentile Bishop of Jerusalem, in  
A.C. 138. From Creation 1123, the trinal of  
 $33 \times 5 = 165$  years.

2d. Thence 201, a Cycle in Astronomy, the Moon  
15h. 25m. fast  $\times 7 =$  the trinal of 37 = 1407,  
in 1545.

From B,  $7 \times 12 = 84 (= 21$ , the trinal of  $4 \times 4)$   
 $\times 3^2 = 9 \times 2 = 18 = . . . . .$  1512

Both periods are stupendously perfect.

**CXXV. THE PEACE OF PASSAU SECURES  
THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE PROTESTANT  
CHURCHES IN GERMANY, 1552.**

From A, 2 Weeks of 111, the trinal of 10, or  
 $777 \times 2 = . . . . .$  1554

From B, 31, the trinal of 5, multiplied by the  
Jubilee, or  $7^2 = . . . . .$  1519

We must here again, notwithstanding the endless  
repetition of the words, write that both periods  
are stupendously perfect.

**CXXVI. MARY REIGNS IN ENGLAND,  
1553.**

From B, 80 Cycles of 19 = . . . . . 1520

**CXXVII. THE RECESS OF AUGSBURG,  
ESTABLISHING THE PEACE OF RELIGION,  
1555.**

From B, the following series :—

1st.  $\frac{19 + 19^2 + 19^3}{19} \times 2 = 762$  ends at  
the accession of Pope Leo III., who,

N

	Years.
5 years afterwards, crowned Charle-	
magne, Emperor of the West, 795 .	762
2d. $19 \times 40$ at 1555 . . . . .	760
	<hr/> 1522

**CXXVIII. THE FINAL ESTABLISHMENT OF  
PROTESTANTISM IN ENGLAND, 1559. ALSO  
IN SCOTLAND.**

From A, 223 Weeks, that number being a Prime . 1561  
From B, 218 Weeks, or the Prime  $109 \times 2 \times 7 =$  . 1526

**CXXIX. THE EDICT OF TOLERATION IN  
FRANCE, 1562.**

From A, the Astronomical Cycle of 391, the Moon  
slow 5h. 15m.  $\times 4 =$  . . . . . 1564

This year was the beginning of the Religious Wars.

**CXXX. SECOND RELIGIOUS WAR IN  
FRANCE, 1566.**

From A, 32 Jubilees = . . . . . 1568

From B, the Week of 73, the trinal of 8 =  $511 \times$   
 $3 = 219$  Weeks of years = . . . . . 1533

The period is, therefore, constituted by the multiplication of the four trinals 3, 7, 21, and 73, and is reconditely perfect.

**CXXXI. THE MASSACRE OF ST. BARTHO-**  
**LOMEW, 1572.**

From B,  $9^3 = 3^4 = 81$  Cycles of 19 = . . . . . 1539  
A most perfect period.

**CXXXII. THE CATHOLIC LEAGUE IN FRANCE.**

Sixth War of Religion, 1576.

From A, 263, a Prime multiplied by 6 = . . . . . 1578

The whole period is bisected by the Second Nicene  
Council and restoration of Images, 787.

Years.

CXXXIII. HENRY IV., KING OF FRANCE,  
1589.From A, 43, the trinal of  $6 \times 37 =$  . . . 1591CXXXIV. HE ABJURES THE PROTESTANT  
FAITH, 1593.From B,  $12 \times 13 = 156 \times 10 =$  . . . 1560CXXXV. JAMES I., STUART, REIGNS IN  
ENGLAND, 1603. Union of the Crowns.From B, the trinal of  $12 = 157 \times 10 =$  . . . 1570CXXXVI. GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS OF SWEDEN  
CONQUERS, AND DIES AT LUTZEN, 1632.From A, the Cycle of  $19 \times 43 = 817 \times 2 =$  . . . 1634CXXXVII. LOUIS XIV. REIGNS IN FRANCE,  
1643.From A, 235 Weeks, or  $7 \times 5 = 35 \times 47 =$  . . . 1645From B, 230, or  $46 \times 5$  Weeks = . . . 1610CXXXVIII. PEACE OF MUNSTER. The In-  
dependence of the Protestant Seven United  
Provinces acknowledged,—and of WEST-  
PHALIA, finishing the Thirty Years' War,  
and securing the Protestant Religion in  
Germany, 1648.From A,  $5^3 = 25 \times (11 \times 6 =) 66 =$  . . . 1650From B, the Cycle of  $19 \times 17 = 323 \times 5 =$  . . . 1615CXXXIX. RESTORATION OF CHARLES II.,  
1660.From A, 277, a Cycle in Astronomy, the Moon  
fast 7h. 8m.  $\times 6 =$  . . . . . 1662CXL. LOUIS XIV. INVADES HOLLAND, 1672.  
The Dutch, in the extremity of distress,

Years.

open the sluices and inundate the country.

William III. declared Stadholder.

From A, 31, the trinal of  $5 \times (3^3 = 9 \times 6 =) 54 =$  1674

CXL. THE PEACE OF NIMEGUEN, 1678.

From A,  $12 \times 7 = 84 \times 20$ , or 21, the trinal of 4,

$\times 80 = . . . . .$  1680

From B,  $7 \times 5 = 35 \times 47$ , that is, the length of  
our Lord's life = 35 multiplied by 47, a Prime = 1645

Both periods are perfect.

CXLII. PETER I. AND IWAN ALEXIEWITSCH,  
CZARS OF RUSSIA, 1682.

From A, 421, the trinal of  $20 \times 4 = . . .$  1684

CXLIII. THE EDICT OF THE DUKE OF SAVOY  
SUPPRESSING THE WALDENSIAN CHURCHES,  
and banishing the people, 1686.

From A, the trinal of  $14 = 211 \times 8 = . . .$  1688  
A most perfect period.

CXLIV. THE REVOLUTION IN ENGLAND.—  
The Stuarts expelled.—William and Mary  
reign, 1688.

From A, the Astronomical Cycle and pro-  
phetic period of 1260 years ends at  
Bagdad taken by the Moghuls, 1258 . 1260  
43, the trinal of  $6 \times 10$ , in 1688 . . . 430

— 1690

This series conspicuously marks the era of the Eng-  
lish Revolution in the Chronology of the world.

CXLV. THE PEACE OF CARLOWITZ, whereby  
the Ottoman power loses nearly half of its  
European dominions, 1699.

Years.

From A,  $7 \times 3^5 = 243 = \dots \dots \dots \dots \dots$  1701

That is, 7 multiplied by the 5th power of 3, or  
by the square of 3 equal 9, multiplied by the  
cube of 3 equal 27.

From B, 34 Jubilees = . . . . . 1666

Both periods are reconditely perfect.

## CXLVI. THE PEACE OF UTRECHT, 1713.

From A, 5 Weeks of the Jubilee, or cubes of 7 = 1715

From B, 240 Weeks, or  $7 \times 12 = 84 = 21 \times 4 \times$ 

20 = . . . . . 1680

Both periods are stupendously perfect.

CXLVII. ACCESSION OF THE HOUSE OF  
HANOVER, GEORGE I., 1714.From A,  $11 \times 12 \times 13 = \dots \dots \dots \dots \dots$  1716

From B, the following series:—

30 Jubilees ending at the accession of  
Julius II., Maximilian I. takes the  
title of Emperor of Germany . 1503 1470  
211 the trinal of 14 . . . . 1714 211

— 1681

CXLVIII. GEORGE II. REIGNS IN ENGLAND,  
1727.

From A, 91, the trinal of  $9 \times 19$ , or the trinal of 3  
 $= 13 \times 19 = 247 \times 7 = \dots \dots \dots \dots \dots$  1729

From B,  $11^3 = 121 \times 2 = 242 \times 7 = \dots \dots \dots$  1694

Both periods are most reconditely perfect.

The reign of George II. is a great epoch in English and European history, signalized by the Austrian War of Succession, and the Seven Years' War, and the beginning of the English Indian Empire. It is from Creation a most

Years.

perfect Cycle of 7204 years, the Moon slow 50 minutes of an hour.

**CXLIX. ACCESSION OF MARIA THERESA,**  
1740, which led immediately to the War of Succession. The King of Prussia invades Silesia.

From A, 871, the trial of  $29 \times 2 =$  . . . . . 1742

**CL. WAR OF SUCCESSION.** Elizabeth Petrowna dethrones Iwan III., and reigns 21 years in Russia, 1741.

From A, 249 Weeks = . . . . . 1743

From B, 244 Weeks = . . . . . 1708

**CLI. THE PRETENDER ROUTED AT CULLO-**  
DEN, 1746.

From A, 92 Cycles of 19 = . . . . . 1748

**CLII. THE PEACE OF AIX-LA-CHAPELLE,**  
1748.

From A,  $7 \times 10 \times 5^2$ , or 25 periods of 70 = . . . . . 1750

From B,  $35 = 5$  Weeks of the Jubilee = . . . . . 1715

Both periods are stupendously perfect.

**CLIII. WAR BETWEEN FRANCE AND ENGLAND,** 1755, which, next year, issues in the Seven Years' War.

From A, 251 Weeks = . . . . . 1757

From B, 246 Weeks = . . . . . 1722

**CLIV. THE FAMILY COMPACT BETWEEN**  
FRANCE AND SPAIN, 1761.

From B, the cube of 12 = . . . . . 1728

**CLV. WAR WITH SPAIN. PETER III. REIGNS**  
IN RUSSIA. PEACE OF PETERSBURGH between Russia and Prussia, 1762.

	Years.
From A, 252 Weeks, or 36 Jubilees = . . . . .	1764
From B, 247 Weeks, or the Metonic Cycle multiplied by 7 and 13, the trinal of 2 and 3 = 91, the trinal of 9, or the Week of 19 = 133, also the trinal of 11, multiplied by 13 = . . . . .	1729
This period thus combines in itself the Cycle of 19, and the trinals 3, 7, 13, 91, and 133, and is complexly perfect.	

## CLVI. THE PEACE OF 1763.

From A, the Cycle of 1765 years, the Moon slow 5 h. 37 m. . . . .	1765
---	------

This is a great Chronological Era, being from the Confusion of Tongues, B.C. 2398, 4 multiples of the perfect Cycle of 1040 years. Also from the Siege of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, B.C. 590, 48 Jubilees = 2352 years.

## CLVII. LOUIS XVI., KING OF FRANCE.

## OPENING OF THE AMERICAN CONGRESS at Philadelphia, 1774.

From A, the trinal of 10 = $111 \times 4^3 = 16$ = . . . . .	1776
--	------

## CLVIII. DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF THE UNITED STATES, 1776.

From A, 254 Weeks = . . . . .	1778
-------------------------------	------

From B, 249 Weeks = . . . . .	1743
-------------------------------	------

## CLIX. THE PEACE OF PARIS AND VERSAILLES, BETWEEN ENGLAND AND AMERICA, 1783.

From A, 255, or $17 \times 5 \times 3$ Weeks = . . . . .	1785
--	------

From B, 250 Weeks = 25 periods of 70 = 10 multiples of the life of Abraham—a number most perfect = . . . . .	1750
--	------

Years.

## CLX. THE FRENCH REVOLUTION, 1789.

From A, 9 periods of 199, a Prime, which nearly all touch eras in history:—

The 2d arrives at the desolation of the Empire by Alaric in . . . . .	396
The 3d, at John, Bishop of Constantinople, assuming the title of Universal Bishop . . . . .	595
The 4th, at the Council of Frankfort condemning images . . . . .	794
The 6th, at Richard Cœur de Lion,— treaty with Saladin, and embarkation to return to Europe . . . . .	1192
The 9th, at . . . . .	1789
	— 1791

Also the following Series:—

To the beginning of the Reformation, 1517, 31 Jubilees = . . . . .	1519
To the beginning of the American War, the harbinger of the French Revolution, in 1775, 43, the trinal of $6 \times 6$ =	
$6 + 6^3 + 6^3 = . . . . .$	258
To 1789, 2 Weeks = . . . . .	14
	— 1791

From B, 43, the trinal of  $6 \times 6 = 258$ , at the elevation of Constantius to the rank of Cæsar by Diocletian, 1st March, 292, the Scriptural year, 291.

Another period of 258 ends at the last taking of Rome by the Goths, 549.

Whence 31, the trinal  $5 \times 40 = 1240$ , arrives at 1789 = 1756

Years.

This great Epoch is from the death of Seth 125

Jubilees = 6125 years;—from that of Noah, 95

Jubilees = 245 Cycles of 19 = 931, the trinal of

$30 \times 5 = 4655$  years; and from the Deluge

$11 \times 13 = 143 \times 5 = 715$  weeks = 5005 years.

**CLXI. CONFISCATION OF THE WHOLE PROPERTY OF THE CHURCH IN FRANCE, 1790.**

From A, the 9th term of a period of Geometrical progression, 1, the first term, and 2, the ratio  
 $= 256$  Weeks = . . . . . 1792

From B, 251 Weeks = . . . . . 1757

**CLXII. FALL OF THE FRENCH MONARCHY, 1792.—BEGINNING OF THE GREAT WAR OF EUROPE.**

From A, the trinal of 3 =  $13 \times 3 = 39 \times 2 = 78$   
 $\times 23 = . . . . .$  1794

This great Era is—

From the Fall, b.c. 5461, 148 Jubilees = 7252

From the Exodus, 1639, 70 Jubilees = . 3430

From the birth of David, 1100, 59

Jubilees = . . . . . 2891

From the baptism of our Lord, a.c. 28,  
 36 Jubilees = . . . . . 1764

And from B, a Series—

1. 90 Cycles of 19 expire in the year  
 $1743$ , when George II. in person gained  
 the great battle of Dettingen . . . . 1710
2. 1 Jubilee in 1792 . . . . . 49  
 —————— 1759

**CLXIII. THE PEACE OF CAMPO FORMIO,  
 THE FIRST PAUSE IN THE WAR OF  
 EUROPE, 1797.**

	Years.
From A, 257 Weeks, that number being a Prime =	1799
The trinal of 12 = 157 Weeks, at the defeat of Solymen by the armies of the first Crusade, at Doryloëum, in 1097 .	1099
100 Weeks in . . . . .	1797 . 700
	— 1799
From B, 36 Jubilees = . . . . .	1764
CLXIV. NAPOLEON, EMPEROR OF THE FRENCH, 1804.	
From A, the Week of 43, the trinal of 6 = 301 × 6 = 6 + 6 <sup>3</sup> + 6 <sup>3</sup> = 258 Weeks of years = .	1806
A period stupendously perfect.	
From B, 11 × 23 = 253 Weeks = . . . . .	1771
CLXV. THE REGENCY OF THE PRINCE OF WALES (GEORGE IV.), 1811.	
From A, 37 Jubilees = 259 Weeks = . . . . .	1813
From B, 254 Weeks = . . . . .	1778
Viz., 140 Weeks, or 20 Jubilees, at the reign of Swen of Denmark, in England	1013
The Week of 19 = 133 × 6 = 798 = 114 Weeks at the Regency . . . . .	1811
The Regency introduces a new era of victorious career in the Peninsular War.	
CLXVI. THE BATTLE OF WATERLOO.— FINAL FALL OF NAPOLEON, 1815.	
From A, a Series—	
1. 1057, the trinal of 32, at the entrance into, and occupation of, Bagdad by Togrul Beg, Sultan of the Seljuks, 1055 . . . . .	1057
2. 40 Cycles of 19 in 1815 . . . . .	760
	— 1817

Years.

From B, a Series—

1. 813, the trial of 28, ends at the siege of Rome by the Saracens, who plunder its suburbs, 846 . . . . .	813
2. 51 Cycles of 19, the length of Me- thuselah's life in 1815 . . . . .	969
	— 1782

**CLXVII. THE REFORM BILL PASSES.—THE  
LAST PRESCRIPTIVE PARLIAMENT DIS-  
SOLVED.—THE PRESCRIPTIVE CONSTITU-  
TION OF ENGLAND PASSES AWAY, 1832.**

From A, 262 Weeks = . . . . . 1834

Viz., 110 Weeks = 770 years, Charlemagne and Carloman kings of France . . . . .	768
$7 \times 19 = 133 \times 8$ , or 8 Weeks of 19 = 1064, at the Reform Bill . . . . .	1832

From B, 257 Weeks = . . . . . 1799

This date is from Creation a Prime, 7309. The Reform Bill passed, from the Creation of Adam, 381,365 Weeks of days, viz., on Friday, 23d March, being just 1 day less than 7309 tropical years.

**CLXVIII. THE FIRST PARLIAMENT, CALLED  
REFORMED, OF DESPOTIC DEMOCRACY, 1833.**

From B,  $12^2 = 144 \times 12\frac{1}{2} =$  . . . . . 1800

This date is from Creation  $430 \times 17 = 7310$  years, a period most perfect; and there is discernible in it the deep analogy that, as Adam stood 17 years, and fell in the 18th, and the Antediluvian World stood 17 Weeks of 19 years, and was destroyed in the first year of the 18th, so the Church of

Years.

God in these realms, at the end of 17 periods of 430, falls into the hands of the Democracy, which signalizes its first year by breaking the Treaty of the Irish Union, and beginning the demolition of the Protestant Church of Ireland.

**CLXIX. THE YEAR 1846, WHEN BEGAN THE DREADFUL JUDGMENTS OF GOD IN THE NATIONS,** by the destruction of the Potato Crop, and one-third of that of Oats in Ireland, whereby a loss was incurred of £15,916,000\* sterling, followed by a dreadful famine there and in the Highlands, wherein, in Ireland only, Two Millions of people are said to have perished. This calculation is reported to have been made in the Ministerial circles.  
 ("Standard," Aug. 2, 1847.)

From A,  $7 \times 12 = 84$  (= the trial of 4,  $21 \times 4$ )  
 $\times (11 \times 2 =) 22 = 7 \times 264 = . . . . .$  1848

From B, 259 Weeks = 37 Jubilees = . . . . . 1813

**CLXX. THE REVOLUTION OF FEBRUARY 24, 1848,** in FRANCE.—The fall, abdication, and flight of Louis Philippe.—France a Republic.—Dreadful insurrection and civil war in Paris, June 23d, 24th, 25th, in which General Cavaignac is said to have boasted that 2,500,000 balls were fired ("Standard," 9th Nov., 1848), and if only 1 in 100 took effect, 25,000 must have been the number of the killed and wounded.

Revolutions in Vienna, Berlin, Naples, Rome, Sardinia, Hungary, with civil war and bloodshed;

\* It was so stated officially in the House of Commons by Mr. Labouchere. "Annual Register," for 1847, p. 9.

the abdication of the Emperor of Austria; the dethronement of the Pope, for a time at least, (though his restoration appears to be resolved upon by the GREAT POWERS, and will probably be effected,\* in order that his ultimate fall, now hastening on by the immediate hand of the Lord, may be more conspicuous and awful), are the events which have marked this YEAR OF WONDERS, an appellation given to it even by worldly writers.

From A,  $5^3 \times 2 = 50$ , multiplied by 37, a Prime . . . . . 1850

Also a Series—

1. 43, the trinal of  $6 \times 5^3 = . . . . .$  1075

Ends at the accession of Gregory VII.,

Hildebrand . . . . . 1073

2. 31, the trinal of  $5 \times 5^3 = . . . . .$  775

— 1850

Ends in . . . . . 1848

From B,  $11^3 = 121 \times 5 = 605 \times 3 = . . . . .$  1815

The *first* period of 605 terminates on the 14th of Nisan 638, the year *after* the taking of Jerusalem by the Saracens (in 637), when it first fell into the hands of the Mahomedan power.

The *second* period on the 14th Nisan, 1243, the year *before* it finally fell into the hands of the Mahomedan power, being taken by the Karismians in 1244.

Both the periods from A and B, are, therefore, quite perfect.

Having thus, in the former and present Section, laid before the reader the whole series of time, Pre-Christian as

\* This is written on April 19, 1849.

well as Post-Christian, which constitutes the evidence for Proposition I., I shall now offer a few concluding remarks.

It was my intention, in the first place, to have selected, and fixed the eye of my readers on, some of the most remarkable periods of the foregoing Table, but I found that the selection must comprise nearly half of the whole, and, therefore, that selection was either impossible or a supererogatory labour, seeing that almost every link of this stupendous chain of time bears upon it, in all the complex variety of the numbers, the impress of the **INFINITE MIND** of the **ETERNAL WORD**, in whom the **ETERNAL FATHER** has constituted the ages. It appears, to me at least, impossible, or at least inconceivable, that any well-constituted mind can get possession of this subject, without an acknowledgment that no human language can adequately express, and no human intellect fathom the depth of that wisdom which contrived, and the greatness of that power which executed this arrangement of the ages.

It is fit and in harmony with all that we know of the glorious perfections of the Godhead, that all times, should as it were pour their fulness, at the foot of the Manger of Bethlehem and the Cross of Calvary, and, by their harmonious and combined concentration at these glorious points of the full coruscations of all goodness, of all wisdom, of all truth, of all justice, of all severity, of all compassion, of all purity, and of all light, and of all love—the points where the humiliation, the death and resurrection of our **GLORIOUS SAVIOUR**, and the exaltation of the **REDEEMED AND SAVED CREATION** do, as it were, meet in eternal harmony and indissoluble embrace—should thus do homage to and glorify Him who is the Alpha and Omega, the First and the Last, in whom dwelleth all the Fulness of

the Godhead bodily, who is the Creator of all things visible and invisible, and the bright effulgence of the Invisible Father.

In conclusion, I affirm that it has now been demonstrated that the Great Post-Christian Ages of the Church, and the World in connexion with the Church, do, as from a common fountain, as it were emanate and diverge from A and B. **THEY ARE, THEREFORE, THE FOCI AND CONCENTRAL POINTS OF THE AGES POSTERIOR TO THE MANIFESTATION IN THE FLESH OF THE ETERNAL WORD;** and they have been previously demonstrated to be the foci or points of concentration of the Ages preceding the Manifestation in the Flesh of the Eternal Word.

I, therefore, at the termination of the argument for Proposition I., remark finally, that in so far as such a subject is capable of the character and impress of that strict Demonstration which is usually, though I think wrongly, limited to purely mathematical theorems, this Proposition may be considered as *demonstrated*, and the usual letters Q. E. D., inscribed upon it.

---

#### SECTION IV.

**Proposition II.—Introductory Remarks, explanatory of the Principles on which the dates were fixed.—Great Series of Time which demonstrate the dates.—Series from Creation to C, and thence to 1846.—From Creation to D.—From Creation to E.—From h to F.—From Creation to F.—From h to G.—From h, i, and k.—Conclusion from the whole Evidence.—Summary and Final Remarks.**

IN entering upon the evidence in proof of Proposition II.,

I shall first recapitulate the date assigned to each of the events to which it has relation.

C. The Incarnation of the Eternal Word is placed in the year . . . . .	B.C.	4
D. The Appearance of our Lord among the Doctors of the Law, when <i>twelve</i> years of age, in . . . . .	A.C.	10
E. His 14th year, when He appeared in his own person, and no longer as the child of Joseph and Mary . . . . .	„	11
F. His Baptism . . . . .	„	28
G. His Transfiguration . . . . .	„	31

The three Old Testament Dates are,—

h. The Fall . . . . .	B.C.	5461
i. The Foundation of Babel . . . . .	„	2400
k. The Confusion of Tongues . . . . .	„	2398

The Proposition which is to be demonstrated is as follows:—

*Let it be supposed that C, D, E, F, G, and h, i, k, are at the dates specified, then their scientific relations to the former, A and B, and to the great eras of the world, shall be such as to demonstrate that they belong to a scheme of time arranged by the OMNISCIENT MIND, and are, therefore, certainly true.*

In originally pitching on these dates I was guided by the principle that, as I had, by *strict analysis* and *induction*, established the fact, that all the great periods of scriptural chronology are measured by *scientific time*, we are entitled, from this fact, to reason *synthetically*, and to use the measures of scientific time in order to establish the dates of great events, which, though *nearly*, are not *exactly*

defined in the Scriptures. This is substantially the same as Dr. Hale's *second rule* for chronologizing, to begin with the *analytical* method and end with the *synthetical*, as expressed by Dodwell, "*a certioribus temporibus ad incertiora progrediendum.*"

In my "Fulness of the Times," published in 1836, I, upon this principle, laid down the date of the Confusion of Tongues and Division of the Earth at 54 Jubilees = 2646 years from the birth of Enos, b. c. 5044, viz., in b. c. 2398. The data on which I here proceeded were, that the earth was divided in the days of Peleg. (Gen. x. 25.) Now, the expression *his days* can only mean the days of his administration, because the *administration* of each patriarch is the only part of his life which is common to no other person, but is peculiar to himself, just as the possession of an estate belongs to the son and heir, only after the death of his father. The administration of Peleg began at the death of Eber, b. c. 2416, and continued till his own death in b. c. 2347, being 69 years; and the year b. c. 2398 is among the first Jubilean eras from any of the great patriarchal periods which occur after the death of Eber. Now, since the division is, by the foregoing text of Genesis, thus fixed in Peleg's administration, and was prophetically foreshown by his name, signifying *division*, in placing it at the first Jubilean era of his administration, I reason in harmony with the strictest principles of synthesis.

For like reasons, and as the date of the foundation of Babel immediately preceded the Confusion of Tongues, I, in the first edition of my Synopsis, placed the building of Babel in b. c. 2400, whence to the taking of Babylon by Cyrus are 98 Cycles of 19, and to B. 128 Cycles of

19, the 8th term of a series of Geometrical Proportion, unity being the *first* term and 2 the ratio.

In the third place, there was a tradition among the Jews that Messiah was to come at the end of 112 Jubilees from Creation = 5488 years. Now, as was the *tradition*, so was the *fact*. The *fourteenth* year of our Lord, when under the Law he first appeared in his own person, being A.C. 11, is exactly from Creation, B.C. 5478, 112 Jubilees, or 16 cubes of 7 = 5488 years; and seeing that the appearance of the **SECOND ADAM**, the **LORD FROM HEAVEN**, in his own person, thus exactly corresponded in time with the traditional expectation; and seeing that this appearance bears an exact co-relation to the appearance of the **FIRST ADAM** as the visible head of this lower world in the day of his creation, I was led next to the conclusion that the event in the life of our Lord which bears an exact co-relation to the **FALL** of our **FIRST FATHER** was his **BAPTISM IN JORDAN** as our Representative, when he entered on a course of spotless obedience as the **SECOND HEAD** of the human race, which was finished by his **DEATH ON THE CROSS**. Carrying back, therefore, the same period of 5488 years or 112 Jubilees, from A.C. 28, the date of his Baptism, we arrive at B.C. 5461, when Adam was seventeen, as the synthetical era of the Fall.

In the order of discovery of these three great dates the third preceded the second, having been arrived at in the introductory dissertation to my "Fulness of the Times," published in January, 1837; but the second not till I composed my "Synopsis of Chronology," which appeared in November following.

At the time when I saw these dates I was not aware of the remarkable relations, which were afterwards found by

me, between them and other great scriptural eras, and which will be stated in the present argument; nor was it till after an interval of several months that I arrived at some of them; others were unknown to me when I began to compose the present work, and the latest has been arrived at even while I have been writing the present paragraph.

I have to add also that, in drawing up the tables which follow, I have received yet *further accessions of light*.

I shall now place before the reader the evidence for the Proposition to be demonstrated, premising that it is not my intention to go into the minuteness of detail with which I thought it necessary to support the first Proposition, containing the evidence for the two great dates of the Nativity and Passion. I shall, therefore, limit myself to the great leading eras of Chronology.

THE GREAT SERIES OF TIME WHICH TERMINATE AT C  
are as follows:—

**CLXXI. CREATION, B.C. 5478.**

### Years.

Thence to C are 782 Weeks, or 2 Weeks of the Astronomical Cycle of 391 years, at the end of which the Moon is behind the Sun 5h. 15m.

This period, uniting in it the Septenary and an exact Cycle, is of stupendous perfection.

## CLXXII. THE BIRTH OF ENOS, B.C. 5044.

Thence to C are 1260, the Prophetic period of Daniel and Revelation, multiplied by  $4 = 12^2 = 144$  multiplied by  $7 \times 5 = 35$ , or 5 Weeks of 144 (a period of stupendous perfection) = 720 Weeks = . . . . . . . . . .

0 2

Years.

CLXXIII. THE BIRTH OF MAHALALEEL,  
B.C. 4684.

Thence to C are the square of 12 =  $144 \times 3\frac{1}{4} =$   
 $468 \times 10 = 120 \times$  the trinal  $13 \times 3 = 39 =$  . 4680

This period, being the multiple of 120, the time of the long-suffering of God in the days of the building of the Ark, and likewise the length of the life of Moses, is most perfect.

CLXXIV. THE BIRTH OF JARED, B.C.  
4519.

Thence to C is the Week of 43, the trinal of 6 =  
 $301 \times 5$  and  $3 = 15$  Weeks of 43 = . . . 4515

This period is most perfect. The two names, MAHALALEEL and JARED, properly signify, THE BLESSED GOD SHALL DESCEND. Their Chronological connexion with the actual descent of the ETERNAL WORD is a new demonstration of the marvellous and recondite wisdom manifested in the arrangement of the times of the Universe.

## CLXXV. METHUSELAH BORN, B.C. 4192.

Thence to C,  $12 \times 349$ , a Prime = . . . . 4188

## CLXXVI. MAHALALEEL DIES, B.C. 3789.

Thence to C, 757, the trinal of  $27 \times 5 =$  . . . 3785

CLXXVII. NOAH BEGINS TO BUILD THE ARK,  
B.C. 3337.

Thence to C, when the HOLY GHOST began to build the FLESH OF HIM who is the TRUE ARK in the WOMB OF THE VIRGIN . . . . 3333

This period is 18 Sari, the Saros being  $18\frac{1}{2}$  years; it is also 101, a Prime multiplied by 33.

	Years.
<b>CLXXVIII. NOAH LEAVES THE ARK, B.C.</b>	
3216.	
Thence to C, $73 \times 44$ , the same as Period XIV. * =	3212
<b>CLXXIX. NOAH DIES, B.C. 2867.</b>	
Thence to C, the trinal of $53 = 409$ Weeks . . . .	2863
A number thus doubly perfect, itself a trinal and a composite of 7, the trinal of 2, and the perfect number. Moreover, 409 is a Prime.	
<b>CLXXX. THE COVENANT OF CIRCUMCISION.</b>	
—SODOM DESTROYED.—ISAAC CONCEIVED, B.C. 2046.	
Thence to C, a perfect Cycle, as in Period	
XXII. † = . . . . .	2042
<b>CLXXXI. JACOB BORN, B.C. 1985.</b>	
Thence to C, the trinal of $44 = 283$ Weeks = .	1981
This number consists of $70 \times 4 + 21$ , and 21 is the trinal of 4 and the composite of two trinals, 3 and 7; 283 is also a Prime.	
<b>CLXXXII. JOSEPH BORN, B.C. 1894.</b>	
Thence to C, the Cycle of $315 \times 6$ , also 270 Weeks, being one and a-half of the prophetic period of 1260 years . . . . .	1890
<b>CLXXXIII. JACOB'S RETURN FROM PADAN ARAM, B.C. 1888.</b>	
Thence to C, $12 + 12^2 + 12^3$ , a most perfect number = . . . . .	1884
<b>CLXXXIV. THE LAST YEAR OF MOSES AND OF HIS DEATH, B.C. 1600.</b>	
Thence to C, 12 Weeks of the Cycle of 19 = 228 Weeks = . . . . .	1596

\* Supra, page 145.

† Supra, page 147.

	Years.
<b>CLXXXV. THE CAPTIVITY IN BABYLON, B.C. 606.</b>	
Thence to C, 43, the trinal of $6 \times 7 = 301 \times 2$ , or 2 Weeks of 43 = . . . . .	602
<b>CLXXXVI. THE END OF THE CAPTIVITY by the Proclamation of Cyrus, B.C. 536.</b>	
Thence to C, 28 Cycles of 19, or 4 Weeks of that Cycle, or $133 \times 4 =$ . . . . .	532
<b>CLXXXVII. THE COMMISSION OF NEHEMIAH, B.C. 445.</b>	
Thence to C, 9 Jubilees = 63 Weeks . . . . .	441
<b>CLXXXVIII. THE CITY OF JERUSALEM RE- TAKEN BY JUDAS MACCABÆUS.—The TEMPLE CLEANSED, and the worship of God restored, B.C. 165.</b>	
Thence to C, 23 Weeks = . . . . .	161

#### POST-CHRISTIAN TIMES FROM C.

I shall limit myself to a very few of these times measuring  
the greatest eras:—

	Years.
<b>CLXXXIX. THE DEFEAT AND DEATH OF MAXENTIUS by Constantine, in the year 312.</b>	
From C, an Astronomical Cycle (also $7 \times 45$ ), at the end of which the Moon is fast 3h. = . . .	315
<b>CXC. THE REFORMATION BEGUN IN GER- MANY, 1517.</b>	
From C, 80 Cycles of 19 = . . . . .	1520
<b>CXCI. THE CONFESSiON OF AUGSBURG PRE-</b>	

Years.

SENTED TO THE EMPEROR CHARLES V., and the LEAGUE OF SMALCALDE formed, 1530.	
From C, the trinal of $8 = 73 \times 21$ , the trinal of 4, or 3 Weeks of 73 = . . . . .	1533
CXCII. THE FIRST FRENCH REVOLUTION, 1789.	
From C, $7 \times 256$ , the 9th term of Geometrical Proportion from unity, 2 the ratio . . . . .	1792
CXCIII. THE LAST GREAT WAR OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION began in 1803.	
From C, 6 Weeks of 43, the trinal of 6, or $6 + 6^3$ $+ 6^3 = 258 \times 7 = . . . . .$	1806
CXCIV. THE YEAR 1846, when the dreadful judgments of God on the Nations began by the Potato Cholera.	
From C, the square of 43 = . . . . .	1849

EVIDENCE FROM THE GREAT PERIODS TERMINATING  
AT D.

I shall nearly limit myself to one series:—

CXCV. From CREATION, b.c. 5478, to D, are 31, the trinal of $5 \times 59 \times 3 = 177 = . . . . .$	Years. 5487
CXCVI. THE DEATH OF ADAM, b.c. 4548, was from his creation 930 years = $31 \times 30$ .	
Thence to D are $31 \times 147$ , which is a period of 93 Jubilees = the trinal of 67 = . . . . .	4557
This period is one, therefore, of the deepest and most recondite perfection, uniting in itself the trinals 3, 7, 31, and 4557, and the Jubilee; and it	

### Years

measures the whole ages from the *disappearance* of the **FIRST ADAM** by death from the world, to the *first appearance* in the Temple of the unknown child Jesus, the **SECOND ADAM**, at the age of **TWELVE**.

## CXCVII. THE BIRTH OF ENOS, B.C. 5044.

From Creation,  $31 \times 14 = 434$  years.

Thence to D are  $31 \times 163$ , a Prime = . . . . 5053

## CXCVIII. THE BIRTH OF ARPHAXAD, B.C. 3215.

From the creation of Adam,  $31 \times 73$ , the trinal of  
**8 = 2263** years.

From the death of Adam,  $31 \times 43$ , the trinal of 6,  
= the trinal of 36 = 1333 years.

These intervals are, therefore, stupendously perfect. Hence to D are  $31 \times 13$ , the trinal of  $3 = 403 \times 8$ , the cube of 2, a period, therefore, reconditely perfect = . . . . . . . . .

## POST-CHRISTIAN TIMES FROM D.

CXCIX. To the CELEBRATED PROTEST OF THE  
LUTHERANS AT THE DIET OF SPIRES, 1529,  
whence they took the glorious name of PRO-  
TESTANTS, are  $31 \times 49$ , the Jubilee = . . .

CC. Thence to 1839 are  $31 \times 10 = \dots \dots \dots$  310

The whole period from Creation to D, consists, as we have seen, of three periods of  $31 \times 59$ . The interval from D to 1839, when a title was obtained for the ground on Mount Zion for a Protestant Church, is one period of  $31 \times 59 = 1829$ . The year 1839 was also signalized by great

Years.

events in the East:—the English Invasion of Afghanistan, the rupture with China, the death of Sultan Mahmoud the Ottoman Emperor, and accession of Abdul Mujeed,—the five great Powers agree to settle the affairs of Turkey.

EVIDENCE FROM THE GREAT PERIODS TERMINATING  
AT E.

1. *Measured by the Jubilee.*

I shall here limit myself to two Series, the first measured by the Jubilee:—

CCI. From CREATION, b.c. 5478, to the DEDICATION OF THE TEMPLE, b.c. 1019, the period is the Week of the Jubilee and cube of 7; also the trinal of  $18 = 343 \times 13$  (the trinal of 3)  
= 91 Jubilees = . . . . . 4459

Here we have the combination of the trinals 7, 13, 91, and 343, the Week of the Jubilee, and the period is stupendously perfect.

CCII. Thence to E are 21 Jubilees =  $343 \times 3 =$  1029

The whole is 112 Jubilees, or  $4^3 = 16 \times 7 =$  . 5488

POST-CHRISTIAN TIMES FROM E.

CCIII. To the TAKING OF JERUSALEM FROM THE CRUSADERS, and END OF THE CHRISTIAN KINGDOM, 1187, 24 Jubilees = . . . . . 1176

CCIV. To the PRESENTATION OF THE PROTESTANT CONFESSION OF FAITH TO THE EMPEROR CHARLES V., AT AUGSBURG, 1530, from E, 31 Jubilees = 1519

Years.

CCV. To the UNION OF Utrecht, which completes the States of Europe embracing the Reformation, 1579, from Creation, 144 Jubilees.

From E,  $8 \times 4 = 32$  Jubilees = . . . . 1568

PERIODS TERMINATING AT E.

2. *Measured by the Metonic Cycle of 19.*

CCVI. THE BIRTH OF ENOS, B.C. 5044.

Thence to the birth of Shem, B.C. 3315,  
are 13 Weeks of 19, or the trinal 133 Years.  
and 13 multiplied = . . . . 1729

Thence to E are 25 Weeks of 19 = . . . . 3325

CCVII. From Enos to the DEATH OF SALAH  
and beginning of the ADMINISTRATION OF  
EBER, B.C. 2517, are 19 Weeks of 19, or  
7 squares of 19 = . . . . 2527

Thence to E are the same number . . . . 2527

CCVIII. From Enos to the BIRTH OF JACOB,  
B.C. 1985, are 23 Weeks of 19 (being from  
the birth of Shem 10 Weeks, or 70 Cycles) = 3059

Thence to E are 15 Weeks of 19 = . . . . 1995

From Enos to E are 14 squares of 19, the whole  
period being bisected by the Administration of  
Eber, and being equal to 38 Weeks of 19 = . 5054

POST-CHRISTIAN TIMES FROM E.

CCIX. THE FIRST YEAR OF GENERAL PEACE  
after the dreadful War of the French Revolution,  
1816.

From E, 5 squares of 19 = . . . . . 1805

The whole period from Enos being the cube of 19  
= 6859 years.

EVIDENCE FROM THE GREAT PERIODS  
EXPIRING AT F.

1. *Series measured by the Jubilee.*

PRE-CHRISTIAN TIMES.

	Years.	Years.
CCX. THE FALL, h . . . . b. c. 5461		
Whence to F is 112 Jubilees, as follows:—		
CCXI. THE EXODUS . . . . b. c. 1639		
Being from the Fall, $13 \times 6 = 78$ Jubilees = 3822		
Thence to F, 34 Jubilees = . . . . 1666		
CCXII. THE FIRST YEAR OF THE LIBERTY OF JEHOIACHIN FROM PRISON IN BABY- LON, b. c. 561.		
From the Exodus, 22 Jubilees, or Cycle of 1078		
Thence to F are 12 Jubilees = . . . . 588 588		
The whole, from h to F, is 112 Jubilees = — 5488		

POST-CHRISTIAN TIMES.

CCXIII. DEATH OF ANASTASIUS, EMPEROR  
OF THE EAST, and enemy of the Catho-  
lics, and ACCESSION OF JUSTIN, who  
notifies it in an Epistle to Pope Hormisdas,  
wherein he, for the first time, styles the  
Popes, SUMMI PONTIFICES, or HIGH  
PRIESTS, 518.

Baronius calls this a memorable period of  
the Church, when, after long discord, the  
Eastern and Western Churches were  
cemented together. This great era in the

Years. Years.

rise of the Papacy is 44 Jubilees = 2156 years, or the Cycle of 1078 multiplied by 2, from the Exodus, and is bisected by the deliverance of Jehoiachin from prison. It is from F, 10 Jubilees or 70 Weeks . . . . .	490	490
<b>CCXIV. THE CITY OF BAGDAD</b> built by the Caliph, Al Mansur, 763.		
From the last date, 5 Jubilees . . . . .	245	
From F, 15 Jubilees . . . . .		735
<b>CCXV. CONSTANTINOPLE TAKEN BY THE LATINS.</b> —The beginning of the Inquisition in Languedoc, 1204.		
From F, 24 Jubilees = . . . . .	1176	
<b>CCXVI. THE OTTOMAN TURKS FIRST INVADE THE TERRITORY OF THE EASTERN EMPIRE, 1302.</b>		
From F, 26 Jubilees = . . . . .	1274	
This great date, which I take from the "Modern Universal History," vol. xii., p. 28, is from the Exodus, 60 Jubilees; from the birth of David, the square of the Jubilee = 2401 years; from the liberty of Jehoiachin, the Jubilee multiplied by the Cycle of 19 = 931, the trinal of $30 \times 2 = 1862$ years.		
<b>CCXVII. THE BATTLE OF MUHLBERG AND DEFEAT OF THE ARMY OF THE SMALCALDIC LEAGUE</b> by the Emperor Charles V.—The LEAGUE DISSOLVED.—		

	Years.	Years.
Accession of Edward VI. of England, 1547.		
From F, 31 Jubilees = . . . . .		1519
CCXVIII. THE FALL OF THE FRENCH MONARCHY, AND GREAT WAR OF EUROPE, 1792.		
From F, 36 Jubilees = . . . . .		1764
From the last date, 5 Jubilees.		
From the liberty of Jehoiachin, 48 Jubilees.		
From the Exodus, 70 Jubilees.		
From the Fall, 148 Jubilees.		

## 2. SERIES TERMINATING AT F,

*Measured by Trinads, and a Cycle in Astronomy.*

## CCXIX. CREATION, B.C. 5478

Computing thence 301, the Week of 43, the  
trinal of 6 multiplied by 12 = . . . 3612

It ends at B.C. 1866, the year before the  
death of Isaac, whence to C are 38  
Jubilees or 98 Cycles of 19 = 1862 years.  
This number, which is also 931, the trinal  
of  $30 \times 2$ , forms a cross-band connecting  
C with F.

From B.C. 1866, computing the trinal of 43 = 1893

It ends at F, and the whole period is . . . . 5505

## CCXX. THE FALL, h, B.C. 5461.

Computing thence the trinal of 31 = 993 + 45  
periods of 31 = 1395 = . . . . 2388

	Years.	Years.
CCXXI. It ends at b.c. 3073, whence a cross-band of time 307 (the fraction of $17 \times 10$ ) ends at A.		
From b.c. 3073 to F, are $31 \times 100 =$ . . . . .	3100	
CCXXII. JOSEPH's EXALTATION IN EGYPT, b.c. 1864.		
Being from the last date $31 \times 39 =$ . . . . .	1209	
Thence to F, are 61 periods of 31 = . . . . .	1891	
Thence computing $31 \times 21 =$ the trinal of 25 = . . . . .	651	
CCXXIII. We arrive at b.c. 1213 (whence a second cross-band of $11^2 = 121 \times 10$ terminates at A.)		
From this date to F, are 40 periods of 31 = . . . . .	1240	
CCXXIV. THE SECOND VISION OF EZEKIEL (ch. xi. 23), b.c. 593		
Being from the preceding date $31 \times 20 =$ . . . . .	620	
Thence to F, are $31 \times 20 =$ . . . . .	620	620
<hr/>		
The whole period from the Fall, h, is 112 Jubilees = . . . . .	5488	
CCXXV. EHUD AND SHAMGAR JUDGES, b.c. 1506.		
Thence to F, are 511, the Week of 73, the trinal of $8 \times 3 =$ . . . . .	1533	
CCXXVI. DAVID REIGNS IN HEBRON, b.c. 1070.		
Thence to F, is an Astronomical Cycle $1040 + 57$ , the Moon slow 7 h. 30 m.		1097

## EVIDENCE FROM SERIES TERMINATING AT, AND COMPUTED FROM, G.

I shall give only one Series, measured by the Cycle of 19.

## PRE-CHRISTIAN TIMES.

	Years.	Years.
CCXXVII. THE FALL, h, WAS B.C. 5461.		
Whence to G are 289 Cycles of 19 as follows:—		
CCXXVIII. THE BIRTH OF EBER, B.C. 2820, is from h $19 \times 139$ a Prime = . . . . .	2641	
Thence to G, are 150 Cycles of 19 = . . . . .	2850	—
		5491
CCXXIX. JACOB'S JOURNEY TO PADAN ARAM AND VISION OF THE LADDER, B.C. 1908.		
Being from Eber $12 \times 4 = 48$ Cycles of 19, the length of Seth's life = . . . . .	912	
Thence to G, are 102 Cycles of 19 = . . . . .		1938
CCXXX. THE SIEGE OF BABYLON BY CYRUS, B.C. 540.		
From Jacob's journey $12 \times 6 = 72$ Cycles of 19 = . . . . .	1368	
And from the siege of Babylon to G are 30 Cycles of 19 = . . . . .		570
CCXXXI. THE COMMISSION OF NEHEMIAH, B.C. 445, from the siege of Babylon, 5 Cycles . . . . .	95	
Thence to G, are 25 Cycles of 19 = . . . . .		475
CCXXXII. THE OVERTHROW OF DARIUS BY ALEXANDER THE GREAT AT ARBELA, B.C. 331, from Nehemiah, 6 Cycles . . . . .	114	
Thence to G, is the square of 19 = . . . . .		361

Years. Years.

CCXXXIII. THE END OF THE GREEK KINGDOM OF SYRIA BY POMPEY, B.C. 65, from Arbela, are 133, the Week of 19 and trinal of $11 \times 2$ . . . . .	266
Thence to G, are 5 Cycles . . . . .	95 95

The whole period, from the Fall, h, to G, is $17^3 = 289$ Cycles of 19, a number stu-	
pendously perfect . . . . .	5491

## POST-CHRISTIAN TIMES.

CCXXXIV. From G to the year 1836, when the English Liturgy in Hebrew was published, and the first Hebrew Christian Congregation established on the 30th Shebat of the Jewish Sacred year, conu-	
merary with 1836 (Feb. 7, 1837), in London, and has since continued, are 5 Squares of 19 = . . . . .	1805
And the whole period from h is 384 Cycles of 19, or $19 \times 12 \times 4^3 \times 2$ , that is by 24 of 16, the square of 4.	

The other intermediate events which occur in the Series from G to 1836 will be found in the Supplement to my "Fulness of the Times," "The Chronological characters marking the year 1836 as the probable termination of the Times of the Gentiles." But when that Tract was given to the public in the summer of 1836, I was not at all aware of the great event that would occur before the year terminated, namely, the publication of the Hebrew Liturgy, and establishment of Hebrew worship, which

must be viewed as signs of the approaching re-ingraftment of Israel into their own Olive Tree, and consequent termination of the Times of the Gentiles.

EVIDENCE FOR PROPOSITION II. FROM GREAT PERIODS RUNNING FROM h, i, AND k.

The evidence from h has been already brought before the reader; 1st. In the great series from CCX. to CCXII. measured from it to F, by the Jubilee, on which the original hypothesis was grounded; but the harmonies of the numbers measuring the intervening dates were then unknown to me, and their discovery afterwards formed the first ground of *evidence*. 2dly. In the equally great series from CCXX. to CCXXIV. of 31 the trinal of 5. 3dly. In the series of Metonic Cycles from h to G, CCXXVII. to CCXXXIII., no less stupendously perfect than the former.

It now only remains that I should in the most concise manner, state the chain of great Astronomical Cycles connecting h with k, with the births of Isaac and David, and with A, which were altogether unknown to me when I placed h in the year B.C. 5461.

	Years.
CCXXXV. From h to k is the perfect Cycle of	
1021 years, at the end of which the Moon is fast	
45m. 57s. $\times$ 3 = . . . . .	3063
At the end of the whole period the Moon is fast	
2h. 17m. 51s.	
CCXXXVI. From h to the BIRTH OF ISAAC, B.C.	
2045, is a perfect Cycle, at the end of which the	
Moon is fast 1h. 21m. . . . .	3416

Years.

CCXXXVII. From h to the BIRTH OF DAVID,  
b.c. 1100, is a Cycle, at the end of which the  
Moon is before the Sun, 10h. 12m. 46s. = . 4361

CCXXXVIII. From h to A is a perfect Cycle,  
the Moon at the end of it being fast 2 h. 42 m. = 5458  
All these dates are also, by this stupendous chain of  
Astronomical Cycles, conjoined, not only with h, but with  
A, and each other.

My evidence from h is now complete and triumphant.

That from k is also included in this series, but as k is  
also a part of the great series of Cycles from the birth of  
Arphaxad, b.c. 3215, to the year 1840, touching the great  
dates:—the 1st of Cyrus, b.c. 536; of C, b.c. 4, which is  
from k, 18 Weeks of 19 = 2394 years: also, in Modern  
History, the Reformation, 1517; the English Revolution,  
1688; I might have brought the Series into the argu-  
ment, but I forbear adding further to the already over-  
grown mass of irresistible evidence.

I now proceed to state finally a few particulars of the  
evidence from i, the Foundation of Babylon, which was  
originally placed by me in the Series of Metonic Cycles and  
Jubilees connected with the taking of Babylon, b.c. 538.

Since I began to pen the present Section, I have found  
from i the following series of trials:—

Years.  
CCXXXIX. From i, b.c. 2400, to D, the  
fraction of 8 =  $73 \times 11 \times 3 = 33 =$  . 2409

This series adds to the evidence both of i  
and D, which mutually confirm each  
other, as with adamantine bands.

CCXL. From i to EZEKIEL'S FIRST VISION

Years. Years.

of the Coming of the Lord between the Cherubim, b.c. 594, are 6 Weeks of 43, the trial of 6 = . . . . .	1806
CCXLI. Thence, 8 Weeks of 43 end at the OVERTHROW OF NAPOLEON AT WATERLOO, and END OF THE GREAT WAR OF EUROPE, 1815 = . . . . .	2408
	— 4214

The whole period, from i to 1815, is, therefore, 86 Jubilees, or 14 of the Week of 43, a number of stupendous perfection, measuring the great ages from the foundation of Babel to the fall of the Empire of Napoleon; measuring also CCXLII. FROM k, THE CONFUSION OF TONGUES, TO ITS MIGHTY AND SALUTARY AND HEALING AND GLORIOUS ANTITHESIS, THE PUBLICATION OF THE HEBREW NEW TESTAMENT FOR THE JEWS, IN SEPTEMBER, 1817.

With this stupendous result I finish my evidence, the whole body of which, if any can resist, it almost appears as if they would also resist if one went from the dead.

HAVING thus concluded the statement of the evidence in support of the Second Proposition, it seems necessary, for the guidance of the thoughts of the reader, that I should briefly recapitulate it.

The number of great periods in support of the first Proposition, brought forward in Sections II. and III., is ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY. In the present section SEVENTY-TWO periods have been added to them, connecting the eight dates which form the basis of Proposition II. with the greatest eras of history. They are arranged in twelve series.

The *first*,\* beginning at Creation, connects C by *seventeen* great Pre-Christian periods, from CLXXI. to CLXXXVIII., and *six* Post-Christian, ending at CXCIV., and the year 1846, with great historical dates.

The *second* † contains *two* great Pre-Christian periods terminating at D, and from D three Post-Christian periods to 1839. They are all measured by 31, the trinal of 5, and connect D with *six* great eras, beginning at Creation, and numbered from CXCV. to CC.

The *third* ‡ contains *two* great periods from Creation to E, and thence three to the Union of Utrecht, measured by the Jubilee from CCI. to CCV.

The *fourth* § contains a great period from Enos to E, measured by 14 squares of 19 = 5054 years, and from E to the first year of the General Peace, 1816, 5 squares of 19; the whole from Enos being the cube of 19 = 6859 years. This series contains *four* great periods, from CCVI. to CCIX.

The *fifth*, || from h to F, contains *three* great Pre-Christian periods, CCX. to CCXII., and the whole is 112 Jubilees. From F to the Fall of the French Monarchy, in 1792, are *six* Post-Christian periods, from CCXIII. to CCXVIII., being from F 36 Jubilees = 1764 years; the whole, from h to 1792, 148 Jubilees = 7252 years.

The *sixth* ¶ contains a great series of 43, the trinal of 6, and the trinal of 43, from Creation to F, CCXIX.

The *seventh* \*\* contains a series of *five* periods from h to F, measured by 31, the trinal of 5, and its own trinal, from CCXX. to CCXXIV.

\* Supra, page 195.      † Page 199.      ‡ Page 201.  
 § Page 202.    || Page 203.    ¶ Page 205.    \*\* Page 205.

The *eighth*\* and *ninth*† are single periods to F, measured by 73, the trinal of 8, and a Cycle in Astronomy, and are numbered CCXXV. and CCXXVI.

The *tenth*‡ is a great series from h to G, measured by 19 multiplied by the square of 17=289, and from G to the year 1836, 5 squares of 19, being from h  $19 \times 12 \times 32 = 384$  Cycles, and numbered CCXXVII. to CCXXXIV.

The *eleventh*§ is a great series of Astronomical Cycles connecting h with k, with the births of Isaac and David, and finally with A; CCXXXV. to CCXXXVIII.

The *twelfth*|| contains two series of trinals connecting i with D, and two other great eras, and also from k to the year 1817, CCXXXIX. to CCXLII.

The whole of these series contain *seventy-two great periods*, connecting the eight dates which are to be demonstrated with the greatest eras and with each other, and they are all measured by *scientific time*, by which is intended, time which has been before *measured* and *arranged* by a superintending intelligence, and the term is used to distinguish it from time *not so arranged*, which may be termed *indiscriminate*.

Furthermore, the intelligence which superintended and arranged these great series must include in it perfect pre-scienece, and is, therefore, that of the Creator.

It must be admitted, that the foregoing long detail of chronological computations, involving as to each, in order to be thoroughly understood, the necessity and the labour of an elemental analysis, can possess no attractions for the superficial and indolent. It ought, however, to be recollected, that the path of ascent to the temple of truth—and to no

\* Page 206.      † Page 206.      ‡ Page 207.  
 § Page 209.      || Page 210.

branch of truth more essentially than that of Chronology—has ever been steep and narrow and difficult.

Should the reader, when he discovers the mass of figures and numerous calculations which fill my pages, hesitate or feel alarm, there is no other course to be followed by him than to lay down the book and abandon the subject. But why should it be so, when we see the dark mass of figures which are boldly encountered by the astronomer or the mathematician, who account the knowledge of the discoveries of science a full and rich reward for their severest labour in its pursuit? If the Chronological Student has an equally single desire for the attainment of that knowledge which prophets and holy men of old most diligently sought and earnestly coveted, he will find, in the varied and complicated series here set before him, the stamp of authenticity and perfect demonstration upon every conclusion, filling the mind with that rich assurance which is among the highest rewards that science itself,—and science having reference not to earthly, but to celestial objects, for such is certainly that of the order of the times connected with the great dispensations of God and the government of the Moral Universe,—can confer upon her most importunate suitors.

It has, therefore, been proved that the relations between C, D, E, F, G, h, i, and k, and the great eras of the world are such as to demonstrate that they belong to a scheme of time arranged by the Omniscient Mind. We have also shown that there are cross-bands of time connecting the series from Creation to F with C, and that from h to F with A. It yet remains, however, in order to render the chain of evidence quite complete, that a direct

chronological connexion should be traced between h, i, and k, and B.

	Years.
I. Now, from h, b.c. 5461, to B, a.c. 33, are 5493 years.	
And computing, 1st. From h, the trinal of 43 = . . . . . 1893	
We arrive at b.c. 3568, whence to C are 12 $\times 11 \times 3^3 = 27 = 3564$ years, forming a cross-band in the present series.	
2d. From the same date to B are $12^3 = 144$ $\times 5^3 = 25$ , or the square of 12 multiplied by that of 5 = . . . . . 3600	
The whole period, which is thus stupendously perfect, is therefore . . . . . 5493	
II. From i, b.c. 2400, to B is the 8th term of Geometrical Progression from unity, 2 the ratio, $= 128$ , and this multiplied by 19 = . . . . . 2432	
III. From k to B are $3^5$ , the fifth power of 3, the trinal of 1 = $243 \times 10 =$ . . . . . 2430	
This number is, therefore, mathematically perfect.	

The three periods now given, which have only been discovered since the completion of the former tabular statement, increase the whole number to seventy-five, which, added to the 170 in the two preceding sections, amount altogether to 245; and yet, as already said, I have given only a selection. For examples of this, as the Nativity, A, is connected with the births of so many illustrious patriarchs, it follows that, in at least three-fourths of these cases, the same perfect periods which measure from their

birth to the Nativity must also measure from the dates of their conception to the Incarnation, C, and yet none of these periods are brought into the Table.

To conclude, in the same sense, therefore, as I placed the mark of demonstration at the end of the reasoning for Proposition I., and since it would be manifestly absurd to refer the stupendous relations of time exhibited in the calculations of this section to *created wisdom*, or to *blind chance*, I must also, at the end of the argument for Proposition II., place the same letters, Q. E. D.

A few remarks appear to be still called for.

In the first place, the reader is requested to recollect, as it has been stated in a former page, that not a single *established date* has been removed by me a single year. The whole of the stupendous relations in the Chronology between the events of distant ages have, therefore, been elicited by the simple process of analysis and induction, quite as much so as the principles of the Material Universe in the philosophy of Newton.

Secondly, it cannot but appear to the reflecting reader, that these stupendous discoveries rescue the Chronology of the Moral Universe from the circle of mere secular knowledge, and from being only a dry detail of dates without interest, and place it, as it were, within the Holy of Holies, as if instinct with life, and pregnant with such evidences of power and skill and complex arrangement, as to fill the mind at every step with wonder and delight. The study, therefore, though deeply intellectual, is no longer one of dry intellect, but of sanctified contemplation and intelligence. How it first affected my own mind in the freshness of its original discovery, and it has even

yet lost nothing of its power, will be best shown by the following passage from my "Fulness of the Times," published in 1836:—

"The first reflection which forces itself on the mind in contemplating this wonderful scheme of time, comprehending in its vast embrace all earthly things, and all ages past, present, and future, is, that its AUTHOR is that ETERNAL BEING who alone presides over, and directs with infinite and unerring wisdom, the destinies of all worlds, and ordains the revolutions of ages for effecting the purposes of his mercy, that *in the dispensation of the fulness of time he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth, even in him.*\*

"Had it been possible for man to have invented this scheme, he who devised it would have proclaimed to the world his own invention; and it could not have remained concealed and utterly unknown for so many ages. The very fact, therefore, of its having remained hidden in the Sacred Pages is evidence quite sufficient that it is not, and cannot be, a human device.

"The second conclusion that we are compelled to draw is, that the book which contains this hitherto hidden and unknown scheme of time, must have been written by inspiration from God. For as no human understanding could have invented such a scheme, so no human industry or pains could have obtained possession of the materials for accurately recording the events of the most distant ages, and the duration of the lives and administrations of so many patriarchs and judges and kings, so as to bring out these collateral schemes of Jubilees and Cycles, without

\* Eph. i. 10.

so much as the defect of *a year*; and at distances in the revolutions of ages so immense as to transcend, beyond measure, all the records of authentic history, and even the ages of fable and romance. I confess I see not what an infidel can say against such a conclusion; and if the Christian who reads these pages shall feel at all as the writer has done at every step of the discoveries which have burst upon him in these researches, he will be constrained, at every moment, to lift up his heart in adoration and wonder at the greatness of the wisdom and the power of that Eternal Being, who thus manifests the depth of his unsearchable wisdom, in ordering the times and the seasons, and who has been pleased to reveal these things in the Scriptures for the instruction of the Church, and in order to the preparation of his servants for the things that are coming, and **TO WHOM, THROUGH CHRIST JESUS, THE ETERNAL HIGH PRIEST, BE GLORY AND PRAISE, FOR EVER AND EVER. AMEN.**

“The next, and last, conclusion inevitably flowing from the consideration of these things is, to the utter shame and discomfiture of all Infidelity, that the **HEBREW DISPENSATION** (by which expression I mean the whole of that economy which is included in the promise to Abraham, *‘In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed’*\*) is from God, and all its events ordered by his providence, and all its destinies—past, present, and future—under his especial superintendence and guardianship; and including, as it does, in it the first and second Comings of **MESSIAH**, all the hopes of this lower creation rest upon and are involved in the future developments of this dispensation, in which are contained every promise of

\* Gen. xxii. 18.

mercy and salvation to the human race, and of the deliverance of the creation itself from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God.” \*

\* Rom. viii. 21.

## PART III.

### THE CHRONOGRAPHY, ETC.

---

#### SECTION I.

Introductory Remarks.—Deep personal respect due to the Chevalier Bunsen.—Reservation of liberty in treating the question.—M. Bunsen's View of the Notes of Time in the Old Testament.—Accuracy of his terms controverted.—His use of the term “hypothesis.”—Limitations to the employment of hypothesis.—His reasons against the principle that Chronology is matter of Revelation.—His terms inaccurate.—If Chronology be a part of what God has spoken it must be true.—Remark by the Chevalier as to the difference between the kernel of truth and its shell.—Animadversions on this.—Four points laid down.—The rejection of Chronology as revealed includes the rejection of Revelation itself.—Arguments for rejecting his system.—Acts xvii. 26. The words imply a scientific order.—This order well known to the Ancient Synagogue.—Deep devices of the Rabbis for preserving this order in their curtailed system,—exemplified.—Gal. iv. 4.—Daniel's Seventy Weeks.—By time God regulates the events of his Moral Administration.—Scriptural exemplifications of this.—Corollary from all that has been offered.—Has God REVEALED the Times?—This discussion forced upon us by the Chevalier's negation, and his reference to Egyptian records.—Character of Egypt, brutish Idolatry.—Testimony of Diodorus.—M. Bunsen's grounds for rejecting Chronology as revealed.—Remarks on the danger of familiarity with images of Idolatry.—The knowledge of time essential to Creation.—Incredibility of M. Bunsen's hypothesis.—If no Chronology of the First Ages, whence the belief of Christ's Advent in the Fifty-fifth Century from Creation?—Suetonius.—Tacitus.—Conclusion.

IN entering on the necessary task of examining the state-

ments and reasoning of the Chevalier Bunsen in reference to the Scriptural Chronology, I shall begin by expressing a hope, that not a word or a syllable will escape from my pen unsuitable to the deep respect which is due to his Excellency personally, both on account of the elevated diplomatic commission of which he was the original bearer from his Sovereign, and his individual character. As to the former, having myself been a member of the London Jewish Society from the year 1809 till now, and having, with some who have slept in the Lord, and of whom I am, perhaps, the solitary survivor,\* joined in taking an humble share in the sorrows and the labours of the Committee in the day of its degradation and danger,—and having, at an early period of the Society, in moving or seconding a motion at one of its anniversaries, in presence of the venerable Mr. Wilberforce and my venerated friend, the late Mr. Lewis Way, called upon the Society *to attack the citadel of Judaism by planting the standard of the Cross on Mount Zion itself*, which, so far as I know, was the first mention made of the Jerusalem Mission,—from the very moment when the object of the Jerusalem Bishopric was first announced as that of M. Bunsen's mission, I have been among its most enthusiastic supporters, chiefly because I have viewed it as a conspicuous sign and fore-shadow of the mighty events which are approaching.

But while I thus feel and thus desire to speak of the Chevalier personally,—a desire which is increased by the fact of my having had the honour of a personal introduc-

\* Those two highly-honoured friends of the Jewish cause, Dr. Marsh and Mr. Grimshawe, still, through God's great goodness, are able to take a share in the Anniversaries of the Society; but they were not on the Committee in London.

tion to his Excellency, and having been received with all the courtesy of the Christian gentleman, and his having been so obliging as to forward some copies of my Works on the Apocalypse and Chart of Chronology to persons of eminence in Germany, besides accepting one for himself,—I nevertheless, in so far as he may seem, in his scheme or his reasoning, to set himself in opposition to the integrity of scriptural truth, must reserve to myself the liberty to imitate the apostle who, in spiritual things, “*would know no man after the flesh*,”\* and to treat the reasonings of the Chevalier quite as unceremoniously as those of the obscurest individual.

He introduces the subject of the Scriptural Chronology, in his *Third Section*, with some remarks, of which the tendency is to represent the notes of time in the Old Testament as being either of the nature of *tradition of contemporaneous events*, or *researches into the history of the past*.

Both terms are, it appears to me, inaccurate. The term *tradition* in the Scriptures is, with one exception, I think, used to distinguish that which is *not written* from the *written Word*. St. Paul’s words, in 2 Thess. ii. 15, are the only exception to this remark.

Again, the word *researches* is not accurate, in reference to the Scriptural accounts of the times of past ages. Research refers to matters which are doubtful. It were, for example, absurd to use this word in reference to such a testimony as that of Gen. vii. 11,—“*In the six hundredth year of Noah’s life, in the second month, the seventeenth day of the month, the same day all the fountains of the great deep were broken up, and the windows of heaven were*

\* 2 Cor. v. 16.

*opened, and the rain was upon the earth forty days and forty nights.*" This testimony is a *record* or *history* on its very face, as to the signification of which no difference of opinion can exist between men of simple minds, even as there can be no difference of opinion as to the signification of the historical proposition, that Louis XVI., of France, was guillotined on the 21st of January, 1793. The province of *research* in this case is, after believing the record, to compare it with other similar testimonies, and to determine what year of the world coincides with the 600th year of Noah. In like manner, all the other Scriptural statements of time are no less *records*. The discrepancies between the different copies are matters to be discussed afterwards. They in no respect whatever affect the original character of the book of Genesis as being, on its very face, a *record* or *history*.

As inaccurate terms always originate in erroneous ideas, so their unrestricted use does always, by reaction, increase the stream of error from which they emanate. I therefore feel myself obliged, at the very outset of this great argument, to deny the legitimacy of the terms in which the Chevalier introduces the whole discussion, and to affirm, that the Scriptural statements of time, whether past or then present, are neither *researches* nor *traditions*, but *records*, written by men who had the most full assurance of the truth of what they committed to writing; and in what way this assurance filled them will be the subject of future remarks.

The Chevalier does, it is true, appear to disarm these remarks of a part of their force by offering, a page or two below,\* a definition of "Tradition," as being "the

\* Page 163.

testimony of an eye-witness, or at least of a well-informed contemporary, of an event." But certainly this is not the sense which any English reader will attach to the term *tradition*, as it perpetually occurs in his pages, and it is quite foreign from the sense of the word in the English language. Moreover, he himself violates this sense when, in p. 189, he speaks of certain numbers of Josephus as having originated in Rabbinical comments *which have grown into tradition*.

I shall not follow him through the contents of his following paragraphs, till we come to a remark in which I am glad to agree with him, "that the success of every chronological investigation depends substantially upon the method pursued."\* But when he adds that "the value or worthlessness of the method will often depend upon the correctness or incorrectness, the comprehensive or limited nature, of the *hypothesis on which it proceeds*," I must pause to ask the question, What has *hypothesis* to do with this inquiry? There are, indeed, *after-questions*, to solve which we must, or at least may, justly call in the aid of hypothesis. For example, if there be discrepancies in different versions of the original record, as are found to exist between the Hebrew and Greek Patriarchal generations, which are of such a nature as to substantiate a charge of deliberate and complicated fraud against one or other of the parties who had charge of the two texts, then the aid of hypothesis may justly, in the absence of direct evidence, be employed in deciding the time when the fraud was perpetrated, and for what end, and against which of the parties the charge may with greatest probability be laid. But even here the employment of hypothesis must be most

\* Page 161.

strictly limited and watchfully guarded from abuse, by a jealous and strict attention to the principles of evidence and induction.

In his next sentence,\* the Chevalier proceeds to reveal, at least in a negative sense, what is the nature and extent of his own hypothesis. "WHOEVER," says he, "ADOPTS AS A PRINCIPLE THAT CHRONOLOGY IS A MATTER OF REVELATION is precluded from giving effect to any doubt that may cross his path, as involving a virtual abandonment of his faith in revelation. He must be prepared, not only to deny the existence of contradictory statements, but to fill up chasms; however irreconcileable the former may appear by any aid of philology or history, however unfathomable the latter."

The answer to this is, that there is here, on the part of M. Bunsen, an inaccuracy in terms. Whether Chronology be a matter of revelation is a question not properly of *principle*, but simply of *fact*, even as the question whether Christianity be a revelation from God, is a question not of *principle*, but of *fact*. It is, in the next place, evident that, though not in express terms, yet at least by implication, the Chevalier does in reality assume as a principle that Chronology is not a matter of revelation, and does thereby prejudicate the question of fact. It is also acknowledged that a fear of the consequence of receiving Chronology as a part of revelation is admitted and cherished. A double obstacle thus exists in the mind to the impartial reception and consideration of the evidence that Chronology is, in fact, a matter of revelation. Truth, if adverse to the already adopted principle and the already cherished prejudication, cries in vain for an impartial

\* Page 161.

hearing. The adversary has got possession of the citadel, and bars its doors.

In direct opposition to the principle here avowed, I shall proceed to the inquiry, whether there is evidence of the fact that Chronology is revealed, and, if I find that it really exists and is conclusive, I at once bow to its authority, utterly careless as to the consequences which may follow.

Before entering on this discussion, however, let me briefly explain the difference between a principle and a fact. It is an eternal and unchangeable *principle* in the Divine mind that the wages of sin is *wrath*; but this principle does not become *fact* till the creature, having sinned, is actually lying under *the wrath of God*.

Now, the denial of the *principle* that Chronology is a matter of revelation would, if strictly interpreted, include the idea that it *cannot be revealed*. This, however, is so improbable and even monstrous a supposition, that we cannot impute it to M. Bunsen. We must, therefore, limit our charge of unsound reasoning against him to that of a prejudication of the fact.

In revelation GOD SPEAKS TO MAN. If a Chronology of the world from the beginning be a part of that which He has spoken, IT MUST BE TRUE; and "LET GOD BE TRUE AND EVERY MAN A LIAR"\*\* must be written against every scheme which really countervails it: and if any such scheme is supposed to exist, either on a more perfect analysis, it must prove to have been misinterpreted and imperfectly understood, which is probably the case as to the Egyptian monuments, or it must be rejected as false, and originating with the lying priesthood of abominable

\* Rom. iii. 4.

idolatry, such as that exhibited in the figures of Egyptian deities appended to the pages of the Chevalier. And with respect to the supposed unfathomable chasms in the Scriptural times, they are the creatures of imagination. Only two very short chasms exist in the actual text of the whole Scriptures, and we have no deficiency in evidence for filling them up.

Before entering upon the Scriptural evidence for the fact that Chronology is a matter of revelation, I shall notice some other points of the introductory reasoning of M. Bunsen. He tells us,\* that, "in the contemplation of human history, faith begins, as the Sacred Books do, with the Divine origin of things; and, starting with the great facts of Creation and the unity of the human race, considers the events handed down principally in their connexion with that Divine origin. The stronger and the more pure this faith is, the more free and independent will be its position in regard to the question, really unimportant if viewed from that position, concerning the external shell of the Divine kernel." I have found it impossible to abridge this passage without injuring its force. The Chevalier then tells us what he means by the external shell. **THIS QUESTION IS, WHETHER THE EXTERNAL HISTORY RELATED IN THE SACRED BOOKS BE EXTERNALLY COMPLETE AND CAPABLE OF CHRONOLOGICAL ARRANGEMENT?**

Now, seeing that the learned writer here so largely employs the language of metaphor, I also may borrow from it a question,—Whether he has ever known in nature a kernel without also a healthy shell? It is true

\* Page 164.

that, the kernel being completed, the shell may be partially injured, or in part lost, but its original existence is essentially necessary. Even so with regard to the external history found in the Sacred Books, and their chronological arrangement; they are no less necessary to the body of truth, of which the Church is the depository, than the shell is to the kernel.

*First*, we affirm concerning them, that they were originally complete for all necessary purposes of the Church of God, one of which was that she should possess an accurate knowledge of the age of the world.

*Secondly*, we affirm, in the next place, that the Scriptural records of time have been wilfully and fraudulently corrupted by the party to which they were first committed, but not until that party had, through unbelief, lost its character as the Church of God; and not in both texts of the Old Testament, but in the Hebrew only, which, at the time when the fraud was committed, was in the exclusive custody of the party guilty of the fraud.

*Thirdly*, we affirm that, excepting in certain passages, not exceeding three in number, where alterations have been made in the Greek from a blind deference to the previously corrupted Hebrew text, the means of correcting which are happily left to us; and, with the exception of two short chasms, the best copies of the former, together with certain chronological notices given by St. Paul in the Acts, still exhibit a perfect chronological chain from Creation down to the destruction of Jerusalem and the first Temple by Nebuchadnezzar, when the Scripture Chronology is met by the Canon of Ptolemy.

*Fourthly*, we affirm, that the means are left to us, by an analytical examination of the existing texts, Hebrew, Greek, and Samaritan, and by unravelling the system of Exoteric and Esoteric Chronology of Josephus, and with the assistance of the texts and tables of some of the ancient chronographers, of restoring, with *perfect certainty*, the whole Chronology of the Scriptures in its *original integrity*.

We shall treat the various points here set before us in the order in which they may offer themselves, in following M. Bunsen through his scanty and partial notices of the Scriptural Chronology. The present Section will embrace only some introductory reasoning on the elements of the argument, a detailed and particular analysis of the chronological statements of the learned writer being reserved for the subsequent sections.

I begin by remarking that, in assuming, as he virtually does, the negative of the question whether Chronology be a matter of revelation, the Chevalier also negatives the whole letter of the Historical Scriptures as understood by the Jewish and Christian Churches, and thereby saps the foundation of revelation itself, as understood by the Church in all ages. His whole reasoning will be found to justify this view of the tendency of his scheme; for, notwithstanding some expressions of general deference to the Scriptures, we shall see that he claims as entire a liberty, either of receiving or rejecting the obvious and literal reading of the periods and numbers which occur in the Sacred Pages, as he would in believing or denying the accounts in a daily newspaper.

In entering on the general argument for rejecting his

system, I first plant my feet, as on a foundation of rock, upon the words of St. Paul, uttered in that city which was the great seat of learning and philosophy, and in the midst of the philosophers of Athens. Speaking with the authority of the Lord and in his name, he distinctly asserts as to the Mundane Times, that they were *ordained* and *determined* and *set in order*, or *arranged before*, by GOD HIMSELF, who hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on the face of all the earth, *ὅρις προτεταγμένους καί τας ὁροθεσίας τῆς κατοικίας αυτῶν*, having determined the times set in order before, and the boundaries of their habitations.\* Now, the literal meaning of these words is, that the order and arrangement of the times were no less ordained of God than the territorial possessions of the different nations. I am not aware whether a literal interpretation of these words will be placed by the Chevalier in the category of that *lamentable adherence to the letter of the Scripture*, the influence of which, he tells us, is so early perceptible even in Chronology.† But be this as it may, our duty and our safety equally require us to defer to the great Apostle of the Gentiles who had seen the Lord, rather than to the Chevalier Bunsen, who, as we venture to presume, has not seen him; and as we cannot suspect the Apostle to have been an impostor or a charlatan, and as we, on the contrary, believe that he spake by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, we see no mode of evading the conclusion that his words are to be understood literally, and that to reject them is to refuse credence to God himself, by whose authority the declaration was made. Moreover,

\* Acts xvii. 26.

† Page 196.

the only conceivable sense which we can attach to them is, that the Chronology of the world was before arranged of God in like goodly order, using the expression analogically to that of a body of men in military array, for such is the original meaning of the verb *τάττω*, that is, in **GREAT SERIES OF SCIENTIFIC TIME**. That this exact arrangement of the times was well known to the ancient Synagogue is manifest from the pains which they took so to corrupt the Chronology, that its order should be as little disturbed as possible. In my "Fulness of the Times," and "Septuagint and Hebrew Chronologies tried by their Internal Scientific Evidence," I have given various exemplifications of this, one of which is the following:—

In the Greek Chronology there is from the birth of Enos, b.c. 5044, to Jacob's journey to Padan-Aram, b.c. 1908, the period of 3136 years, or 64 Jubilees; and the series, carried down to the year 1817, when the New Testament in Hebrew was given to the Jews, is 140 (or 20 Weeks of) Jubilees = 6860 years. In the Hebrew the birth of Enos is placed in b.c. 3769, and Jacob's journey in b.c. 1760, the interval being 41 Jubilees = 2009 years. The difference between the Greek and Hebrew is here, therefore, exactly 23 Jubilees. Now the simple fact that, in this great period of Chronology, the difference between the Greek and Hebrew numbers amounts to an exact sum of Jubilees, or 161 Weeks, proves the existence of the deepest fraud on the part of the corruptors. The manner in which this result was effected must now be placed before the reader. The discrepancy between the two systems in the patriarchal generations, from Enos to Nahor, is as follows, the Greek being *plus* and the Hebrew *minus*:—

	Years.
In the four Antediluvian Patriarchs, Enos, Cainan, Mahalaleel, and Enoch, 100 each . . . . .	400
Lamech . . . . .	6
	<hr/> 406
In the six Postdiluvians, Arphaxad, Salah, Eber, Peleg, Reu, Serug, 100 each . . . . .	600
2d Cainan, omitted in the Hebrew . . . . .	130
Nahor . . . . .	50
	<hr/> 1186
The sum of these numbers, being <i>plus</i> in the Greek and <i>minus</i> in the Hebrew, is . . . . .	1186
On the other hand, the Hebrew Scribes, by making Terah die at the age of 205, in the year of the Call, when Abraham was 75 years of age,* do, in effect, place the birth of Abraham in the 130th year of his father, instead of his 70th, thereby adding 60 years to Terah's generation. It must be also acknowledged, that the actual Greek text follows the Hebrew text as to Terah's age of 205; but the Samaritan has preserved the genuine number of 145 years, which is the only one that harmonizes with the Scriptures as to Terah's age when he had Abraham, and accords with the unanimous testimony of the ancients.	
The years added in the Hebrew scheme in Terah's generation must be subducted from the sum of their curtailments . . . . .	60
	<hr/> 1126
The remaining amount curtailed in the Hebrew scheme of the generations is . . . . .	

\* Gen. xi. 32.

Years.

The journey of Jacob to Padan-Aram being predicated 1 year in the Hebrew, this adds to the former sum . . . . . 1

The total sum of Hebrew curtailment is, therefore,  
23 Jubilees exactly, = . . . . . 1127

The profound artifice manifested here by the Rabbis consists in this. The sum of 1186 years, first subducted in the Hebrew, forms 24 Jubilees and 10 years, or 23 Jubilees, and an overplus of 59 years, so that the period would have ceased to bear either the Jubilean or Septenary character. This would have spoilt the whole plot, which was to forge the curtailed scheme, so as to make it still bear the original features of scientific arrangement. Therefore, to make the surplus of 59 an even number, 1 year is further curtailed by predating Jacob's journey to Padan-Aram,\* and thus the total sum curtailed becomes 1187 years.

From this sum the 60 years added to Terah's generation (the special reason for which appears to have been to remove from the Hebrew scheme the anomaly of Abraham having been the cotemporary of Noah for 58 years, as he remains, even in the present Hebrew Chronology, the cotemporary of Shem for 150 years, and of Arphaxad for

\* The proof of this was given 12 years ago in my "Fulness of the Times," and is as follows:—

Greek Chronology.	Hebrew Chronology.
The birth of Abraham . . B.C. 2145	1996
Jacob goes to Padan-Aram	1908
—	1760
The intervals are . . . . .	237
	236

88 years) being deducted, the remainder is, as already shown, 23 Jubilees = 1127 years.

In the nature of things, it is quite impossible that the Scribes should have used such artifice to preserve a scientific order in their curtailed system, had they not certainly known that such an order existed in the original Chronology. I have, however, elsewhere, more fully demonstrated their deep skill in the corruption of the Chronology from the birth of Enos; but it would exceed the limits of the present volume to transfer my reasoning to it; I shall, therefore, content myself by a reference to the work where it is to be found, quoting only the following remark introductory to my analytical examination of the Hebrew Series:—"This Series is, I think, the masterpiece of the framers of the Hebrew Chronology, bearing upon it such marks of *deep contrivance* that, were it not quite apparent in what manner it was effected, it would be almost impossible to believe it a forgery, and not to receive it as the exact truth." \*

The next text of Scripture, upon which we ground the belief that the Chronology was scientific in its structure is Gal. iv. 4, "*But when the fulness of time was come, God sent forth his Son, born of a woman, born under the law.*" There are, I think, different reasons for giving to these words a sense in strict accordance with our views. The *first* is, that we can see no conceivable sense in which the term *fulness* can be applied to time, but that of its bearing some such internal characters of order and arrangement as to distinguish it from time which is promiscuous or without

\* See my "Septuagint and Hebrew Chronologies Tried by the Test of their Internal Scientific Evidence," pp. 36—45, for a discussion of the whole question as to this part of the Hebrew Scheme.

ostensible order. The *second* is, that the only period given in prophecy specially to measure the ages which were to introduce the Messiah, being the *Seventy Weeks* revealed to Daniel, is in an eminent degree scientific, containing in it 10 Jubilees or Squares of 7 years, or 70 *Weeks of Years*,  $120 \times 7 = 840$  tropical months, 101 a Prime  $\times 5 = 505$  Lunar years,  $101 \times 60 = 6,060$  Lunations, and 25,567 Weeks of Days, minus 7 hours and 28 minutes. The *third* is, that the lives of many of the Patriarchs, Adam, Seth, Cainan, Enoch, Methuselah, Noah, Shem, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Moses, are measured by scientific periods. The *fourth* is, that the Climacterics of human life are measured by 7.

It is, moreover, manifest from the Scriptures that *Time* is that by which God regulates all the events of his Moral Administration. Our Lord in all his actions carefully and minutely observed it. When, after John's imprisonment, he went forth preaching the Gospel, his words are, Mark i. 15, "THE TIME IS FULFILLED, and the kingdom of God is at hand, repent ye and believe the Gospel." He would not by a *single day* anticipate the time. Now, if this beginning of our Lord's Ministry was in the year 29, according to my view of the Chronology of the 70 Weeks being the equal bisection of the last week, then from Creation, b. c. 5478 to a. c. 29 = 5506 years is measured by two trinals. That of 28 = 813 from Creation, terminates in b. c. 4665, whence to the Nativity, b. c. 3, are 666 (the trinal of  $10 \times 6$  and also the apocalyptic number\*)  $\times 7$  being a week of that number = 4662 years, and from the Nativity to 29 is 31 the trinal of 5. Also from the former

\* Rev. xiii. 18.

date, B.C. 4665, to A.C. 29, is the trial of 68 = 4693. In each of these two Series we have a fulness of time from Creation to our Lord's begun Ministry. The former Series also conceals in itself another deep analogy. When Christ came to John for baptism, he was **THIRTY YEARS OF AGE**. Now in the former Series we discover that he began his Public Ministry when he was *thirty-one*, which is exactly **ONE-THIRTIETH** of the whole **AGE OF ADAM** = 930 years.

On other occasions our Lord was not inattentive to the minutest portions of time. When scornfully called upon by his unbelieving brethren to go up to the Feast of Tabernacles, he answers that his time was not yet come.\* But need we multiply these examples, since the most superficial acquaintance with the Gospel history must show us a like regard to time in the manifestation of every new branch of the truth,—even the fundamental verity that Jesus is the Christ must not be announced till the appointed hour. The glorification of our Lord himself hinges as it were (see John xii. 23; xvii. 1), with deep reverence be it written by me, on the arrangement of time by the Eternal Father; and as to the day and hour of his second advent in glory, he declares (Mark xiii. 32) that angels know it not, even **THE SON** knoweth it not, but **THE FATHER** only. It is manifest, therefore, that **TIME** is among **THE HIGHEST OF GOD'S MYSTERIES**. And, accordingly, in Dan. xii. 7, the **THREE TIMES AND A-HALF** are announced with an oath, **IN THE NAME OF HIM WHO LIVETH FOR EVER AND EVER**. Yet we are to believe that it is no part of Revelation, and for the true knowledge

\* John vii. 8.

of it we are referred to the dog-worshippers and cat-worshippers of Egypt, and the Priests of the Bull-God\* Apis, at whose consecration see for the things that were done, not to be placed before Christian eyes, the text of Diodorus! †

The importance of time is further manifested by God's revelations of the times of future dispensations to the prophets for the instruction of the Church. The Seventy Weeks of Daniel have already been considered. The 400 years revealed to Abraham will come under view in a subsequent page. But there are the 2300 DAYS revealed to Daniel (viii. 14), which, by the Jewish Rabbis of the middle ages and the great body of Protestant commentators on prophecy, are interpreted as *years*, according to the principle established by God in Ezek. iv. 6. There are the three times and a-half of Dan. vii. 25; xii. 7; Rev. xii. 14, which from xii. 6 and xiii. 5, we identify with the number of 1260 days and 42 months, and interpret to signify 1260 years, and this period was, by a Swiss astronomer, M. Cheseaux, as well as the former one of 2300 years, discovered, about a century ago, to be a Cycle in Astronomy. He submitted his paper to Messrs. de Mairan and Cassini of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Paris. The former, after reading his Dissertation, remarked to him, "qu'il n'y avait moyen de disconvenir des vérités et des découvertes qui y étoient prouvées, mais qu'il ne pouvoit comprendre comment et pourquoi elles étoient aussi réellement renfermées dans l'Ecriture Sainte."

\* Reading the word god backwards, we have Bull-dog, a duality of Egyptian deities.

† Lib. i. 86.

What impression these striking facts, that the 2300 and 1260 days of Prophecy counted as years are Cycles, the former bringing back the Sun and Moon to within *ten hours*, and the latter *twelve hours*, of the positions from whence they started at the commencement of each period, may make, with reference to their mystical interpretation as years, on the mind of M. Bunsen himself, I cannot conjecture; but I fear that by the German school generally they will be treated with mingled scorn and contempt, although in this country the mystical sense of these numbers has been received by the great body of writers on Prophecy, numbering among them minds of the highest order for judgment and learning. Be it so that our interpretation is thus met, we have been too long tutored in the school of controversy to permit any *opponent* to choose *our weapons*. Let our opponents choose their own armour, offensive and defensive, and we will select ours from the armoury of the Sanctuary, utterly careless of any assertion that they do not feel the edge of our sword.

The Corollary from all that has been offered is, that, in the Divine mind, there is an arrangement and predetermination of all times of such a nature as to be strictly scientific in its order, and, as it is the science of the Infinite Mind which has ordained it, the whole scheme, when discovered, must be such as to manifest his glory who created, and in perfect wisdom rules, all worlds. It must, in other words, in its variegated characters of order and combination, transcend the powers and previous conceptions of created minds.

The next question to be treated in this great argument is, whether God, having in the Scriptures intimated the actual

existence in the Eternal Mind of such an order of time, has, by giving no chronology of the ages as a part of his Revelation to Man, wholly concealed from him the knowledge of it, and, having abandoned his holy Prophets and Apostles, as well as that People *to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service, and the promises, whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all God blessed for ever*,\* to grope in midnight darkness respecting past times, has left us in these latter ages, when the sand-glass is so nearly run out, and the bright rays of another and higher dispensation are already beaming even to the zenith, to discover them from the dubious and contradictory readings and interpretations, by the learned men of this age of universal scepticism, of the mutilated records and sepulchral monuments of that people who, of all the ancient nations, appear to have been the lowest sunk in the abyss of brutish idolatry.

To the discussion of this question we are compelled by the denial, already mentioned, of M. Bunsen, that Chronology is revealed at all, and not only so, but by his referring us, without disguise, to the Egyptian records for light on the question of creation,† as to whether there was one universal or several partial and local floods,‡ and on the great question of the unity of the human race and its primordial epochs. It is previously asked also “If, after having ascertained the date of the Egyptian empire, we inquire whether it tallies *with Scripture tradition as to the Creation of mankind*, and whether it corroborates the chronological systems based upon it,”—“or, if we agree not to dispute about a few thousand years, how the result of our computations affects the question of creation,

\* Rom. ix. 4, 5.

† P. xxviii.

‡ Ibid.

must we blink the point altogether, instead of answering it?"

The controversy, therefore, is forced upon us, not only for the vindication of the Scriptural Chronology, but of the very foundations of the Christian Revelation, and we will not blink it.

I shall next observe, that the character above given of the Egyptians, as the lowest sunk in the abyss of brutish idolatry, will be justified by a reference to the pages of Diodorus Siculus, from which I now select the following testimonies:—

*“ Περι δε των αφιερωμενων ζωων κατ’ Αιγυπτιον εικοτως φαινεται πολλοις παραδοξον το γνομενον, και ζητησεως αξιον. σεβονται γαρ ενια των ζωων Αιγυπτιοι καθ’ ινπερβολην, ου ζωντα μονον, αλλα και τελευτησαντα. οιον τους τε αιλουρους, και τους ιχνευμονας και κυνας. ετι δε ιερακας, και τας καλουμενας παρ’ αυτοις ιβεις προς δε τουτοις τους τε λυκους, και τους κροκοδειλους, και έτερα τοιαυτα πλειω. ”*

“ That which is practised in Egypt as to the sacred animals naturally appears to most persons to be strange, and worthy of investigation. For the Egyptians worship with extreme devotion certain animals, not only while alive, but when dead, as cats, and ichneumons, and dogs; also hawks, and that which they call the ibis; moreover, wolves, and crocodiles, and various others.”\*

He afterwards informs us, that if any of their sacred animals died, they covered it with a linen cloth, and, beating their breasts, with lamentations, carried it to be embalmed; and, having provided oil of cedar and other odoriferous matters for its long preservation, buried it in sacred places.†

\* Diodorus Sic., lib. i., 83.

† Ibid., ubi supra.

Again, “However incredible and approaching to fables the things already said may appear, that which we are about to declare will appear even more paradoxical. When Egypt has sometimes been pressed by famine,” “φασι πολλοὺς αλληλῶν μὲν ἀφασθαι διὰ τὴν εὐδειαν, τῶν δὲ αφιερωμενῶν ζῶν τὸ παραπάν μηδὲ αἰτιαν σχειν μηδενα προσενηνεχθαί. αλλὰ μην γε καὶ καθ' ἣν αν οἰκιαν εὐρεθῆ κυνῶν τετέλευτηκως, ἔυρωνται παντες οἱ κατ' οἰκον οὐτες δλον τὸ σωμα, καὶ ποιουνται πενθος,” “they relate that in the extremity of want many of the people have devoured one another, but no one is accused of having at all meddled with the sacred animals. But if in any house a dead dog is found, all the members of the family shave their whole bodies and mourn.”\*

This is the system of idolatry which the apostle declares to have changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and to four-footed beasts, and creeping things.† And this is the people to whose sepulchral monuments M. Bunsen attributes a higher authority than the records of Moses and book of Genesis.

It has appeared that the original ground on which M. Bunsen rejects the fact that Chronology is a matter of revelation is, that the belief of it puts a restraint on the freedom of inquiry, and imposes the necessity of denying contradictory statements, and filling up chasms, however unfathomable they may be. In his next page‡ we, however discern certain misgivings, as if he saw the abyss of scepticism into which he is about to plunge, and lead his disciples. His work is described as “one of exclusively historical research, but *entered into with a deep feeling of*

\* Diodorus Sic., lib. i. 84.

† Rom. i. 23.

‡ Page 162.

*respect for the general chronological statements of Scripture* which have been considered for so many centuries as forming the groundwork of religious faith, and are, even at the present moment, intimately connected with the Christian faith." He is, therefore, "to admit as established the truth of all facts in the civil history of the Jews, however remotely they may be connected with revealed religious truths, *until the contrary has been demonstrated.*"\* We shall see afterwards the length and the breadth of this respect for the chronological statements of the Scriptures, when we discuss his views on those in Genesis. In the meanwhile, it is quite apparent from the passage I have quoted, and what follows in his pages, that the infallibility and supreme authority of the Scriptural Chronological statements are rejected. The whole of his reasoning, and hesitation, and seeming deference to Scripture brings him in effect back to *the naked and undisguised denial of the fact that Chronology is a matter of revelation.* Moreover, as it would be in common life an insult to address a Sovereign, or Nobleman of Ducal rank, with the respect and in the style which would be counted in the highest degree courteous to a commoner, so all professed feelings of respect for the chronological or other statements of the Scriptures which do not include a recognition of their supreme authority, are really insults to the Scriptures.

M. Bunsen, as we have seen, in avowing the negation of the fact that Chronology is a matter of Revelation, grounds it upon the apprehension that such a belief must circumscribe and fetter the freedom of the subsequent inquiries of the recipient of this faith. Now, certainly, this effect must follow if the belief be false, but not

\* The italics are mine in both places.

otherwise. To believe that which God has revealed is not only the first duty of the creature, but is the highest exercise and highest attainment of the created understanding; it is, like obedience to the will of God,—perfect freedom.

I ask, on the other hand, are there no dangers from unnecessary familiarity with the horrid system of idolatry, of which the emblems and monuments appear in the pages of the Chevalier? Is it not possible that, in the ardent pursuit of antiquarian research, men of the highest attainments in the world of science may be led to look on the idolatry of Egypt as a very harmless thing, an error rather of the understanding than a presumptuous dereliction from the glory and majesty of the Eternal Creator?

What is it which so effectually and fatally corrupts youth as to place before its eyes the paintings of obscenity? Can it then be that the habitual and complacent contemplation of the images of brutish idolatry should be quite innocuous?

Were I a father, I should show my children these drawings of Egyptian Idolatry, but I should along with them exhibit to them the prints of the Boa-constrictor, the Rattle-snake, and deadly Cobra-capella as less destructive and less to be abhorred than the former, inasmuch as they can only kill the body; whereas the system of Egyptian Idolatry destroyed the soul, and prepared its deluded votaries, after brutalizing all the moral faculties of man, for associating with those fallen spirits for whom was kindled the fire of the Second Death.

I now proceed to close the present Section, by offering some remarks upon the previous probability or improbability of Chronology forming a part of Revelation.

The knowledge of time is essential to the well-being and perfection of Creation. Even animals, in their various places and functions in the scale of being, are taught by instinct a most accurate knowledge of the times for their due and orderly performance. What is the past history of the world without Chronology? It is a chaos of events without order and without connexion, an abyss of waters without a shore. What is the order of a family without the due observance of time? Upon this knowledge depends every earthly operation, from those of the scullery and the kitchen in the household, to the movements of the Cabinets of Kings and the deliberations of Legislatures in political life.

Is, then, we ask with wonder that the possibility of it should have entered any mind believing Revelation at all, the Church of God, to which was given the *living oracles*, *λογία ζωτικά*, that portion of his rational Creation which He sanctifies through the Word of Truth and obedience of faith, which the Eternal Son purchased by his death on the Cross, who are the heirs of the kingdom of glory, who are heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ,—is this Church, and the rational Creation in this lower world in connexion with it, the only portion of God's Providential Government left without any knowledge of its times, to grope in the thick darkness of Egypt? The supposition is utterly incredible. It would place the Church of God in a lower state of honour than even the animal creation, to which, though no rational knowledge of time is given, the instinctive knowledge supplies its place, whereas the Church is here supposed to have neither. This hypothesis is contrary to the whole analogy of God's dispensations; for, seeing that in his Prophetic Word He

has been pleased to reveal to his servants his purpose to give to his saints the kingdom and dominion under the whole heaven.\* He has also, as preparatory to that glorious event, discovered, in the concluding book of the Sacred Canon, an outline of the revolutions of the kingdoms of this world and the fortunes of his Church, until his **SECOND ADVENT IN GLORY**. But all this would have been ineffectual without some certain intimation of the times, because the day of deliverance to the Church and the world, called by St. Paul, in Ephes. i. 10, “the Dispensation of the Fulness of the Times,” *εις οικονομιαν του πληρωματος των καιρων*, might, for aught that we knew without such intimation, be as far off in futurity as the fabled ages of the Priesthood of the Egyptian idols are in the past.

Whether the Chevalier may endeavour to parry this argument by following his countryman Ewald, for whom he professes so high a regard, in denying prophecy altogether we cannot conjecture, though, from his argument respecting the 400 years revealed to Abraham, we suspect it will be so. Be this as it may, we shall not, on that account, consent to lay down that mighty weapon of the spiritual warfare which is specially called by the Holy Ghost “the witness of Jesus” (Rev. xix. 10). Our Lord himself never was hindered, by the unbelief of his enemies and their obdurate resistance to the truth, from wielding the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God.

If there were no complete Scriptural Chronology, whence the eager inquiries of the Prophets as to what, and what manner of, times the Spirit of Christ did signify,

\* Dan. vii. 27.

when he testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow; and the no less eager questions recorded by Daniel in his twelfth chapter, and the answer confirmed by an oath in the awful name of Him that liveth for ever and ever? Certainly, if a Chronology of the *future* be revealed, as it unquestionably is in Daniel, there must be a Chronology of the *past*, for it is the *past* and the *present* and the *yet remaining short future* added together which constitute the **FULNESS**.

Finally, I ask if there was no Chronology of the first ages, whence the universal belief that Christ was to appear in the fifty-fifth century from Creation, a belief, the reality and universal diffusion of which is testified in the celebrated passages of Suetonius and Tacitus, and although they do not specify the *time*, the exact truth of the tradition is demonstrated by the fact, that our Lord appeared in his Prophetic office, according to the then universally-received Chronology, before the curtailed scheme of the Rabbis had been contrived, just after the end of the fifty-fifth century:—

“*Precrebuerat oriente toto vetus et constans opinio esse in fatis ut eo tempore Judæâ profecti rerum potirentur.*” (*Suet. Vesp.*, iv. 8.)

“*Pluribus persuasio inerat antiquis sacerdotum literis contineri eo ipso tempore fore ut valesceret Oriens præfectique Judeâ rerum potirentur.*” (*Tacit.*, lib. v. 9, 13.)

But, in reality, to deny the existence of the Pyramids of Egypt because we have not seen them, were not more extravagant than the marvellous fact of the denial that the Book of Genesis contains a Chronology of the first ages of the human race. Moreover, a Table of that Chronology, and of the Jewish Commonwealth and king-

dom down to its subversion by Nebuchadnezzar, B. C. 588, when the Scriptural Chronology is met by the Canon, will be placed in the Appendix; every link of it is deduced from the Scriptures. It combines a great series of facts which, according to the principles laid down by himself, the Chevalier is bound to account for. He is most respectfully challenged to do it, for the great question may not be blinked.

---

## SECTION II.

Examination of M. Bunsen's Sketches of Scriptural Chronology in Book I. sect. iii.—The title of sect. iii. objectionable.—It gives to Egypt a wrong place in Scriptural Chronology.—The cessation of Scriptural narrative from the Dedication upwards controverted.—His Table from Moses to the Foundation formed on an unsound principle.—The author's Table, remarks in reference to it.—Evidence internal and external for filling up two Chasms.—M. Bunsen's inference from the artificial character of the numbers 40 and 20—Answered by the exhibition of still more perfect Series—Wheels within wheels as in the Cherubic Vision.—M. Bunsen on the period from Moses to Joseph, or the sojourn in Egypt.—Assertion that the 400 years of Gen. xv. have no historical precision, and that the period of 430 years in Exodus xii. 40 is not Chronological, considered and answered.—The assertion that it is unhistorical charges the Scriptures with falsehood—Is opposed to the universal sentiments of Chronologers, and the Jewish and Christian Churches.—The period of 430 was exactly fulfilled.—It is the measure of other great periods.—Series from Sacred History—From Profane—In connexion with the Eras of Troy and Foundation of Rome.—Conclusion—the Chevalier's assertion crumbles to powder.—The exact Chronology of the 400 years shown from the Scriptures.—M. Bunsen

sweeps away the whole Chronology of Genesis, by negativing the Patriarchal Generations from Adam to Noah and Noah to Abram as referring to Individual persons, and by applying them to nations and tribes.—Revelation, by this hypothesis, blown into the air, and the whole received Chronology of the Church of God.—The question as to the difference between the Greek and Hebrew Systems dismissed by M. Bunsen almost in silent contempt.—Closing remark.

I now proceed to follow, step by step, the notices of Scripture Chronology found in the pages of the Chevalier, in Book I. sect. iii. of his volume. The title of this Section is, “Egyptian tradition among the Jews.—Jewish and Christian Researches into the Chronology of Egypt.”

This title, so far as it is intended to be applied to the Scriptural Chronology, appears to give to Egypt and its history, a place and an importance in it which is the reverse of the truth.

Egypt is scarcely mentioned in the Scriptures, after the children of Israel left it, but with dishonour. It is the *house of bondage*. Trusting in Egypt was the political sin of the people and rulers of Judah.\* Alliance with Egypt was probably the first snare of Solomon, who never appears to have married an Israelitish woman, and was ruined by his heathen seraglio. Egypt in prophecy is the *basest of kingdoms, never again to exalt itself among the nations.*†

M. Bunsen sets out with an acknowledgment of the harmony between the Scriptural and Egyptian Chronologies up to the time of Rehoboam and Solomon, but asserts that from the time of the Dedication upwards, the

\* Isaiah xxx. 1—3; Ezek. xvii. 16, 17; Jeremiah xlvi. 13—22.

† Ezek. xxix. 14.

continuous narrative of the Scriptures ceases.\* Now, if by a continuous narrative is intended a string or series of chronological links, following each other with the regularity of a systematic arrangement, we at once admit that no such narrative exists, for it is not in this manner that the Scriptures generally record the facts or the times which have relation to the Church of God and his People.†

But if, on the other hand, it be affirmed that there is not such a detail of administrations and notes of time in Scripture as to form the basis of a complete Chronology, then we shall, to such a *theoretical negative*, oppose *the fact of a complete Table of Chronology* formed on that basis, and the Chevalier may, if he thinks it fit, show where we have erred.

It is not, indeed, denied that there are in the direct narrative of the Old Testament two chasms or blanks, which the Chevalier, by disjoining their subdivisions, increases to four. But these chasms have long since been pointed out in my Chronological works, and the data given

\* Page 165.

† The reader may see in Gen. xxxi. 41 compared with xli. 46 and xlvi. 9, likewise Acts xiii. 20, 21, the manner in which God has been pleased to impart to us the *lengths of times* of which no word is found in the *direct histories*. These passages appear to me to contain the strongest possible evidence that the whole Scriptural text was written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, for therein, *as if by chance*, in an altercation between Laban and Jacob, and an answer to a question put by Pharaoh to Jacob, and in a discourse by St. Paul in the Synagogue of Antioch, most momentous periods of Chronology are unanswerably established, which would otherwise have perplexed us with perhaps insuperable difficulties.

for certainly filling them up. I had not then, however, seen the shorter and simpler mode of doing this from the actual text of 1 Kings vi. 1, which will now be laid before the reader.

The Chevalier then\* exhibits a Table of the Chronology from Moses to the foundation, according to his own view of the books of Judges, of Samuel, and 1 Kings, excluding, however, the periods of the whole first six Servitudes,† “*as not being historical, or as included in the other numbers, or unimportant;*” but how they are not historical he does not explain. They are no less specifically mentioned, in the text of the books of Judges and Samuel, than the administrations; and how, in a Chronological discussion, numbers which amount to 111 years can be unimportant, is quite incomprehensible. By leaving them out, he sets out on a principle utterly unsound.

His sum of years is, down to the Foundation . 442

But he allows 20 years too much for Samson, as his years are properly included in the 40 years of the 6th Servitude under the Philistines:—deduct . 20

*(These additions will be vindicated afterwards.)*

The sum total of administrations, including the

\* Pp. 168, 169.

† He terms them *rebellions*.

7th Servitude (or Samuel as Judge before the battle of Mizpeh = 20 years) is . . . . .	501
The first 6. Servitudes . . . . .	111
 The amount is Josephus's period from the Exodus to the Foundation . . . . .	612

In order that the reader may clearly discern the various parts of the Chronology for the period from the Exodus to the Foundation, I shall subjoin a scheme of it in two columns, the one containing the *Administrations*, including the *Chasms*, and the other the *Servitudes*. The Chasms are distinguished by italics, and are filled up as in my Tables, and I shall afterwards state the reasons and the evidence upon which I proceed in so filling them.

Moreover, when I come to the system of Josephus in the next section, the strict analysis of his Exoteric and Esoteric systems will have the effect, we believe, of removing every remaining doubt as to these points.

Servitudes.	Length. Years.	Administrations.	Length. Years.
		Moses, B.C. 1640 . . .	40
I. Mesopotamia.—Cushan Rishathaim . . . . .	8	<i>Joshua and the Elders,</i> 1st Chasm . . . . .	27
		Othniel . . . . .	40
II. Moab.—Eglon . . . . .	18	Ehud and Shamgar . . .	80
III. Canaan.—Jabin and Sisera . . . . .	20	Deborah and Barak . . .	40
IV. Midian. . . . .	7	Gideon . . . . .	40
		Abimelech . . . . .	3
		Tolah . . . . .	23
		Jair . . . . .	22
V. Ammonites . . . . .	18	Jephthah . . . . .	6
		Ibzan . . . . .	7

Servitudes.	Length. Years.	Administrations.	Length. Years.
		Elon . . . . .	10
		Abdon . . . . .	8
VI. Philistines . . . . .	40		
		20 of which Samson was Judge.	
		Eli 40—1 = . . . . .	39
		Total of Administra- tions from the En- trance to the Death of	
		Eli . . . . .	345
		Add for Moses. . . . .	40
			385
VII. Philistines. — Ark in Philistia and at Kirjath Jearim, 20 + 1 = . . . 21			
Total Servitudes . . .	132	Samuel, 2d Chasm . . .	12
		Saul King.—His years not given in Old Testament, but in Acts xiii. 21 . .	40
		David . . . . .	40
		Solomon. First . . . . .	3
		Total . . . . .	480
		The number in 1 Kings vi. 1.	

I shall first state why I have subtracted 1 year from the administration of Eli and added it to the seventh Servitude. We learn from 1 Sam. vi. 1, that the ark of the Lord was in the land of the Philistines seven months, and that it returned in *wheat-harvest*, or May; therefore, the battle in which the sons of Eli fell and the ark was taken must have been about September, or early in October, and the year, we may conclude, in which so great a calamity happened to Israel, although in the chain of times it was

reckoned the 40th of his administration, was, by the Scribes struck out from the administrations, which were thus reduced from 481 to 480 years, the number inserted fraudulently in 1 Kings vi. 1 to support their curtailed Chronology, the reasons for which will come more fully before us in a future page.

In the meanwhile, although this number has been fraudulently inserted in a place where there is negative evidence that it was not found in the days of Origen,\* even as it does not now exist in the parallel text of 2 Chron. iii. 2; yet we may discern the wisdom of God in permitting this act, since the number itself, being, as we have seen, the sum total of the administrations, furnishes evidence of the exact length of the two *Chasms* which have, in what way and for what end we know not, been left in the direct Scriptural narrative, and that the first of them *did not always exist* will be shown from the testimony of Clemens of Alexandria.

This number in 1 Kings vi. 1, has found its way into the actual text of the Septuagint, doubtless in deference to the Hebrew. The Chevalier states, that the number given by the Greek is 440, but in the Complutensian edition, and several other of Holmes' manuscripts, it is 480. We may without difficulty account for the smaller number, by supposing that in inserting it the copyist reckoned from the *Entrance* instead of the *Exodus*.

I shall now state the *external* evidence for filling up

\* He cites the passage as it stood in the text of the *Seventy* in his time as follows, thereby proving that the number then formed no part of it:—

Ητοιμασαν τους λιθους και ταξιλα τρισιν ετεσιν, εν δε τω τεταρτῳ ετει μηνι δευτερῳ Βασιλευοντος του Βασιλεως Σολομωντος επι Ισραηλ, &c.

these two chasms as has been done above. The *internal* evidence is their exactly making up the series of administrations to the number of 480 years, to which adding the Servitudes, 132, the sum is the authentic Chronology of Josephus from the Exodus to the Foundation, 612 years.

Our authority for the first of 27 years is,—1st. The number given by the inspired Apostle Paul, in Acts xiii. 20, being from the *Division* to *Samuel* 450 years. The former event, by the infallible inspired authority of the book of Joshua,—for we are not yet arrived at the point of denying the authority of the Scriptures on the authority of modern scepticism,—was 45 years from the sin of the spies, in the second year of the Exodus, from which it was, therefore, 46 years, being, according to our Tables, b.c. 1593. Now, measuring thence 450 years, we are brought precisely to the death of Eli, b.c. 1143, whence runs the *time* of Samuel, although his *administration* did not properly begin till the Battle of Mizpeh, 20 years later.

This period is made up as follows:—

	Years.
The Administrations from the entrance into Canaan,	.
as given page 252, to the end of Eli . . . .	345
Add the sum of the first six Servitudes . . . .	111
	456
Deduct from the Entrance, b.c. 1599, to the Division, 1593, from which the 450 years begin . . . .	6
The remainder is exactly, from the Division to the capture of the Ark, b.c. 1142 . . . .	450

The 27 years, as an essential part of the 450, rest, therefore, on the authority of St. Paul himself.

2d. Clemens of Alexandria says, in the Stromata, lib. I. xxi. § 108, that, according to the book of Joshua, he succeeded Moses for 27 years. But Clemens places immediately after that period the first Servitude, without any interval, and it therefore included, in his view, the time of the Elders and anarchy. With Clemens also concurs Theophilus. But others of the ancients, as Syncellus, the Paschal Chronicle, and Nicephorus, allow, besides 27 years for Joshua, a further period of 18 years for the elders, which is totally inconsistent with St. Paul's period of 450 years, and cannot be reconciled with it.

The *external* evidence for the period of 12 years to fill the second chasm arises,—

1st. From the period of 612 years, given in two places by Josephus,\* as the interval from the Exodus to the Foundation, which absolutely requires 12 years for Samuel. Josephus himself also gives that period as the length of his administration *alone*,† though he adds to him 18 years *ALONG WITH SAUL*.‡

2d. Theophilus likewise states the period of 12 years for Samuel. It is true that he gives only 498 years as the length from the Exodus to the accession of David, but he makes a mistake as to the administration of Ehud, which he writes  $\epsilon\tau\epsilon\sigma\omega\eta'$ , 8 years, instead of  $\pi'$ , 80, and sums up the whole period accordingly at 498 years; now if we add to this the amount of this error of 72 years, it becomes 570, which is the exact period from God's appearance to Moses in the Bush, B.C. 1640, to the accession of David, 1070. Thus he is, by the correction of a

\* Ant., vi. 5, 4; against Apion, ii. 2. The Chronology of Josephus will be discussed in the next section of this volume.

† Ib., vi. 13, 5.

‡ Ib., vi. 14, 9.

manifest error, turned into a witness for our whole computation of this part of the Chronology, including the two chasms of 27 and 12 years; confirming also the genuine Chronology of Josephus, which is 612 years from the Exodus, in Nisan, b. c. 1639, to the Foundation, b. c. 1027 = 612 years, and, therefore, 570 from the appearance at the Bush, the year before the Exodus, to David.

To return now to the argument of the Chevalier Bunsen. He offers it as a reason against the credibility of the Scriptural Chronology from Moses to Gideon, that all the numbers are either 40 or 20. In other words, because the Chronology bears the precise character of *Divinely-artificial arrangement* which St. Paul, in the Areopagus, affirms that it *actually does*, therefore it is pronounced by the learned writer to be *incredible*.

What, then, if we exhibit to the Chevalier, under the external garb of order *which he rejects*, a still more *recondite order*? or, like the Cherubic Wheels in Ezekiel, circles within circles of time, strictly scientific?

1st. From the birth of Reuben, b.c. 1907, to the administration of Othniel, a Week of the Jubilee = 343 years; and thence to Abimelech, 5 Jubilees = 245; and thence to the third year of the building of the first Temple, when, probably, the Sanctuary might be covered in, an equal period; and thence to the first foundation of the second Temple, b.c. 535, a period of 10 Jubilees, or 70 Weeks, being from Reuben, 343, the Week of the Jubilee, and also the cube of 7 multiplied by 4. Thence to the Nativity, b.c. 3, 76 Weeks, or 4 Weeks of the Cycle of 19 = 532 years.

Measuring next by the Metonic Cycle, we have, first,

from the Exodus, b.c. 1639, to the administration of Ehud, 133 years, or the Week of 19; thence to that of Tolah, b.c. 1316, 10 Cycles, or 190 years; thence to b.c. 1183, the last year of the sixth servitude, and probable date of the death of Samson, 133 years; and thence to the last year of David, when Solomon was crowned the first time, 152 years, or 8 Cycles; thence to the last year of the captivity in Babylon, b.c. 537, 26 Cycles of 19 = 494; and thence to the appearance of the Angel Gabriel to Zacharias, 4 Weeks of 19. The whole period, from the Exodus to the appearance of Gabriel to Zacharias, being the Metonic Cycle 19 multiplied by 43, the trinal of  $6 \times 2 = 86$ . Now, here we have not only a perfect sum total, but a recondite order in the subdivisions of the Chronology. Nor is this all. The Exodus, b.c. 1639, whence we reckon this series of 19, is from the *birth of Seth*, b.c. 5249, exactly 3610 years, being 10 squares of 19. Also the vision of Zacharias, the opening event of the Christian dispensation, where our series *terminates*, is from the *death of Seth*, b.c. 4337, exactly 12 squares of 19 = 4332 years. We call upon M. Bunsen to account for these various and recondite harmonies of number in any other way than by admitting a Superintending Intelligence arranging the times, and that Intelligence Infinite. We hope that so foolish a thought will not be entertained as that the author of these pages manufactured his Tables with a view of producing any one of these results. He begs to assure the Chevalier and his readers, on the veracity of a man who believes that all liars shall have their place in the LAKE OF FIRE, that when, from a close Scriptural induction and analysis, he first laid down the Chronology, not

one of these results was known to him, and that some of them have only been seen in penning this page of MS.

We shall, in the next place, press M. Bunsen with other series of chronological harmonies, all resting on the perfect accuracy of the periods of 40 and 20 years, which he rejects. Astronomers pronounce the Cycle of 1040 years to be most perfect. Although, according to our present Tables, the error of 1 h. 18m. in which the Moon is slow results from it, yet it brings the year, the lunation, and diurnal motion of the earth, to converge within little more than an hour.

Now, applying this Cycle to the times which the Chevalier pronounces to be without chronological character, I find the following among various other examples of exact concord :—

	Years.
1. The Call of Abraham was	. . . . . b.c. 2070
The accession of Solomon	. . . . . 1030
<hr/>	
The interval is the perfect Cycle of	. . . . . 1040
Add a second period of 1040, it terminates in	
the 14th year of our Lord, the date E of the	
former part of this Work.	
2. The birth of Ishmael, the type, as St. Paul assures us, of the Dispensation of Sinai, was b.c. 2059	
The Consecration of the Temple, the acme of that Dispensation, was . . . . . 1019	
<hr/>	
The interval is	. . . . . 1040
3. The rearing of the Tabernacle in the second year of the Exodus was in	. . . . . b.c. 1638

	Years.
The deportation of Jehoiachin to Babylon was in	598
The interval was . . . . .	1040
4. The birth of Isaac was . . . . .	B.C. 2045
The taking of Jerusalem by the Seljuks was A.C. 1076	
The interval is 1040 × 3 = . . . . .	3120

We, therefore, with all the boldness of Christian sincerity, but with all respect to him personally, are compelled to affirm, that either M. Bunsen must retract his rash assertion that all Chronology is out of the question in the Scriptural periods, or he must account for the harmonies now placed before him, and others without number, upon any other hypothesis than that of a simple and honest acquiescence in the declaration of St. Paul, that all Chronology is ordained in perfect order by the wisdom of God, and is revealed in the Scriptures. It, at any rate, must be inferred by me, that however qualified the Chevalier is to discuss the subject of the Egyptian Chronology, which is a question to be settled between himself and his competitors in that branch of inquiry, we think he is altogether unprepared, in the present state of his knowledge, for instituting a comparison between the evidence for the Chronology of Egypt and for the times revealed in the Scriptures, for of these his knowledge is yet scarcely matured; and the proofs of this will multiply upon us as we proceed with this inquiry.

The next period reviewed by him is that from Moses to Joseph, or the sojourn of the children of Israel in Egypt.\*

\* Book I., sect. iii., A. ii., page 171.

Here, as everywhere else, he claims the same liberty of rejecting the Scriptural annunciations of times, as if it were a common history. Nor is there any perceptible limit set to this license, so that the whole of that Book, on which the Church of God has founded her received system of time in all ages, is really cast into the mire of human conjecture; and as every inquirer must have the same liberty, it cannot fail, in the minds of many, to terminate in undisguised Infidelity.

The two periods discussed by him in this place are, the 400 years announced to Abraham in Gen. xv. 12—17, and the 430 recorded by Moses in Exod. xii. 40. With regard to the former number it is asserted, that “the time specified is merely that during which the posterity of Abraham should be servants in a foreign land, namely, 400 years,”—“that their bondage formed the *exception* instead of the *rule*, and served to mark the contrast between the years immediately preceding the Exodus and the previous centuries.” The inference drawn, after some other remarks, is, “There is, consequently, no historical precision in this statement.”

I now request the reader to open the Bible, and see by whom, and in what manner, this *STATEMENT*, as the Chevalier terms it, was made: “*After these things the word of the Lord came unto Abraham in a vision, saying, Fear not, Abram: I am thy shield and thy exceeding great reward.*”\* Thus is the whole narrative prefaced and introduced. The only speakers in it are **GOD** and **ABRAM**; and it is **GOD HIMSELF** who is, by the Sacred Historian, said to have made the annunciation which is, by M. Bunsen, termed *a statement in which there is no precision*.

\* Gen. xv. 1.

I dare not trust my pen in writing the thoughts which these words suggest ; I therefore leave them in their own nakedness to the meditation of the Christian reader. It is manifest, however, that, by the Chevalier, the whole narrative is really considered as a *Jewish fable*. There was no such appearance of the Almighty to Abram, and no such vision : the whole is a vague, distant tradition, perhaps brought into a written form by Moses. With him, therefore, we must, in the consideration of this question, reason as with those who deny Revelation—as if this passage of Genesis were part of a human narrative. Before going into the general argument, I shall inform the reader that as to the text in Exod. xii. 40, “*Now the sojourning of the children of Israel, who dwelt in Egypt, was four hundred and thirty years*,” M. Bunsen affirms, that *this statement* may seem to originate in the **SAME THEORY** which forms the foundation of the previous passage, viz., that in Gen. xv.

I shall next proceed to treat the whole subject of debate between the Chevalier and the Christian Church, with reference to these two periods of 400 and 430 years, on the grounds of abstract and Scriptural reasoning and evidence. I shall then show, from the Chronology, that both of them have been most exactly fulfilled ; and, in treating this part of the subject, viz., their actual and exact fulfilment, I shall place the historical period of 430 first in the order of inquiry, and, as second to it, the prophetic number of 400.

If the assertion that there is no *historical precision* in the statement respecting the 400 years be understood literally, and *with the precision* which the learned author seems to require, it must be considered as negativing any

certain signification whatever of the Divine annunciation. From this meaning of his words he himself accordingly does not shrink ; he boldly affirms, although his affirmation is skilfully put in the form of a question, to which the answer is self-evident, “Can we require any further proof that no *accurate specification of time* is here throughout to be expected, but that the whole is to be viewed as a prophetic mode of expressing a long period, and that the determinate number of four is but a *conventional form borrowed from the genealogical registers?*”\* Who then, I ask, with deep feelings of sorrow for the writer who has presumed to send forth these words to the Christian public of this kingdom, is the supposed BORROWER ? Is it HE who in vision spake to Abraham ?—but I have forgot that there was no vision—or is it MOSES, who recorded the vision ? As M. Bunsen demands *precision* in the annunciation, we also demand from him, not only *precision* in the terms of his reasoning, but in the statement of his evidence ; and we further request, that he will not impute to us so gross an error as that of accepting bold assertions for evidence and demonstration,

I ask, in the next place, if no accurate specification of time was intended, and that Abraham was left in total ignorance, what was the signification of the term *four hundred years* ? wherefore was the annunciation made at all ? For, be it observed, that the annunciations of *mystical* and *symbolical time* made in Dan, vii. 25, and viii. 14, and xii. 7—13, form parts of Prophetic Visions given in *symbol*, and declared to belong to *distant ages*, and which were then sealed up, and only to be opened by the great Political and Ecclesiastical Revolutions to the

\* “*Egypt’s Place*,” vol. i. p. 172.

end of time. There were, therefore, deep reasons for concealing those times under the veil of symbol, to be only rent asunder at the approach of THE END, as it *is, in point of fact, now* rent asunder. It was, however, quite otherwise with respect to the annunciation of time made to Abraham. This forms part of a vision prophetic, indeed, in substance, but uttered in a style as literal as that of the history of the past, and having relation, not to distant ages, but to times nearly impending and at the door. Its end was doubtless, like the analogous vision of the Seventy Weeks of Daniel, to guide the expectations and strengthen the faith of Abraham and his posterity, till the time of the promised redemption.

As to the assertion, that there is no historical precision in the statement of the time, it may be further asked, where it is possible in the pages of any historian, whether sacred or profane, to find precision more perfect than in the narrative of the vision in Genesis, of which the annunciation of 400 years forms the Chronology? This vision is not only narrated with the minutest detail of circumstance,—is not only supremely important in its prophetic sense, but in its doctrinal aspect is, to use the language of figure, considered by the Apostle Paul himself, in his great argument in the Epistle to the Romans, to be, as it were, the MAGNA CHARTA, the great Charter of the Church through the countless ages of eternity, proclaiming justification by faith from the curse and condemnation of the violated law. Now, this is the vision of which the annunciation of time given, according to the text of Moses, by the Almighty himself, and confirmed by the awful solemnity of a Covenant, in the ratification of which a BURNING LAMP, the symbol of the

DIVINE PRESENCE (the Shekinah), passed between the pieces of the confirmatory sacrifice, of which M. Bunsen presumes to affirm, that it has *no historical precision*.

But it is said further, that the bondage formed the exception and not the rule. Now, it is remarkable that in my "Strictures on the Rev. S. R. Maitland's Four Pamphlets on Prophecy," published seventeen years ago, I argued from this very passage of Genesis, respecting which M. Bunsen affirms that it has no historical precision, in the following words:—"It is not, however, necessary to prove that the war against the saints was carried on by the Papacy during the whole of the 1260 years; it is enough to show that the Pope was constituted the head of the visible Church of Christ within the territories of the fourth beast of Daniel, or the Roman Empire, during that period. Now, that he was thus set over the Church is proved by the Decree of Justinian, issued in the year 533. Mr. Maitland's argument is to the effect of showing that we cannot prove an actual persecution of the saints during a great part of the supposed 1260 years, therefore that period has no real existence. Our answer to this argument is, that it was thus declared by God himself to his servant Abram,—"Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a *stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them, and they shall afflict them four hundred years.*" We therefore require Mr. Maitland, according to the principles of reasoning which he adopts, to show that the seed of Abraham did actually serve, and were really afflicted by, the strange nation during the whole of the four hundred years; and as he confessedly cannot do this, we ask him further, whether he will daringly affirm, that therefore the Divine annunciation failed in its fulfilment,

*i. e.*, was not true? We presume he will with horror shrink back from such presumptuous blasphemy. Let him then apply the principles of the fulfilment of that period of 400 years to the 1260 years, and let him know and learn, that in the Divine annunciations of prophetic times there is a largeness and a comprehensiveness of purpose and meaning which mock the littleness of his hypercritical nicety."

That which I then presumed that Mr. Maitland would with horror shrink back from, though he did not, in fact, shrink from an entire misrepresentation of my argument, in his reply to my Pamphlet, M. Bunsen boldly avows. In dealing with his objection I must, therefore, observe, that the great annunciations of prophecy do not, in the least, participate in the minuteness and littleness of modern political documents, or of the reasonings and false refinements of modern dialecticians. They possess the character of brief comprehensiveness, and seize the great outlines of their subjects, to satisfy the minds of the *babes* to whom God condescends to reveal his truth by the teaching of the Spirit, and to leave the scholars and the disputers of this world *to stumble, and fall, and be broken, and be snared, and be taken.*\*

In the Divine annunciation now under review three things are affirmed concerning the seed of Abraham. *First*, they were to be strangers in a land not theirs. *Secondly*, they were to serve the strange nation. *Thirdly*, they were to be afflicted by them. It is enough to show that any one of the three particulars was actually accomplished, as the first undeniably was during the whole

\* Isa. viii. 15.

period of four hundred years, and that the other two marked its consummation.

For it is the end of every dispensation which stamps upon it its peculiar character. Thus our Lord's death upon the cross, to save us from our sins, is the event which stamps upon his first Advent the distinctive character of *appearing once to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.*\* Now, in like manner, seeing that the dispensation of pilgrimage in Canaan and Egypt ended in bondage and cruel servitude, the duration of which, at the very least, exceeded 80 years, and probably half as much more (since from the death of Joseph to the appearance of God to Moses at the bush was exactly 144 years), this *century of bondage and oppression* was that which stamped the character of the whole dispensation which terminated in it.

Even before the descent into Egypt, Jacob's servitude in Padan-Aram, connecting it also with the cruel oppression exercised by the Philistines towards his father Isaac, as recorded in Gen. xxvi., and the disingenuous devices which Abraham had been tempted to put in practice to conceal that Sarah was his wife, made it manifest, that the general character of the dispensation towards these illustrious patriarchs was not expatriation only, but, if not of bondage, yet of deep trial and fear and affliction.

Finally, with reference to the objection of the Chevalier that the bondage was the exception and not the rule, it may be asked, not without feelings which I forbear from expressing, Did He who, amidst thunderings and lightnings and the voice of the trumpet from Mount Sinai, uttered the words, "I am the Lord thy God which have brought

\* Heb. ix. 26.

thee out of the land of Egypt, OUT OF THE HOUSE OF BONDAGE," err in describing the dispensation of wrath from which He had with outstretched arm delivered his people? Was Israel commanded to profess a lie before the Lord his God, in confessing that *the Egyptians evil-entreated us, and afflicted us, and laid upon us hard bondage; when we cried unto the Lord God of our fathers, the Lord heard our voice and looked on our affliction, and our labour, and our oppression.*\* Their slavery, indeed, as to all human help, was as hopeless as that of the Spartan Helots.

I proceed to the consideration of M. Bunsen's reasons against the period of 430 years.

"Now the sojourning of the children of Israel, who dwelt in Egypt, was 430 years."

"This statement may seem (says M. Bunsen) to originate in THE SAME THEORY which forms the foundation of the previous passage:" "or it may be said the latter is the historical strictly chronological, the former the prophetic form." "Upon either view it is plain that the two data taken literally do not agree, and that they are, therefore, NOT STRICTLY CHRONOLOGICAL."

To us, who, on the assurance of the apostle, believe the whole Scriptures to be given by inspiration of the Holy Ghost—a belief which, however foreign to Modern German Theology, the Chevalier must have discovered to be common to every section of the Church of God in this country, as it was to the Fathers of the German Reformation, it appears not short of direct infidelity to speak of a number thus expressly recorded and solemnly confirmed by the words which follow:—*And it came to pass at the end of the four hundred and thirty years, even the self-same*

\* Deut. xxvi. 6, 7.

*day it came to pass, that all the hosts of the Lord went out from the land of Egypt,* as not strictly chronological.

M. Bunsen, however, in his subsequent reasoning goes still further.—“The earlier sojourn in Canaan is fixed at 215 years; this number, therefore, here forms the basis of the computation, the period from the migration of Abram into Canaan to the Exodus having been considered as ranging itself in two equal divisions, one of which belongs to Canaan, and the other to Egypt. But then, *it should have been said, the children of Israel and their fathers*, which, is in fact the reading both of the Alexandrian MS. of the Seventy, and of the Samaritan Version. *But no such regular division can ever be historical.* Consequently, the addition must be considered as a license of conjectural criticism, and a preference given to the Hebrew Text. But 430 is exactly the double of the time from Abram’s entrance into Canaan down to Jacob’s journey to Egypt. The number, therefore, is itself *conventional* and *unhistorical*. For it were, in OUR OPINION\* as repugnant to any sound critical view of the passages to suppose that in early times such genealogical lists could have been so parcelled out,” &c., namely, into two equal periods of 215 years, “as to assume the one period to have really been exactly the double of the other.”

In reading this passage (which I have somewhat abridged) a crowd of thoughts arise in my mind to which my space does not permit my giving utterance. First, the judicious reader, who is accustomed to demand evidence for every fact to which he yields assent, will see that there is here not a shadow of evidence, but crude and groundless assumptions, directly opposed to that record, viz., the

\* The capitals are of course mine.

books of Moses, to which our Lord himself in his temptation by the devil appealed as of supreme and infallible authority, to which he also appealed against the Sadducees, and with which he began his momentous prophetic exposition on the day of his resurrection, as recorded by St. Luke.

It is *assumed*, without evidence, that the period of 430 years was the result of a computation, or adjustment, by doubling the former period of 215 years, from Abraham's arrival in Canaan to the descent into Egypt.\* It is *assumed*, without evidence, that no such division (viz., of any interval in Chronology into two equal parts) can be historical. The truth of this principle I shall speedily bring to the test of history itself. It is *assumed*, against the express testimony of the Scripture text, that the number of 430 is *conventional*, the meaning of which word in the English language is, that it was agreed upon by compact. Who were the parties to the compact we are not informed. Was Moses the chief actor in it? It is further *asserted*, without evidence, that the period is *unhistorical*. Now, as no one can have the hardihood to deny that Exod. xii. does profess to be a real history, and, indeed, M. Bunsen himself, with admirable consistency, affirms,† that *history was born in that night when Moses, with the law of God in his heart, moral and spiritual, led the people of Israel out of Canaan*. To affirm that the Chronology of that event is *unhistorical* is, in other words, to charge the Sacred Text with falsehood.

Let it be next observed, that it has been the nearly unanimous sentiment and testimony of the most eminent

\* See for all these assumptions "Egypt's Place," vol. i. p. 173.

† Page 23.

Chronologers, ancient and modern, that this number of 430 years is the exact Chronology of the interval from Abraham's arrival in Canaan to the Exodus, in entire harmony with the Sacred Text received in its most literal sense. In denying it M. Bunsen, therefore, places himself in direct opposition not to the testimony of Scripture only, but to the really unanimous voice of the Jewish and Christian Churches. The only exception to this unanimity, that I know, among the ancients is Theophilus, who computes the 430 as the measure of the actual dwelling of the children of Israel in Egypt from the descent of Jacob to the Exodus; but as he had suffered himself to be deceived by the present Hebrew text, against the express testimony of St. Luke,\* to the rejection of the second Cainan, and also deducts 72 years from the administration of Ehud, the excess of 215 years, in the period from the Call to the Exodus, does little more than compensate for these deductions.

Not only are the opinions and testimonies of the ancients arranged in impenetrable phalanx against M. Bunsen in the rejection of this period of 430, but it further appears, that he has no support even from his countryman and friend, M. Ewald,† a writer who, if his sentiments are correctly quoted by a reviewer in the "Christian Remembrancer," must, by the Churches of God in this country, be numbered among those German divines not far removed from Infidelity.

I now proceed to show that the period of 430 years is the exact measure of the interval from the arrival of Abraham at Sichem to the Exodus. The Call is placed by me, on the authority of the best copies of the Seventy,

\* Luke iii. 36.      † M. Bunsen's "Egypt," vol. i., p. 184.

in exact harmony with the Chronological Summary of Demetrius, given in the ninth Book of the “*Præparatio Evangelica*” of Eusebius, in *y.w.* 3409. But, as the Call might be given late in that year, and, according to the analogy of the Mosaic types, about the time, or a little before the Feast of Tabernacles,—and as some delay, even if it were given earlier, was probably occasioned by the death of his father Terah, which was before he left Haran,\*—the remaining months of the year would be run out in the slow movements of a patriarchal family, with their flocks and herds big with young, and therefore the arrival of Abraham at Sichem is set down by me in Nisan, probably the 15th day, of the year following, *y.w.* 3410, *b.c.* 2069. The Exodus was on the 15th Nisan, April 13, *y.w.* 3840, *b.c.* 1639. The interval is exactly 430 years. The whole period was bisected by the descent into Egypt and settlement in Goshen, 215 years before, *viz.*, *b.c.* 1854; and of this mode of exact bisection, whereof M. Bunsen rashly asserts that it can never be historical, I shall produce so many examples from the records of profane history, which cannot be gainsayed, as to set the question at rest in the minds of impartial inquirers.

I shall next prove that the same number of 430 years measures various other great periods of the Divine dispensations. From the birth of Eber, the father of the Hebrew race, *b.c.* 2820, to David, *b.c.* 1100, are  $430 \times 4 = 1720$  years. From the birth of Aaron, *b.c.* 1723, to the Nativity, *b.c.* 3, is the same. The first 430 terminates at the administration of Jair, *b.c.* 1293, and the last in

\* *Acts vii. 4.*

b.c. 433,\* the date of Nehemiah's return to the Court of Artaxerxes, and the terminating point of the Old Testament Chronology, there being no note of time given afterwards, and thence to the Nativity are 430 years. The intervening period between the Exodus and the journey of Nehemiah consists of 6 periods of 201 years, which is a Cycle in Astronomy, at the end of which the Moon is before the Sun about 15 hours. Moreover, the whole period of 2066 years, from the entrance of Abraham to the Nativity, divides itself by the trinal of 41 = 1723 years, terminating in b.c. 346; whence 343 years, the Week of the Jubilee and trinal of 18, ends at the Nativity. I shall further state, that these features of perfect order have only been seen by me in penning this very paragraph, and thus has it been with me perpetually; Cycles within Cycles, where I before thought were only chronological nebulæ, have manifested themselves by the application of a perfect analysis, not less powerful in aiding the discovery of chronological truth than the magnificent telescope of Lord Rosse in resolving the celestial arcana.

I have not yet done with the historical number of 430 years. It is also the measure of the prophetical number of  $390 + 40 = 430$  years, discovered in vision to the Prophet Ezekiel † under the symbol of days, "*I have appointed thee each day for a year.*" In other words, *each day* of the Prophet's lying on his side was significative of *a year* in the history of his people. Whether this be a part of the Sacred Text to which M. Bunsen will concede,

\* Neh. xiii. 6. Being the thirty-second year of Artaxerxes' reign, proved in the first Part of this Volume, sect. ii., pp. 97—112, to have begun b.c. 464.

† Ezek. iv. 5, 6.

if indeed he does to any part, the character of *inspiration* we feel quite at a loss to conjecture, for, in truth, he appears to us to receive just as much of God's revelation as it pleases him, and no more; so that as a book, or rather **THE BOOK**, of supreme authority the Bible is cast down from its high elevation into the very mire of human disputation and scepticism. But, be this as it may, I shall now show that Ezekiel's period of 430 years was fulfilled in *history*, no less than revealed in *vision*.

It exactly measures the interval from the dedication of the Temple by Solomon, B.C. 1019, to the *second year* of the siege of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, B.C. 589, when, for want of lambs, the daily sacrifice ceased. The 390 terminate at the Reformation by Josiah in his *twelfth year*, B.C. 629, whence the 40 terminate in B.C. 589. Or if the period be computed from the first Passover in the Temple, B.C. 1018, the 390 years come out in the 13th of Zedekiah, when Jeremiah received his commission, whence to the destruction of the city, B.C. 588, is another exemplification of the period of 40 years of God's long-suffering and forbearance.

We have thus, from the arrival of Abraham in the Promised Land, to the Nativity, three different periods of 430, separated from each other and quite distinct; but as we have already shown in part, and shall now show more completely, they are linked together by intervening spaces of scientific time, and thus form one complex and perfect whole. I shall place them in a tabular form.

	Years.	Years.
L. Abraham arrives at Shechem	.	B.C. 2069
l. The Exodus	.	1639
The interval is	.	— 430

Years. Years.

M. The Dedication . . . . .	B.C. 1019
M is from L 150 Weeks = 1050 years, as to the composition of which see below, period m.	
And from l it is 31, the trinal of 5, multiplied by 20 = . . . . . 620	
m. The second year of the siege of Jeru- salem by Nebuchadnezzar, when the Daily Sacrifice ceased . . . . .	589
m is from l 150 Weeks, or 35, the life of our Lord on earth, multiplied by 30; or 175, the life of Abraham, multiplied by 6 = . . . . . 1050	
The interval from M is . . . . .	430
N. The last point of the Old Testament Chronology, Neh. xiii. 6 . . . . .	433
n. The Nativity . . . . .	3
The interval is . . . . .	— 430
N is from L 409, a Prime, $\times 4 =$ 1636 from l 201, a Cycle, $\times 6 =$ 1206	
n is, as shown in page 271, from the birth of Aaron, $430 \times 4 =$ . 1720	
n is from l . . . . .	1636

All the facts now set before the reader must, according to M. Bunsen's own acknowledged principle, \* "be explained;" and we believe that the only rational and possible mode of accounting for them is, to refer them to the superintending intelligence of the Almighty Creator.

\* See "Egypt's Place," p. xxviii.

This great number of 430 years and its bisection, 215, are applicable to various other periods of Sacred and Profane History. From the birth of Seth, the *first-born* of the antediluvian family, from which sprang the present race of Man, b.c. 5249, to that of Ham, the *last-born*, b.c. 3314, are 9 periods of  $215 = 1935$  years; and from Ham to the year 1847, when (reckoning the year from Nisan to Nisan) the last shock of the great earthquake, under which Europe and Germany now reel like a drunkard\* (viz., on February 24, 1848, but 2d of the Jewish month Adar, 1847, exactly 2 periods of 1723, the trinal of 41 = 3446 years from the death of Moses in Adar, b.c. 1600), began its mighty throes, are 5160 years, or 12 periods of 430. This immense period thus subdivides itself:—From Ham to the Nativity are  $43 \times 11 \times 7$ , or 11 Weeks of 43, and from the Nativity to 1847, the square of 43 = 1849. The whole period, from Seth to 1847, is  $215 \times 11 = 2365 \times 3 = 7095$  years; the *first* period of 2365 arrives at b.c. 2884, being 20 squares of 12 before the incarnation of the Eternal Word, the *second* at b.c. 519, the date of the decree of Darius Hystaspes for the building of the Temple, and the *third* in 1847. The last period of 215 begins at the death of Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden at the battle of Lutzen.

I now turn to profane history for other examples of this number. The date of the fall of Troy adopted by the great body of our Chronologers, being that of Eratosthenes, was b.c. 1183; computing thence 430 years, we

\* The figure is strictly Scriptural; see Isa. xxiv. 20, which describes the *very earthquake* under which all nations are now trembling with fear.

are brought to the foundation of Rome according to Varro, B.C. 753; and this period is bisected by B.C. 968, exactly a Millenary, or 1,000 years, before the Passion, and, therefore, in itself a great chronological era. Thence 215 years bring us to B.C. 538, the fall of Babylon; other 215 end at B.C. 323, the death of Alexander, the event which paved the way for the partition of the Macedonian Empire and for the elevation of Rome; whence 215 terminate at the year, B.C. 108, being 15 Weeks before the Nativity, and 20 Weeks before the Passion. Thence 215 terminate in A.C. 108, being from the Passion  $75 = 5^3 \times 3$ . Thence 215 terminate at the final defeat and death of Licinius, and the subjection of the whole Roman Empire of the East and West to Constantine, 323. Continuing the series, it touches the following great dates:—the year 538, when the Goths besieged Rome; 753, when Pope Stephen, having gone into France and applied to Pepin for succour against Astolpus, King of the Lombards, declared Pepin and his sons, Charles and Carloman, Patricians of Rome. The series terminates at the era of the last war between Russia and Turkey, and the beginning of the breaking up of the prescriptive Constitution of England by the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, 1828, being from the fall of Troy 1 Week of 430, or 10 Weeks of 43 = 3010 years, and from Rome founded 6 multiples of 430, or 60 of 43 = 2 periods of the number revealed in Dan. xii., or 1290 years.

Thus we have found in Profane History a stupendous series of that very number and division, being 215 years, of which M. Bunsen dogmatically pronounces that *no*

such regular division can ever be historical. He may, perhaps, endeavour to escape from the results which we now press upon him, by rejecting the dates we assign to the fall of Troy and the building of Rome. Did, then, Eratosthenes and Varro, the former of whom lived in the third century before Christ,\* and the latter, who died at ninety in b.c. 28, by chance lay down false dates, producing such harmonies of time? and was Varro in some hidden communication with the Doctors of the Synagogue in placing the foundation of Rome in b.c. 753, so as to fall precisely 175, the length of Abraham's life, multiplied by the cube of  $3 = 27 = 4725$  years, from b.c. 5478, the true date of Creation; equal also to the Astronomical Cycle of 315 years (at the end of which the Moon is before the Sun 3 hours) multiplied by 15; equal also to 675 Weeks, or 7 multiplied by the square of 5, and again by the cube of 3, and also in harmony with the following series of great eras in history:—

	Years.
1. From Creation to the division of the lands by Joshua, b.c. 1593, are 777, a number most perfect, being the Week of 111, the trinal of 10, multiplied by 5 = . . . . .	3885
2. From the Division to the Varronian era of the Foundation, b.c. 753, $70 \times 12 =$ . . . . .	840
3. From the Foundation to the Seventy Years' Captivity in Babylon, b.c. 606, 3 Jubilees, the length of Jacob's life . . . . .	147
4. From the Captivity to b.c. 459, the sixth of Artaxerxes, according to the Canon, at the end of	

\* He was born in b.c. 275.—*Clinton.*

Years.

which the decree in favour of Ezra was issued, the same period . . . . .	147
5. From that year to the taking of Babylon by Seleucus, and the era of the Seleucidæ, b.c. 312 .	147
6. From the Era of the Seleucidæ to the recovery of the city, and purification of the Temple by Judas Maccabeus, b.c. 165 . . . . .	147
7. From that event to the finishing of Herod's preparations for rebuilding the Temple, b.c. 18 .	147
8. From that Era to the taking of Constantinople by the Ottomans, under Mahommed II., 1453, $147 \times 10 =$ . . . . .	1470
This great period is moreover bisected by the year 718, the date of the raising of the last siege of Constantinople by the Saracens.	
9. From the taking of Constantinople to that event which was the foundation of the Mission of his Excellency the Chevalier Bunsen to the court of Her Majesty, viz., the purchase of land on Mount Zion, for the erection of a Protestant Church, 1838, are 55 Weeks of years = . . . . .	385
This date is, moreover, 55 Weeks = 385 of the Cycle of 19 from the Era of Creation = 7315	
From the death of Seth, 18 Weeks of the Jubilee = . . . . .	6174
From the Division by Joshua, 70 Jubilees =	3430
From Rome Founded $7 \times 370 =$ . . . . .	2590
We once more ask with whom Varro took counsel when he fixed the Foundation from the death of Seth, b.c. 4337, 512 Weeks of years = . . . . .	
	3584

	Years.
From the death of Noah, b.c. 2867, 302 Weeks =	2114
From the death of Jacob, b.c. 1838, $5 + 5^3 + 5^3 =$	
$155 \times 7 = . . . . .$	1085
Being just one multiple of 155 more than Adam's life, which is $155 \times 6 = 930$ years.	

Finally, who inspired Varro with a prophetic spirit to place the foundation of Rome exactly  $7 \times 3 = 21$ , the trinal of 4, multiplied by  $11^2 = 121 = 2541$  years before the French Revolution of 1789, that *preludious shock* of the *mighty earthquake*, under the *last and dreadful shock* of which, within the space of a few weeks, the political fabric of Europe crumbled to dust during the past year?

Now, the answer to these questions is easy and simple, if we receive the inspired testimony of St. Paul, that God hath ordained and arranged in perfect order the times of the world. For the city and Church of Rome is the great enemy of the Church of God, the metropolis of evil, and the concentration of the great Apostasy of the last ages, and her long career of blood is now demanded from every European kingdom which has given support to her. Consequently, as the Nativity and Passion of our Lord and Saviour are, on the one hand, the CONCENTRATE POINTS OF THINGS SPIRITUAL in the Mundane times, THE MERIDIAN, as it were, of LIGHT, the Chronology of their great moral and spiritual ANTIPODE must also be expected to stand prominently marked as the MERIDIAN, if such an expression be allowable, of DARKNESS in the great scheme of time. We certainly infer, therefore, notwithstanding

the objections of some writers, that B.C. 753 is the true era of Rome.\*

Another inference from what we have now offered is, that M. Bunsen's self-confident assertion, that no such regular division of Chronology as the Scriptures indicate can ever be historical, crumbles to powder when the test of the chronology of history is applied to it.

I now shall offer a more special reply to the allegation of the Chevalier concerning the number of 400 years, revealed to Abraham in Gen. xv. 15, that *there is no historical precision in this statement*, by showing that it was most exactly fulfilled.

First, It differs in its nature from the number of 430 years already discussed. For, whereas, this is a record purely *historical* of that which was already past, the former is altogether *prophetic*.

Now, it is of the nature of the prophetic annunciations of times in the Scriptures, that no definite description of the events which mark the moments of their commencement or termination are given. They are left to be discovered by the Church in their actual fulfilment, till which, for the most part, only near approximations to them

\* In composing my "Fulness of the Times," I felt disposed to adopt the year B.C. 752, in which I found a total eclipse of the Sun by calculation; but on referring to the then distinguished Professor of Astronomy in Edinburgh, he answered, in a letter to my relative, Dr. Handyside, "From a careful calculation I find that the Sun was eclipsed the least possible quantity, about  $\frac{1}{2}$  of a digit, at Rome, on May 15th o.s., B.C. 752." He adds, "One of this magnitude cannot be seen by the naked eye. It was in countries much farther south that the eclipse was considerable." See my "Fulness of the Times, Part II. Pref. p. xxii.

are to be arrived at. Thus, with regard to the period of 70 Weeks or 490 years of Daniel, which is the only instance, I think, where this general rule is departed from by the declaration that the period was to commence from the decree to restore and to build Jerusalem, the fact that there were three different decrees of the Persian monarchs; 1st. That of Cyrus, in his first year. 2d. That of Darius Hystaspes. 3d. That of Artaxerxes Longimanus, besides the Commission of Nehemiah, to any of which the language of the prophecy might be thought to apply, did, in reality, place it in the same state of uncertainty with other prophecies. We are not, therefore, whatever were the reasons for which this state of uncertainty was ordained, one of which probably was, that the *scholars—the proud in the imaginations of their hearts—might stumble and fall*; and another, that the Church might be kept in a state of watchfulness, to expect that there should be a departure from it in this prophetic annunciation to Abraham.

It is, however, sufficiently definite to enable us now to apply it with perfect confidence. The words are, “Know of a surety that **THY SEED** shall be a stranger in a land, &c., and they shall **AFFLICT THEM FOUR HUNDRED YEARS.**” It is the last words, describing the **PERIOD OF TIME**, which we are now to consider, our former remarks\* having sufficiently vindicated the accuracy of the description of their captivity in Egypt. Now it was the *seed of Abraham* which was to be strangers and in bondage for 400 years, and this expression invariably is used to signify his seed according to *promise*, that is, Isaac and his posterity, for to Ishmael and his descendants it is nowhere, I think, applied, not even in Gen. xvii. 20, where, if at all, we

\* See above, pp. 264—267.

might have looked for it. Consequently, it is certain that the 400 years could not begin till the birth of the *promised seed*, viz., Isaac. Nor could it even then begin, because that *seed* was still as it were blended in one family with the children of *the flesh*,\* and it was not this mixed family of the flesh and promise to which the words refer, but to the latter only. Now, it was at the weaning of Isaac, and casting out of Ishmael, that the separation was made between these two branches of the Abrahamic family. This event is placed by Philo Judæus in Isaac's *seventh year*, *i.e.*, when he was six complete,† and certainly on all matters connected with Jewish tradition he is a witness unexceptionable. Now, the birth of Isaac was *B.C. 2045*, so that Philo's testimony brings out his weaning and the casting out of Ishmael in *B.C. 2039*, and from this great event, as it unquestionably was, seeing that it first as it were constituted the separate seed which was the subject of the prophecy, computing 400 years, we arrive at the Exodus, *B.C. 1639*, making it manifest that the predicted period was *most exactly fulfilled*, and levelling with the dust the objections of M. Bunsen, although I must express my fear that this reasoning will make little impression upon many minds, too deeply, I apprehend, tinged with the false philosophy of the Modern school to listen to the simplicity of the truth.

In his next or 3d section of B. 1, the Chevalier proceeds at once to sweep away in a few sentences the whole Chronology of the book of Genesis, whether according to the Greek or Hebrew texts (not to mention

\* Rom. ix. 8.

† περὶ δὲ την ἐπταετιν ἡλικιαν πανταμενω της εν γαλακτι τροφης εκεινω.  
Philo. Oper. tom. i. p. 393.

the Samaritan), as received by the Church of God in all ages, as a fable.

“While, therefore,” (says he,) “we may be perfectly convinced of the personality, not only of Jacob and Isaac, but also of Abraham, **AND IT IS OBVIOUS TO EVERY ONE THAT WITH ABRAHAM HISTORICAL PERSONALITIES TAKE THE PLACE OF EPONYME PATRIARCHS**, we may yet even in the age of *Abram the Hebrew*, recognise a period neither to be calculated by generations of individuals nor capable of being measured by any means now at our disposal.” “The *family tree* of the chosen friend of God,” *i.e.*, the whole Patriarchal generations from Adam to Noah and Noah to Abram, “represents therefore the connection between nations and their tribes, not personal connection between father and son, and records consequently epochs, not real human pedigrees.”

Thus, then, the Christian Revelation itself, which confessedly, according to the reasoning of the Apostle Paul, rests on the certain truth and verbal signification of the records of Moses, since, in the Epistle to the Romans, the whole edifice of doctrine as to the fall in Adam, and the reign of death, and the redemption by Christ, and justification by faith, is built, as upon a rock, on the literal interpretation of Genesis, and also his doctrine of the resurrection in 1 Cor. xv.; and in the Epistle to the Hebrews all that he writes upon the power and excellency of faith, as confirmed by the examples of Abel, of Enoch, and of Noah, no less rests on the real and personal application of that which Moses records concerning them,—is not undermined only, but blown into the air, by the rash hypothesis of the Chevalier, which has no other foundation than that *he chooses so to imagine*; for to speak of evidence

were an insult to truth and to the understandings of that large and happily increasing class of readers who require solid reasons for everything they believe.

Moreover, this fond imagination of the learned author not only demolishes the whole genealogical table of the Patriarchs in Genesis, but the whole received Chronology of the Church of God in every age; for, whatever differences of opinion exist as to the question between the Greek and Hebrew schemes, there has hitherto been perfect unanimity as to the fact that the Book of Genesis does contain the whole Chronology from Creation to Moses. Indeed, were we to negative the existence of the Pyramids of Egypt, we should not, as already remarked, reason more *extravagantly* than the learned writer, who, with the book of Genesis before him, maintains that *it does not contain a Chronology of the Primeval ages.*

M. Bunsen, however, is not startled at the difficulties of his system. He at once abandons as a *terra incognita*, an unknown and undiscoverable region, the whole pre-Abrahamic times:—"For this reason we abstain from all Chronological definition of both the periods prior to Abram—the primeval history both before and after the flood." He afterwards observes, "The variations in the Samaritan text and the Septuagint betray systematic alterations, and do not agree with each other." Thus he also abandons as utterly unimportant (and in this he is certainly consistent) the question between the three chronologies, which, as to one of them, indeed, viz., the Samaritan, is easily settled, seeing that the Samaritans were never the Church of God, and, therefore, though their text is invaluable in having preserved certain true readings no longer found in the Hebrew, yet that as a

whole they should have preserved the true Chronology is exceedingly improbable, and is, in fact, negatived by the contradictions of their antediluvian generations. But, as to the two other systems, the Hebrew and the Greek, the former held by the Jews, (who once were the Church of God, and who, from the Apostolic age to that of Origen, though they had ceased to be the Church, exclusively possessed the custody of the Hebrew text,) the latter held by the successors of the Apostles and the whole Churches of Christ, the question which of them is the authentic Chronology has been matter of keen debate in the Church since the era of the Council of Trent. It is not, indeed, in itself of difficult decision, as was seen by Bishop Stillingfleet and declared in his "Origines Sacræ," but there are certain doubts moving in the inner chambers of the heart as to how the reception of the Greek might affect the ecclesiastical prospects of some, and how it might damage the reputation for orthodoxy of others who move in the atmosphere of popular favour, which hinder the impartial consideration of the evidence.

This question is, however, by the Chevalier dismissed almost in silent contempt.

I cannot feel any deep regret that this hypothesis, however opposed to all sound theology and all tradition, to use the favourite term of M. Bunsen, which I do here *legitimately* to signify the traditionary as well as internal evidence for the Book of Genesis, has been offered to the Christian public of this country. For however these things may go down in *Germany*, (once the cradle of the Reformation, but now the nursery, we fear, of every form of Infidelity, and reaping, in its awful political state, the sad fruits of her departure from the faith of Luther and

Melancthon, and from the Lord himself,) we trust that in *this country*, of which the Churches may, perhaps, like that of Philadelphia, be said to have yet *a little strength*,\* this attempt to lay in the dust the authority of Moses will, from every section of the Church, be met with the firmest and most uncompromising resistance, and if so, the discussion of these deeply important and fundamental questions must result in the triumph of truth.

---

### SECTION III.

The Chevalier Bunsen's View of the Chronology of Josephus.—The Exoteric and Esoteric Systems of the Jewish Historian.—The difference between them shown to be exactly equal to the sum of the curtailments effected by the Scribes in the Patriarchal Generations.—His Esoteric Scheme demonstrated to be identical with that deduced from the Scriptures by the Author, and embodied in his Tables.

THE Title of Subdivision B of the Third Section of M. Bunsen is, "THE RESEARCHES OF THE EASTERN SCHOOL INTO EGYPTIAN HISTORY." His first head is, "JEWISH RESEARCH—THE SEPTUAGINT—JOSEPHUS;" and it is comprised in ten pages.

After some introductory remarks there occur, in the first paragraph of p. 185, a whole string of assertions, upon each of which I shall write a simple negative. *First*, it has *not* been proved "that many of the variations in the Hebrew and Greek texts must have originated in a discrepancy in the tradition itself, which it is no longer in our power to reconcile." It is, on the contrary, proved

\* Rev. iii. 8.

that the variations have originated in deep and systematic fraud and design. The series from the birth of Enos, given in the last Section,\* contains demonstrative evidence of this; and there are multiplied evidences of it through my former works.† *Secondly*, it is *not* proved that a charge of systematic tampering with the traditional dates (I must protest against the word *traditional*, they are *recorded* dates) must be made *against* the *Septuagint themselves*, or critics who lived very little before their time; I make the charge against the *Hebrew doctors* after our Lord's ascension to heaven. *Thirdly*, it is *not* proved that no systematic chronological tradition was in existence for the times prior to Solomon. The collective body of the patriarchal generations and times of the Judges, added to the means afforded to us for filling up the two short chasms, as has been done in the last Section,‡ form a most accurate and systematic order of Chronology, stamped, as has already been proved, with the evidences of the deepest science, and perfectly understood as to the *facts*, though, as to the *science*, only *in part*, by the Jewish doctors, and by some of the ancient Chronographers, as to the *facts only*. After having thus charged the *Septuagint* with a systematic tampering with traditional dates, we find, at the end of the very same paragraph, the following admission:—"We are, nevertheless, very far from joining with the Talmudists in their cry of condemnation,"—viz., against the *Septuagint*,—"we are, on the contrary, grateful to those who have preserved for us such

\* Pages 231—234.

† See also *supra*, pp. 119—121, for other proofs of legerdemain on the part of the Rabbis in corrupting the Chronology.

‡ *Supra*, pp. 253—256.

evidence of the state of the chronological numbers in the old MSS., that even the dullest investigator may receive a palpable hint in what light they are to be viewed." "We consider the Septuagint, therefore, as the heirs of Jewish and Alexandrian research and as the earliest known commentators on Biblical Chronology."

But if the Septuagint have thus preserved for us the chronological numbers of the old MSS., how is it that they are chargeable with tampering with these dates?

As it is my intention to follow M. Bunsen I shall offer some preliminary observations on the system of the Jewish writer. He had a knowledge of the true Chronology from Creation, quite as accurate as we have of the English reigns from the Conquest to the accession of Queen Victoria. But his great object is to involve it in confusion and uncertainty; partly, for the end, common to the learned ancients, of barring the door of science against the profane vulgar, but chiefly for the purpose of perplexing the Christian Church in its calculation of the times of the Messiah. He had before him both the Chronology of the Seventy and that of our present Hebrew text, and uses both, mixing them up together in such a manner as to have made our most learned men give up the attempt to unravel his intricacies in utter despair. He mocks at Chronological truth: he does not, however, invent periods which have no existence. His mode is to apply real Scriptural periods to wrong dates. Thus, his period of 1179 years, Jewish War, vi. 10, said to be from David's reign in Jerusalem to the destruction by Titus, is the exact period from the accession of Saul, b. c. 1110, to a. c. 70, when Jerusalem was taken. Other examples of this will be given below.

Besides having two Chronologies, the longer Greek and the shorter Hebrew, he has two systems of his own,—the Exoteric and Esoteric. The former is contrived to cover and conceal the Esoteric, which is identical with the true Scriptural Times and in perfect harmony with the Tables of my Synopsis. When, however, these Tables as to their fundamental principles and dates were originally constructed, which was in the year 1835, previous and in order to the publication of my “Chronology of Israel and the Jews,” in the preface of which work I carried up my computation to Creation, I was not in the least aware of the powerful and unanswerable confirmation they would afterwards receive from the system of Josephus, of the existence of whose Esoteric Scheme I was then quite ignorant.

Another expedient of Josephus for concealing and corrupting the truth is, in long series of time, to double particular subdivisions of the whole period. An example of this will be given immediately. I, in the meanwhile, remark that of the whole of these tricks of Josephus M. Bunsen, in his very brief notices of his system, appears quite unconscious, and, I really believe, is ignorant of their existence. He, therefore, does not, we think, in fact, understand the system of the Jewish Historian, and, to use one of his own figures, he unwittingly offers to his readers the shell instead of the kernel of his Chronology.

He tells us that Josephus reckons 1656 years from Creation to the Flood; but he keeps back the two important facts, that his detail of the generations from Adam to the Flood, given immediately below (Ant., i. 3, 4), is that of the Seventy, excepting only the generation

of Lamech, which is 6 years less, 182 instead of 188, and the sum total is 2256 years: and the second no less important fact, that at the head of his first book he gives the period of 3833 years as the Chronology from Creation to the death of Isaac. Now, if to this sum the 6 years fraudulently subtracted from Lamech's generation be restored, it forms 3839 years, the exact sum of years, not from Creation to the *death of Isaac*, but to the *Exodus*, according to the text of the Septuagint, and in agreement with his own detail of the generations from Adam to the Flood, and with the testimony of Demetrius, preserved to us in the ninth Book of the "Præparatio Evangelica" of Eusebius, which the Chevalier has not thought fit to give, though, as an impartial investigator of truth, he was, I think, bound not to withhold evidence unfavourable to his own system. The passage in the original Greek is given in the marginal note,\* and it places the descent into Egypt 3624 years from Creation, and from the Flood (the birth of Arphaxad) 1360 years, that is, in *v. w.* 3625, or *b. c.* 1854. Both numbers are in exact harmony with the Chronology of the Seventy, as stated in my Tables; for, adding to the former 215 years, the Scriptural interval from the Descent to the Exodus, it gives for the last, *v. w.* 3840 and *b. c.* 1639.

It follows, therefore, that the period of 220 years, from the death of Isaac to the Exodus, given by Josephus at the beginning of his second Book, is a forgery.

The further proof of this is contained in the fact that, if from the sum of 3833 years from Creation to the death

\* Είναι δε από του Αδαμ ἔως του εισέλθειν εἰς Αιγύπτου τους του Ιωσηφ συγγενεῖς ετη, γχ κδ'. από δε του κατακλυσμού ἔως της Ιακούβ παρουσιας εἰς Αιγύπτου ετη απξ'.

of Isaac, given at the beginning of the first Book of the Antiquities, we subtract the forged period of 220 years, the remainder is 3613 years, being the exact Chronology from Creation to b.c. 1865, the actual date of the death of Isaac, according to the Septuagint and Demetrius. Now, the manner in which Josephus obtains this forged period of 220 years is by doubling the period from the 1st of Nisan, b.c. 2085, being the year after the death of Nahor (when he was 130 and Abraham 60 years of age), to the death of Isaac. And the result is the same whether we strike it off in the first Book or in the second; only that if we do it in the former, and bring down its Chronology to the actual date of the death of Isaac, we must, in the latter (the second Book), add the 6 years abstracted from Lamech's generation to the 220, to obtain the true Chronology from Isaac's death, in b.c. 1865, to the Exodus, 1639, which is 226 years.

And that 226 is the true interval is thus manifest. Abraham at the Call was 75 years of age;\* Isaac was born 25 years after, and lived 180 years,† he therefore died 205 years after the Call. And since we have seen that the journey of Abraham filled the remaining months of the year, and that the 430 years are reckoned from his arrival at Sichem, we must reckon from the Call, which might not be earlier than Tisri, b.c. 2070, to Tisri in the year of the Exodus, 431 years. We thus have 431 — 205 = 226 from the death of Isaac to the year of the Exodus.

We therefore establish the Esoteric Chronology of the two first Books of the Antiquities as follows:—

\* Gen. xii. 4.

† Gen. xxxv. 28.

	Years.	Years.
Book I. From Creation to the death of Isaac = 3833 — 220 = . . .	3613	
Book II. From thence to the Exodus . . .	226	—
 Making the Exodus, as in my Tables, v. w.		
3840 current, or complete . . .	3839	
Subtracting from which the amount curtailed in the Antediluvian Generation . . .	606	
The Postdiluvian Generation . . .	780	—
		1386
 The remainder is Josephus' curtailed Exoteric Chronology (as stated by M. Bunsen, p. 186) from Creation to the Exodus . . .	2453	

M. Bunsen's remarks on the system of Josephus do not comprehend in them any attempt to establish what his system of time really is, or to reconcile his apparent contradictions. It is, however, admitted to be "clear that he possessed no other traditional records of the remoter periods but the books of the Scriptures."\* There was, then, it appears, a Primitive Scriptural Chronology.

After further remarking that Josephus followed the Septuagint in reckoning 430 years for the earlier sojourn in Canaan and Egypt, we are told, that he reckons from the Exodus to the Foundation, in his *Antiquities* (viii. 3, 1), 592 years, but in his work against Apion 612 years. Of these two numbers the Chevalier afterwards asserts, "They are both evidently made up in the most arbitrary manner."

\* M. Bunsen's "Egypt," vol. i. p. 186.

“ Both originate, doubtless, in rabbinical comments which have grown into tradition.” \*

This, doubtless, is a very facile mode of blinking the question as to which of these periods is the genuine one of Josephus; but we cannot permit it to be settled in so summary a way. We have seen in a former page that 612, the larger of these numbers, is exactly equal to the sum of the Administrations as given in the actual Hebrew text of 1 Kings vi. 1, = 480 years, and the Servitudes 132 years. This fact at once negatives M. Bunsen’s assertion, that the number is made up in an arbitrary manner. But, as the settlement of this difference of 20 years between the foregoing two numbers is a necessary preliminary to an inquiry into his whole system, we must go into it more particularly, by placing Josephus in the witness-box, under the searching cross-questioning of an exact analysis, against which I have never yet met with any corruption of the truth which can endure.

He incidentally tells us, in Ant. xi. 4, 8, that before the captivity and dissolution of their polity they first had the kingly government for 532 years 6 months and 10 days.

This number is exactly equal to the following summaries:—

		Years.	Mths.	Days.
Ant. VIII.	From the death of David to that of Ahab . . . .	163	0	0
IX.	From Ahab’s death to Capti- vity of Samaria . . . .	157	0	0

\* M. Bunsen’s “Egypt,” vol. i. p. 189.

	Years.	Mths.	Days.
X. Thence to the taking of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar .	132	6	20
	<hr/>		
	452	6	20
Add the reigns of Saul and David	80	0	0
	<hr/>		
The total is . . . .	532	6	20

So utterly, however, does he disregard truth, that the details of the reigns given by Josephus himself in the same books of the Antiquities amount to 20 years more, being  $552\frac{1}{2}$  years.\* However, it is certain that the former number, 532, is his Exoteric Chronology of the Regal Period, for it is in his Summaries that he offers to us the results of his computations.

This sum of 532 years, his Exoteric Regal Period from Saul to Zedekiah, being subtracted from the number of 1062 years, which is given in Ant. x. 8, 5, as the Exoteric interval from the Exodus to the destruction by Nebuchadnezzar, leaves 530 years as the ESOTERIC and AUTHENTIC CHRONOLOGY of Josephus, from the Exodus to the beginning of the Regal Period at the accession of Saul. It is probable, however, that this period may by Josephus have been reckoned from the appearance of God at the Bush, 1 year in numeration before the Exodus.

Now, the appearance of God to Moses at the Bush was, according to the Chronology of the Septuagint as laid down in my Tables (and in harmony with the testimony of Demetrius, and also, as we have shown above,

\* See Supplementary Dissertation, being the second part of my "Fulness of the Times," pp. 29, 30, 33.

with the Esoteric Chronology of Josephus himself), in y.w. 3839, b.c. 1640, and the accession of Saul was in y.w. 4369, b.c. 1110, the interval between them being in exact harmony with the foregoing result obtained from Josephus as his Esoteric reckoning, 530 years. Moreover, adding to this sum for Saul's reign 40 + 40 for David, and 3 for Solomon, to the foundation, it gives the sum of 613 years as the authentic and Esoteric period of Josephus from the appearance in the Bush, being in exact harmony with 612 reckoned from the Exodus in the year following, or the discrepancy of 1 year may arise from the period of Josephus of 1062, from which the result was obtained, being *current* = 1061 *complete*. This would reduce the 530 to 529, reckoned from the Exodus, which plus 83 = 612 years.

In either way, whether 530 from the appearance at the Bush, or 529 from the Exodus, be established as the Esoteric Chronology of Josephus to the Regal Period, it entirely negatives his smaller reckoning of 592 years from the Exodus to the Foundation. That reckoning is the result of his large number of 552 years for the Regal Period, which, though given in the detailed list of reigns, is always repudiated in his Summaries. The number is thus made out. If the reader will be at the pains to add up the whole reigns of the Kings of Judah in my Tables, including the interregnum of 12 years, he will find it amount to 522 years, which is the true interval from Saul's accession, b.c. 1110, to the Destruction, 588. Now, Josephus adds 40 years to the reign of Solomon which he makes 80 years, and 2 to that of Jehoram = 42, and he leaves out the interregnum of 12 years. This gives  $42 - 12 = 30 + 522 = 552$ , the amount of his

detailed list. But, as it is wholly unsupported by evidence, this number being also repudiated in all the Summaries of Josephus, it seems only worthy of notice as affording an illustration at once of his utter disregard of truth and his anxious desire to involve the times of the Scriptures in inextricable confusion. The result of the whole inquiry is to confirm the period of 612 years as his authentic Chronology from the Exodus to the Foundation, and as the truth, by such a mass of evidence as to place it on the basis of absolute certainty.

I shall next observe, that the sum of  $1062\frac{1}{2}$  years, from the appearance in the Bush to the Destruction, given by Josephus, as already mentioned, in Ant., x. 8, 5, is exactly 10 years above the truth. The former event being in b.c. 1640, and the latter b.c. 588, the interval is 1052 years, and Josephus, in order to make it 1062, doubles the reign of Zedekiah, which is ten years complete. But, in the adjustment of his summaries to make out the sum of 1062, he keeps this quite out of sight, and equally mocks at the truth and scorns consistency with his own details, which, in one place, Ant., vi. 14, 9, give 40 years for the reign of Saul, whereas, in Ant., x. 8, 4, he states him to have reigned only 20.

The results already obtained are as follows:—

	Years.
1. The Esoteric period of Josephus, from Creation to the Exodus, is . . . . .	3839
2. From the Exodus to the Foundation his authentic Chronology, as given by himself in Ant., xx. 10, and against Apion ii. . . . .	612
Total from Creation to the Foundation . . . . .	4451

being in current time, as in my Tables, Year of the World, 4452, b.c. 1027.

The same period in Africanus is 4453,\* but, as M. Bunsen states that the best MSS. give 4460 for the Dedication, this is equivalent to 4452 for the Foundation, my date exactly. The scheme of Africanus will engage our attention in the following sections.

The Exoteric period of Josephus from the Foundation to the Destruction is given in Ant., viii. and ix. and x.; and, although the sums which make it up have been given in a former page, I shall again place them here, in order to give, with the periods of Josephus, the true Chronology, in a parallel column, of each interval.

Josephus' True  
Exoteric Chronology.

Book VIII. The remainder of 163 years,

said to measure from the first of Solomon to the death of Ahab (it should be the death of Jehu; the anachronism is not *accidental*, but *designed* by Josephus to confound his readers, or to cover his fraud in doubling the reign of Solomon; and as Ahab died b.c. 911, and Jehu, b.c. 869, it amounts to 42 years): 163 from the first of Solomon, minus 3 years, gives from the Foundation . . . 160 158

Book IX. To the taking of Samaria . . . 157 148

Book X. To the taking of Jerusalem . . . 132½ 133

Total from the Foundation to the Destruction . . . 449½ 439

Now the Esoteric and authentic Chronology of Josephus for this period is thus made out:—

\* Routh, Rel. Sacr., vol. ii. p. 361.

	Years.	Mths.	Days.
In Jewish War, vi. 4, 8, he gives, from the Foundation to the Destruction by Titus	1130	7	13
And from its second building by Haggai in the 2d of Cyrus . . . . .	639	0	45

The difference is, from the Foundation to the 2d of Cyrus, but really the 1st of Cyrus . . . . .	491	6	0
--	-----	---	---

Now, seeing that in the Chronology of the Septuagint, as given in my Tables, the Foundation was in b. c. 1027, and the 1st of Cyrus 536, the difference is in exact harmony with the foregoing result obtained from Josephus . . . . .	Years.	491
Moreover, subtracting from this number of years the interval from the Destruction, b. c. 588 To the 1st of Cyrus . . . . .	536	52

It gives as the Esoteric Chronology of Josephus, from the Foundation to the Destruction, in exact agreement with our own calculation just given . . . . .	439
---	-----

The results of these numbers give, therefore, according to Josephus, the Destruction by Nebuchadnezzar in . . . . .	y.w. 4891
And the 1st of Cyrus . . . . .	4943

It is true that Josephus does, here as everywhere else, attempt to throw dust on the truth by another of his designed anachronisms, in confounding the 2d (1st) of Cyrus with the 2d of Darius. But, as in his Summaries of

Chronology he always reckons down to the 1st of Cyrus (which, in Book xi., he rightly places at 70 years from the Captivity) and *from* the same date, we will not suffer ourselves to be deceived by his designed tortuosities. Moreover, as I have observed elsewhere,\* there is, in the eleventh Book of the Antiquities, an entire confusion between the circumstances which marked the two returns in the 1st of Cyrus and 2d of Darius. There can, therefore, be no doubt that the 1st of Cyrus is the real termination of his period of 491 years in the Esoteric Chronology.

In my "Synopsis of Chronology" I have carried down a minute analysis of the scheme of Josephus from the date at which we have now arrived, namely, the 1st of Cyrus, to the taking and ruin of the city by Titus; and, when I began to pen the present section, it was my intention to have transferred a brief summary of it to these pages. But I feel that it is time for me to relieve my readers from these tedious and almost endless, as it may appear to them, series of figures, referring to that work for what yet remains to complete the review of Josephus, and demonstrate the absolute identity of his Esoteric system with my Tables. I shall, however, before closing my inquiry, take a brief view of the principal dates of the Jewish historian in years of the world, as they have by M. Bunsen been transferred to his own pages.

As the key to what I am about to offer, the reader is requested to recollect that the difference between his Summaries of Time and the true Chronology amounts to the following two sums of years:—

1. The amount curtailed by the Rabbis in the

\* See my "Fulness of the Times," Second Part, pp. 36, 37.

	Years.
generations of the Antediluvian Patriarchs, as enumerated in a former page . . . . .	606
2. The curtailments in the Postdiluvian genera- tions, also enumerated . . . . .	780
<hr/>	
Total sum of years curtailed . . . . .	1386

Josephus knows nothing of the addition made by the Rabbis to the generation of Terah, and does not anywhere acknowledge it. He is, on the contrary, an undeviating authority against it by computing the generation of Terah and birth of Abraham in his seventieth year.

The following are the great dates of Josephus brought before his readers by M. Bunsen :—

1. The Flood, according to the text of Josephus, in the y.w. 1656. Adding the antediluvian curtailments, 606 years, the result is y.w. 2262, b.c. 3217, as the true date of that event as in my Tables.

2. The birth of Abraham, y.w. 1948. Adding 1386, the total amount of curtailments, the date becomes y.w. 3334, b.c. 2145, in exact harmony with my Tables.

3. The call of Abraham and his journey, y.w. 2023. Adding 1386 years, the true date is, y.w. 3409, b.c. 2070, in accordance with my Tables.

4. The date of the Exodus has already been verified in a former page.\* It is given by M. Bunsen from Josephus in y.w. 2453, which is properly the date of the appearance at the Bush. To this add 1386, it gives y.w. 3839, b.c. 1640, as the date of the commission of Moses, in precise harmony with my Tables.

\* *Supra*, pp. 290—292.

5. Building of the Temple, y. w. 3045. But, as this period is the result of Josephus' spurious number of 592 years from the Exodus to the Foundation, it must be corrected by adding 20 years, according to the true number of 612, and it becomes y. w. 3065. To this add 1386, and it becomes 3451, only the period is counted in complete instead of current time, and becomes, as in my Tables, y. w. 3452, b. c. 1027.

6. M. Bunsen, however, adds a second number, y. w. 3102, which Josephus, in Ant., viii. 2, 1, gives as the date of the Foundation. Now, in the year 1836, I, in the Preface to the second part, or Supplementary Dissertation to my "Fulness of the Times," proved that this is a gross anachronism, and that the number carries down the Chronology to the death of Solomon and accession of Rehoboam. This is proved by the fact that it exceeds the preceding number of 3065 precisely 37 years. Now, adding to 3102 the sum of Patriarchal curtailments, 1386, it becomes 4488, being 1 year less than my Tables, probably from Josephus having reckoned this period also in complete time instead of current. It will, therefore, stand y. w. 4489, b. c. 990.

7. The Destruction, 3516 or 3513, Ant., x. 8, 4. This number has an excess of 10 years, being the over reckoning of Josephus as proved in a former page, from the Exodus to the Destruction, by doubling the reign of Zedekiah.\* Reckoning the period, therefore,  $3503 + 1386$ , it gives 4889 complete time, the second year of the siege of Jerusalem, b. c. 589, when the daily sacrifice ceased.

Finally, and to conclude the argument. It has been said in a former page, that the period of 1179, given in

\* *Supra*, p. 296.

Jewish W., vi. 10, as the interval from David's reign in Jerusalem to the destruction by Titus, is really the exact measure of the period from the accession of Saul to the destruction. We have further seen\* that, according to the Esoteric scheme of Josephus, the accession of Saul was 530 years after the appearance in the Bush, and in y. w. 4369. Adding to this year Josephus' period of 1179 years, it arrives at y.w. 5548; and if the reader will turn to the Tables of Chronology in my Synopsis or Chart, and as I hope to give in the Appendix, he will see that the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus was in that very year, y.w. 5548, and a.c. 70.

And, as I sometimes make calculations by memory in my waking hours on my couch of rest, as if to set the Seal of Demonstration on the whole reasoning in this Section, it was given to me to see in lying awake in the silence and darkness of the very night before I pen this paragraph, viz., on the 8th June, 1849, that from Creation to the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 are exactly the Square of  $43 = 1849 \times 3 = 5547$  years complete; and further, that from the Fall, b.c. 5461, to the same great and dreadful event is 553, the trial of 23, and also 79 weeks multiplied by 10 = 5530 years.

The sum of these two great periods, both brought out by stretching Josephus, as it were, on that rack for knaves, a perfect and searching cross-questioning by analysis, being,—

	Years.
1st. From the Exodus to the Regal period, and the accession of Saul . . . . .	529
2. From Saul to the taking of the city by Titus	1179

\* Supra, pp. 294, 295.

Years.

Is a perfect Cycle in Astronomy, at the end of which the Moon is before the Sun only 35 minutes of an hour, thus setting the Seal of Astronomical science on the whole period from Moses to Titus . 1708

It may very naturally excite a suspicion in some minds, when the entire harmony between my own Chronology and the Esoteric scheme of Josephus is perceived by them, that this is the effect of studied contrivance upon my part. To remove this surmise, I shall refer the reader to my "Chronology of Israel," from the Exodus to the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, which was published in 1835, wherein he will find, with the exception of the date of the Nativity, as to which I was then in a state of doubt, the identical Scriptural Chronology now embodied in the Table at the end of this volume. It is true that, in my former work of 1835, which was the fruit of five years' laborious application of mind to the subject, my Table was carried no higher than the Exodus, b.c. 1639, yet in the Preface there is a Summary given up to Creation, which is placed in b.c. 5478, as in my present Tables. Now, at that time I was altogether unacquainted with the Chronology of Josephus. I did indeed soon afterwards enter on the study of his works so far as was necessary towards the establishment of the date of the death of Herod and the chronology of his reign, but it was not till the summer of 1836, when I was most happily compelled to do it by the attack made on my scheme from the supposed age of Terah at the birth of Abraham, which is noticed in a former part of this work, that I entered on the systematic analysis of his whole Chronology in its various

branches, which was laid before the public in the Supplementary Dissertation to my "Fulness of the Times" in November, 1836. Now the Esoteric Chronology of Josephus is the genuine Chronology of the Scriptures and of the Jewish Church before the Scribes set themselves to the nefarious task of corrupting it. My own Tables were carefully and laboriously perfected, with the Bible in my hands, in its different texts, Hebrew, and Greek, and Samaritan, nor did I leave the task until perfectly satisfied that I had succeeded in the restoration of the authentic Chronology; for it is the thing the most abhorrent to my mind to offer to the public the crudities of an ill-regulated and unsubdued imagination for the truth. It follows, therefore, that the exact harmony between the Esoteric scheme of Josephus and my Tables is simply the identity of truth with itself. And such is the strength of the truth, that I feel unshaken confidence that were the learning of Oxford combined in one phalanx with the science of Cambridge they cannot overthrow it. And with regard to the negation by the Chevalier Bunsen of the existence of any Scriptural Chronology of the first ages, the whole reasoning in this section not only proves that this negation is without any support from the writings of the Jewish historian, but on the contrary, that the examination of his whole system establishes the ancient and Scriptural Chronology on the irrefragable basis of evidence and perfect certainty.

---

## SECTION IV.

The remarks of M. Bunsen on Chronology among the Apostles and Fathers of the Eastern Church during the first and second Centuries considered.—Analytical review of the Great Mundane periods of Clemens of Alexandria, which are left wholly unnoticed by the Chevalier,—showing the corrections whereby they are brought into entire harmony with the Tables of the Author.

“CHRISTIANITY” (affirms M. Bunsen) “engrafted on the limited inquiries of the later Greeks and Romans the grand ideas of a creation and unity of the human race, and thus held out to chronological science a novel and unlooked for object.” “It required a connexion between the primitive traditions of the Bible and the historical traditions of the Gentiles.” “From that moment Egyptian research became linked with Jewish.”

Now, of all this I see not in the Scriptures a single word. It is nowhere said that the great facts revealed by Christianity were engrafted on the limited researches of the Greeks and Romans. These researches were of the *wisdom of this world which God has made foolish*, and of the *understanding of the prudent which God will bring to nothing*.\* The end of the Christian Revelation was to destroy all *this wisdom*, and to substitute for it *the wisdom of God*. The Scriptures record, in its naked majesty, the Chronology of the world, and command our assent. It is true, indeed, that the corruption of the record by one of the parties, either the keepers of the Hebrew or the Greek, does, at first view, render the inquiry more complicated; but, if this question be, as it easily may be speedily, decided

\* See 1 Cor. i. 19—28.

by minds weaned from all secret partialities and prejudice, very little delay needs to intervene before we are led into the assured knowledge of the whole times of the world.

All Egyptian research, so far as it reaches the truth, and all genuine Mundane times, must (as has in a great measure been already proved in these pages) render homage to the Chronology of the Bible, because this, being recorded by the inspiration of God, is certainly true. And should M. Bunsen affirm that we here beg the question, the reply is, that we only beg the question that the Christian Revelation is from God. Should this be denied, then we must reason on other grounds.

He next says that the Apostle Paul expresses "*very marked opinions*" upon various points of Jewish "*Chronology*," and then he quotes his discourse in Acts xiii., mentioning the 40 years in the wilderness, the division of the land, and the 450 years of the Judges, and adds, "this is clearly the same *calculation* as results from the separate dates of Josephus."

Now, we must protest against both the words, *opinions* and *calculation*, in reference to these apostolic statements. It is not the statement of an *opinion*, and scarcely deserves the name of a *calculation*, that from the conquest of England, by William the Norman, in 1066, to the taking of Constantinople by the Ottoman Sultan, Mahammed II., 1453, are 387 years. But if we analyse this number, and find it to consist of 
$$\frac{6 + 6^3 + 6^3}{6} = 43 \times 3^3$$
, then it becomes calculation. The apostolic statements are not, therefore, even if we were to view Paul in no higher light than that of a learned Jew, either of the nature of opinions or cal-

culations; and far less so, if we consider him as an apostle who had seen the Lord, and received his commission with the inspiration of the Holy Ghost directly from him. As for the alleged identity of what is called the *calculation* of St. Paul with the separate dates of Josephus, it was shown by me, fourteen years ago, in my "Chronology of Israel,"\* that the summary of 476 years, given by Josephus as the Chronology of his 5th Book of Antiquities, is made out, without his period of 18 years of anarchy (mentioned in B. vi. 5, 4) by supplying the two blanks of Tolah, 23 years, and Abdon, 8. It was further shown that, to harmonize it with St. Paul's period of 450 years, the following corrections are required:—To Joshua's administration, stated at 25 years, 2 years must be added. 1 year given to Shamgar, which forms part of the 80 of Ehud, and 20 years for Sampson, whose administration formed a part of the 6th Servitude of 40 years, must be subtracted. The result is  $476 + 2 - 1 - 20 = 457$ . With what truth or justice can it then be said that St. Paul's period of 450, from the Division, b. c. 1593, to the death of Eli, b. c. 1143, is clearly the same calculation as results from the separate dates of Josephus, when we find that the supply of two blanks left by the Jewish historian, and three other corrections, are required to harmonize his sum total with that of the apostle? Had knowledge here guided the pen of the Chevalier, he would perhaps have told his readers that St. Paul's number is from the original Scriptural record, and, therefore, the exact truth, and that Josephus' summary of 476 years is a corruption of the truth.

\* See that Work, p. 47.

I now proceed to the remarks of the Chevalier on  
THE CHRONOLOGY OF CLEMENS OF ALEXANDRIA.

His account of it is meagre and partial. After a few introductory remarks, censuring the ancient Chronologers for the principles upon which they build their primæval synchronisms of different nations, which have, in fact, no connexion with any scheme of Chronology derived exclusively from the Scriptures, M. Bunsen "selects, as an example, an inquiry instituted by Clemens into the age of Moses and the Exodus, to which a peculiar importance attaches, as having alluded to the connexion between that event and the commencement of the Sothiac period." Between the Exodus and the beginning of that period, which was in b.c. 1322, Clemens had in the same page given the number of 345 years, thereby placing the Exodus in b.c. 1667. The learned writer then gives the Series of Clemens he had selected as an example, which reckons from Moses and Inachus to the first Olympiad 870 years. "We thereby obtain" (says M. Bunsen) "b.c. 1647 as the era of the Exodus."—Now this date, be it observed, is only 7 years higher than that of the commission of Moses in my Tables.

But, in the very next page of Clemens, there is a great Series of Scriptural times from Creation to the death of Commodus, as to which M. Bunsen preserves a total silence. It becomes necessary for me, however, to bring it forth from the silence of the grave, as it were, to which the learned Egyptologist would consign it, and to place it before my readers.

This great Series is as follows,\* and I place opposite to

\* It is found in "Clemen. Oper." Venice, 1757, tom. i., p. 403.

each number the true Scriptural period, with the excess or deficiency in Clemens:—

	Length of Periods.			Errors in Clemens.		
	In Clemens.		In the true	Excess.		Deficiency.
	Y.	M.	D.	Y.	M.	D.
A. From Adam to the Flood (to Shem) . . .	2148	0	4	2163	0	0
B. Shem to Abraham (to Terah) . . .	1250	0	0	1100	0	0
C. Terah to the Division of the Land (to the En- trance into the Land)	616	0	0	616	0	0
D. Entrance to the End of the Elders that sur- vived Joshua. This period is here omitted by Clemens, but is compensated after- wards . . .				26	0	0
E. Judges to Samuel (End of Elders, B.C. 1573, to Saul) . . .	463	7	0	463	0	0
F. Kings, B.C. 1110, (to the taking of Babylon by Cyrus, B.C. 538) . .	*572	6	10	572	0	0
G. To the End of the king- dom of Persia (death of Bessus, B.C. 329) .	235	0	0	209	0	0
H. To the death of Antony, B.C. 30 . . .	312	0	18†	299	0	0
I. To the death of Com- modus, 31st Dec., A.C. 192 . . .	222	0	0	221	9	23
	5819	2	2	5669	9	23
	190	4	5	40	11	26

Now, throwing aside the odd months and days on either side, as being compensated by similar fractions in the

\* In another place he had already given from David's reign to the destruction by Nebuchadnezzar the period of 482 years, which is exactly right.—"Clemen. Oper." tom. i., p. 391.

† This sum appears to be formed by doubling the 18 years from the second Triumvirate of Octavius, Antony, & Lepidus, B.C. 43, to the death of Antony, B.C. 30.

other series, though not expressed, the difference between the Chronology of Clemens and my Tables is precisely 150 years, and it occurs in period B, from Shem to Terah, where Clemens is demonstrably wrong. Shem was born 98 years before the flood, and the Postdiluvian generations, in the best copies of the Septuagint being—

Shem . . . .	100
Arphaxad . . . .	135
Cainan . . . .	130
Salah . . . .	130
Eber . . . .	134
Peleg . . . .	130
Reu . . . .	132
Serug . . . .	130
Nahor . . . .	79 *

---

The sum total from Shem to the  
birth of Terah is . . . . 1100

How, then, are we to account for this excess of 150 in the Chronology of Clemens? and also the omission of period D in its proper place, and its insertion in period G? as well as the balance of the deficiency in period A by a nearly corresponding excess in other numbers?

I apprehend that the whole must be traced to the purpose of establishing an Exoteric and Esoteric system, either by Clemens himself, or the Chronologers from whom he obtained the whole periods.

For these ends periods B and C, in the true Chronology, being added, amount to 1716 years. Now, the interval

\* The reading of the Vatican is here 179, but it is not supported by a single MS. or by the Aldine.

from the marriage of Isaac, b. c. 2005, to the descent into Egypt, b.c. 1855 = 150 years, which belongs to C, is doubled, and, in order to conceal the fraud, it is carried back to period B, which, by a second disingenuous trick, is said to come out at Abraham, *i. e.*, when he had Isaac, although it demonstrably falls short of it 20 years, even after adding the spurious 150 years; but striking off this number, it arrives exactly at the birth of Terah, b.c. 2215, which is, by the following number C of 616 years, measuring from it to the Entrance, b.c. 1599, demonstrated to be the true termination of B.

The sum of 2148 for A, appears to be a similar device for concealing the exact truth, for it agrees with no copy of the Septuagint. The number, if the shorter reading of the generation of Methuselah in the Vatican copy, 167 years, had been adopted, would have been 2143 years. But the compensating sum of 13 years added to period H, and the fractional months in E and F, which altogether nearly balance the deficiency in A, appear to mark design upon the whole series, for the purpose of establishing an Exoteric scheme, to bar the entrance of the temple of truth against the PROFANE VULGAR. The whole of this Series is, however, evidently identical with that in my Tables; for, if we throw aside the fractional months and days in Clemens, as balanced by similar fractions of defect not expressed, then we have equally from C, b.c. 2215, to the end of the kingdom of Persia, b.c. 329, in Clemens and my own Tables, the same sum of 1886 years. Moreover, subtracting from the sum total of Clemens the forged number of 150 years in B, his whole Chronology differs from my Tables only 7 months and 21 days.

There is another great sum of the Chronology of the

world from Creation, given by Clemens in the same passage of the Stromata, which the Chevalier Bunsen has forgotten also; and we cannot but wonder that a writer of his high reputation should thus venture to subject himself to the imputation of dealing unfairly with evidence opposed to his own theory, unless, indeed, he would rather lie under the suspicion of a very limited and partial acquaintance with the subject he professes to treat. But it is not possible that he should have overlooked this passage of the Stromata. Having, however, prejudiced the whole question, by deciding, against the letter of the Bible itself, that the Bible contains no Chronology of the primitive ages, he passes over in silent contempt the testimonies in Clemens, that the Bible does contain a Chronology of the primitive ages, as to which the ancients were, if not quite, yet very nearly, agreed, and the best among them unanimous.

Clemens tells us, that, according to Eupolemus, there were from Adam to the 5th of Demetrius and 12th of Ptolemy, or, as Mr. Jackson and Dr. Russell understand him, to the 5th of Demetrius Poliorcetes and 10th of Ptolemy Lagus, b.c. 296, the sum of 5149 years. Now, if, as there is reason to believe, Eupolemus followed the Chronology of Demetrius of Alexandria, then we are informed by Clemens, in the same place, that this writer counted from the captivity of the Ten Tribes to the captivity of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, only 128½ years, or 128 years complete, and from the former captivity of the Tribes to the fourth Ptolemy, viz., Philopator, whose reign began b.c. 222, the period of 573 years, and from that of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar 338 years. Now, from the 1st of Nisan after the captivity of Samaria,

yiz., b.c. 720, not as the text of Clemens bears to the FOURTH Ptolemy (Philopator), but to the *third* Ptolemy, Euergetes, b.c. 247, are 473 years. This, then, and not 573, which leads to no marked date, was the original number of Demetrius. But, as it is counted from b.c. 720, whereas 721 was the actual date of the taking of Samaria, the corrected number from b.c. 721 to 247 is 474. It further appears that the year b.c. 585, being the Scriptural 22d of Nebuchadnezzar, is the Demetrian era of the captivity (probably because the captives were then placed in bonds to be carried away at the beginning of the year following, Jer. lii. 30), and it results that the true period from Samaria taken in b.c. 721 to b.c. 585, being 136, exceeds by 8 years the alleged computation of Demetrius, which we have seen to be only 128 years. Moreover, from b.c. 585, computing the Demetrian period of 338 years, it leads us down, not to the fourth Ptolemy, Philopator, b.c. 222, but, like the former number of 473 years, only to the third, Euergetes, b.c. 247, and the amount of this error is exactly equal to the whole reign of the latter, Euergetes, being 25 years. The effect of the former error of 8 years, which comes in at the year 721, is to annihilate, in the Mundane Era of Demetrius, the interval from the captivity of Samaria in that year to the invasion of Judea by Sennacherib in b.c. 713; and the effect of the second error of 25 years is to annihilate the interval in his Mundane era between the year b.c. 585 and 560, the last being the date of the death of Astyages of Media, and the accession of Cyaxares (Darius the Mede of Scripture), and the result of the two errors  $8 + 25 = 33$  struck off from the whole sum of his years is, that, at each date in years before Christ, after b.c. 585,

his Mundane Era will come 33 years nearer to the Christian era than it ought to do, so that b.c. 585 being, in the true Chronology, y.w. 4894, the next y. w. 4895 will, in consequence of this double error of  $8 + 25 = 33$  years, be made, not b.c. 584, but 552. In order to rectify the error, we must, therefore, in computing the Demetrian Chronology after the year b.c. 585, carry back the years before Christ 33 years. If, indeed, we had not been able to show where the two errors occur, they would have extended back to his date of Creation itself, and have made the real Mundane Era of his Chronology b.c.  $5478 - 33 = 5445$ ,\* but seeing that we have placed our finger on the exact places where errors occur, and can demonstrate the amount, the requisite correction brings back his whole scheme to entire harmony with our own Tables, and the Esoteric Chronology of Josephus.

We have seen that Eupolemus, who is evidently a disciple of Demetrius, gives, according to the text of Clemens, the period of 5149 years complete as the Mundane Era of the 5th of Demetrius, or 10th or 12th of Ptolemy Soter, being b.c. 296. Consequently, in order to correct the errors, we carry back the date to b.c.  $296 + 33 =$  b.c. 329, as the true termination of that Mundane period. This restores the Chronology of Demetrius to consistency with itself; for we have seen in a former page† that he places the descent into Egypt in y.w. 3624, in our Tables b.c. 1855, whence computing 1526 years, we are brought to y.w. 5150, or b.c. 329, which is from Creation 5149 years complete = 271 Cycles of 19; from the

\* Dr. Russell, in his Connexion, vol. i., p. 65, so computes it, with 1 year minus 5444.

† Supra, p. 290.

Deluge it is 8 Squares of 19 = 2888 years; from the accession of David, b.c. 1070, it is 39 Cycles; and before the Passion 1 Square of 19 = 361; and, being the termination of the SECOND KINGDOM of Daniel and the epoch of the THIRD, is a great era in History and Prophecy and the Dispensations of God; and thus the elements of the great period from Creation which then terminates, stamp upon this period of Mundane Chronology the indelible characters which mark the superintendence of infinite wisdom and almighty power.

There yet remain two numbers in the foregoing passage of Clemens which seem to present insuperable difficulties. I mark them with the letters K and L.\*

K. In Sect. 140 he says, that from the seventy years' captivity and restoration to the captivity by Vespasian are summed up 410 years.

L. In Sect. 141, that from the Exodus to the date given before, viz., the 5th of Demetrius Poliorcetes, b.c. 296, which we have seen must be carried back to b.c. 329, are 2580 years.

Now, in order to the solution of these numbers, I first, following Jackson and Mr. Clinton, reduce the former to 1580 years. Still they remain apparently inexplicable. Being, however, *Exoteric*, they contain in them the *Esoteric*.

The solution is this:—The interval from Jehoiachin's delivering himself up to Nebuchadnezzar, b.c. 599, to the fall of Persia, b.c. 329 = 270 years, is doubled in the number L, and is subtracted from the true period of K.

From L = 1580 subtract 270, the remainder is 1310 years; and to K = 410 add 270, the sum is 680 years.

Now, from the Exodus, b.c. 1639, computing L corrected, 1310 years, we are brought down to b.c. 329,

\* Strom., lib. i. xxi., § 140 and 141.

the epoch already mentioned. Again, adding to B.C. 610, the date of the death of Josias, in which event was the real fall of the kingdom of Judah, the sum of K corrected, 680 years, we arrive at the triumph of Vespasian and Titus for the Jewish War, A.C. 71.

There are two other periods given by Clemens in the same place, the first being from Vespasian, *i.e.*, his Jewish triumph, to the death of Commodus, A.C. 192, 121 years, which is quite correct. The other, from the 5th of Demetrius to the Consulship of Caius Domitianus and Cassianus, 120 years, I have not been able to solve, as this Consulship is not found among the lists in my possession, and the editors of Clemens seem equally at a loss.

As Clemens himself, or the Chronologers from whom he borrows, in the summary of Chronology from Creation given above, fixes 235 years as the duration of the kingdom of Persia, and 312 for that of Alexander to the death of Antony, and, since he assigns the 1st of the 48th Olympiad, B.C. 588, as the date of the Captivity in another passage of his Works,\* giving to it 70 years, and to terminate in the 2d of Darius, B.C. 520, it ought to be the 4th, B.C. 518, it is quite impossible not to see, when he gives 410 years as the period from the return from Babylon to the destruction by Titus, (whereas the sum of the two subdivisions of the period, as given by himself to the death of Antony, amounts to 547, to which add to the destruction by Titus 99, and the whole period as stated by him is 646, and in

\* Strom., lib. i., cap. xxi., § 127, Leipsic Ed., vol. ii., p. 86, Venice Ed., tom. i., pp. 394, 395. Clemens, however, here falls into the anachronism of confounding the captivities of Jehoiachin and Zedekiah. The date given is that of the last, but the name is that of Jehoiachin. Yet, two pages before, he clearly distinguishes between the three months' reign of Jehoiachin, and 11 years of Zedekiah, when his eyes were put out and he was led captive to Babylon.

the true Chronology from Babylon taken, B.C. 538, to Jerusalem, taken A.C. 70, are 607 years); it is, we say, impossible not to see that, either he is bewildered amidst the contradictory statements of chronologers, or is misleading us. Were it possible, we should be glad to ascribe such things to the errors of transcribers; but the systematic nature of the corruptions forbids so favourable a view. We are compelled to refer them to the purpose of giving an *Exoteric* system for the vulgar, reserving the *Esoteric* for the initiated. The solution of the problems by a severe analysis always, however, affords triumph to the cause of truth.

In leaving the Chevalier's remarks on Clemens, I cannot but express my deep conviction that, while he has, as we have seen, left unnoticed everything in the text of Clemens unfavourable and opposed to his own system, he has, from the notes of time which he has drawn from his pages, deduced no arguments tending to the support of his abnegation of the Scriptural testimony, and of the whole received Chronology of the Ancient Church.

---

#### SECTION V.

The Chevalier Bunsen's remarks on the Chronology of Julius Africanus.

—The key to this Writer's aberrations from the received Chronology shown to be his rejection of the Second Cainan, and another minute error in the birth of Arphaxad.—His assertion that the exact era of the Incarnation is beyond the province of the Scientific Chronology considered.—The science of numbers in his own pages unobserved by him.—Argument from the scientific structure of Antediluvian Chronology.—The testimony of the Paschal Chronicle.—Concluding remarks.

I now follow M. Bunsen into his remarks on the Chrono-

logy of Africanus, of the key to whose aberrations from the general system of the ancients, as well as the text of the Scripture, in assigning 744 years from the Exodus to the Temple founded, the Chevalier appears not to have obtained possession. If he will accept it from an opponent in argument, I will endeavour to place it in his hands.

There was in the Jewish Church, as observed in a former page, a knowledge of the outlines of the earlier times of the world, quite as accurate as we now have of the length of the reigns of the kings of England. Very soon, however, after the ascension of our Lord, the Jewish Scribes, in order to show that He had appeared too early to be the promised Messiah, whose appearance was, by tradition, fixed about the year 5500, corrupted the Hebrew text,—which was, after the death of the apostles, exclusively in their possession,—and made up the curtailed scheme of Chronology, whereby, as shown by Usher, who has most accurately seized their system, the Christian era is fixed in the year of the world, 4004, which was, as now demonstrated in my works, and confirmed by the Esoteric scheme of Josephus, really in the year of the world, 5479. That this was done in the apostolic age is manifest from the fact, that Josephus (who was the cotemporary of the apostles, and finished his Antiquities in the 13th of Domitian, A. C. 93, and before, according to the testimony of antiquity, John composed his Gospel) had, as is fully demonstrated in the last section, both the Greek and Hebrew schemes before him, and has mixed them up together in his jumble of the times.

From the Jewish Church the true Chronology, with the Scriptures in the Septuagint version, passed to the Christian, and also the knowledge of the ancient tradition of

the age of our Lord's appearance, which, reckoned to his Baptism, varied only 5 years plus the exact number of 5500. But the early struggles of the Church too much engrossed the attention of her doctors to permit their giving attention to matters not considered as of primary importance or of absolute necessity, and the great question of the Chronology was naturally thrown into the shade. It was at length resumed in the second century by Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch, and in the third by Africanus; but it was not resumed in its original Integrity. Both these writers fell into the snare laid for the Church by the omission of the second Cainan in the Postdiluvian generations, effected by the Jewish Scribes, whereby they lost 130 years in the Mundane Era. Africanus also, as Mr. Clinton tells us, lost by error the 2 years from the Flood to Arphaxad. His whole loss was, therefore, 132 years.

These writers, though thus taken in the snare laid by the Rabbis as to that one generation, were yet not prepared to abandon the ancient Chronology, and with it the universal tradition as to the time of the Messiah's Advent, of the truth of which they were unalterably persuaded. In order to bring it out they adopted a system of compensation, or adding the amount lost to subsequent periods. Theophilus, as we have already mentioned,\* adds the lost years to the period from the Call to the Exodus. But, in order that the reader may have a right view of his system, I shall now subjoin a short analysis of the sums of years wherein it differs from the true Chronology. I take it from his work "Ad Autolicum," lib. iii., and place in two columns his sums of Deficiency and Excess :—

\* *Supra*, p. 270.

	Deficiencies in Theophil- lus.	Excess in Theophil- lus.
In the generation of Methuselah he adopts the spurious reading of some copies of the LXX., 167 for 187 . . . . .	20	
From the Flood to Arphaxad . . . . .	2	
The second Cainan . . . . .	130	
Nahor, at the birth of Terah . . . . .	75	
The authentic age being . . . . .	79	
	—	4
		—
		156
Excess in the period from the descent of Jacob into Egypt to the Exodus, in the Scriptural Chronology, 215, in Theo- philus, 430 . . . . .		215
The Administration of Ehud and Shamgar computed by Theophilus, 8 years, in the Book of Judges, 80 . . . . .		72
Total down to the death of David . . . . .	228	215

The result is, that down to Solomon the deficiency in the Chronology of Theophilus amounts to  $228 - 215 = 13$  years. Accordingly, the 1st of Solomon is placed by him in v.w. 4436, and adding 13, it is the date of the Septuagint Chronology in my Tables, 4449.

I shall not pursue the Chronology of Theophilus further than to say, that he makes altogether, from Creation to the death of Marcus Aurelius, A.C. 180, the sum of 5698 years, being 41 above the truth; and as it is, at the accession of Solomon, 13 under the truth, there are about 54 of excess from Solomon to the death of Aurelius.

There are, however, in this sum total two obvious errors in the Roman Chronology. \*He gives to Claudius a reign of 23 instead of 13 years, and to Galba 2 years and 8 months, which is 2 years of excess. Subtracting these sums,  $10 + 2 = 12$ , from his whole sum of years to the death of Aurelius, a.c. 180, it is reduced to 5666 years, being above the truth 29 years exactly. Now, it will be seen, by reference to his work "Ad Autolycum," that he computes the Seventy Years' Captivity in Babylon from the end of Zedekiah, b.c. 588, down to the 4th of Darius Hystaspes, which, by an anachronism common to many of the Fathers, he confounds with the 1st of Cyrus (though Cyrus had died 11 years before), and then he gives 29 years for the reign of Cyrus. Now this period of 29 years forms the real excess in the sum total of his Chronology, all his other errors of defect being compensated by countervailing errors of excess, and his whole amount of years is equal exactly to the true Chronology, plus 29 years, making his Christian era,  $5478 + 29 = 5507$ .

Returning now to Africanus, whose loss in the Chronology of the primitive ages we have shown to be exactly 132, it will be seen that he adopts the same principle of compensation as Theophilus; but, instead of applying it to the interval between the Descent into Egypt and the Exodus, he leaves that period untouched, and introduces the lost 132 years into the next division of the Chronology, viz., from the Exodus to the Foundation. There again he re-enters the track of the genuine Chronology, and continues in it down to the reign of Cyrus, where, with all the Christian Chronologers,—and, as we have just seen, Theophilus,—he again diverges from it by confounding

the date of the reign of Cyrus in Persia Proper, on the death of Astyages, with his accession to the empire of the Medes, between which events there were 23 years of difference, which are added to the Chronology between the year b. c. 559 and the Christian era, which is thus, in Africanus, brought out in y. w.  $5478 + 23 = 5501$ .

Now, that these observations furnish the key to the whole differences between the Chronology of Africanus and my own Tables, (already shown to harmonize with the corrected scheme of the Septuagint and the Esoteric Chronology of Josephus,) I shall demonstrate from the dates of Africanus, quoted by M. Bunsen himself, or by Routh:—

	Years.
Africanus gives the Mundane date of the birth of Abraham	y. w. 3202
Add the 132 lost years	132
It gives the exact date in my Tables	3334
Africanus' date of the arrival of Jacob and family in Egypt, y. w. $3493 + 132 =$ date of my Tables for their settlement in Goshen	3625
The Exodus, y. w. 3705 (Routh); but M. Bunsen properly corrects the number, and gives as his true date, 3708, which $+ 132 =$	3840
Being that of my Tables.	
The Foundation, y. w. 4453 (Routh); but the Chevalier states, that the best MS. gives for the Dedication y. w. 4460, which is my own date; and if so, y. w. 4452 is also the correct date of Africanus, as it is that of my Tables for the Foundation, which was 8 years before the Dedication.	

Years.

The interval of 744 given by Africanus from the Exodus to the Foundation is, therefore, exactly 612, the authentic Chronology, plus 132, as will appear evident from the dates and periods set down above from the pages of Routh and M. Bunsen:	
the Exodus being . . . . .	y. w. 3708
Add 612 + 132 = . . . . .	<u>744</u>
It gives for the Foundation . . . . .	y. w. 4452

Now, I challenge the Chevalier to account for the fact, that Africanus, having, by errors of  $2 + 130 = 132$  years in the generations after the Flood, deviated from the true Chronology of the Seventy, comes back to an entire accordance with it just at the era of the Dedication, unless by admitting the fact, that there was an authentic tradition in the Old Testament Church, and received by the Apostolic Churches, of the true Chronology of the world. It may here be added that, as it has been already shown, and will again be proved, that the Chronology from the Creation to the Dedication was defined by a strictly scientific period, we shall find also in the interval from the Deluge to the Dedication the characters of exact mathematical order. The period from the Flood, b. c. 3217, to the Dedication, 1019, being 2198 years, is exactly  $\frac{12 + 12^3 + 12^5}{12} = 157$  multiplied by 14. It is 2

Weeks of the trial of 12.

In a former page,\* M. Bunsen had asserted, that the assumption of the year of the world 5500 as that of the Incarnation of Jesus Christ by Africanus and the Greek Fathers, although far preferable to that of the Western Churches and

\* Page 201.

Newton, “*was, of course, like the other two, far beyond the province of scientific Chronology.*” If the meaning here were that it does not belong to scientific Chronology to fix, irrespectively of Scriptural testimony, the exact times of the Incarnation, I should have offered no objection to it; but this is not apparently the meaning of the learned author. Connecting the passage with his abandonment of the whole Scriptural times from Creation to Abraham in his 182d page, it is manifest that he, in like manner, abandons the Chronology of the Incarnation as involved in hopeless uncertainty and darkness, thus negativing any approximation to its solution. We must here oppose to him the prophecy of the Seventy Weeks, not indeed with any sanguine expectation that he will submit to its authority, but we follow the example of our Lord, who did not the less employ the written Word in his contests with opposers because He knew they would resist its testimony.

From whatever date the Seventy Weeks were computed, whether from the 1st of Cyrus, y. w. 4943, or the 2d of Darius, or the 7th or 20th of Artaxerxes, it was evident, to the ancient Church, that the period of 490 years must come out, in the first case, in the fifty-fifth century from Creation, and, in the two last, must come into the fifty-sixth century. The Church was, therefore, certainly not left without a Prophetic Calendar, justifying the conclusion that the Messiah would be manifested in or about the year 5500; and as it was easy to confound the date of his public *manifestation* with the *Incarnation*, and to reason with respect to what was yet future from one event to the other, they were practically within a very few years of the exact truth, since, in fact, his baptism was in y. w. 5506.

But the reader will cease to feel surprise at the rashness of M. Bunsen's assertion, as to not only the date of Africanus, 5500, but that also of the Western Churches, 4000, being beyond the province of the scientific Chronology, when he learns that even scientific periods which occur in his own pages are unobserved by him, evidently because he has failed to discern their character. Lest this remark should seem to savour of presumption, I proceed to the proof of what is asserted.

The Chevalier gives 4460 years as the Mundane era of the Dedication in the MS. of Africanus. Now, this is equivalent, as all Chronology is noted in current time to 4459 years complete, a number most perfect in its mathematical characters. It is the Jubilee, or square of 7 = 49, multiplied by the trinal fraction of 9, the square of 3, or  $\frac{9 + 9^2 + 9^3}{9} = 91$ . Or it is the Week of the Jubilee, or cube of 7 = 343, which is also the trinal of 18 multiplied by the trinal of 3 = 13. Moreover, carrying on this series, at the sum of 112, or 16 weeks of the Jubilee = 5488 years, it arrives at the 14th year of our Lord, when he first appeared in his own person and was subject to ordinances, A.c. 11. At the end of 144 Jubilees, or  $7^3 \times 12^2 = 7056$ , it arrives at the year 1579, the date of the Union of Utrecht, which finished the number of the sovereign states of Europe that embraced the Reformation.

I shall here turn upon the Chevalier with his own words.\* "No writer in these days who deals honestly and conscientiously with 'Scriptural'† Chronology can

\* Introduction, p. xxviii.

† The Chevalier's word is, of course, "Egyptian."

evade the questions," by what contrivance and under what superintending mind were these scientific results effected ? The facts "must be explained ; to deny them would be a proof of little skill and still less candour on the part of any critic who had once undertaken to prosecute the inquiry."

I acknowledge the justice of the demand here made, with relation to the monuments of Egypt.—It is the demand I have myself perpetually, but in vain, made upon my opponents in the chronological argument, and am now about to make upon the Chevalier.

Proceeding upon the principle thus laid down by himself, I shall press him still more closely. He affirms, as has been seen, that the Mundane dates, both of Africanus and of the Western Churches, are beyond the province of scientific Chronology. I shall, in refutation of this assertion, show that the antediluvian Chronology contains in it such a variegated and complex tissue of scientific time as to demonstrate that it bears the impress of the infinite wisdom and power of the Creator.

In the following Table each period is distinguished by a letter of the alphabet :—\*

	Years.
A. The life of Adam is $\frac{5 + 5^3 + 5^9}{5} = 31 \times 30 =$	930
B. The life of Seth is 19, the Metonic Cycle, $\times 12 \times 4 =$	912

\* Although not a few of the following great Series were introduced into the Second part of this work, it becomes requisite again to bring them into the present discussion with M. Bunsen, and therefore to repeat them ; as it would not be possible by a general reference to the Tables of Part ii. to do complete justice to the question immediately before us.

	Years.
C. Enos born, from Adam 2 Weeks of 31, the trinal of 5 = . . . . .	434
c. Enos died, b.c. 4139, $\frac{10 + 10^2 + 10^3}{10} = 111 \times 10$ from the birth of Seth, b.c. 5249 = . . . .	1110
D. Cainan born, b.c. 4854, from Adam 13, the trinal of $3 \times 12 \times 4 = 48 = . . . .$	624
The length of his life $\frac{9 + 9^2 + 9^3}{9} = 91$ or $13 \times 7 \times 10 = . . . . .$	910
d. Died, b.c. 3944, after the birth of Enos . . .	1100
E. Mahalaleel born, b.c. 4684, from the Fall, b.c. 5461,* the fraction of 10 = $111 \times 7 = . . .$	777
e. Mahalaleel died, b.c. 3789, from Seth born $\frac{8 + 8^2 + 8^3}{8} = 73 \times 20 = . . . . .$	1460
From Jared born . . . . .	730
F. Jared born, b.c. 4519, from Seth born $\frac{8 + 8^2 + 8^3}{8} = 73 \times 10 = . . . . .$	730
G. Enoch born, b.c. 4357, from Enos born a perfect Astronomical Cycle, at the end of which the Moon is slow only 10 minutes 43 seconds . . . . .	687
From Creation the Cycle of $19 \times 59 = . . .$	1121
Thence to the Deluge, 60 Cycles of 19 = . . .	1140
Thence to the Passion, 33 Weeks of 19 = . . .	4389
H. Japhet born, b.c. 3317, from Enoch born the perfect Astronomical Cycle of . . . . .	1040

\* I really do not know and cannot conjecture whether the German Rationalists believe in the Fall as a fact. Does Ewald believe it?

Years.

From Enos born, the perfect Cycle of 1727 years, the Moon slow 1 h. 28 m.	1727
I. Shem born, b.c. 3315, from the 1st of Nisan of the 1st year of Enos, being b.c. 5043, the Cube of 12 = . . . . .	1728
K. Ham born, from the birth of Seth $\frac{6+6^2+6^3}{6} = 43 \times 45 = 215 \times 9 =$ . . . . .	1935
L. Death of Lamech, b.c. 3252, from death of Adam, b.c. 4548 = $12^2 \times 9 =$ . . . . .	1296
M. Death of Methuselah, b.c. 3223, from birth of Lamech, b.c. 4005, the perfect Astronomical Cycle of 391 years, the Moon slow 5 h. 15 m. $\times 2 =$ . . . . .	782
m. The life of Methuselah is $19 \times 51 =$ . . . . .	969
N. The Deluge, from Creation the Week of 19 and the trinal of 11 = $133 \times 17 =$ . . . . .	2261
From the death of Seth $70 \times 4^3 = 16 =$ . . . . .	1120
O. The Descent from the Ark and everlasting Covenant from Creation, a Cycle in Astronomy, the Moon fast 6 h. 36 m. . . . .	2262
P. From Creation, to the birth of Arphaxad, the first Postdiluvian, b.c. 3215, are 31, the trinal of 5, $\times 73$ , the trinal of 8 = . . . . .	2263
p. From the death of Adam to the birth of Arphaxad are $31 \times 43$ , i.e., the trinals of 5 and 6 multiplied into each other, and the sum is the trinal of $6^2 = 36 =$ . . . . .	1333
It is, therefore, a number of recondite perfection.	

Here I shall pause to ask, What are we now to think of

the assertion of the Chevalier, that this Divine record is an historical representation of the migrations of the primitive Asiatic race of man (not then, we presume, those of Europe, or Africa, or America, seeing that his friend Niebuhr, with ill-concealed scorn, rejects the idea of a common human origin,\* and it is left by the Chevalier as one of the questions yet to be illustrated by the Egyptian monuments,† so that we are not to believe the testimony of the Bible), and records Epochs and not real human pedigrees?

It were at least decent and comely that some evidence were produced to justify an hypothesis so strange as well as novel. Instead of evidence we find the self-confident assertion, "it is obvious to every one that with Abraham historical personalities take the place of eponyme patriarchs." We tell the Chevalier that it is not obvious to us; and that it was as little obvious to the apostles of the Lord, who everywhere reason from the facts of Patriarchal history, the sin of Adam and its consequences—the faith of Noah—the preaching of Enoch, as historical personalities, no less than the facts recorded concerning Abraham; and it has been as little obvious to the Churches of God in every age. Does M. Bunsen really think that his simple assertion is to overthrow this body of testimony, of inspired apostles, and of uninspired but holy men in all ages? Then must we turn against himself his words in reference to the assertion of Petavius, that the Egyptian dynasties are fabulous:—"If this statement is meant for a proof, it still remains due, for he has advanced nothing but positive assertions in his

• "History of Rome," vol. ii. p. 255.

† P. xxviii.

comments on the "Patriarchal generations;\*" and we must also ourselves recall him to the principle already mentioned as laid down by himself, that the facts placed before him, as to the scientific structure of Antediluvian Chronology must be accounted for. We, in the meanwhile, limit the demand to that Chronology, because to extend it to Post-diluvian times, whether ancient or modern, would be to enter a boundless field of discussion and controversy.

Before drawing this section to a close, I must draw the attention to the powerful evidence for the exact truth of my own chronological conclusions which is afforded by the testimony of the Paschal Chronicle, one of the manuals of the Church, classed by M. Bunsen along with Syncellus among the later Byzantines,—Malalas, Cedrenus, and the *Chronicle of Easter*.

It gives as the era of the Deluge . . . y.w. 2262

The Exodus y.w. 3838-3839

and distinguishes between these two dates, that Moses and Aaron went in to Pharaoh in the former, but that after March 21st the year 3839 began to run. The years are one minus than my own date, which may be explained by the Chronicle giving them in complete time, while mine is current. I shall here remark that I thought, till I met with this testimony in the Paschal Chronicle, that I might claim *originality* in having noticed and introduced into my scheme the fact that, during the time that Moses stood before Pharaoh one year passed away and another began, for the circumstance is, I think, passed over in all other works on Chronology that I have seen. It now,

\* The two last words are substituted for "Egyptian Dynasties," page 232.

however, appears that the Paschal Chronicle had anticipated me twelve centuries ago at least, as it brings down the Chronology to the seventh century.

I shall now state a more remarkable coincidence between its conclusions and my own, which was only seen by me since these sheets were in the press.

By a reference to my "Synopsis of Chronology" it will be found that I place the Exodus on 15th Nisan, April 13th, b. c. 1639, and I have since, on calculation, discovered that it was **SUNDAY**. Now there is a computation in the Chronicle, vol. i. p. 140, Bonn Edition, of the date of the first Passover, being that celebrated in Egypt, which is placed on the 14th of the Moon (viz., we conclude of her *Phasis*, though this is not *expressed*) of the first month, viz., Nisan, on the 13th of April, and on the first day of the *Week*, **SUNDAY**.

I confess myself unable to comprehend the principles of the calculation, I only state the fact. My own computation rests on the certain foundation of the perfect astronomical Cycle of 3435 years, reckoned back from the 14th Nisan, 1797, which fell on Wednesday, the 12th of April. This Cycle contains 42,485 lunations = 1,254,607 days 1 h. 41 m.; the days contain 179,229 weeks 4 days, and at the end of it the Moon is slow only 53 minutes 38 seconds of an hour.

Therefore, by this Cycle, the 14th Nisan—when, at three in the afternoon, the Lamb was slain,—b. c. 1639, is brought out upon Saturday, the 12th of April. The 15th of Nisan, when the Paschal Lamb was eaten, begins on the same evening by *our reckoning* at sunset, being the evening of the Jewish first day of the *Week*, **SUNDAY**.

The only difference between the result of my calcula-

tion and that of the Paschal Chronicle is, that the latter makes Sunday, the 13th of April, the 14th Nisan, whereas I make it the 15th. This discrepancy might arise from the Chronicle not accurately distinguishing between the slaying of the Lamb and the Supper as belonging to two days, the 14th and 15th.

I observe, finally, that the Chronicle places the foundation of the Temple 4451 years from Creation, in exact accordance with my Tables, which, in current time, give **y. w. 4452** for that great event.

#### CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS.

I SHALL not follow the Chevalier in his remarks on the Byzantine School of research, further than to draw the attention of the reader to a charge of daily *increasing rigour* in the orthodox School, and what he means by this increasing rigour appears, from his words which follow:—“Syncellus, who flourished about the year 800, endeavoured to conciliate its favour by imparting to Chronology a more exclusively Scriptural character.” Syncellus is “a somewhat caustic critic, and attacks Eusebius in very scurrilous terms.”

I shall here remark, that there are other and purer motives for giving to Chronology, if not an *exclusively*, yet, at least, an *authoritatively* Scriptural character, than a desire to conciliate the favour of ecclesiastical superiors. All authentic Scriptural Chronology, being a part of the volume of inspiration, comes to us with the authority of Him who inspired the sacred penmen to record it. We are assured by St. Paul, that “*all Scripture is given by inspiration of God.*”\* St. Peter also tells us, with refer-

\* 2 Tim. iii. 16.

ence to the Prophetic Word, that "*holy men of old spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.*"\* Above all, our Lord perpetually refers to the Bible as of supreme and infallible authority, emphatically declaring that "*the Scriptures cannot be broken.*"†

M. Bunsen, on the other hand, whatever be his standard of faith as to the actual degree of authority ascribable to the Scriptures in matters of doctrine, not only, as we have seen, excludes their chronological statements from the sacred precincts, or consecrated ground of inspiration, but in his remarks on Clemens of Alexandria he informs us, that "*his scholarship and philosophy guarded him against that lamentable adherence to the letter of Scripture,*"—"*the influence of which is so clearly perceptible even in Chronology.*"

Now, it were at least desirable that we were furnished with some definite canon of interpretation, to teach us how far the letter is to be adhered to and how far departed from. We are quite at a loss, and are too dull of comprehension to understand what we are to substitute for the literal interpretation of the words, "*Adam lived two hundred and thirty years, and begat a son in his own likeness, after his image, and called his name Seth.*" We are not less unable to perceive what are the evils which spring from that which M. Bunsen terms, *a lamentable adherence to the letter* of this passage of Genesis.

When we turn to the writings of the Apostles and the Evangelists, with the recorded sayings and reasonings of our Lord himself, we see no warrant whatever for departing from the letter, in records purely historical, or for interpreting the Bible upon other principles than any other

\* 2 Pet. i. 21.

† John x. 35.

book. We, moreover, see no limits to the aberrations of the human mind if the departure from the plain letter be admitted and sanctioned. Are we to submit ourselves to *M. Bunsen* as an infallible guide? Are we to adhere to the *letter* in the interpretation of his own sentiments and views? or to seek, in his *plainest annunciations*, for some *mystical* and *hidden* meaning differing from the letter? Are we to give up ourselves to the *thousand and one* glosses of the German school till, as the hapless victims of the Minotaur, a dark scepticism shall immure us in a labyrinth of opinions, with no thread of Ariadne to guide us to emerge to the light of day?

Until these questions are answered, and until *M. Bunsen* shall produce *Scriptural authority* for a departure from the *letter of the Scriptural narrative*, we shall seat ourselves at the feet of the Prophets and Evangelists and Apostles of the Lord, and of the Lord of the Apostles, and shall continue to imbibe their lessons, and receive their testimonies, according to the natural meaning of human language.

Still, every question of *rational criticism* is left open to us, not only with reference to the real signification, but also as to the authenticity of the actual Hebrew text. We are not, therefore, bound to believe that the reading now found in the twenty-second Psalm, ver. 16, the signification of which is not that of the Greek and of our version, “They pierced my hands and my feet,”—but, “As a lion my hands and my feet,”\* are the true and original reading. Nor are we bound to receive the actual reading of 1 Sam. vi. 19, and to believe that 50,070 men in a country village, the whole inhabitants of which might not be as many

\* The present Hebrew reading is, כָּרְדִּי יְדִי וּרְגַלִּי.

hundreds, were slain for looking into the Ark. The reading is manifestly corrupt. Josephus rejects the thousands and hundreds and reads 70. We might hazard a conjecture that the original reading was 7, and that, in passing through the hands of transcribers between the age of Samuel, more than twenty-nine centuries ago, it has been magnified to its present incredible ciphers. Every such correction must, however, rest, as it here does, on the *nature of things* corroborated by the *Sacred Text itself*.

Now, on these principles we may hazard an opinion that the numbers of the armies of Israel, in the present text of Numbers are not the original reading, and, therefore, that Moses is not responsible for them. In chap. ii. 32 the total number is 603,550, and 40 years afterwards, in chap. xxvi. 51, they were 601,730. None were included in this prodigious host under twenty years or probably above sixty. These numbers, therefore, include the result of about 2,000,000 of souls in the camp of Israel. Now, it is from *the text of Moses himself* that I draw the reasons for thinking that these numbers have been tampered with. He declares to the children of Israel, “The Lord did not set his love upon you or choose you because ye were *more in number* than any people: for ye are\* the *fewest* of all people.”

In exact harmony with these words he had in the beginning of the same chapter told them that each of the seven nations that were to be cast out before them was

\* Deut. vii. 7. Our translators put the verb substantive in the *past* tense, but the original, in which the verb is *understood*, requires the *present*; accordingly the LXX render it so—“ὑμεῖς γαρ εστε οὐλιγοστοι παρα παντα τα εθνη,” “for ye are fewest of all nations.”

*greater and mightier than they.* He afterwards says, that the Lord would put out those nations before them by little and little; “Thou mayest not consume them at once, lest the beasts of the field multiply against thee.” Now how absurd had been the fear of the wild animals multiplying against Two Millions of the Rational Creation, planted in a country not much larger than Yorkshire!

If, therefore, the numbers of Israel were, as in the present text, since each of the seven nations they were to drive out exceeded them in number, Palestine must then have contained more than 14 millions of souls, whereas, the enumeration made by Joab, in the reign of David, being 800,000 fit to bear arms in Israel and 500,000 in Judah,\* gives a total population of less than 6,000,000.

When Moses was commanded to take the sum of all the males of the first-born of the children of Israel from a month old and upwards, they were found to be 22,273, but we must subtract one-third as under 20 years, and the first-born above 20, the age for bearing arms, amount to about 15,000. Now, allowing six children as the average number in a family, and one-half or three sons to each, it would give 45,000 men. We are, however, to recollect that it was only the eldest sons that *opened the womb* who were counted among the first-born. In one family perhaps in four a daughter might open the womb, and in that family there was no first-born. We must, therefore, add to the 15,000 first-born above 20, about 5,000 *eldest sons* who were not *first-born*, and multiplying the sum of 20,000 by 3, it would place Moses at the head of an army of 60,000 men,—as large a force, when accompanied by

\* 2 Sam. xxiv. 9.

their families, as could be concentrated so as to leave Egypt in one night.

I have before me the weekly Report of the Registrar-General of London, taken from the "Standard" of the 28th March. He gives as the population of London and its vast suburbs, according to the returns of 1841, the number of 1,948,369 souls, covering an area of 115 square miles, and the central districts, with 373,605 souls, cover only 2·8 square miles.

Let it then be considered by the intelligent reader that, according to the ciphers now found in the book of Numbers, a number at least equal to that included in the returns of the Registrar-General, which, seeing that they lived in the midst of the Egyptians, could not have occupied a smaller area there than 115 miles, were in one night collected into one vast mass and left Egypt. All the circumstances preceding and attending their deliverance were, indeed, miraculous, and are, therefore, taken out of the range of common facts and ordinary reasoning; but we are nowhere told that there was anything miraculous in their own movements. They marched and walked, as we march and walk, and occupied the same space as we do.

Let it be further supposed by the reader that the 2,000,000 which now inhabit London and its suburbs were, from the fear of an invading army, commanded by an inspired Prophet, and miraculously guided in one night, to march out of London on the route for Gravesend, and to encamp; and by two more marches were to arrive at the bank of the Thames between Gravesend and Sheerness, and that there, by the same mighty power that cleft the former Sea, the channel of the Thames were

dried, and its bottom of mud and quicksand converted into a level road of rocky hardness ; still the difficulty remains of concentrating and marching the vast mass of two millions of men, women, and children, which must have occupied a space of ten or twelve square miles, even if crowded together as in the central districts of London, across the channel of the river in one night, and landing them on the coast of Essex. Considerations of a like nature as to the impossibility of suddenly finding provisions for so vast a mass, when, on their entrance into the land, the manna ceased, as recorded in Joshua, press upon us with new and reiterated force. The space of time was too short to have organized a Commissariat, and in the midst of a hostile people collected Depôts.

Let the intelligent reader, then, follow Joshua in the detail of his military operations—the encompassing of Jericho once each day for six days, and seven times the last day, by 600,000 men ! then the operations of the ambush before Ai, and he will see that the record of the facts and of the numbers are not to be reconciled.

It also remains certain, either that the number of the first-born, 22,273, or the 600,000 is spurious. One of them must yield to the battering-ram of Scriptural analysis and criticism.\* Both cannot be true, and Moses

\* How do our commentators meet the difficulty and apparent inconsistency of the two numbers ? Lightfoot and Gill wisely pass it over in silence. Bishop Patrick, on the other hand, and Mr. T. Scott, boldly encounter it by the assertion that the words of God himself to Moses : "Number all the first-born of the males of the children of Israel from a month old and upwards, and take the number of their names : and thou shalt take the Levites for me (I am the Lord) instead of all the first-born among the children of Israel,"—refer to and include only the first-born sons during the period of less than

is not accountable for both, and for which he is accountable let his own words already quoted decide. It is thus proved that the *text of the Bible*, when *closely examined*,

thirteen months since they had left Egypt. Scott even dilates upon it, and proceeds to count the births, male and female, of *first-born children* within the year at about 45,000; according to this rate of increase, during the forty years' abode in the wilderness there must have been begotten, of *first-born sons*, about . . . . . 880,000

Add the number then under 20, who, according to this strange hypothesis, were not numbered, and were also not included in the 600,000 soldiers, *at the lowest estimate* . . . 200,000

---

1,080,000

The sum is the whole of the *first-born* who came out of Egypt, and were begotten during the forty years, according to Scott's hypothesis. Now, supposing that *one half* (which is a large estimate, considering that they were not included in the sentence of death which was limited to those above 20) died in the wilderness, we shall, at their arrival in the plains of Moab, have an army of more than 500,000 *first-born* warriors, which being only one-third of the whole, the number of the warriors must at that time have exceeded **A MILLION AND A-HALF** instead of being the *paltry cypher* of 600,000! Such appear to be the inevitable results of the violent wresting of the Scriptures by these two venerable commentators when they, in *direct and flat contradiction to the meaning of language*, tell us that God's command to number *all the first-born of Israel, from a month old and upwards*, and Moses' express record of the fact, that *all the first-born, from a month old and upwards, were numbered, and amounted to 22,273*, included only those from *one to thirteen months old*.

Other consequences follow no less contrary to sound doctrine, among which may be stated, that if so, *those very first-born Israelites who were spared and passed over in the night* when the first-born of Egypt were slain **WERE NOT THE LORD'S**.

The *systems of our commentators*, it must be confessed, are of deeper foundation and more adamantine strength than the fulcrum which Archimedes vainly sighed for. *His* was to move the *earth only*: *theirs* move not the earth only, but the *commands, the records of Heaven itself!*

*bears witness against its own corrupters, and actually annihilates them;* and this is one of the most powerful evidences of the actual inspiration of the Sacred text, that no attempts to corrupt it are successful.

It remains that I should offer a conjecture as to the time when the numbers were corrupted. It appears most probable that it was first effected in the copy of the Law sent by the High Priest Eleazar, as narrated by Josephus, to Ptolemy Philadelphus of Egypt, at his own request, in order to its being translated into Greek. The canon of the Old Testament had then been closed for a century and a-half, and prophecy had ceased. The High Priests who ruled the nation were, without doubt, sometimes men of true piety, but oftener, it is to be feared, had no greater pretensions to true and enlightened godliness than many who now occupy the Bench of Bishops in the Church of England. They had their SUMNERS, but they had also others of opposite characters, High Churchmen, worldly, carnal, and ambitious of their own glory, and that of the Jewish nation. Here, then, was a fit opportunity for raising the nation higher than ever in the estimation of the Heathen by a tenfold multiplication of their numbers when they left Egypt. The temptation was too strong to be resisted by worldly men, and even men of true piety might fall into the snare, counting it meritorious to magnify the people of the Lord. The corruption, if this conjecture be right, was, therefore, effected *in order to its introduction into the Greek Version.* Now, if so, we may see the wonder-working Providence of God in reserving *this very Version* (corrupted in a matter of no practical importance to us) in order to bear witness against, and demonstrate the subsequent cor-

ruption of the Hebrew text, in a matter of the *deepest moment*, namely, the whole chronology of the primitive ages and times of our Lord's Advent in the flesh.

But if these numbers have been thus changed, how, it will be asked, are we to explain the silence of our Lord and his apostles upon it?\* We answer that Christ did not appear as a REFORMER OF CHURCH OR STATE, or as a SCRIBE to correct the Hebrew text, but as the SAVIOUR OF THE WORLD. The Scriptures were given as the most precious of God's talents, like the Ark of the Covenant to the custody and safe keeping of the Church; and if the Church, through the sins of her rulers, once lost the Ark, what marvel if in part she defaced his written Word as she did in reality abolish in practice his commandment, "*Thou shalt have none other gods before me.*"† Nevertheless, our Lord's constant and solemn and authoritative reference to the Scriptures evidently implies that their text had, by the overruling Providence of God, been kept pure in all matters of doctrine and manners and genuine history, even that of Jonah the Prophet. And as to the corruption which we now charge upon the text in Numbers, IT IS, AND CAN ONLY BE, DEMONSTRATED BY THE TEXT ITSELF; and had the Church rightly used THE TEXT in the mode of a SEARCHING ANALYSIS, the corruption would long since have been, we will not say *rectified*,

\* I have myself, in the chronological controversy, reasoned in favour of the Greek from our Lord's silence, and have, as I now confess, laid too great stress upon it. The demonstration in that case is, however, complete without any reference to our Lord's silence.

† "And there stood before them [viz., before every form of creeping things, &c.] seventy men of the ancients of the house of Israel, with every man his censer in his hand." (Ezek. viii. 11.)

but at least *detected*, and consequently the stumbling-block to Infidels and sincere inquirers from the actual numbers would have been removed. It is of no moment to us to know what the original numbers were, but it is of the utmost moment that we should know that the present numbers are not the original.

Now, it is remarkable that when Josephus, in his work against Apion, cites the words of Manetho as to the expulsion of the Hyesos, or Shepherds, whom he evidently identifies with his own nation, he mentions their number, with no protest or expression of dissent, as being 240,000. ("Against Apion," i. 14.)

To conclude. Had I desired popularity, or the good opinion of the RELIGIOUS WORLD, I should doubtless have suppressed these remarks. But that desire I have long since trodden under foot. Wo unto you, when all men (even of the Religious World, we apprehend) speak well of you. Better their censures than their applause.

## APPENDIX I.

REMARKS INTRODUCTORY TO THE FOLLOWING  
TABLE.

As the Jewish sacred year begins about the vernal equinox, it becomes necessary in adjusting some of the great dates, as, for example, the death of Moses, and the finishing of the Second Temple, to compute our *years before Christ* from the VERNAL EQUINOX also. The death of Moses in Ve-Adar, B.C. 1600, really happened in March of our year, B.C. 1599; but to have so counted the year would have contradicted the Scripture narrative, that Moses died in the same year as Aaron, viz., the 40th of the Exodus. In like manner the Second Temple having been finished in Adar, this event must be placed, not in B.C. 515, but 516.

Since, after the rebellion of the Ten Tribes the Chronology of the Scriptures is carried on in the line of the kings of *Judah*, the dates of the kings of *Israel*, from Rehoboam, B.C. 990, to Hoshea, B.C. 729, are given only according to the Septuagint, and are not carried into the column of years, but are placed with their names in the column appropriated to the kingdom of the Ten Tribes.

The same rule is observed with respect to other dates that do not belong to the direct line of the Scriptural Chronology, which, after the captivity, is carried on in the line of the Canon of Ptolemy. Thus the times of the Latin kingdom and of Rome, prior to the year B.C. 65, also the eras of the Prophets and of the High Priests, after the Captivity till B.C. 175, are placed in the column appropriated to events and reigns, or dates not in the direct order of the Chronology.

After the two Chronologies meet in B.C. 810, it has not been thought necessary to insert the Hebrew years of the world at each date. They are inserted only at every *tenth date* to the end of the Table.

I have placed in italic the following events, the dates of which are not exactly recorded in the Scriptures, but are deduced by me according to the principles mentioned in this volume:—1, The Fall; 2, The Foundation of Babel and Confusion of Tongues; and 3, The arrival of Abraham at Haran. Also 4, The Death of Joshua. In this date, moreover, there is a further correction of 1 year in the present copy of the Table. It is placed, not, as in my Synopsis, in B.C. 1583, but 1582.

TABLE OF THE CHRONOLOGY FROM CREATION TO THE  
EPOCH OF THE GENTILE BISHOPRIC OF JERUSALEM,

## SHOWING ALSO

THE GREEK AND HEBREW CHRONOLOGIES, AND THEIR DIFFERENCE, AT  
EACH DATE, IN YEARS AND JUBILEES, TO THE POINT WHERE THEY  
MEET, VIZ., THE ACCESSION OF UZZIAH IN THE YEAR B.C. 810.

	SEPTUAGINT.		HEBREW.		DIFFERENCE of the GREEK and HEBREW, at each date, down to the Christian Era. Years. Jubilee.
	YEARS Of the World.	Before Christ.	YEARS Of the World.	Before Christ.	
CREATION.					
Adam created, 1st Nisan, 23d March	1	5478	1	4004	1474 30 4
<i>Adam falls</i>	18	5461	1	—	1457 29 36
Seth born, near the end of the sacred year	230	5249	130	3874	1375 28 3
Enos born, his father, Seth, being 205 years	435	5044	235	3769	1275 26 1
Cainan born . . . Enos . . . 190 "	625	4854	325	3679	1175 23 48
Mahalaleel born . . . Cainan . . . 170 "	795	4684	395	3609	1075 21 46
Adam dies, 14th Nisan, 23d March	931	4548	930	3074	1474 30 4
Jared born . . . Mahalaleel 165 "	960	4519	460	3544	975 19 44
Enoch born . . . Jared . . . 162 "	1122	4357	622	3382	975 — —
Seth dies, aged . . . 912 "	1142	4337	1042	2962	1375 28 3
Methuselah born . . . Enoch . . . 165 "	1287	4192	687	3317	875 17 42
Enos dies, aged . . . 905 "	1340	4139	1140	2864	1275 26 1
Lamech born . . . Methuselah 187 "	1474	4005	874	3130	875 17 42
Enoch translated, aged . . . 365 "	1487	3992	987	3017	975 19 44
Cainan dies, aged . . . 910 "	1535	3944	1235	2769	1175 23 48
Noah born . . . Lamech . . . 188 "	1662	3817	1056	2948	869 17 36
Mahalaleel dies, aged . . . 895 "	1690	3789	1290	2714	1075 21 46
Jared dies, aged . . . 962 "	1922	3557	1422	2582	975 19 44
Noah begins to build the Ark . . .	2142	3337	1536	2468	869 17 36
Japhet born . . . Noah . . . 500 "	2162	3317	1556	2448	869 — —
Shem born . . . — . . . 502 "	2164	3315	1558	2446	869 — —
Ham born . . . — . . . 503 "	2165	3314	1560	2444	870 17 37
Lamech dies, aged . . . 753 "	2227	3252	1651	2353	899 18 17
Methuselah dies, aged . . . 969 "	2256	3223	1656	2348	875 17 42
The Ark finished	2260	3219	1654	2350	869 17 36
<i>The Flood, May 17th. From Creation, 17 weeks of the Cycle of 19 = 119 Cycles</i>	2262	3217	1656	2348	869 — —
POSTDILUVIAN PATRIARCHAL AGE.					
Noah leaves the Ark, May 17. The Covenant of God with him and all flesh, Gen. ix. 9 . . . . .	2263	3216	1657	2347	869 17 36
Arphaxad born, his father, Shem, being 100 years	2264	3215	1658	2346	869 — —
2d Cainan born, his father, Arphaxad . . . 135 "	2399	3080	—	—	—
Salah born . . . Cainan . . . 130 "	2529	2950	1693	2311	639 13 2
Noah dies, aged . . . . . 950 "	2612	2867	2006	1998	639 17 36

	SEPTUAGINT.		HEBREW.		DIFFERENCE of the GREEK AND HEBREW, at each date, down to the Christian Era. Years. Jubilee.							
	YEARS Of the World.	Before Christ.	YEARS									
			Of the World.	Before Christ.								
<b>POSTDILUVIAN PATRIARCHAL AGE—</b>												
<i>Continued.</i>												
Eber born . . . . .	Salah being 130 years	2659	2820	1723	2281	539	11	0				
Shem dies, aged . . . . .	600	2764	2715	2158	1846	869	17	36				
Peleg born . . . . .	Eber . . . . .	134	2793	2686	1757	2247	439	8	47			
Arphaxad dies, aged . . . . .	538	2802	2677	2096	1908	769	15	34				
Cainan dies, aged . . . . .	460	2859	2620									
Reu born . . . . .	Peleg . . . . .	130	2923	2556	1787	2217	339	6	45			
Salah dies, aged . . . . .	433	2962	2517	2126	1878	639	13	2				
Serug born . . . . .	Reu . . . . .	132	3055	2424	1819	2185	239	4	43			
Eber dies, aged . . . . .	404	3063	2416	2187	1817	599	12	11				
<i>Babel founded</i> . . . . .		3079	2400	1757	2247	153	3	6				
<i>Confusion of Tongues and Division of the Earth begun</i> . . . . .						3081	2398					
Peleg dies, aged . . . . .	339	3132	2347	1996	2008	339	6	45				
Nahor born . . . . .	Serug . . . . .	130	3185	2294	1849	2155	139	2	41			
(Job probably was his contemporary.)												
Reu dies, aged . . . . .	339	3262	2217	2026	1978	239	4	43				
Terah born . . . . .	Nahor . . . . .	79	3264	2215	1878	2126	89	1	40			
Abraham born . . . . .	Terah . . . . .	70	3334	2145	2008	1996	149	3	2			
Serug dies, aged . . . . .	330	3385	2094	2049	1955	139	2	41				
Nahor dies, aged . . . . .	208	3393	2086	1997	2007	79	1	30				
<i>Abraham arrives at Haran</i> . . . . .		3406	2073	2082	1922	151	3	4				
Terah dies, aged . . . . .	145	3409	2070	2082	1922	148	3	1				
Abraham called . . . . .			—	—	2083	1921	149	3	2			
He arrives at Sichem, and goes into Egypt . . . . .		3410	2069	2084	1920	149	—	—				
Covenant of God with him, Gen. xv. . . . .		3418	2061	2091	1913	148	3	1				
Ishmael born, his father being . . . . .	86	3420	2059	2094	1910	149	3	2				
<i>The Covenant of Circumcision. Sodom destroyed. Conception of Isaac</i> . . . . .						3433	2046	2107	1897	149	—	—
Isaac born . . . . .		3434	2045	2108	1896	149	—	—				
Sarah dies, aged . . . . .	127	3471	2008	2145	1859	149	—	—				
Isaac's marriage . . . . .		3474	2005	2148	1856	149	—	—				
Jacob born . . . . .		3494	1985	2168	1836	149	—	—				
Abraham dies, aged . . . . .	175	3509	1970	2183	1821	149	—	—				
Jacob goes to Padan-aram . . . . .		3571	1908	2244	1760	148	3	1				
Reuben born . . . . .	Jacob . . . . .	78	3572	1907	2252	1752	155	3	8			
Simeon born . . . . .	—	80	3574	1905	2253	1751	154	3	7			
Levi born . . . . .	—	81	3575	1904	2254	1750	154	—	—			
Judah born . . . . .	—	82	3576	1903	2255	1749	154	—	—			
Joseph born . . . . .	—	91	3585	1894	2259	1745	149	3	2			
Jacob returns from Padan-aram . . . . .		3591	1888	2265	1739	149	—	—				
He arrives at Shechem . . . . .		3592	1887									
Benjamin born . . . . .	Jacob . . . . .	104	3598	1881	2272	1732	149	—	—			
Isaac dies, aged . . . . .	180	3614	1865	2288	1716	149	—	—				
Joseph stands before Pharaoh . . . . .		3615	1864	2289	1715	149	—	—				
First year of plenty . . . . .		3616	1863	—	—	148	3	1				
First year of famine . . . . .		3623	1856	2296	1708	148	—	—				
Jacob and family go to Egypt . . . . .		3624	1855	2298	1706	149	3	2				
They are settled in Goshen . . . . .		3625	1854	—	—	148	3	1				
Famine ended . . . . .		3630	1849	2303	1701	148	—	—				
Jacob dies, aged . . . . .	147	3641	1838	2315	1689	149	3	2				
Amram born . . . . .		3684	1795									
Joseph dies . . . . .		3695	1784	2369	1635	149	—	—				
Levi dies . . . . .		3712	1767									
Aaron born . . . . .		3756	1723	2430	1574	149	—	—				
Moses born . . . . .		3759	1720	2433	1571	149	—	—				
Appearance of God to Moses at the bush . . . . .		3839	1640	2513	1491	149	—	—				

	SEPTUAGINT. YEARS Of the World.		HEBREW. YEARS Of the World.		DIFFERENCE of the GREEK AND HEBREW, at each date, down to the Christian Era. Years. Jubilee.		
<b>MOSES LAWGIVER.</b>							
The Exodus, 15th Nisan, Sunday, 13th April, and passage of the Red Sea.	3840	1639	—	—	148	Jbs. Yrs. 3 1	
The Law given from Mount Sinai, 2d June, Tabernacle reared. Sin of spies, . . .	3841	1638	2514	1490	148	— —	
Miriam dies in the first month, Aaron in the 5th, and Moses on the 7th day of Ve-Adar, March 14, Friday, . . . .	3879	1600	2553	1451	149	3 2	
<b>JOSHUA ENTERS CANAAN, Wednesday, 16th April. JERICHO FALLS,</b>	3880	1599	—	—	148	3 1	
Division of the Lands begun; from Creation 777 $\times$ 5, . . . . .	3886	1593	2559	1445	148	— —	
<i>Joshua dies,</i> . . . . .	3897	1582	2577	1427	156	3 9	
The end of the period of the Elders and Anarchy, wherein occurred the events recorded in Judges xviii.—xxi. from the date of the Fall 12 <sup>2</sup> = 144 $\times$ (3 <sup>3</sup> = 27) = 3888 years, . . . . .	3906	1573	—	—	—	— —	
<b>THE JUDGES.</b>							
I. Servitude under Cushanrishathaim . . . . .	3907	1572	2591	1413	159	3 12	
Othniel judge. Rest 40 years, . . . . .	3915	1564	2599	1405	159	— —	
II. Servitude under Eglon, king of Moab, . . . . .	3955	1524	2662	1342	182	3 35	
Ehud, and then Shamgar, judges. Rest . . . . .	3973	1506	2679	1325	181	3 34	
80 years, . . . . .	4053	1426	2699	1305	121	2 23	
III. Servitude under Jabin, king of Canaan, and Sisera, 20 years, . . . . .	4073	1406	2719	1285	121	2 23	
Deborah and Barak, judges. Rest 40 years, . . . . .	4113	1366	2752	1252	114	2 16	
IV. Servitude under Midian, 7 years, . . . . .	4120	1359	2759	1245	114	— —	
Gideon, judge. Rest 40 years, . . . . .	4160	1319	2769	1235	84	1 35	
Abimelech, judge . . . . .	4163	1316	2772	1232	84	1 35	
Tolah, . . . . .	4186	1293	2789	1215	78	1 29	
Jair, . . . . .	4208	1271	2799	1205	66	1 17	
V. Servitude under Ammonites and Philistines, . . . . .	4226	1253	2817	1187	66	— —	
Jephthah, judge, . . . . .	4232	1247	2823	1181	66	— —	
Ibzan, . . . . .	4239	1240	2830	1174	66	— —	
Elon, . . . . .	4249	1230	2840	1164	66	— —	
Abdon, . . . . .	4257	1222	2848	1156	66	— —	
VI. Servitude under Philistines, 40 years, . . . . .	4297	1182	2848	1156	26	26	
20 of which Samson was judge, . . . . .	4337	1142	2888	1116	26	—	
VII. Servitude under Philistines. Ark at Kirjathjearim, . . . . .	4357	1122	2908	1096	26	—	
Samuel, judge, . . . . .	4369	1110	2909	1095	15	15	
<b>THE KINGDOM OF ISRAEL.</b>							
Saul, king 40 years. From Jacob's arrival at Shechem, 777 y., . . . . .	4371	1108	2911	1093	15	—	
His third year, 1 Sam. xiii. 1, . . . . .	4379	1100	2919	1085	15	—	
David born, . . . . .	4409	1070	2949	1055	15	—	
— reigns in Hebron, . . . . .	4416	1063	2956	1048	15	—	
— reigns in Jerusalem. From death of Jacob, 31 $\times$ 5 <sup>2</sup> = 775 y., . . . . .	4419	1060	2959	1045	15	—	
He brings the ark to Zion, . . . . .	4449	1030	2989	1015	15	—	

	SEPTUAGINT.		HEBREW.		DIFFERENCE of the GREEK AND HEBREW, at each date, down to the Christian Era. Years. Jubilees.	
	YEARS Of the World.	Before Christ.	YEARS Of the World.	Before Christ.	Jbs. Yrs.	
Temple founded, . . . . .	4452	1027	2992	1012	15	—
finished. From Noah's leaving the ark and the everlasting co- venant, 183 the fraction of $13 \times$ $12 = 2196$ yrs. From the Vision of the Ladder, B.C. 1908, 111 the fraction of $10 \times 8 = 888$ yrs., . . .	4459	1020	3000	1005	15	—
——— dedicated, . . . . .	4460	1019	3001	1004	15	—
First Passover in the Temple, . . . . .	4461	1018	3002	1003	15	—
God appears to Solomon the second time, . . .	4469	1010	3009	992	18	18
1 Kings ix. 1, 10, . . . . .	4489	990	3029	975	15	15
Death of Solomon, . . . . .						

	SEPTUAGINT.		HEBREW.		DIFFERENCE of the HEBREW & GREEK Years.	
	YEARS Of the World.	Before Christ.	YEARS Of the World.	Before Christ.		
KINGDOM OF } JUDAH. } { KINGDOM OF TEN TRIBES, ISRAEL.						
Rehoboam, 17 years	The Ten Tribes rebel, Jeroboam reigns B.C. 22 years, . . . 990	4489	990	3029	975	15
Shishak of Egypt spoils Jerusalem, . . . . .		4493	986			
Abijah, 3 . . . . .		4506	973	3046	958	15
Asa, 41 . . . . .	Nadab, 1 year, 968 Baasha, 23 . . 967 Ela, 1 . . 944 Zimri and Omri, 10 . . 943 Ahab, 22 . . 933	4509	970	3049	955	15
Jehoshaphat, 25 . . . . .		4550	929	3090	914	15
Ahaziah, 2 . . . . .	Ahaziah, 2 . . 911	4569	910	3108	896	14
Elijah translated, . . . . .	Elijah translated, . . . . .	4569	910	3108	896	14
Jehoram, 6 . . . . .	Joram 12 . . 909	4575	904	3115	889	15
Ahaziah, 1 . . . . .		4581	898	3119	885	13
Queen Athaliah, 6 . . . . .		4582	897	3120	884	13
Jehoash, or Joash, 40 . . . . .	Jehu, 28 . . 897 Jehoahaz, 17 . . 869 Joash, 16 . . 852	4588	891	3126	878	13
Amaziah, 29 . . . . .		4628	851	3165	839	12
Interregnum, 12 . . . . .	Clemens and Theophilus give 39 years to Amaziah; and 156, the Interregnum was only 2 yrs.	4657	822	0	0	
Uzziah, 52 . . . . .	Jeroboam II., 41 . 836 Interregnum, 22 . 795	4669	810	3194	810	

Two Chronicons  
show the same  
Hebrew Before  
Christ, from this  
date are identical.

		SEPTUAGINT.	YEARS Of the World.	Before Christ.	HEBREW. Y. W.
<i>Era of the Olympiads,</i>	B.C.		4703	776	3228
Zechariah and Shal-lum, . . . . .	1 year 773				
Menahem, . . . . .	11 . . . . .	772			
PUL, KING OF AS-SYRIA, invades					
Israel, . . . . .	2 . . . . .	761	4708	771	
Pekahiah, . . . . .	20 . . . . .	759			
Pekah, . . . . .					
Jotham in Judah, 16 years,			4721	758	
ROME FOUNDED (VARRO).			4726	753	
NABONASSAR REIGNS IN BABYLON— <i>His Era.</i>			4732	747	
Ahaz in Judah, 16 years,			4737	742	
TIGLATH-PILESER of Assyria carries captive the Tribes beyond Jordan,			4739	740	
Interregnum in Israel, . . . . .	10 . . . . .	739			
Hoshea, <i>current,</i> . . . . .	9 . . . . .				
<i>Complete,</i> . . . . .	8 . . . . .	729			
Hezekiah in Judah, 29 years,			4753	726	
SHALMANESER of Assyria takes Samaria, and carries captive the Ten Tribes, . . . . .			4758	721	

## ASSYRIA.\*

Mr. Clinton (vol. i. pp. 263—282) fixes from Ctesias the epoch of Ninus, the first king of Assyria, in the year . . . . . B. C. 2182

Jackson, in his Chronological Antiquities, (vol. i. pp. 262, 263, 267, 268,) gives a catalogue of four kings who reigned in Babylon between Belus and Ninus, filling a period of 217 years, which, being added to the date given above from Mr. Clinton, brings out as the era of Belus, . . . . . B. C. 2399

Being in these Tables the 2d year of the building of Babel. This coincidence is very remarkable. But it deserves notice, that Jackson places these reigns 166 years lower down, viz., that of Belus (p. 267) in . . . . . B. C. 2233

and of Ninus in . . . . . 2016

Syncellus, (p. 165,) places the fall of the first Assyrian empire in y. w. 4675, and as he gives y. w. 4747 as the 1st of Nabonassar, the difference between these two Mundane years being 72, added to b. c. 747, the 1st of Nabonassar, gives his date of the end of the first Assyrian empire as being . . . . . B. C. 819

Mr. Clinton adopts this date (vol. i. p. 262), and it is also brought out by the numbers of Eusebius, who reckons the fall of the Assyrian empire in the year of Abraham, . . . . . 1196

\* When we pass from the Scriptural Chronology to the Profane we also pass from the region of *certain* to that of *probability*.

To which add 819, and it gives the era of the birth of Christ as it is found in his Tables, viz., in the year of Abraham, . . . . . 2215  
 He also makes it parallel with Ol. 195, 1, and A. C. 1, thus adopting the era (afterwards) of Dionysius as that of the Nativity.

I have in vain attempted to feel my way through the various and conflicting statements and conclusions of Chronologers as to the particulars which make up the whole sum of the times of the Assyrian empire. Even Mr. Clinton, whose deep learning is usually guided by a sound judgment, in his remarks prefixed to his proposed arrangement of the later kings, is only able to say, (vol. i. p. 277,) "We may, *perhaps*, arrange the numbers and the names supplied by Abydenus and Polyhistor in this manner."

It appears, however, that from the numbers already given, the following great outlines are established:—

The reign of Belus, or Nimrod, in Babylon, . . . . . B. C. 2399  
 Years.

Of Ninus in Nineveh, . . . . . 217 2182  
 The empire overthrown by the Medes, . . . . . 1363 819

The kingdom of Assyria rises again under a line of Princes, of whom the following appear in the scriptural narrative:—

1. Pul, 2 Kings xv. 19,	. . . . .	771
2. Tiglath Pileser, 2 Kings xv. 29,	. . . . .	740
3. Shalmaneser makes Hoshea tributary,	. . . . .	728
4. Sennacherib (probably Sargon, Is. xx. 1),	. . . . .	713
Second Median revolt,	. . . . .	711
5. Esarhaddon reigns in Nineveh,	. . . . .	—
He leads Manasseh captive,	. . . . .	677
Nehochodonosor,	. . . . .	650
He slays in battle Phraortes, king of Media,	. . . . .	634
He sends an army under Holopernes to lay waste Palestine. Holopernes perishes by the hand of Judith,	. . . . .	633

As I am compelled to dissent from the opinion of Jackson, Hales, and Mr. Clinton, who place the destruction of Nineveh in B. C. 606, and to accord with Prideaux, that it was not later than B. C. 612, I shall give my reasons for this.

The reasons of the former learned writers, which are drawn from the great age attributed to Tobit and Tobias, the former 158 years, and the latter 127, are demolished by the facts, that the Latin version of Tobit by Jerome, makes Tobit only 102 years, and Tobias 98 years at their deaths. The Syriac copy of Tobit gives to Tobit  $58 + 7 + 37 = 102$ , and to Tobias 107 years. The two Hebrew versions in Walton's Polyglott are silent as to the ages of both Tobit and Tobias; and of the foregoing four copies, the Syriac is the only one which mentions that Tobias survived the destruction of Nineveh. If we suppose that he was ten years old at the captivity of Samaria, then to have survived the ruin of Nineveh, at Mr. Clinton's date, he must have lived to the age of 125, a length of years not very probable, there being no Scriptural example of it except that of Jehoiada, the priest, who lived 130 years (2 Chron. xxiv. 15), after Aoram, the father of Moses.

The Chronological arguments of these writers, from the duration of the dominion of the Scythians in Asia, are unsatisfactory, inasmuch as Justin (lib. ii. 5) gives only 8 years for the duration of that dominion instead of 28 years, the period of Herodotus.

Lastly, the awful message of Jeremiah to the nations, in his 25th chapter, which was in the 23rd year from the 13th of Josiah, that is, B. C. 640 — 12 = B. C. 628 — 22 = B. C. 606, evidently indicates that Nineveh must have fallen before that date. It is plain from v. 28, that the nations were then in a state of peace, which contra-

dicts the view of those learned writers who make that very year the date of the Fall of Nineveh ; and as the name of Nineveh does not occur in the list of the nations which were to be destroyed, it is manifest that it must have fallen already. Accordingly, we are expressly told by Josephus, (Ant. x. 5, 1,) that the expedition of Pharaoh-Necho, 2 Kings xxiii. 29, when Josiah was slain, B.C. 610, was after the destruction of the Assyrian dominion. Prideaux says that Eusebius places the taking of Nineveh in the 29th of Josiah. In my Armenian copy it appears to be the 28th, which was B.C. 613. I place it with Prideaux in B.C. 612.

	SEPTUAGINT. YEARS	HEBREW. Y. W.
	Of the World.	Before Christ.
JUDAH ONLY.		
Sennacherib, king of Assyria, invades Judah . . . . .	4766	713
His army destroyed by the Angel . . . . .	4767	712
Manasseh in Judah, 55 years . . . . .	4782	697
Esarhaddon sends Manasseh in chains to Babylon, and carries captive the remainder of the Ten Tribes, Isaiah vii. 8 . . . . .	4802	677
Ammon in Judah, 2 years . . . . .	4837	642
Josiah in Judah, 31 years . . . . .	4839	640
Josiah's reformation in his 12th year . . . . .	4850	629
The volume of the law found—His reformation in his 18th year, 2 Kings xxii. 3, 8; xxiii. 22 . . . . .	4856	623
Nineveh destroyed by the Medes and Babylonians . . . . .	4867	612
Josiah dies of his wounds in battle with Pharaoh-Necho . . . . .	4869	610
Jehoahaz in Judah, 3 months . . . . .		
Jehoiachim in Judah, 11 years current . . . . .	4870	609
		3395
THE PROPHETS.		
Elijah . . . . .	from . . . . .	B.C. 924 to 910
Elisha . . . . .	about . . . . .	910 852
Jonah . . . . .	about . . . . .	859
Hosea . . . . .	about . . . . .	773
Amos . . . . .	—	—
Isaiah . . . . .	about . . . . .	760 700
Micah . . . . .		750
Nahum . . . . .		727
Zephaniah . . . . .		623
Joel . . . . .	perhaps about . . . . .	620
Jeremiah . . . . .		628 585
Daniel . . . . .		606 534
Ezekiel . . . . .		594 574
Habakkuk . . . . .	perhaps . . . . .	620
Haggai . . . . .		520
Zechariah . . . . .		—
Malachi . . . . .	about . . . . .	430 425
BABYLON, THE FIRST KINGDOM OF DANIEL, IN ITS CONNEXION WITH THE CHURCH.		
The following reigned in Babylon from the era of Nabonassar, according to the canon of Ptolemy :—		B.C.
Nabonassar . . . . .	14 years	747
Nadius . . . . .	2 "	733
Chinzirus and Porus . . . . .	5 "	731
Jugeus . . . . .	5 "	726

	B. C.	SEPTUAGINT.		HIEROGL. Y. W.
		YEARS Of the World.	Before Christ.	
Mardocempadus, or <i>Merodach Baladan</i>	12 years 721			
Archianus	5 " 709			
Interregnum	2 " 704			
Belibus	3 " 702			
Apronadius	6 " 699			
Regibelus	1 " 693			
Mesesimordachus	4 " 692			
Interregnum	8 " 688			
Asaradinus, or <i>Esarhaddon</i>	13 " 680			
Saosduchinus	20 " 667			
Chinaladinus	22 " 647			
Nabopolassar the 2 last years with Nebuchadnezzar, his son, 21 years, viz.	19 " 625			
Nebuchadnezzar with his father	2 " 606			
Alone	604			
In making out the foregoing list, I have consulted Jackson, Hales, and Mr. Clinton. The joint reign of Nebuchadnezzar with his father for two years was one of the earliest results I arrived at in composing my Chromology of Israel;* but is not acknowledged by these writers. It is held by Prideaux and Usher.				
Nebuchadnezzar reigns in Babylon with his father, Nabopolassar	4873	606		
He takes Jerusalem. The 70 years' captivity	—	—		
Daniel carried to Babylon	—	—		
Nebuchadnezzar reigns alone on his father's death	4875	604		
Jehoiachim rebels against Nebuchadnezzar	4876	603		
Jehoiachin, or Jeconiah, or Coniah, reigns 3 months in Jerusalem. He delivers himself up to Nebuchadnezzar	4880	599		
He is sent in chains to Babylon—First year of his captivity	4881	598		
Zedekiah, in Jerusalem 11 years current	—	—		
In his ninth year Nebuchadnezzar besieges Jerusalem	4889	590		
The city taken, and with the Temple burned	4891	588		
Nebuchadnezzar dies about the end of the Jewish sacred year	4917	562		
Evil-Merodach in Babylon, 2 years	4918	561		
He releases Jehoiachin from prison at the end of the former year, 562. The liberty of Jehoiachin counted from 561	—	—		
Neriglissar in Babylon, 3 years	4920	559		
Cyrus reigns in Persia Proper	—	—		
Neriglissar of Babylon slain in battle by Cyrus	4923	556	3448	
Laborosoarchod reigns 9 months in Babylon	—	—		
Belshazzar, or Nabonadius, reigns in Babylon 17 years	4924	555		
Daniel's Vision of the Four Kingdoms, ch. vii.	—	—		
His Vision of the Ram and He-goat	4926	553		
Cyrus takes Sardis	4931	548		
He takes Babylon	4941	538		

SECOND KINGDOM—THE MEDES AND PERSIANS—IN  
ITS CONNEXION WITH THE CHURCH.  
THE MEDES.

Arbaces of Media overthrows the first Assyrian Empire  
The kingdom of Assyria having risen in a new form  
appears again to have brought the Medes in subjection to it.  
After the second rebellion of the Medes, already noticed  
under the head of Assyria, the following kings reigned  
in Media:—

\* See that work, ch. ii.

	B. C.	SEPTUAGINT. YEARS Of the World.	Before Christ.	BRITANN. Y. W.
Dejoces . . . . .	53 years 709			
Phraortes . . . . .	22 " 656			
Cyaxares . . . . .	40 " 634			
Astyages . . . . .	35 " 594			
Cyaxares, ii., Darius, the Mede . . . . .	559			
Mr. Clinton holds, on the authority of all the ancient Greek writers, that in b. c. 559, Cyrus forcibly seized the kingdom of Media, which was thenceforth subject to Persia. But this contradicts the testimony of the Prophet Daniel, who informs us most clearly that at the taking of Babylon, and during the reign of Darius, the Medes were the ruling power.				
Darius the Mede reigns in Babylon 2 years . . . . .		4941	538	
Daniel's Vision of the 70 Weeks . . . . .				
Cyrus reigns over the Medes and Persians. His proclamation for the return of the Jews, 28 Jubilees from Jacob's departure for Padan-aram . . . . .		4943	536	
The foundation of the Second Temple, Ezra iii. 8 . . . . .		4944	535	
Cambysee (called in Ezra iv. 6, Ahasuerus) reigns in Persia . . . . .		4950	529	
He conquers Egypt . . . . .		4954	525	
Smerdis, the Magian (Ezra iv. 7, Artaxerxes), usurps the throne of Persia, b. c. 522 . . . . .				
Darius Hystaspes reigns in Persia 36 years . . . . .		4958	521	3483
Foundation again of the Second Temple, Hag. ii. 18 . . . . .		4959	520	
Babylon having rebelled against Darius, he besieges it . . . . .		4962	517	
Babylon taken. Its gates and walls demolished . . . . .		4963	516	
The Temple finished and dedicated in Adar . . . . .				
Darius invades Scythia, and conquers Thrace . . . . .		4966	513	
He sends an expedition to India, which he next year conquers. The pushing of the Rami southward, Dan. viii. 4 . . . . .		4970	509	
The first year of Athenian liberty, after the expulsion of the Pisistratidae, in b. c. 510 . . . . .		4970	509	
Tarquin Superbus banished from Rome. Consuls . . . . .				
Darius invades Greece. Marathon . . . . .		4989	490	
Xerxes reigns in Persia 21 years . . . . .		4994	485	
He invades Greece. Is defeated at Salamis . . . . .		4999	480	
Artaxerxes Longimanus reigns in Persia 41 years current . . . . .		5015	464	3540
Esther goes in to Artaxerxes and pleases him . . . . .		5019	460	
He marries her. His decree in favour of Ezra. The 70 Weeks begin . . . . .		5021	458	
His commission in favour of Nehemiah . . . . .		5034	445	
Nehemiah returns to the court of Artaxerxes in the 32d year of his reign (Neh. xiii. 6). This is the last point of time noted in Scripture Chronology . . . . .		5046	433	
Beginning of the Peloponnesian War . . . . .		5048	431	
Death of Artaxerxes. End of the Old Testament canon, 14 squares of 19 from Creation . . . . .		5055	424	
Xerxes II. and Sogdianus reign in Persia,—the former two, and the latter seven months . . . . .				
Darius Nothus reigns in Persia 19 years . . . . .		5056	423	
Artaxerxes Mnemon reigns in Persia 46 years . . . . .		5075	404	
Athens taken by Lysander. End of Peloponnesian War . . . . .				
Retreat of the 10,000 . . . . .		5078	401	
Epaminondas defeats the Spartans at Leuctra. Thebes dominates in Greece . . . . .		5108	371	
Ochus reigns in Persia 21 years . . . . .		5121	358	3646
Alexander the Great born . . . . .		5123	356	
Philip of Macedon defeats the Athenians and Thebans at Chaeronea . . . . .		5141	338	
Arogus, or Arses, reigns in Persia . . . . .		5142	337	

	SEPTUAGINT. YEARS Of the World.	Before Christ.	HEBREW Y. W.
Philip, generalissimo of Greece . . . . .	5142	337	
Philip assassinated . . . . .	5143	336	
Alexander reigns . . . . .			
Darius Codomannus reigns in Persia . . . . .	5144	335	
Alexander passes the Hellespont and invades Persia . . . . .	5145	334	
He overthrows Darius at Arbela (Gaugamela) . . . . .	5148	331	
Darius is slain by Bessus . . . . .	5149	330	
<b>THE THIRD, OR GRECIAN KINGDOM, IN ITS CONNEXION WITH THE CHURCH.</b>			
<b>GREECE.</b>			
Cecrops, the first King of Athens, 375 years before the Fall of Troy (Mr. Clinton, vol. i. p. 59) . . . . .		b. c. 1558	
Codrus, the last king, falls in battle . . . . .		1068	
Archons for life . . . . .			
Decennial Archons in Athens . . . . .	754		
Annual Archons . . . . .	684		
Draco, Lawgiver . . . . .	624		
Solon . . . . .	594		
Pisistratus, tyrant . . . . .	560		
He dies—Hippias and Hipparchus, his sons, succeed him . . . . .	527		
Hipparchus slain . . . . .	514		
Hippias expelled . . . . .	510		
ATHENS rules Greece after the victories at Salamis, Platæa, and Mycale . . . . .	479		
SPARTA rules after the taking of Athens by Lysander . . . . .	404		
THEBES dominates after the battle of Leuctra . . . . .	371		
PHILIP of MACEDON has dominion over Greece after the battle of Chæronea . . . . .	338		
Death of Bessus. Complete subjugation of Persia by Alexander Aridaeus, on the death of Alexander, reigns nominally over his empire seven years . . . . .	5150	329	
The generals of Alexander divide the empire . . . . .	5156	323	3681
Ptolemy seizes Judea and Syria, and takes Jerusalem . . . . .	5159	320	
Alexander Ægus reigns nominally over the empire . . . . .	5163	316	
Seleucus takes Babylon. The Era of the Seleucidæ, or of Contracts. He reigns 32 years . . . . .	5167	312	
Ptolemy Lagus, or Soter, reigns in Egypt 20 years, Dan. xi. 5 . . . . .	5174	305	
The battle of Ipsus—Antigonus slain. The empire of Alexander is finally divided into four,—Ptolemy has Judea and Cœle-Syria,—Seleucus, Upper Syria and the East,—Cassander, Macedon and Greece,—Lysimachus, Bythinia and Thrace, &c. . . . .	5178	301	
Ptolemy Philadelphus reigns in Egypt 38 years . . . . .	5194	285	
Antiochus Soter, in Syria, 19 years . . . . .	5199	280	
The Septuagint Version made . . . . .	5202	277	
Antiochus Theus reigns in Syria 15 years . . . . .	5218	261	
Ptolemy Euergetes, in Egypt, 25 years . . . . .	5232	247	
He conquers great part of Syria (Dan. xi. 7) and takes Seleucia . . . . .	5233	246	3758
Seleucus Callinicus, in Syria, 21 years . . . . .			
Being overthrown in a battle with Ptolemy Euergetes, they make peace . . . . .	5236	243	
Seleucus Ceraunus, in Syria, 2 years . . . . .	5254	225	
Antiochus the Great, in Syria, 36 years . . . . .	5256	223	
Ptolemy Philopator, in Egypt, 17 years . . . . .	5257	222	
Antiochus with a great army re-takes Seleucia, and recovers the greater part of Cœle-Syria, Dan. xi. 10 . . . . .	5260	219	

	SEPTUAGINT. YEARS Of the World.	Before Christ.	HEBREW. Y. W.
Ptolemy defeats Antiochus at Raphia, Dan. xi. 11 . . . . .	5262	217	
Ptolemy Epiphanes, in Egypt, 24 years . . . . .	5274	205	
Antiochus seizes Palestine and Coele-Syria . . . . .	5276	203	
Scopas, commanding the army of Ptolemy, occupies Jerusalem . . . . .	5280	199	
Antiochus defeats Scopas at Paneas, and recovers Jerusalem . . . . .	5281	198	3806
Antiochus having, in the preceding year, entered Greece, is defeated by the Roman Consul, Atilius, at Thermopylae . . . . .	5288	191	
He is defeated by the Romans under Lucius Cornelius Scipio in Asia, and forced to make peace, Dan. xi. 18 . . . . .	5289	190	
He is slain . . . . .	5292	187	
Seleucus Philopator, in Syria, 12 years, Dan. xi. 20 . . . . .	5298	181	
Ptolemy Philometor, in Egypt, 35 years . . . . .	5304	175	
Antiochus Epiphanes, in Syria, 11 years, Dan. xi. 21 . . . . .			
HIGH PRIESTS OF THE JEWS AFTER THE RETURN FROM BABYLON.			
Jeshua . . . . .	53 years	B. C. 536	
Jehoiachim . . . . .	30 "	483	
Eliashib . . . . .	40 "	453	
Joиada, or Judas . . . . .	40 "	413	
John, or Jonathan . . . . .	32 "	373	
Jaddua, or Jaddus . . . . .	20 "	341	
Onias . . . . .	21 "	321	
Simon the Just . . . . .	9 "	300	
Eleazar . . . . .	15 "	291	
Manasses . . . . .	26 "	276	
Onias II. . . . .	33 "	250	
Simon II. . . . .	22 "	217	
Onias III. . . . .	20 "	195	
Antiochus sells the High Priesthood to Jason for 360 talents of silver, and deposes Onias . . . . .	5304	175	
Jason introduces Heathen rites in Jerusalem, and sends money for the sacrifices of Hercules, 2 Mac. iv. 19 . . . . .	5305	174	
Menelaus supplants Jason, and buys of Antiochus the High Priesthood. Jason flies . . . . .	5307	172	
Antiochus invades Egypt, and gains a great victory at Pelusium . . . . .	5308	171	
He again invades and conquers all Egypt, but Alexandria. On his return he takes and sacks Jerusalem, and defiles the Temple by offering swine's flesh upon the altar of burnt-offerings . . . . .	5309	170	3834
He a fourth time invades Egypt, and being forced by the Romans to return, he, by his lieutenants, again ruins Jerusalem, builds a fortress on Mount Acre, overlooking the Temple, and the same year erects the image of Jupiter Olympius on the altar of burnt-offerings . . . . .	5311	168	
The seven Brothers, Maccabees, and their Mother, are martyred, 2 Mac. vii. . . . .	5312	167	
Judas Maccabeus, Prince of the Jews, 6 years . . . . .	5313	166	
He recovers the city, cleanses the Temple, and restores the worship of God . . . . .	5314	165	
Antiochus Eupator, in Syria, 2 years . . . . .	5315	164	
Jacimus, or Alcimus, High Priest of the Jews, 3 years . . . . .	5316	163	
Demetrius Soter, in Syria, 12 years . . . . .	5317	162	
Judas Maccabeus sends an embassy to Rome, and makes an alliance with the Romans, which is the first connexion of the Church of God with the Fourth Kingdom of Daniel . . . . .	5318	161	
Jonathan, Prince of the Jews, 17 years . . . . .	5319	160	
Alexander Balas reigns in Syria, 5 years . . . . .	5329	150	3854

	SEPTUAGINT.		HEBREW. Y. W.
	YEARS Of the World.	Before Christ.	
Demetrius Nicator, in Syria	5333	146	
Ptolemy Physcon Euergetes II., in Egypt, 29 years	5336	143	
Simon, Prince of Judea, 8 years			
Antiochus VI. Epiphanes, in Syria, 1 year			
Trypho reigns in Syria	5337	142	
Antiochus Sidetes, in Syria, 8 years	5341	138	
John Hyrcanus, Prince of Judea, 29 years	5344	135	
Demetrius Nicator again reigns in Syria	5351	128	
Alexander Zebina, in Syria, 2 years	5354	125	
Antiochus Grypus in Syria	5356	123	
Ptolemy Soter, or Lathyrus, in Egypt, 36 years	5362	117	
Aristobulus, Prince of Judea	5373	106	
Alexander Jannæus, Prince of Judea, 27 years	5374	105	3899
Seleucus Nicator, in Syria, 3 years	5384	95	
Philip, in Syria, 9 years	5387	92	
Tigranes, King of Armenia, reigns in Syria	5396	83	
The following reigned in Damascus:—			
Antiochus IX. Cyzicenus		B. C. 113	
Antiochus X. Eusebes		95	
Demetrius III. Eukærus		92	
Antiochus XI.		88	
Ptolemy Auletes reigns in Egypt	5398	81	
Queen Alexandra reigns in Judea, 9 years	5401	78	
Aristobulus reigns in Judea, 6 years	5410	69	
Antiochus Asiaticus reigns in part of Syria, 4 years			

FOURTH KINGDOM -ROME-IN ITS CONNEXION  
WITH THE CHURCH.The Romans come on the theatre of action connected with the  
Church, in the year . . . . . B.C. 65THE ROMANS TRACE THEIR ORIGIN FROM THE  
TROJANS.

	B. C.
Troy taken	1183
1. Æneas reigns in Lavinium	3 years, 1180
2. Ascanius in Lavinium and Alba (38 current)	37 " 1177
3. Silvius	29 " 1140
4. Æneas	31 " 1111
5. Latinus	51 " 1080
6. Alba	39 " 1029
7. Capetus	26 " 990
8. Capys	28 " 964
9. Calpetus	13 " 936
10. Tiberinus	8 " 923
11. Agrippa	41 " 915
12. Allades	19 " 874
13. Aventinus	37 " 855
14. Procas	23 " 818
15. Amulius	42 " 795
	427
Rome founded, from Creation, 15 Cycles of 315, also 175, the length of Abraham's life x 27 = 4725 years, and from the taking of Troy 430 years	753

	B. C.	SEPTUAGINT. YEARS Of the World.	Before Christ.	Y. W. HERRICK.
1. Romulus . . . . .	37 years			
Interregnum . . . . .	1 "			
2. Numa . . . . .	43 "	715		
3. Tullus Hostilius . . . . .	32 "	672		
4. Ancus Martius . . . . .	24 "	640		
5. Tarquinus Priscus . . . . .	38 "	616		
6. Servius Tullius . . . . .	44 "	578		
7. Tarquinius Superbus . . . . .	25 "	534		
8. Expulsion of Tarquin . . . . .	244	509		
The names and reigns of the Latin Kings in the foregoing list have been taken by me from the text of Dionysius Halicarnassus, and compared with the list of Mr. Clinton, vol. i. p. 137. The reigns of the Roman Kings I have copied from Hale's, and there is no difference with respect to them among Chronologers, excepting as to the era of the Foundation, the Fasti Consulares counting it B. C. 752, and Varro 753. These reigns may be seen in any tables.				
Rome under KINGS 244 years.				
REPUBLIC—CONSULS . . . . .	B. C. 509			
DECEMVIRS . . . . .	451			
The Decemvirs deposed. Consuls again . . . . .	449			
MILITARY TRIBUNES with Consular authority . . . . .	444			
and to 409, sometimes Consuls.				
Military Tribunes only . . . . .	408			
Rome burnt by the Gauls. Camillus Dictator. He } saves Rome . . . . .	389			
Anarchy . . . . .	376			
Consuls restored . . . . .	366			
Pyrrhus, King of Epirus, invades Italy . . . . .	280			
He is defeated . . . . .	275			
All Lower Italy subdued by the Romans . . . . .	266			
First Punic War . . . . .	264			
Peace with Carthage. Sicily relinquished to Rome . . . . .	241			
Second Punic War . . . . .	218			
Hannibal enters Italy. Romans defeated at the } Ticinus and the Trebia . . . . .	—			
At Thrasymene . . . . .	217			
— Cannæ . . . . .	216			
Hannibal remains in Italy 13 years after the Battle } of Cannæ—He is recalled to Africa . . . . .	203			
He is defeated at Zama by Scipio Africanus . . . . .	202			
Peace with Carthage . . . . .	201			
Philip of Macedon defeated by the Consul Flaminius at Cynoscephalæ . . . . .	197			
Peace with Philip. The Grecian cities declared free . . . . .	196			
The Romans first cross the Hellespont, and under Cornelius Scipio Asiaticus, as already noticed, defeat Antiochus the Great at Magnesia . . . . .	190			
Perseus, King of Macedon, defeated at Pydna by Paulus Aemilius, June 22, and carried prisoner to Rome. End of the kingdom of Macedon . . . . .	168			
Third Punic War . . . . .	149			
Macedon formed into a Roman province . . . . .	148			
Carthage taken by Aemilianus Scipio the younger . . . . .	146			

	SEPTUAGINT.	YEARS		HEBREW.
		Of the World.	Before Christ.	
The Romans inherit the kingdom of Pergamus . . . . .	B. c. 133			
Sylla PERPETUAL DICTATOR . . . . .	82			
Pompey dethrones Antiochus Asiaticus, and abolishes the Greek kingdom of Syria, which next year is made a Roman province . . . . .	5414	65		
Pompey takes Jerusalem, and profanes the Temple (285 Cycles = 15 squares of 19 from Creation) . . . . .	5416	63		
Hyrcanus reigns in Judea 23 years . . . . .	—	—		
THE FIRST TRIUMVIRATE—Pompey, Crassus, and Cæsar . . . . .	5419	60		
Illyrium and Gaul assigned to Cæsar . . . . .	5420	59	3945	
Cæsar invades Gaul . . . . .	5421	58		
His first Expedition into Britain . . . . .	5424	55		
He again passes into Britain—the Britons sue for peace . . . . .	5425	54		
Crassus plunders the Temple of Jerusalem . . . . .	—	—		
Is defeated by the Parthians, and perishes . . . . .	5426	53		
Cleopatra reigns in Egypt 21 years . . . . .	5428	51		
Beginning of the Civil War between Pompey and Cæsar, b. c. 50				
Pompey overthrown at Pharsalia, May . . . . .	5431	48		
Cæsar Perpetual Dictator—First Julian year . . . . .	5434	45		
Slain in the Senate-house, March 15 . . . . .	5435	44		
Octavianus heads Cæsar's party—Antony driven from Rome, November . . . . .	—	—		
THE SECOND TRIUMVIRATE—Octavianus, Antony, and Lepidus, November 27 . . . . .	5436	43	3961	
The Battle of Philippi. Octavianus and Antony conquer. Brutus and Cassius kill themselves . . . . .	5437	42		
The Parthians invade Syria, take Jerusalem, make Hyrcanus prisoner, and Antigonus king . . . . .	5439	40		
Herod takes Jerusalem, and reigns 36 years complete, 37 current—Antigonus put to death by Antony . . . . .	5442	37		
The Battle of Actium . . . . .	5448	31		
Antony and Cleopatra kill themselves . . . . .	5449	30		
Egypt formed into a Roman province . . . . .	—	—		
Octavianus Emperor of Rome . . . . .	—	—		
He receives the title of AUGUSTUS. The Era of the AUGUSTAN MONARCHY . . . . .	5452	27		
Herod begins to rebuild the Temple, from the Dedication the perfect Cycle of $334 \times 3 = 1002$ years, and before the Passion 1 Jubilee, or $7^2 = 49$ . . . . .	5462	17		

### FIRST ADVENT OF CHRIST, AND JUDGMENT ON THE JEWISH NATION.

The Angel Gabriel appears to Zacharias, and announces the Birth of John the Baptist. (From the Birth of Seth, b. c. 5249, 23 <i>twelves</i> of 19 years, from his death 12 squares of 19) . . . . .	5474	5	
Gabriel sent to the blessed Virgin Mary. She conceives of THE CHRIST, 14 Cycles of 391 from Creation . . . . .	5475	4	
Jesus CHRIST born at Bethlehem, (Joseph flees into Egypt with the Holy Child,) 365 $\times$ 15 = 5475, or 15 <i>years of years</i> from Creation . . . . .	5476	3	4001
Herod dies. Archelaus king. The Holy Family return from Egypt. From Creation 5477 years, a perfect Cycle . . . . .	5478	1	4004
Archelaus deposed and banished by Augustus . . . . .	5486	8	After Christ.
Judea made a Roman province, Coponius Procurator, 5 Cycles of 1097 years from Creation . . . . .	—	—	
Tiberius Emperor of Rome, August 19th . . . . .	5492	14	
Pontius Pilate Procurator of Judea . . . . .	5505	27	

	SEPTUAGINT.	YEARS	HEBREW.
	Of the World.	After Christ.	Y. W.
John the Baptist begins his ministry	5505	27	
Jesus Christ baptized in Jordan, 112 Jubilees from the Fall	5506	28	
His first Passover, John ii. 13	5507	29	
His public ministry, after John's imprisonment, begins in Autumn			
He DIES ON THE CROSS upon Friday, the 1st April, n.s., or 3d April, o.s., 290 Cycles of 19 from Creation. Rises and ascends to heaven, 13th May, n.s.	5511	33	
Caligula Emperor of Rome, March 25th	5515	37	
Claudius Emperor of Rome, January 25th	5519	41	
Herod Agrippa king of Judea			
The Apostle James slain by Herod	5522	44	4048
P. Felix Procurator of Judea	5530	52	
The first Council at Jerusalem, Acts xv.	5531	53	
Nero Emperor of Rome, October 13th	5532	54	
The Apostle Paul is imprisoned at Jerusalem	5537	59	
The first dreadful persecution against the Church	5542	64	
The Apostles Peter and Paul suffer martyrdom	5543	65	
Gessius Florus, the last Roman Procurator of Judea			
The Jewish War begins, July and August	5544	66	
Vespasian enters Galilee with 60,000 men, May	5545	67	
Galba, Otho, and Vitellius successively Emperors of Rome, are, one after the other, killed, the empire filled with slaughter		68,69	
Vespasian Emperor of Rome, July	5547	69	
Jerusalem taken and destroyed by Titus, from Creation $43^2 \times 3$ ; the Fall 553 the fraction of $23 \times 10 = 5530$	5548	70	4074
The War ends by the taking of Massada 7 years after it began, 40 years 1 day after the Passion, and $10 + 10^2 + 10^3 \times 5 = 5550$ years from Creation	5551	73	4077
Vespasian orders the lands of Judea to be sold (Jewish War, vii. 6, 6)	5551	73	
Erects the Temple of Peace, in which he places the spoils of the Temple of Jerusalem	5553	75	
Titus Emperor of Rome, June 24th	5557	79	
Domitian Emperor of Rome, Sept. 13th	5559	81	
Agricola reduces the whole of Britain	5562	84	
Flavius Clemens, Consul and colleague of Domitian, put to death by him for professing Christianity	5573	95	
Nerva Emperor of Rome	5574	96	
John writes his Gospel	5575	97	
Trajan Emperor of Rome	5576	98	
Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, suffers martyrdom	5585	107	
Simeon, Bishop of Jerusalem, crucified	5592	114	
Adrian Emperor of Rome, Aug. 11th	5595	117	4121
Quadratus and Aristides present an Apology for the Christians	5604	126	
Aquila translates the Old Testament into Greek, under the auspices of the Rabbis, for the purpose of throwing discredit on the Septuagint. He was an apostate from Christianity to Judaism*	5606	128	
The Jews, under the false Messiah Barchochebas, rebel against the Roman Government, 134—Bithor, their fortress, is taken on the 10th August, 135, and Barchochebas slain. The war, in which 580,000 Jews fall by the sword, is ended in	5614	136	
Adrian finishes the rebuilding of Jerusalem, and calls it Aelia Capitolina.—The Jews are forbid entering the City	5615	137†	

\* Prideaux, vol. iii., pp. 68, 69; Russell's Connect., vol. i., pp. 82, 83.

† In fixing these dates, I have carefully compared the conclusions of Basnage and Crevier's "History of the Roman Emperors," and the testimony of Eusebius in his "Chronicon," and the Annotations of Valerius in the "Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius." The result at which I arrive is, that the building of Aelia (begun before the war) was the occasion of the Jews rising in rebellion, but that the City was not completed till after the war.

	SEPTUAGINT.	Y. W.	HEBREW.
	YEARS Of the World.	After Christ.	
The following Nisan, A.C. 138, being from Creation 1123, (the trial of 33) $\times$ 5 = 5615 years, is the epoch of their final exclusion.			
Antoninus Pius, Emperor of Rome, July 10th . . . . .	5616	138	
Marcus ordained the first Gentile Bishop of Jerusalem . . . . .	5616	138	
The Epoch of Gentile Bishopric of Jerusalem dates from the first } Easter after the ordination, 39 Squares of 12 from Creation }	5617	139	4143

## APPENDIX II.

## A TABLE OF TRINAL FRACTIONS.

As this form of numbers occurs so perpetually in these pages, I have thought it advisable to insert from an "Essay on the various Scientific Measures of the Mundane Times," which accompanies my "Chart of Chronology," a short account of their nature and properties, and a table of the fractions up to that of  $85 = 7311$ , referring the reader to that Essay for an account of the manner in which I discovered them.

The TRINAL FRACTION is the Root, *plus* the Square, *plus* the Cube of each number, divided by the Root. Thus  $\frac{2 + 2^2 + 2^3}{2} = 7$ , which is, therefore, the trinal fraction of 2. I

shall subjoin a Table of these fractions for each number, from 1 to 85, the fraction of which being 7311, when carried back from the point of time where we now stand, being 1849, brings us to the 16th year of the world and of Adam, or when he was 15 years complete, B.C. 5463; and as the fraction of 86 being 7483, when computed back from 1849, ascends to 157 years before Creation, it is not applicable to the actual Mundane Chronology, for which reason I do not carry the Table further than the fraction of 85.

These fractions possess peculiar properties, for a more full account of which, as well as of their relations to the Lunar periods of our planet, and the Solar year, I must refer to the extract from Professor Wallace, given in a former page of this volume, and to my other works.\* I shall here briefly mention the following:—The ascending ratio of each fraction from the one

\* See especially my "Season of the End, or Scientific Chronology of the Year 1840," pp. 6—18; also Appendix I. to the Supplement of the fourth edition of my "Dissertation on the Seals."

immediately below itself, is equal to twice its own root. Thus 3 being the fraction of 1, that of 2 is  $3 + \sqrt{2 \times 2} = 4 = 7$ . Also the fraction of 999, being  $999,001 + 1000 \times 2 = 2000$ , is the fraction of  $1000 = 1,001,001$ . The fraction of each number is also the *Root*, plus the *Square*, plus 1. Thus the root  $2 + 2^2 + 1 = 7$ , the fraction of 2.

These fractions, as will be seen by the Table, divide themselves into Series of TENS or DECADS, which are subdivided into FIVES or PENTADS. The sum of the roots of each first Pentad is divisible by 5, and of each second Pentad by 10, and the sums of the roots form a series of Arithmetical Progression, of which the common difference is  $5^2 = 25$  in each Pentad. The series is, therefore, 15, 40, 65, 90, &c.

The sum of the fractions of each Pentad also forms a Series of Progression : that of the first Pentad is 15 (the sum of the Roots),  $\times 5 = 75$ ; the sum of the second is 375; but the difference continually increases in the ratio of  $5^2 = 25 \times 10 = 250$  in each Pentad. The series is, therefore, 75, 375, 925, 1725, &c.

Having stated these things, I shall now give the Table, from which it will be seen that the Trinals are the furthest removed from being promiscuous numbers :—

A TABLE OF THE TRINAL FRACTIONS FROM 1 TO 85,  
SHOWING THE SUMS OF THE ROOTS AND FRACTIONS  
AT EACH PENTAD.

Decads.	Numbers of the Pentads.	Roots.	Sums of the Roots of each Pentad.	Trinal. Fractions.	Sums of the Fractions of each Pentad.
I.	1	1	15	3	75
		2		7	
		3		13	
		4		21	
		5		31	
2	6		40	43	375
		7		57	
		8		73	
		9		91	
		10		111	

Decads.	Numbers of the Pentads.	Roots.	Sums of the Roots of each Pentad.	Trinal. Fractions.	Sums of the Fractions of each Pentad.
II.	3	11		133	
		12		157	
		13		183	
		14		211	
		15		241	
			65		925
	4	16		273	
		17		307	
		18		343	
		19		381	
		20		421	
			90		1725
III.	5	21		463	
		22		507	
		23		553	
		24		601	
		25		651	
			115		2775
	6	26		703	
		27		757	
		28		813	
		29		871	
		30		931	
			140		4075
IV.	7	31		993	
		32		1057	
		33		1123	
		34		1191	
		35		1261	
			165		5625
	8	36		1333	
		37		1407	
		38		1483	
		39		1561	
		40		1641	
			190		7425

Decads.	Numbers of the Pentads.	Roots.	Sums of the Roots of each Pentad.	Trinal. Fractions.	Sums of the Fractions of each Pentad.
V.	9	41		1723	
		42		1807	
		43		1893	
		44		1981	
		45		2071	
		—	215	—	9475
10	46			2163	
	47			2257	
	48			2353	
	49			2451	
	50			2551	
	—	—	240	—	11,775
VI.	11	51		2653	
		52		2757	
		53		2863	
		54		2971	
		55		3081	
	—	—	265	—	14,325
12	56			3193	
	57			3307	
	58			3423	
	59			3541	
	60			3661	
	—	—	290	—	17,125
VII.	13	61		3783	
		62		3907	
		63		4033	
		64		4161	
		65		4291	
	—	—	315	—	20,175
14	66			4423	
		67		4557	
		68		4693	
		69		4831	
		70		4971	
	—	—	340	—	23,475

364 APPENDIX II. A TABLE OF TRINAL FRACTIONS.

Decads.	Numbers of the Pentads.	Roots.	Sums of the Roots of each Pentad.	Trinal. Fractions.	Sums of the Fractions of each Pentad.
VIII.	15	71		5113	
		72		5257	
		73		5403	
		74		5551	
		75		5701	
			365		27,025
IX.	16	76		5853	
		77		6007	
		78		6163	
		79		6321	
		80		6481	
			390		30,825
IX.	17	81		6643	
		82		6807	
		83		6973	
		84		7141	
		85		7311	
			415		34,875

## APPENDIX III.

## ON THE DATE OF THE DEATH OF JOSHUA.

It yet remains that I should offer some reasons in vindication of my corrected date of the death of Joshua, B.C. 1582, whereof there is no further account given in the Scriptures than that he died at the age of 110 years.

We have seen that the whole period from the entrance into Canaan and the first Servitude was 27 years. Now, since we must allow a considerable interval for the Elders who overlived Joshua and the Anarchy, I, for the reasons given in my Chronology of Israel, p. 51, have followed the opinion of Bonfrerius, approved by Bishop Patrick, which supposes Joshua to have ruled Israel 17 years. Moses died in Adar, B.C. 1600. Counting Joshua's administration from the 1st of Nisan, B.C. 1599, this period comes out in B.C. 1582.

Josephus, it is true, gives 25 years for his Administration (Ant. v., 1, 29), and in another place (Ant. vi., 5, 4) he tells us, that after the death of Joshua, for 18 years, the Hebrews "*had no settled government, but were in an anarchy.*" These two periods of  $25 + 18$  would make altogether 43 years from the death of Moses to the end of the first Servitude, but as this sum of years is entirely irreconcileable with Josephus's authentic Chronology of 612 years, from the Exodus to the Foundation, it must be rejected. The learned Jew is here evidently at his usual employment of mystifying and falsifying the Scriptural times.

Now, I have shown that one of the usual modes in which he effects this is by *doubling* or *reckoning twice* one and the same interval, and I shall now show that he has done so here. Both his periods of 25 and 18 years are genuine subdivisions of the Chronology, but they overlap each other just 8 years in the following manner:—1st. Reckoning from the accession of Joshua in B.C. 1599, 25 years, we arrive at Nisan, B.C. 1574, the date, as we conjecture, not of the death of Joshua, but of

the last of the Elders who overlived him, whence to Nisan, B.C. 1572, the era of the first Servitude, are 2 years of apostasy and anarchy. 2d. The Administration of Othniel being dated B.C. 1564, reckoning back from this point, Josephus's period of 18 years, we arrive at B.C. 1582, as the authentic date of the death of Joshua, according to the testimony of Josephus himself in Ant. vi., 5, 4, and in harmony with my Tables. It is thus shown also, that the former period of 25 years overlaps the second of 18 years exactly 8 years, being the interval from the death of Joshua himself, in B.C. 1582, to that of the last of the Elders who overlived him (Josh. xxiv. 31), B.C. 1574, and about 2 years before the beginning of the first Servitude. This period of 8 years is, therefore, reckoned twice by Josephus, for the purpose of mystifying the Chronology; and, on being thus cross-questioned, by comparing his discordant testimonies with each other, he is made to bear witness against himself, and to let out the truth.

It is observable, that Josephus counts the whole period from Joshua's death to Othniel as that of the anarchy, which, therefore, extended through the first Servitude under Cushan Rishathaim, who was a tyrant and oppressor rather than a ruler.

---

## APPENDIX IV.

---

A SUMMARY OF THE REASONS FOR REJECTING THE  
HEBREW CHRONOLOGY AND RECEIVING THE GREEK  
AS THE TRUTH OF GOD.

LET me begin by saying a few words to allay the apprehensions of some good men, lest the rejection of the patriarchal generations of the Hebrews should weaken the general authority of the Old Testament. Now, let us here observe, that we will not yield even to these pious individuals in zeal for the honour of the whole volume of inspiration, but we claim for the text of the New Testament equal infallibility of inspiration that they do for the Hebrew; and we will not concede to them one jot or one tittle of the recorded genealogy of our Lord, in the text of St. Luke, in order to save the credit of the Jewish Scribes, after they had rejected the Lord of glory. We may also well ask those who entertain such scruples, whether they truly, and in earnest, believe themselves to be actuated by a purer zeal, and a deeper veneration for the Old Testament Scriptures, than such men as Bishop Walton, the Editor of the Polyglott, and the deeply learned Kennicott, who spent his life in the arduous labour of restoring the original text of the Hebrew Scriptures, and who both accorded with us in receiving the Septuagint Chronology and rejecting the Hebrew; and we may add to their names that of the illustrious Bishop Stillingfleet.

It cannot, indeed, be denied that, in the present day, the tide of vulgar opinion in England,\* especially in the *Church*, the *University of Oxford*, and what is called the *religious public*, runs strongly in favour of the Hebrew, so that even a degree of discredit and suspicion of heterodoxy attaches to those who advocate the Greek Chronology. There is a passage in Bishop Stillingfleet, in treating of the fact that error is often mistaken for truth, which shows how serious an impediment is offered by

\* Not, I think, in Scotland. I have not heard of an individual in these northern parts, who has censured me for upholding the Greek. In Ireland (I learn by letters from excellent clergymen) the Greek has many advocates.

such things to her reception. “*Truth*,” says the learned Prelate, “*though she be so fair and pleasing as to draw our affections, is yet so modest as to admit of being courted; and, it may be, deny the first suit to heighten our importunity. And certainly nothing hath oftener forbid the banns between the understanding and truth inquired after, than partiality and pre-occupation of judgment, which makes men inquire more diligently after the dowry than the beauty of truth; ITS CORRESPONDENCY TO THEIR INTERESTS, THAN ITS EVIDENCE TO THEIR UNDERSTANDINGS. An useful error hath often kept the keys of the mind for free admission, when important truths, but contrary to men's PRECONCEPTIONS OR INTEREST, have been forbidden entrance.*” \*

To these striking and important remarks we may add another. For truths which are counted *essential and fundamental*, men are often willing to bear the cross, while they shrink from it if the truth, for which they are to endure a species of martyrdom, be such as they count of *secondary moment and unessential to salvation*. They even persuade themselves that if they were to advocate truths of this character *it would hurt their usefulness*.

Having, as I hope, repelled the objections of these over-scrupulous and pious persons, who are so jealous for the honour of the Hebrew Scribes, I shall now add, that so far is the reception of the Greek Chronology from having any tendency to shake the authority of the Old Testament, that, to an extent and in a degree quite inconceivable by those who have not sifted the subject thoroughly, it adds new strength and authority to those Scriptures. It, on the one hand, frees the narrative of the Book of Genesis from paradoxes, historical and moral, that tend more to impugn its credibility than all the cavils of Infidels; reconciling it, on the other hand, to the most authentic histories of the earlier ages among ancient nations. It also harmonizes the genealogy of our Lord in St. Luke's Gospel, of which the generation of the Second Cainan is an essential part, (confirmed by every manuscript of any authority, and by every version,) with the Scriptural verity of the text of Genesis, as it came in its original purity from the pen of Moses.

If it may be permitted also to an author to bring forward the

\* *Origines Sacrae*, vol. i. p. 8. Oxford, 1797.

practical effects of his system upon his own mind, as an evidence of its truth, I can, without hesitation, affirm, that my veneration for the Old Testament Scriptures has never been so profound, and my conviction of the *entireness of the inspiration of its historical books so deep*, as since I saw the wonders of its authentic Chronology, an excess or a deficiency of only *one year* in which would have destroyed or marred the great results of science that are imbosomed in it.

In entering upon the inquiry as to the comparative strength of the evidence in favour either of the Greek or Hebrew times, the very first fact which arrests our attention is, that *we did not receive the Hebrew text from the Church of God, but from the bitterest enemies of Christ and his Church*, the unbelieving Jews of the third and fourth centuries; whereas the Greek text of the Seventy, which was used and publicly read in the Apostolic Churches, was handed down to us from the apostles and their successors in the Churches planted by them.\* Thus it happens that the question respecting the Chronology resolves itself, as was said nearly two centuries ago by Bishop Stillingfleet, in his *Origines Sacrae*, into a very narrow compass. “The whole controversy concerning this part of the Chronology of the World, viz., from the Deluge to Abraham, comes at last to this, whether it was more probable that the Jews, who lived under the second Temple (who were then the trustees to whom were committed the oracles of God), whom the LXX followed in their version, had the true reading, or the Talmudic Jews after their dispersion and banishment from their country, when they were discarded by God himself from being his people, when he broke up house among them at the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple.”†

\* Walton Prolegomena, ix. 37; Prideaux, vol. iii. pp. 63, 64. Oxford, 1830. The Rev. H. Horne, in his invaluable Introduction to the Scriptures (vol. ii. pp. 328—333, 7th Ed.), has shown that of the quotations of the Old Testament found in the *New*, there are agreeing *verbatim* with the Septuagint, and only changing the person and number, 74; quotations from the Septuagint, with *some variation*, 47; agreeing with it *in sense but not in words*, 32; differing from the Septuagint, but *agreeing exactly or nearly* with the Hebrew, 11; and differing both from the Hebrew and Septuagint, 19. Mr. Horne remarks also,—“How extensively this version was in use among the Jews, appears from the *solemn sanction given to it by the inspired writers of the New Testament.*” (Ibid., p. 210.)

† *Origines Sacrae*, vol. ii. p. 150.

It is undeniable, also, that for at least a century and a half after the Apostolic age, the Jews had the exclusive possession of the Hebrew text, nor was the Hebrew language known or studied by any of the fathers till the time of Origen, so that the Jews had both time and opportunity, if they were so inclined, to corrupt their Scriptures. The question being thus one of TESTIMONY, we are to decide which of the two parties or witnesses, the Apostolic Churches, or the Synagogue, was most worthy of credit. Nor can any of the moral phenomena of our own times more demand our admiration than the preference generally given in the *Modern Protestant Churches* to the testimony of the *Synagogue*, were it not that we believe that few even of our men of study are aware of the great simplicity of the question, and that even men of learning, on such questions, are generally disposed to follow the track of their leaders; and that of those who do obscurely see the light, not many are bold enough to follow out their convictions at the hazard of displeasing *their superiors in the Church and the religious public*.

There is another class of arguments which I shall now place before the reader, confirmatory of those already offered. We are informed in the Book of Genesis (x. 25), that the earth was divided in the days of PELEG. But, according to the Hebrew Chronology, the five former patriarchs, from Noah to Eber, all outlived Peleg, seeing that he died in the year B.C. 2008, whereas, Noah lived till B.C. 1998, 10 years, and Eber till B.C. 1817, 191 years after him. Now, this is altogether inconsistent with the above text of Genesis, for if this Chronology were true, it would be more proper to say, that the earth was divided in the days of Noah than of Peleg.

Again, according to the Hebrew Chronology, the Tower of Babel was built, and the confusion of tongues happened, little more than a century after the flood; so that, from Noah to Eber, all the patriarchs outlived these events;—Noah about two centuries and a-half, and Shem three centuries. Now, here we are struck with difficulties, moral and historical, and paradoxes of a very unusual nature. If the confusion of tongues happened in the days of Noah, then must Noah himself, and his immediate descendants, have been mutually unintelligible to each other.

This Chronology, also, wholly violates the order of the universe, as declared in the Scriptures, Eccles. i. 4, that *one generation passeth away and another generation cometh*; for, according to the Hebrew, no less than *ten* generations, from Noah to Terah, were alive upon earth at one and the same time: and of these Shem was called upon to bury *seven* generations of his own children, Eber *six* generations, Arphaxad and Salah each *five*, and Nahor *four*. Noah, who lived *nine centuries*, Shem, who lived *six centuries*,—three other generations, whose lives were *four centuries*, were contemporaries of others who lived less than *two centuries*. Eber even outlived Abraham. There are, however, two texts of Genesis which entirely demolish this strange medley of paradoxes and contradictions. In Gen. xv. 15, God tells Abraham, “*Thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace; thou shalt be buried in a good old age:*” and in xxv. 8, it is said, “*Abraham died in a good old age, and full of years.*” But how could this be, if all the generations from Shem to Serug, whose lives were from 300 to 600 years, had, with the exception of Peleg, been his contemporaries, and Eber was yet alive, and that Abraham himself did not attain to half their years? But, according to the Greek Chronology of all the former patriarchs, whose ages exceeded 300 years, Serug is the only one who was his contemporary, having died when Abraham was 51, or 124 years before him.

Lastly, according to this Chronology, either the whole family of Noah must in his lifetime, while also Shem, Arphaxad, Salah, and Eber, were alive, have risen in rebellion against their great ancestor, or we must admit that all these venerable patriarchs, and Noah himself, joined in the impious project of building the tower of Babel; and yet, that of this act of daring rebellion, or equally daring apostasy, the Scriptures tell us nothing!

In a paper which was written for the “Morning Watch,” and appeared in that Journal in June, 1831, I was led, by the whole of these considerations, to the following reasoning:—“Now the earlier of these Postdiluvian generations (which were contemporaries of Abraham) must have continued to beget children at the age of three centuries, and the latter at more than a century and a-half; but if so, how is it that the Scriptures celebrate the great faith of Abraham, in believing he

was to have a son at the age of *one century*, when *he saw before his eyes* his own forefathers begetting children at the age of *three centuries*?"

After having forwarded the foregoing paper to the editor of the "Watch," I had an opportunity of looking into the "Prolegomena" of Bishop Walton, which I had never before seen, and found in it the following words, the last of which I had, as will be observed, in so remarkable a manner *anticipated* :—" Nec diffidere potuit Sarah se propter senectutem parituram, aut Abrahamum voluptati operam daturum, cum Abraham erat tantum annorum 99, Sara aliquot annis junior, *et oculis utrique viderent*, avos, abavos, tritavos, et eorum avos et abavos, annorum ducentorum, 300, 400 filios procreantes."\* Having stated some further difficulties, the Bishop ironically adds,— " Hæc tamen omnia, quæ nisi concedatur calculus LXX prudentioribus *atropa* videntur, *vulgaris chronologorum nil curat*, quibus (ut ait Petavius, chronologorum hujus *sæculi princeps*) *nil intra est oleum, nil extra est in nuce duri*; qui nullo se negotio expedient, cum prudentiores *inscitiam suam fateri mallent*,† quam aliquid falsum, vel absurdum affirmare."

Having, since the foregoing paper in the "Watch" was published, added the Polyglott Bible to my library, I should willingly quote much more largely from the unanswerable reasoning contained in the Prolegomena, did my limits permit me to do it.

The specific charge which we bring against the Jewish Rabbis, is, that they have stolen from the sacred text, and annihilated a period altogether of 1474 years in the Chronology, being the difference between the Septuagint era of Creation, b.c. 5478, and the Usherian era, b.c. 4004; and the charge which we bring against the Western Churches since the Council of Trent, is, that they have in effect *abetted this fraud*. In doing so, we have the support, *with only one exception*, of all the most eminent men who have treated this subject for some centuries, including the names of Walton, Kennicott, Jackson, Hales, Isaac Vossius, Stillingfleet, Dr. Russell, &c., and the exception is Mr. Clinton, who has treated the Sacred Chronology as a secondary object. We have also, as is admitted by Baronius in the Apparatus to his Annals, the testimony of the whole body

\* Proleg. ix. 63.

† A hard confession for University men!

of the fathers, or as it is more fully expressed by Walton,— “To these testimonies of Jews and foreigners may be added the voice (suffragium) of the whole Christian Church, both Eastern and Western, which has always followed the Greek computation: and of all the celebrated writers who have lived in the Church until the last century, when most (but not all) of the writers of the Roman Church, thinking themselves bound by the decree of the Council of Trent, defend the Hebrew computation, not because it is found in the Hebrew manuscripts, but because it is so read in the *LATIN VULGATE*.”\*

It generally happens, however, in the most complicated cases of robbery, that some of the stolen articles are found, which serve at length to discover *the thieves*; and in the present case it will, I think, be acknowledged by fair reasoners, that if we can find, in possession of the *Jews themselves*, any of the *stolen years*, this fact must be conclusive against them. In the present Hebrew text of Gen. v. 3, it is written, “*Adam lived an hundred and thirty years, and begat Seth.*” Now, through the providence of God, the following passage has been preserved in the Targum of Jonathan Ben Uzziel, on Gen. iv. 25:—

וְזֶה אָדָם חָבָב יְהוָה אֲגַחַתָּה לְפָנָיו מִזְרָחָה וְלִתְחָרֵב שְׁנִין דְּאַחֲקָטְלִיל הַבָּל חִילְדָתָה נָר וְקָרָה  
תְּהִ שְׁמִינִי טָהָר

*And Adam knew his wife again at the end of one hundred and thirty years FROM THE MURDER OF ABEL, and she bare a son, and called his name Seth.*

Now, the *Jews themselves* being witnesses against themselves, it is plain from these words, that the present generation of *Adam*, in our Hebrew Bibles, is *false*, and that *Seth* was born 130 years *after the death of Abel*, which is placed, by ancient tradition,† about the year 100 of *Adam*, thus confirming the Greek Chronology.

In conclusion, let it be remembered that the Church of God, from *Adam* to the second coming of Christ, is **ONE BODY**. To this body, called by St. Paul *the ground and pillar of the truth*, God has committed the whole of truth that He hath seen meet to reveal to man, to be kept and used for his glory,—and of this truth, the knowledge of the times of the Church and of the World is an important part. If, then, through the negli-

\* Proleg. ix. 62.

† Hales, vol. i.

gence of the Church in past ages, this part of the truth has been lost, as has confessedly been the case from the Apostolic times, since when no two writers have agreed upon it, then *it is the duty of the Church, and God will require it of her*, to seek for this precious pearl of wisdom with the most unremitting diligence till it is found ; and, if the author of this Treatise is guilty of undue presumption in expressing his belief that it *is* at length found, surely those disciples of the Hebrew Chronology, who pretend that they have put on the panoply of truth, will feel no difficulty in overthrowing his reasoning, and meeting the body of facts which he has placed before them. But they must be met by *facts and evidence*, and not, as they have sometimes been, by *assertions*, unsupported by evidence ; and if they cannot be thus met, then the inevitable conclusion must be, that the Septuagint Chronology is true, and that the upholders of the Hebrew, have been unwittingly **OPPOSING THE TRUTH OF GOD.**

## WORKS PUBLISHED BY THE SAME AUTHOR,

AND MAY BE HAD OF

SEELEYS, and HATCHARD & SON, London; WILLIAM WHYTE & CO., or  
GRANT & SON, Edinburgh; JOHN ROBERTSON, Dublin;  
JOHN SMITH & SON, Glasgow.

---

1. LETTERS and ESSAYS, Controversial and Critical, on Subjects connected with the Conversion and National Restoration of Israel, first published in the "Jewish Expositor." Price 8s.
2. The CHURCH of ROME the APOSTASY, and the POPE the MAN of SIN and SON of PERDITION of St. Paul's Prophecy, in the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians. Second Edition, with an Appendix, containing an Examination of the Rev. W. Burgh's attempt to vindicate the Papacy from these charges, and to fix on the Protestant Churches the imputation of falsely interpreting the prophecies of Antichrist. Price 2s. 6d.
3. A REVIEW of the Rev. Dr. WARDLAW'S SERMON on the MILLENNIUM: with an Answer to his Arguments against the Millennial Resurrection and Reign of the Saints and Martyrs of Jesus. Third Edition, with an Appendix, containing Strictures on certain passages of Dr. Wardlaw's Sermon on Civil Establishments of Christianity. Price 1s.
4. The PRE-MILLENNIAL ADVENT of MESSIAH DEMONSTRATED from the SCRIPTURES: especially addressed to the consideration of the Ministers of Christ. First printed in the "Christian Observer," and now republished with Corrections and Additions. Third Edition, with a Preface, containing Strictures on a Tract, entitled, "The Time of Christ's Second Coming identified with the Day of Judgment." Price 1s. *At present out of print.*
5. The DOCTRINE of the MILLENNIAL ADVENT and REIGN of MESSIAH Vindicated from the Objections of the "Edinburgh Theological Magazine." With an Appendix, containing Remarks on Dr. Hamilton's recent Works on Millenarianism. Second Edition, with some Strictures on a Review of the Author's Pre-millennial Advent of Messiah, &c., in a late number of the "Edinburgh Christian Instructor." Price 1s.
6. STRICTURES on Mr. FRERE'S Pamphlet on the General Structure of the Apocalypse; being an Appendix to the Scheme of Prophetical Arrangement of the Rev. Edward Irving and Mr. Frere critically examined. Price 1s.
7. A CRITICAL EXAMINATION of some of the Fundamental Principles of the Rev. George Stanley Faber's Sacred Calendar of Prophecy, with an Answer to his Arguments against the Millennial Advent and Reign of Messiah. *At present out of print.*
8. STRICTURES on certain leading Positions and Interpretations of the Rev. Edward Irving's Lectures on the Apocalypse; with Observations on the true Principles of Apocalyptic Arrangement and Interpretation. Price 8s.
9. STRICTURES on the Rev. S. R. MAITLAND'S FOUR Pamphlets on Prophecy, and in Vindication of the Protestant Principles of Prophetical Interpretation. Price 2s.
10. The JUBILEAN CHRONOLOGY of the SEVENTH TRUMPET of the APOCALYPSE, and the Judgment of the Ancient of Days, Daniel vii. 9. With a brief account of the Discoveries of Mons. de Cheseaux, as to the great Astronomical Cycles of 2300 and 1260 years, and their difference 1040 years. Price 2s. *At present out of print.*

WORKS PUBLISHED BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

11. The POLITICAL DESTINY of the EARTH as Revealed in the BIBLE. Second Edition, enlarged. Price 6d.
12. The CHRONOLOGY of ISRAEL and the JEWS, from the Exodus to the Destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans. With Remarks on the Systems of former Chronographers. Price 6s.
13. The FULNESS of the TIMES; being an Analysis of the Chronology of the Seventy. In Two Parts. With an Introductory Dissertation, wherein are established the Epoch of the Fall of Adam, and its Chronological connexion with the great Eras of the World, and with the Present Times; containing also, Strictures on the Rev. E. Bickersteth's Scheme of Scripture Chronology. Price 12s.
14. The SEPTUAGINT and HEBREW CHRONOLOGIES Tried by the Test of their Internal Scientific Evidence; with a Table from Creation to the Accession of Uzziah in b.c. 810, showing their Jubilean Differences at each Date, also on the Great Periods which terminate in and mark the Year 1838 as the Point of Time which sums up and concentrates, as in a Focus, the Chronology of all Past Ages, and appears likewise to show the Approach of the End. Price 4s. 6d.
15. The SCIENTIFIC CHRONOLOGY of the Year 1839, a Sign of the Near approach of the Kingdom of God. Price 4s. 6d.
16. A SUPPLEMENT to the above, Comprising the Arithmetical Solution and Chronological Application of the Number 666. Price 1s. 6d.
17. The SEASON of the END; being a View of the Scientific Chronology of the Year 1840. With Prefatory Remarks on Theories of Geology as opposed to the Scriptures, and an Appendant Dissertation on the Dates of the Nativity and Passion. Price 1s.
18. A DISSERTATION on the SEALS and TRUMPETS of the APOCALYPSE, and the Prophetical Period of 1260 years. With a Supplement in Two Parts: I. On the Scientific Chronology as a Test of Apocalyptic Interpretation. II. Containing Additional Evidence of the Scientific Character of the Great Numbers of Daniel. Also, an Appended Discourse on the Scientific Measures of the Mundane Times, and the Reasons for the Greek Chronology; and a Table of the Greek and Hebrew Chronologies from Creation to the End of the Jewish War. Fourth Edition. Price 14s.
19. A CHART of SACRED CHRONOLOGY from CREATION to the DESTRUCTION of JERUSALEM by the ROMANS, and END of the JEWISH WAR, coloured. With a Short Essay on the Scientific Measures of the Mundane Times, and the General Reasons for Rejecting the Hebrew and Receiving the Greek Chronology. Price 4s. 6d.
20. A SYNOPSIS; or, SUMMARY of CHRONOLOGY, in its Connexion with the Historical and Prophetical Scriptures from the Era of Creation. Showing the Dates both of the Greek and Hebrew Systems and their Differences. Containing also, an Analysis of the Various Scientific Measures of the Mundane Ages, the Reasons for the Greek Chronology, and an Examination of the Schemes of Usher and Josephus; of the Chronological Summaries of Clemens, Eupolemus, and Demetrius; and of the Dates of the Nativity and Passion in the recent Works of Mr. Gresswell, Mr. Browne, and Dr. Jarvis. 2d Edit. Price 10s. 6d.
21. The FULFILLING of the TIMES of the GENTILES, a CONSPICUOUS SIGN of the END; being an Analytical Survey of the Times of the Four Kingdoms of Daniel and of Jerusalem, from the year b.c. 606 to the present year, 1847, which is shown to be their common point of Concentration and Fulness. Price 2s. 6d.
22. The ANGEL with the MEASURING-LINE to MEASURE JERUSALEM, (Zechariah ii. 1), and the Times of the Vision. A Chronological Tract. Second Edition, Corrected and Enlarged. Price 3d.







