

Stack

Annex

5

066

851

A

0
0
0
2
8
6
5
6
8
1



UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY

nia





B. C. 97.
A CHRONOLOGICAL

ESSAY

ON THE

SACRED HISTORY,

FROM THE

CREATION of the WORLD

TO THE

BIRTH of CHRIST:

BEING A

DEFENCE of the Computation of the

SEPTUAGINT.

WITH

TABLES, wherein the *Greek* and *Hebrew*
Accounts are compared together and ad-
justed to the *Julian* PERIOD.

To which is added

An ESSAY on the Confusion of LAN-
GUAGES, and a Discussion of that Question,
Whether the Primitive Language be any where
remaining?

By THOMAS BRETT, LL.D.

LONDON:

Printed for FLETCHER GYLES, against Gray's-
Inn in Holborn. MDCCLXXIX.

226
226

066
851



A

CHRONOLOGICAL ESSAY, &c.



Shall not pretend to make any long Discourse concerning the Usefulness of Chronology: This is certain and evident to all that understand any thing of the Matter, that the best Hi-

story must be very lame and imperfect without it; and many things may be imposed upon us for undoubted Truths which are not so, if we are altogether unacquainted with the Series of the Times, and cannot tell the Order wherein Things were transacted. It

B

is

is the Want of this has caused the *Turks* to be so shamefully put upon in the History of ancient Times, as to be made believe that *Alexander* the Great was the General of *Solomon's* Army, and *Julius Cæsar* the Master of his Horse. For as *Scaliger* observes, *Chronology is the Life and Soul of History, without which History is but a confused Lump, a mere Mola, an indigested Piece of Flesh, without Life or Form.* Upon this Account many great and learned Men have thought it worth their while to write elaborate Treatises on this Subject. And it is not any Part of my Design or Purpose to find Fault with, or to cavil at any Thing that has been done by others: But conceiving that the most Part of those, who for this last Century or the preceding have entered on this Work, have (as I think) without just Cause wholly rejected the Chronology of the *Greek Church*, as not worth their taking Notice of, ^a tho' the whole *Christian Church*, both *Eastern* and *Western*, followed this Computation till these last Ages, except *St. Augustin* and *St. Jerom*, I have thought it convenient to compose certain Chronological Tables, from the Creation of the World to the Birth of our Saviour, according to the Computation of the *Greeks* and the Version of the *Seventy*, and have adjusted them as near as I could to

^a Prolegom. ad Bibl. Polyg. p. 68.

the Computation of the *Hebrews*, according to *Ludovicus Capellus*, whose Chronology seems to be the most exact and the most agreeable to the Scriptures of any that I have seen, and I think is deservedly preferred by ^b Bishop *Walton* to all others.

But before I enter upon this Work, it may be convenient to say something in behalf of the Translation of the Seventy, which has suffered much in its Reputation of late Years both with *Protestants* and *Papists*. The *Protestants* being wonderfully zealous for the *Hebrew* Text, and the *Papists* (since the Council of *Trent*) for the *Latin Vulgate*, have both of them spoken so despicably of the Version of the Seventy as if it was of no manner of Use and Authority. But when I consider that this Version, even in many Places where it differs from the *Hebrew* Text, contains those Scriptures which our Saviour and his Apostles made use of and appealed to, I cannot have so low an Opinion of it. I shall give one Instance of this to the *English* Reader, who either has not Skill or Opportunity to compare the *Hebrew* and the *Septuagint*, and that is in the xivth Psalm and 3^d Verse. There if he compares this Psalm in his Bible, which is translated from the *Hebrew*, with the same Psalm in his Common-Prayer-Book translated from the *Septuagint*,

^b Præfat. ad Proleg. in Bibl. Polyglot.

he will find that in his Common-Prayer-Book there are four whole Verses more than are in his Bible, *viz.* *Ÿ.* 4, 5, 6, 7. yet these Verses are every one of them cited by *St. Paul* in the same Words, *Rom.* iii. 14, 15, 16, 17, 18. And certainly *St. Paul*, who was excellently well skilled in the *Hebrew*, would not have cited these Words from the *Septuagint* in an Epistle which he wrote by the Direction and Inspiration of the Holy Spirit, if they had not lain in the authentick Scriptures in this very Order he quotes them, and made a Part of this Psalm from whence he cites both what goes before and what follows after them. I say not this with any Design to invalidate the Authority of the *Hebrew* Text, which undoubtedly is the most Authentick, and is to be preferred before any of the Versions how ancient soever, even as much as an Original exceeds the best Translation. However, forasmuch as the *Hebrew* Bible (tho' written at first by Men divinely inspired and guided by the Holy Spirit, and therefore authentick in the highest Acceptation of that Word, and not faulty so much as in a single Letter, yet) like other Books has been often transcribed, and the Transcribers not being infallible like the first Penmen, some Mistakes have been committed, so that we cannot say we have one Copy now extant altogether free from them; and it is also apparent that there are at this Day various Readings in
that

that as well as in other Books of Antiquity, I do not see it necessary that we should in all Points pin our Faith upon the Authority of those *Hebrew* Copies still extant, so as not to vary from it, tho' there be never so apparent Reason to do so. It is then acknowledged, and I most firmly believe, that those who first wrote the Holy Scriptures in their original Language were infallible, and not guilty of any Mistake in their Writing even to a Tittle; but those which copied from them were not so; and it is certain the Copies during the Continuance of the *Jewish* State were very numerous, vast Numbers of which were burnt and destroyed under the Tyranny of *Antiochus Epiphanes*, and no doubt but a great many also were lost and perished with the City and Temple of *Jerusalem*, and we have no Assurance that the few ancient Copies which yet remain, were in all Points more authentick than those that are no longer extant. We do piously believe, that the Providence of God would preserve for the Use of his Church such a Copy as might have the fewest Faults, but we have not any certain Assurance of it, and there was the less need of such an authentick Copy of the Original for the Use of the *Christian* Church, after the Bible had been translated into a more general and better known Tongue, as it was by the Seventy, and that Translation had been recommended to the Church by our Saviour
1
and

and his Apostles, who, as I observed before, frequently made use of it, who cited it often and appealed to the Scriptures as they were contained in that Version, as I have shewed in one remarkable Instance, and might do in several others if it were needful. I would not however set the Version above the Original, far be that from any Thought of mine. But since, as I observed, there were various Copies of the Original, which did differ from one another in some few Particulars, (tho' God be praised there is no material Difference in Matters of great Moment) and most of those Copies are now lost, and it is also certain that the *Septuagint* was translated from a Copy not now extant, that Translation where it differs from the Original now extant may be made use of to shew us wherein the Copy from whence that Version was made differ'd from those which we now have: And therefore to urge the Authority of the *Septuagint* in some Cases, is not to prefer the Version to the Original, but only amongst various Readings of the Original to make a Judgment which is the best. And (c as Bishop *Stillingfleet* observes) *the whole Controversy comes at last to this, whether it be more probable that the Jews, who lived under the second Temple (who then were the Trustees to whom were committed the Oracles of God) whom the LXX*

c Orig. Sacr. Book iii. chap. 4. §. 9.

follow in their Version, had the true Reading, or the Talmudick Jews after their Dispersion and Banishment from their Countrey, 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. However, as I said, I would not willingly deviate from the *Hebrew Bibles* we now have without apparent Reason so to do. It remains therefore, that I enquire if there be such Reason to prefer the Chronology of the LXX. to that of the *Hebrew* which we now have.

The main Difference between the *Hebrew* and the LXX, in the Point of Chronology, is from the Creation of the World to the Death of *Abraham*: After that Time there is very little, if any, Difference between them. Now to settle the Distance of Time (which is the Business of Chronology) from the Creation to the Flood, we have recourse to the fifth Chapter of *Genesis*, where we have the Ages of all the Patriarchs from Father to Son during that Period. Now it is not so material as to this Point how long each of these Persons lived, as what Age he was of when he begat his Son; for when the Son was born, the Years of the Father and Son were then concurrent, and cannot be reckon'd as distinct. During this Period the LXX (as may be seen in the Chronological Table) add an 100 Years to the Age of most of these

Ante-

Antediluvian Patriarchs, to the Years assigned by the *Hebrew Account* for their begetting their Sons, and subtract an 100 Years from the Time they lived after the Birth of their Sons; so that altho' there be no Difference between them as to the Time that each Patriarch lived in all, yet the 100 Years that one has more than the other before the Birth of their Sons causes some hundreds of Years Difference in the Chronology of this Period: For according to the *Hebrew Account* the Flood fell out *An. Mund.* 1656, and according to the *LXX A. M.* 2262. During this Period nothing is recorded as memorable but the Age and Death of each Patriarch, the Wickedness of *Cain* and his Posterity, and how their Daughters being married into the pious Race of *Seth* corrupted that holy Generation also, so that the whole Earth being overspread with Wickedness, God was provoked to destroy the whole Race of Mankind, except *Noah* and his Family, by an universal Deluge. All this I must acknowledge might as well happen within the Space of 1656 Years, which is the *Hebrew Account*, as in the Space of 2262 Years, which is the Account of the *LXX*. So that for this Period I confess I see no Reason why one Computation may not be thought as good as the other. Only, as I observed, we have the Authority of the Primitive Church, on the Side of the *LXX*.

But

But from the Flood to *Abraham* the Case is very different; here also the LXX make most of the Patriarchs to have been an hundred Years elder when they begat their Sons, than the *Hebrew* supposes them to have been, as may be seen in the Tables of this Book. So that whereas the *Hebrew* places the Birth of *Abraham* but 352 Years after the Flood, the LXX place it 1132 Years after that Time. Here I think there is apparent Reason to prefer the Chronology of the LXX to that of the *Hebrews*. For

I. The LXX as well in this Period as in that before the Flood, add an 100 Years to the Age of most of these Patriarchs before they begat their Sons; which certainly they would not have done, if it had not been so in the Copy from which they translated: So that it is plain the *Hebrew* Copy, which they made use of, was different in this Place from what we now have. There being therefore various Readings in the Copies of the Original, we are to make our Judgment which appears to be the most Authentick. Therefore

II. The Original, from whence the Translation of the LXX was taken, seems to be the most Authentick; because the Genealogy on which this Chronology very much depends, is more perfect in the LXX than in
C the

the *Hebrew* we have now, if there be any Weight in the Authority of *St. Luke*, who tells us, *Luke* iii. 35, 36. that *Sala* was the Son of *Cainan*, which was the Son of *Arphaxad*; whereas our *Hebrew Bibles* say, *Gen.* x. 24. and xi. 12. that *Arphaxad* begat *Salah*, but the *LXX* in the same Places have it, *Arphaxad* begat *Cainan* and *Cainan* begat *Sala*, which is agreeable to *St. Luke*, but the other is not so. Now if *St. Luke* wrote as he was inspired by the Holy Ghost, there is no doubt but his Genealogy must be true, and consequently that the *Hebrew Copy* from which the *LXX* made their Version must have the truest Reading in this Place. *Beza* indeed, out of his extravagant Zeal for the present *Hebrew Text*, has put *Cainan* out of his Translation of *St. Luke's Gospel*, having for it the Authority of a single Manuscript. But he gave this MS. to the University of *Cambridge*, where others have had the Opportunity of collating it as well as himself: And *Archbishop Usher* and *Bishop Walton*, who both examined it, judged it to be the most faulty MS. now in being. Particularly in this Genealogy of *St. Luke* (besides the leaving out *Cainan*, whose Name is in all the other MSS. that have been yet collated by the Learned) this MS. has altered the Names of all the Persons between *Joseph* and *Salomon*, and instead of those which are in all other Copies in *St. Luke*, has put in those

which

which are in St. *Matthew*; which, as Bishop *Walton* observes, makes its Authority of no Weight in this Case, since it is plain, that the Writer of that MS. did, in this Place at least, make his Alterations with Design. Since therefore St. *Luke* does so apparently confirm the Genealogy of the LXX, no doubt but that Genealogy is the truest; and if the *Hebrew* which we have now be faulty in its Genealogy for this Period, it is more probable that it should also be more faulty in the Chronology of the other Period before the Flood than the LXX.

III. The *Samaritan Pentateuch*, is that which was preserved by the ten Tribes after their Separation from the House of *David* and the Temple at *Jerusalem*, and was by the Priest which ^d *Assar-baddon* fetched back from the Captivity to instruct the *Cutbeans* in the Law of the Lord, left with that People (who were afterwards called ^e *Samaritans*) and by them preserved to this Time (so that it is no other than another Copy of the original *Hebrew*;) and is exactly agreeable to the LXX in the Chronology of this Period. But

IV. Unless the Chronology of the LXX for this Period from the Flood to *Abraham* be admitted, it will be a very difficult Mat-

^d Ezra iv. 2.

^e 2 King xvii. 28.

ter to reconcile the Scripture with it self. For the Confusion of Languages and Dispersion at *Babel* fell out at the Birth of *Peleg*, for his Father gave him the Name *Peleg* on Account of that Dispersion, as we learn from *Gen. x. 25.* which according to the *Hebrew* Account was but 100 Years after the Flood. Now it is scarce possible that from three Men in the Space of 100 Years, the World could be so peopled as it must have been at the Time of this Dispersion. Besides according to this Account *Noah* and his three Sons were living at the very Time when this sacrilegious Attempt was made to build a Tower up to Heaven, and yet no Notice is taken of them either as forwarding or prohibiting this Work; surely if they had been then living they could not have been unconcerned Spectators of it, and *Noah* a *Preacher of Righteousness*, as the Scriptures call him, would not have failed to have preached against this wicked Undertaking, had he been then living; and his two good Sons *Sem* and *Japhet* would have at least protested against it, had they not been dead before that Time; and if they had done so, I cannot think but *Moses* would have recorded it. We read also, that in *Abraham's* Time the World was well settled under its several Kings; a very potent Prince reigned then in *Egypt*, and divers Kings served *Chederlacmer* fourteen Years, and no Regard or Notice is taken of *Noah*,
the

the undoubted King and Father of them all, who according to the *Hebrews* was still living when these Kingdoms were created. This is at least very improbable. How also could the Birth of *Isaac* be so miraculous, when *Abraham* was but 100 Years old and *Sarah* 90, if at that Time *Sem*, *Arphaxad*, *Sala* and *Heber*, their great-great-great Grandfathers were still living and getting Children? But if the Chronology of the LXX. be admitted, all these Difficulties vanish. According to that Account *Noah* and *Sem*, and consequently his other two Sons, died a pretty while before the Birth of *Peleg*, and the Building of *Babel*; *Arphaxad*, *Sala* and *Heber*, and all the long lived Patriarchs were dead before the Birth of *Abraham*; and the Lives of Men were contracted to about 200 Years or less before he was born. I shall not insist upon the Antiquity of the *Assyrian* Empire, which according to the most common Accounts we have of it must have begun before the Flood or immediately after, if we follow the *Hebrew* Chronology; because there is no such Certainty in the *Chaldean* Chronicles as to give us just Cause to question the Truth of any other History merely because it is not agreeable with them; and the same may be said of *Egyptian* and *Chinese* Antiquities: Yet even these are reconcileable with the Chronology of the LXX.

V. What I have here laid down is countenanced by the Authority of some of the greatest Men of our own Church in the last Age: viz. ^f Bishop Walton in his *Prolegomena* to the *Polyglot Bible*, ^g Bishop Stillingfleet in his *Origines Sacræ*, ^h Isaac Vossius Canon of *Windsor*, ⁱ and Sir Walter Rawleigh in his *History of the World*, whose Words are so remarkable, that I think fit to transcribe them here. If we look over all, and do not hastily satisfy our Understanding with the first Things offered, and thereby being satiated do slothfully and drowsily sit down, we shall find it more agreeable rather to follow the Reckoning of the LXX, who according to some Editions make it above 1072 Years between the Flood and Abraham, than to take away any Part of these 352 Years given. For if we advisedly consider the State and Countenance of the World, such as it was in Abraham's Time, yea before Abraham was born, we shall find that it were very ill done of us by following Opinion without the Guide of Reason, to pare the Time over deeply between Abraham and the Flood; because in cutting them too near the Quick, the Reputation of the whole Story might perchance bleed thereby, were not the Testimony of the Scriptures supreme, so as no Objection can approach it: And that we did not follow withal the

^f Pag. 68.
te:pret.

^g Book iii. c. 4. §. 9.
ⁱ P. l. l. 2. c. 1. §. 7,

^h De LXX In-

Precept of St. Augustine, that wheresoever any one Place in the Scriptures may be conceived disagreeing to the whole, the same is by Ignorance of Misinterpretation understood. For in Abraham's Time all the then known Parts of the World were peopled: All Regions and Countries had their Kings. Egypt had many magnificent Cities, and so had Palestine and all bordering Countries; yeu all that Part of the World besides as far as India: And those not built of Sticks, but of hewen Stones, and defended with Walls and Rampires, which Magnificence needed a Parent of more Antiquity than those other Men have supposed. And therefore where the Scriptures are plainest and best agreeing with Reason and Nature, to what End should we labour to beget Doubts and Scruples, or draw all Things into Wonders and Marvels? Giving also strength thereby to common Cavillers, and to those Men's apish Brains, who only bend their Wits to find Impossibilities and Monsters in the Story of the World and Mankind. I cannot but subscribe (says Bishop Stillingfleet) to the Words of this judicious Historian, and no doubt but they deserve Consideration.

All these Things being considered, I hope it may be of some use to the World, to present it with a Chronological Table from the Creation of the World to the Birth of our Saviour, according to the LXX, especially since I do not reject the *Hebrew* Chronology,

but have adjoined a Table of that to the other, so that the whole Scripture Story is adjusted as near as may be to both Accounts, and every one left to his Liberty which he will follow.

Now because there are various Readings of the LXX in this Matter of Chronology, I have chosen to follow Dr. *Grabe's* Edition of the *Alexandrian MS.* as the most Authentick. And one great Cause which has induced me to do this, is because I find this Computation to be exactly agreeable to that of the *Greek Church*, and as I am persuaded of the primitive Church also: According to which Account, our Saviour was born towards the End of the Year after the Creation 5508, and so you will find in these Tables.

As to the *Hebrew Chronology*, I have exactly followed that of *Ludovicus Capellus*, (except in one Place where I shew my Reason for dissent) whose *sacred Chronology*, as it is published in the *Prolegomena* to the *Polyglot*, I have here translated almost *verbatim*, it being certainly the best and most agreeable to the Scriptures of any yet extant, as will appear evident to all that shall carefully observe the Reasons which he gives at the End of each Chronological Table.

I have confined my self to the sacred Chronology only, because if I had run into profane Matters I must have been more voluminous than I had either Will or Leisure

to be. However, because all Chronology since *Scaliger's* Time has been adjusted to the *Julian Period*, I have also adjusted these Chronological Tables to that Period; whereby it will be very easy for any Body to find out when any Action mentioned in prophane History happened. For if you consult *Helvicus*, or any other Chronologer that has adjusted his Chronology to this Period, and then look into these Tables to see what Year of the World, either according to the *Hebrews* or the *Greeks*, is concurrent with it, you will thereby discover what Patriarch Judge or King was Contemporary with the Person you find mentioned in any prophane History. Thus for Instance, would you know what Year of the World, according either to the *Hebrews* or *Greeks*, *Belus* the Father of *Ninus* began to reign over the *Assyrians*, and what Patriarch was his Contemporary? *Helvicus* says, that according to the eldest Accounts *Belus* began his Reign *An. Per. Jul.* 2357, which by the Tables of this Book is concurrent with the Year of the World 3152 according to the *Greeks*, and 1746 according to the *Hebrews*; and that he was Contemporary to the Patriarchs *Heber*, *Reu* and *Serug*, if we follow the *LXX* Account, or to *Noah*, *Sem*, *Arphaxad* and *Sala*, if we follow the *Hebrew*.

In the *Hebrew* Chronology I have, as I said before, exactly followed *Ludovicus Capellus*,

D

except

except in the Number of Years from *Joshua's* Division of the Land to the Oppression of *Israel* by *Chuskan-rislatbaim*, in which Place I add 20 Years to his Account, for which I there give my Reason, and I hope a very satisfactory one. So that whereas he makes the Birth of our Saviour to fall out *A. M.* 4102. according to the *Hebrews*, I make it to have been *A. M.* 4122. If therefore we subtract 4122 from 5508, the Year of the World in which our Saviour was born, according to the *Greeks*, the Remainder will be 1386; and consequently the first *A. M.* according to the *Hebrews*, will be concurrent with *A. M.* 1387. according to the *Greeks*. Therefore *A. M.* 1. according to the *Hebrews*, being set against *A. M.* 1387 according to LXX in the same Line, there will appear a continued *Anachronism* in the Lives and Deaths of the Patriarchs from *Adam* to *Abraham*; for the same Patriarchs will be found to have been born, and to have died upon different Years of the *Julian* Period, according to the different Accounts of the *Hebrew* and the LXX. But from the Death of *Abraham* to the Birth of our Saviour, there will be a perfect *Synchronism* between the two Accounts: So that altho' the Years of the World are different in the two Accounts, yet every Action taken Notice of in the Tables will be but once mentioned, as falling out according to both Accounts on the same Year of the *Julian* Period,

The of Abraham.

A. M. according to
LXX.

1	
230	
435	
625	
795	
796	
930	
960	
1122	
1142	ham.
1287	
1340	
1387	
1474	
1487	gat Isaac.
1516	
1535	
1621	
1662	out from Ur of the re.
169	nd Abraham went from
17	
180	ged 86, Gen. xvi. 16.
3482	
3489	
3493	erthrown, Gen. xvii. 24.
3494	acob, Gen. xxi. 5.
3515	
3531	r.
3534	aged 40. Gen. xxv. 20.
3544	
3554	6.
3569	v. 7.
3573	5, 17.

his before Page 194

1000

Period, and consequently to have preceded the Birth of our Saviour by the same Number of Years.

NOTES upon the first TABLE.

Capellus makes two Tables of what I here make but one; which indeed is very proper because here are two great Periods comprehended, from the Creation to the Flood, and from the Flood to *Abraham*. But then *Capellus* does not adjust the Years of the World according to the LXX and the *Hebrew* together, so as to let us know what Year of the World according to the LXX, is concurrent with the Year of the World according to the *Hebrew*: Only he sets down in different Columns how many Years each Patriarch lived before he begat a Son, how many Years he lived afterwards, and how long he lived in all, according to the different Accounts of the *Hebrew*, the LXX and *Samaritan*, from *Gen. v. and xi.* But according to the Method I have taken, I found it more convenient to put these two Tables into one, because according to the LXX the Flood fell out many Years before it happened according to the *Hebrews*. If therefore I had ended my Table with the Flood according to the Computation of the LXX, I must have left many Transactions which happened before the Flood, according to the *Hebrew*, for my

second Table. Or if I had continued my first Table till the Flood happened, according to the *Hebrew*, I must have put into it many Transactions which happened after the Flood according to the *LXX*, either of which I thought improper. Wherefore I have continued the Table to the Death of *Abraham*, from which Time forward there is a perfect *Synchronism* between both Computations.

This whole Chronological Table is composed from the fifth and eleventh Chapters of *Genesis*, until the Birth of *Abraham*. In which Chapters the Age and Death of each Patriarch is set down, together with the Time when they begat their Sons. For the Passages which happened after the Birth of *Abraham*, I have set down Chapter and Verse in the Table, to every one of them not contained in the two Chapters above-mentioned.

There is a Place in this Table which deserves Consideration, wherein both the *Hebrew* and *LXX* are equally concerned, and that is the Birth of *Abraham*, *Gen. xi. 26*. It is said, *Terah* lived 70 Years and begat *Abram*, *Nabor* and *Haran*. From whence many Chronologers have inferred, that *Abraham* was born when his Father was but 70 Years of Age, supposing that he was the first-born of those three Sons, because he is first-named. But this is no just Inference, for *Gen. v. 32*. *Noah* is said to have begotten *Sem*,
Ham

Ham and *Japhet* when he was 500 Years old; tho' by the Chronology of *Moses* before and after the Deluge compared together, it is manifest that *Sem* was not born till *Noah* was a Year or two older: And it is generally supposed, that *Japhet* was the eldest of *Noah's* Sons. But the Dignity of *Sem*, the Father of the Holy Seed and Church of God, is assigned as the Reason why he is first named. And by the same Reason *Abraham*, who is styled in Scripture *the Friend of God* and *Father of the Faithful*, may well be put before his two elder Brethren. Thus *Isaac* and *Ishmael*, the Sons of *Abraham*; *Jacob* and *Esau* the Sons of *Isaac*; *Moses*, *Aaron* and *Miriam*, the Children of *Amram*, are so far from being named according to the Order of their Birth, that they are generally set in a quite contrary Method, and only according to the Order of their respective Dignity. Besides the Continuation of the Chronological Series of Years by *Abraham* and not by *Nabor* or *Haran*, as well as the like Chronological Series before by *Sem* and not by *Japhet*, is another, and perhaps the most proper Occasion of their being named first. And it is probable that *Haran*, tho' last named, was the First-born, since *Nabor* one of his Brothers married his Daughter *Milcab*, and *Lot* his Son appears to have been not much younger than *Abraham*. But what I think sets the Matter beyond Dispute, is that which follows

lows the mention of these three Sons of *Terah*; which is, that *Terah* after the Death of his Son *Haran* in *Ur* of the *Chaldees*, departed from thence with *Abraham* and *Lot* to go into *Canaan*, and sojourning a while in the Land of *Haran* died there, being 205 Years old. After this, as we learn from the Beginning of the next Chapter, *Abraham* left *Haran*, and came into the Land of *Canaan*; and it is said that *Abram* was seventy five Years old when he departed out of *Haran*. Which being after his Father's Death, who died at the Age of 205, it is certain *Abraham* could be no more than 75 when *Terah* died: Therefore subtracting 75 from 205, the Remainder is 130 for the Age of *Terah* at *Abraham's* Birth. And so it is in the Table.

NOTES upon the second TABLE.

It is not expressed in the Scripture how old *Jacob* was when his Father blessed him and sent him to his Uncle *Laban*, nor yet at what Age he married and begat his Sons; and consequently in what Year of the World these Things happened, is not directly set down in any Place. However we may plainly collect what *Jacob's* Age was when he married and had Children, by this Method: He was 130 Years old when he went down into *Egypt*, as appears from *Gen. xlvii. 9*. He
was

The second TABLE, from *coming out*
of *Egypt*.

A. M. according to LXX.	Julian Period.	A. M. according to the Hebrew.	
3617	2822	2231	<i>Ismael</i> died aged
3632	2837	2246	<i>Jacob</i> fled to <i>Lab.</i>
3639	2844	2253	He marries <i>Leab</i>
3642	2847	2256	<i>Levi</i> born, <i>Gen.</i>
3646	2851	2260	<i>Joseph</i> born, <i>Gen.</i>
3652	2857	2266	<i>Jacob</i> returned in
3663	2868	2277	<i>Joseph</i> sold into
3674	2879	2288	<i>Isaac</i> died aged 1
3676	2881	2290	<i>Joseph</i> stood befo
3682	2887	2296	<i>Manasseh</i> and <i>Ep</i>
3684	2889	2298	<i>Jacob</i> went down
3701	2906	2315	<i>Jacob</i> died in <i>Eg</i>
3756	2961	2370	<i>Joseph</i> died aged
3779	2984	2393	<i>Levi</i> died aged 1
3814	3019	2428	<i>Moses</i> born, <i>Exo.</i>
3854	3059	2468	He fled to <i>Jethr</i>
3894	3099	2508	Forty Years after from thence, <i>Acts</i> vii. 23.
3934	3139	2548	They wandred 4 ^{iv. 7.}

The second TABLE, from Abraham to Exodus, or the Children of Israel's coming out of Egypt, and to the Death of Moses.

A. M. accord- ing to LXX.	Julian Period.	A. M. ac- cord. to the Hebrew.	
3617	2822	2231	<i>Ishmael</i> died aged 137. <i>Gen.</i> xxv. 17.
3632	2837	2246	<i>Jacob</i> fled to <i>Laban</i> , <i>Gen.</i> xxviii. when he was 78 Years of Age.
3659	2844	2253	He marries <i>Leah</i> and <i>Rachel</i> , <i>Gen.</i> xxix. 21, 28. in the eighty fifth Year of his Age.
3642	2847	2256	<i>Levi</i> born, <i>Gen.</i> xxix. 34. when <i>Jacob</i> was aged 88.
3646	2851	2260	<i>Joseph</i> born, <i>Gen.</i> xxx. 22. when <i>Jacob</i> was aged 92.
3652	2857	2266	<i>Jacob</i> returned into the Land of <i>Canaan</i> , <i>Gen.</i> xxxi. aged 98.
3663	2868	2277	<i>Joseph</i> sold into <i>Egypt</i> aged 17. <i>Gen.</i> xxxvii. 2, 28.
3674	2879	2288	<i>Isaac</i> died aged 180. <i>Gen.</i> xxxv. 28, 29.
3676	2881	2290	<i>Joseph</i> stood before <i>Pharaoh</i> aged 30, <i>Gen.</i> xli. 46.
3682	2887	2296	<i>Manasseh</i> and <i>Ephraim</i> born, <i>Gen.</i> xli. 50.
3684	2889	2298	<i>Jacob</i> went down into <i>Egypt</i> aged 130, <i>Gen.</i> xlvii. 9.
3701	2906	2315	<i>Jacob</i> died in <i>Egypt</i> aged 147, <i>Gen.</i> xlvii. 28.
3756	2961	2370	<i>Joseph</i> died aged 110, <i>Gen.</i> i. 22.
3779	2984	2393	<i>Levi</i> died aged 137, <i>Exod.</i> vi. 16.
3814	3019	2428	<i>Moses</i> born, <i>Exod.</i> ii. 2.
3854	3059	2468	He fled to <i>Jethro</i> , with whom he served 40 Years, <i>Exod.</i> ii. 15. and <i>Acts</i> vii. 23.
3894	3099	2508	Forty Years after he returned into <i>Egypt</i> , and brought up the Children of <i>Israel</i> from thence, <i>Acts</i> vii. 23.
3934	3139	2548	They wandred 40 Years in the Wilderness, and then <i>Moses</i> died aged 120. <i>Deut.</i> xxxiv. 7.

was born, as may be seen in the former Table, *A. M.* according to LXX 3554, of the *Julian Period* 2759, and *A. M.* according to the *Hebrew* 2168. Therefore his Descent into *Egypt* 130 Years after, must fall out *A. M.* according to LXX 3684, of the *Julian Period* 2889, and *A. M.* according to the *Hebrew* 2298. *Joseph* was at that Time 38 Years old, for he was 30 Years old when he stood before *Pharaoh*, *Gen.* xli. 46. and this was eight Years after, *viz.* in the second Year of the Famine: Therefore subtracting 38 from 130, there remains 92 for the Age of *Jacob* when *Joseph* was born. Now if we compare *Gen.* xxx. 21. with *Gen.* xxxi. 41. we shall find that *Jacob* had served *Laban* 14 Years when *Joseph* was born. Wherefore subtracting 14 from 92, the Remainder is 78 for the Age of *Jacob* when he fled to *Laban*, *viz.* *A. M.* according to LXX 3632, of the *Julian Period* 2837, and *A. M.* according to the *Hebrew* 2246.

The Time when *Moses* was born is thus collected. *Moses* was 80 Years old when he spoke to *Pharaoh*, and brought the Children of *Israel* out of *Egypt*, *Exod.* vii. 7. immediately after which the Law was delivered to him on Mount *Sinai*, *Exod.* xix, &c. Now from the Promise made to *Abraham* to the giving of the Law were 430 Years, *Galat.* iii. 17. God also told *Abraham*, *Gen.* xv. 13. and *Acts* vii. 6. that his Seed should be a
Stranger

Stranger or Sojourner in the Land that is not theirs four hundred Years: Which four hundred Years must undoubtedly begin from the Birth of *Isaac*, who was the first of the promised Seed, and immediately at his Birth began to sojourn in the Land wherein his Father was a Stranger. The Promise therefore which was made to *Abraham* in *Mesopotamia* before he dwelt in *Charran*, must be thirty Years before the Birth of *Isaac*. Wherefore I have placed *Abraham's* going out from *Ur* of the *Chaldees* with his Father *Terah* into *Charran*, in the former Table, in the seventieth Year of his Age, viz. thirty Years before *Isaac* was born, where it is said they dwelt for some Time, *Gen. xi. 31.* being probably detained by *Terah's* Sickness, and the Infirmities of his Age, for there he died. And then *Abraham* with *Lot* came into *Canaan* when he was seventy five Years old, as has been already observed and proved. It is also said *Exod. xii. 40.* Now the sojourning of the Children of Israel, who dwelt in Egypt was four hundred and thirty Years. It is observable, that this Text does not say, the Children of Israel sojourned in Egypt for so long Time, but only that they dwelt some Time in Egypt, and that the whole Time they were Sojourners, or dwelt in a Land not their own, was four hundred and thirty Years. But the Version of the LXX is yet plainer, Now the sojourning of the Children of Israel, as to the Time they

they sojourned in the Land of Egypt and the Land of Canaan, they and their Fathers, was four hundred and thirty Years. The Samaritan Pentateuch also has it just as it is in the LXX. Neither of these Readings contradict the Hebrew as we now have it, only they are more full and express than the Hebrew. And the Fullness of Expression in these Readings is confirmed by the Apostle, in the Words above cited from Galat. iii. 17. where he plainly makes these four hundred and thirty Years to commence from the first Promise made to Abraham, from which Time, as has been shewed, he began to be a Sojourner and left his own Countrey, to go into the Land of Canaan, where he sojourned thirty Years before he had his promised Seed, and then he and his Seed were Sojourners four hundred Years longer in Canaan and Egypt. If therefore we count four hundred and thirty Years from Abraham's Departure out of Ur, or four hundred Years from the Birth of Isaac to the Time of the Exodus, or the bringing forth the Children of Israel from Egypt, we shall find that this Exodus happened A. M. according to LXX 3894, of the Julian Period 3099, and A. M. according to the Hebrew 2508; consequently that the Children of Israel dwelt in Egypt but two hundred and ten Years. And that Moses was born A. M. according to LXX 3814, of the Julian Period 3019, and A. M. according

E to

to the *Hebrew* 2428, as it is set in this Table.

NOTES upon the third TABLE.

The Period of Time contained in this Table, has very much perplexed Chronologers; because, tho' the Succession of the Judges one to another, and the Number of Years that each Oppressor tyrannized, be as one would think as plainly set down as can be desired, as may be evident to any that consult the several Texts as they are cited in the Table, yet the Number of Years, as their whole Sum is given us from the *Exodus* to the Building of the Temple, 1 *King*. vi. 1. viz. four hundred and eighty Years is not reconcileable to the Particulars set down in the foregoing Table by above a hundred Years. The Chronologers, to reconcile this Difference, have generally put the Years of Oppression into the Years of the Judges, thereby to reduce their Number to the above-mentioned Sum, which is by no Means agreeable to the Places where those Passages are mentioned. For Instance, *Judg.* iii. 8. it is said, the *Children* of Israel served Chushan-rishathaim eight Years. Then follows how *Othniel* delivered them, after which, *ver.* 11. it is said that the Land had rest forty Years. Now how could the Land have such a time of Rest if they were oppressed for

The f Moses, to the Building of the
Solomon.

A M. ac-
cording to
LXX.

3935 *aan* under the Conduct of *Jeshua*, the Beginning

3940 *rs*: So the End of that War happened in this Year.
3941 For which less than a Year cannot well be assigned.

3961 . 8.
3969 and the Land had rest 40 Years, *Judg.* iii. 10, 11.

4009
4027 and the Land had rest 80 Years, *Judg.* iii. 30.

4107 ad rest 40 Years, *Judg.* v. 31.
4127 I.

4167 , *Judg.* viii. 28.
4174 s, *Judg.* ix. 22.

4214

4217
4240
4262 .
4280 *udg.* xii. 7.

4286

4293

4303
4311 , and judged them 20 Years, *Judg.* xv. 20.
4351

4371 ii. 21.

4411

4451

4491 e fourth Year of *Solomon*, 1 *King.* vi. 1. and 2 *Chr.* iii. 1.
4495 ling, 1 *King.* vi. 38.

4502 . 42.

4531

The third TABLE from Exodus and the Death of Moses, to the Building of the Temple, and to the Death of Solomon.

A. M. according to LXX.	Julian Period.	A. M. according to the Hebrew.	
3935	3140	2549	The Children of <i>Israel</i> came into the Land of <i>Canaan</i> under the Conduct of <i>Jeshua</i> , the Beginning of the Year after <i>Moses</i> died, <i>Josh.</i> iii. 1.
3940	3145	2554	The War with the <i>Canaanites</i> continued about 6 Years: So the End of that War happened in this Year.
3941	3146	2555	The Division of the Land was made the Year after. For which less than a Year cannot well be assigned.
3961	3166	2575	<i>Cushan</i> began to oppress <i>Israel</i> eight Years, <i>Judg.</i> iii. 8.
3969	3174	2583	<i>Othniel</i> began to judge <i>Israel</i> and subdued <i>Cushan</i> , and the Land had rest 40 Years, <i>Judg.</i> iii. 10, 11.
4009	3214	2623	<i>Eglon</i> oppressed <i>Israel</i> 18 Years, <i>Judg.</i> iii. 12.
4027	3232	2641	<i>Ehud</i> delivered <i>Israel</i> from the Oppression of <i>Eglon</i> , and the Land had rest 80 Years, <i>Judg.</i> iii. 30.
4107	3312	2721	<i>Jabin</i> oppressed <i>Israel</i> 20 Years, <i>Judg.</i> iv. 3.
4127	3332	2741	<i>Debora</i> and <i>Barak</i> delivered <i>Israel</i> , and the Land had rest 40 Years, <i>Judg.</i> v. 31.
4167	3372	2781	The <i>Midianites</i> oppressed <i>Israel</i> 7 Years, <i>Judg.</i> vi. 1.
4174	3379	2788	<i>Gideon</i> delivered <i>Israel</i> , and judged them 40 Years, <i>Judg.</i> viii. 28.
4214	3419	2828	<i>Abimelech</i> usurped the Government as King 3 Years, <i>Judg.</i> ix. 22.
4217	3422	2831	<i>Tolai</i> judged <i>Israel</i> 23 Years, <i>Judg.</i> x. 1.
4240	3445	2854	<i>Jair</i> judged <i>Israel</i> 22 Years, <i>Judg.</i> x. 3.
4262	3467	2876	The <i>Ammonites</i> oppress <i>Israel</i> 18 Years, <i>Judg.</i> x. 8.
4280	3485	2894	<i>Jephthah</i> delivered <i>Israel</i> and governed 6 Years, <i>Judg.</i> xii. 7.
4286	3491	2900	<i>Ibzan</i> judged <i>Israel</i> 7 Years, <i>Judg.</i> xii. 9.
4293	3498	2907	<i>Elon</i> judged <i>Israel</i> 10 Years, <i>Judg.</i> xii. 11.
4303	3508	2917	<i>Abdon</i> judged <i>Israel</i> 8 Years, <i>Judg.</i> xii. 14.
4311	3516	2925	The <i>Philistines</i> oppressed <i>Israel</i> 40 Years.
4351	3556	2965	<i>Sampson</i> began to deliver <i>Israel</i> from the <i>Philistines</i> , and judged them 20 Years, <i>Judg.</i> xv. 20.
4371	3576	2985	<i>Eli</i> judged <i>Israel</i> 40 Years, 1 <i>Sam.</i> iv. 18.
4411	3616	3025	<i>Samuel</i> and <i>Saul</i> governed <i>Israel</i> 40 Years, <i>Acts</i> xiii. 21.
4451	3656	3065	<i>David</i> reigned 40 Years, 2 <i>Sam.</i> v. 4, 5.
4491	3696	3105	<i>Solomon</i> reigned 40 Years, 1 <i>King.</i> xi. 42.
4495	3700	3109	The Temple began to be built in the Beginning of the fourth Year of <i>Solomon</i> , 1 <i>King.</i> vi. 1. and 2 <i>Chr.</i> iii. 1.
4502	3707	3116	The Temple was finished, being 7 Years in Building, 1 <i>King.</i> vi. 38.
4531	3736	3145	<i>Solomon</i> died, having reigned 40 Years, 1 <i>King.</i> xi. 42.

for eight Years of that time? So again, *Jud.* iv. 3. it is said of *Jabin* that *twenty Years he mightily oppress'd the Children of Israel*; and then after the Deliverance by *Deborah* and *Barak*, *Jud.* v. 51. we read that *the Land had rest forty Years*. How could that be, if the twenty Years Oppression took up one half of that time? And the like may be said upon all other Passages of this Nature, in all which the Years of Oppression are as plainly distinguished as may be from the Years of rest; others therefore make the Oppressions to have continued no more than a few Months at any time, and that the meaning of eight, or twenty, or seven Years Oppression is only that they were oppressed some few Months in the eighth, or the twentieth or the seventh Year of the Jubilee. But this is certainly a very forced Construction, and what Ground is there from the Text to give this Construction to the Years of Oppression, more than to the Years of Rest? This is plainly forcing a great Number of Texts to give place to one. Besides *St. Paul* expressly tells us, *Acts* xiii. 20. that after the Division of the Land of *Canaan* to the twelve Tribes, *God gave unto them Judges about the Space of four hundred and fifty Years, unto Samuel the Prophet*. But there is no making four hundred and fifty Years, or any thing near it for the time of the Judges, except the Years of Oppression be taken into the Account, as well as

the Years of Rest. For if there were four hundred and fifty Years from the Settlement of the Children of *Israel* in the Land of *Canaan* unto *Samuel*, as *St. Paul* expressly says there were, there were certainly more than four hundred and eighty Years from *Exodus*, or the going out from *Egypt* to the building of the Temple by *Solomon*. For, as appears by the foregoing Table, there were forty seven Years from *Exodus* to the Division of the Land, forty Years more from the beginning of *Samuel's* Government to the beginning of the Reign of *David*, and forty Years from thence to the beginning of *Solomon's* Reign, and three whole Years of the Reign of *Solomon* before the Temple began to be built, which make in all one hundred and thirty Years to be added to the four hundred and fifty *St. Paul* speaks of, none of which can be cut off from the Account. These make together five hundred and eighty Years from *Exodus* to the Building of the Temple. From whence it is manifest, that there must be a Mistake in the Text, *1 Kings* vi. i. which makes it but four hundred and eighty Years from *Exodus* to the building of the Temple. And yet that single Text is the only Ground our modern Chronologers have for confounding the Years of Oppression and the Years of Rest, and all the Years of the Judges, and making a Multitude of Texts unintelligible. There is also no Question, but there was an-

ciently

ciently a various reading of that Text, in the Book of *Kings*, though it is not to be met with either in the original or any of the ancient Versions we now have. If it had not been so, St. *Paul* would not have asserted what is so opposite to it, especially in a Discourse to the *Jews*, who would not have let slip such an Opportunity of confuting him, if they had then had such a clear Text of their Side as this now is. Besides *Josephus* a learned *Jew*, and who flourished a little after St. *Paul's* Time, makes the Years from *Exodus* to the Building of the Temple very near the same with those assigned for that Space in the foregoing Table, which, I think, he hardly would have done, if that Text, 1 *King*. vi. 1. had then determined the Years from *Exodus* to the Building of the Temple to be four hundred and eighty, as it does now. Some other Number of Years stood there at that Time, some Number near six hundred, little more or less. For *Josephus*, when he speaks of the Building of the Temple, *Antiqu. lib. 8. c. 2.* says it was five hundred ninety two Years after the Children of *Israel* came out of *Egypt*; and in his second Book against *Apion*, not far from the Beginning, he says it was six hundred and twelve: Which inclines me to believe that the Text in the Book of *Kings* did not then precisely name the Year as now, but said, *about six hundred Years after the Children of*

Israel

Israel *came out of* Egypt; and then twelve Years more or eight Years less may be agreeable enough to it: But if the Text had then stood as it does now, *Josephus* in one Computation had differed from it one hundred and twelve, and in the other one hundred and thirty two Years, which I cannot think he would do. But if *Josephus* would have so differ'd from a Text in the Scriptures, which himself received as of divine Authority, it is certain *St. Paul* would not; and yet, as it now stands, his Computation differs from it one hundred and thirty Years, but two Years less than the largest Computation of *Josephus*. From all which I conceive it is manifest, that this Text in the Book of *Kings*, which has caused so much Confusion in the Chronology of the Old Testament during the Times of the Judges, has been corrupted by the Transcribers since the Days of *St. Paul* and *Josephus*, and therefore no Stress is to be laid upon it. And whoever will compare the Chronology in the preceding Tables from *Adam* to the Building of the Temple, according to the *Hebrew*, with that of *Josephus*, will find but little Difference betwixt them. For *Josephus* says, in the forecited Place of his Antiquities, that the Temple was built five hundred and ninety two Years after the Departure of the Children of *Israel* out of *Egypt*, and by the foregoing Tables it is six hundred and one, which is but eleven

Years

Years difference. Then he says it was one thousand and twenty Years after *Abraham* came out of *Mesopotamia* into *Canaan*; according to these Tables it is one thousand and twenty six, but five Years different. From the Flood he says it was one thousand four hundred and forty Years; and here according to the *Hebrew* Account, which *Josephus* follows, it will be found one thousand four hundred and fifty three, but thirteen Years different. And from *Adam* he says it was three thousand one hundred and two; and according to the *Hebrew* Account in these Tables it was three thousand one hundred and nine, but seven Years different. So that from the Creation of the World to the Building of the Temple, I have differ'd from *Josephus* but seven Years. A very inconsiderable Difference in so long a Period.

But I must not conceal another Objection may be made against lengthening this Period from *Exodus* to the Building of the Temple, and that is the long Life which must then be attributed to three Men in Succession, *Boaz*, *Obed* and *Jesse*, who must each of them beget a Son when he was one hundred and fifty Years old or more, if we compute the Years of the *Judges* as I have done. But whoever will look into the *Abridgment of the Philosophical Transactions*, Vol. III. pag. 306, 307. and see the Account there given of *Thomas Par*, who died 1635. in the 153^d Year of his
 Age,

Age, and might have lived much longer if he had not been brought to Court and high fed, will not see any Reason to think it incredible that there might be three Men succeeding one another who might live to a greater Age, and who might also get Children at that Age. So that there is no Occasion to shorten this Period on that Account.

Some modern Chronologers disliking this Method of confounding the Years of Rest with the Years of Oppression, have tried another Way to reconcile this Part of the Scripture Chronology, and to shorten the Time of the Judges. In order to which, they suppose that the Oppressions only affected some Parts of *Israel*, whilst the others had rest, and so there might be Oppression and Rest at the same Time: Also they suppose several Judges to have been Contemporaries, one judging one Part of the People whilst another judged the other Part. Upon these Suppositions they tell us, that only the east Parts were oppressed by *Cushan*, and when *Othniel* had overcome him, the Land had Rest forty Years. Then those east Parts were again oppressed by *Eglon*, who being slain by *Ehud*, the Land had Rest eighty Years. But all the Land had not Rest so long according to them: For within five Years after this Deliverance by *Ehud*, they suppose the west Parts of *Israel* were oppressed by the *Philistines* twenty Years, and that at the End of those
 twenty

twenty Years *Jabin* oppressed the north Parts twenty Years more. So that they suppose forty Years of Oppression to have been concurrent with Part of these eighty Years of Rest, only in different Parts of the Land. Whereas they suppose the forty Years Rest under *Othniel*, the forty Years under *Deborah* and *Barak*, and the forty under *Gideon*, to have been so many Years Rest of the whole Land. Yet the Scripture makes no Distinction between the eighty Years Rest and those several forty Years, as if these were total and the other but partial. For the Words *Judg.* iii. 30. *the Land had Rest fourscore Years*, are as clear and as full as they are, *Judg.* iii. 11. or *Judg.* v. 31. where it is said, *the Land had Rest forty Years*; or *Judg.* viii. 28. *the Countrey was in Quietness forty Years*. Therefore I can see no Reason to say, that the whole Land had Rest for these three forty Years, and that but Part of it should have Rest for the eighty Years. And indeed I believe we shall hardly find any Author sacred or prophane saying in general Terms that a Land is at Rest, while there is War or Oppression in any Part of it. An Invader many Times comes no further than the Coasts of a Countrey; but whilst he lies upon those Coasts and harrasses them, we can't say in general Terms that the Countrey is at Rest, much less can we say so, when he enters far into the Countrey and oppresses a great Part

F

of

of it. Therefore I do not see how the Scripture can say that *the Land had Rest fourscore Years*, if *Jabin* oppressed one Part of it for twenty Years, and the *Philistines* another Part of it twenty Years during that Time. Then they suppose that *Jair*, *Jephtha*, *Ibsan* and *Elon* judged only North and East *Israel*, whilst *Eli* judged South and West *Israel*, and that *Sampson* lived under the Judicature of *Eli*. Also they suppose North and East *Israel* to have been oppressed by the *Ammonites* eighteen Years during the Judicature of *Jair* in those Parts, and South and West *Israel* to have been oppressed by the *Philistines* forty Years while *Eli* judged that Part of the Land. But that *Israel* was not thus oppressed during the Time they were under the Protection of these Judges, appears from *Judg.* xi. 16. where it is said, *the Lord raised up Judges which delivered them from the Hand of those that spoiled them*. Whereas, according to this Hypothesis, there were several Judges who did not deliver them at all. For during the whole forty Years of *Eli*'s Judicature, the People were under an heavy and continued Oppression of the *Philistines*; and at the same Time the Part which they suppose to have been under *Jair*, was oppressed eighteen Years of the twenty two Years that he was their Judge. And yet the Scripture represents *Jair* as one of the most flourishing of the Judges, who had, as we read, *Judg.*

x. 4. *thirty Sons that rode on thirty Ass-colts, and they had thirty Cities called Harvoth-Fair,* that is, the Villages of *Fair*. Could a Judge that was subject to an oppressive foreign Power, maintain so numerous a Family in such Grandure? Again, *Sampson* is said to have judged *Israel* twenty Years, *Judg.* xv. 20. and xvi. 31. yet according to this Chronology he is supposed to have lived altogether under the Judicature of *Eli*. How then could he be Judge himself for so long Time as the Scripture twice tells us that he was? These, I think, are just Objections against this Hypothesis, which is the latest has been invented, to reduce the Number of Years from *Exodus* to the Building of the Temple to four hundred and eighty. Whereas if we follow *St. Paul's* Computation, and allow four hundred and fifty Years for the Time of the Judges, there would be no need of making such Suppositions as will not accord with the Story of that Time as delivered in Scripture. And we have the Computation of *Josephus* to induce us to believe the Transcribers have been mistaken in the Number four hundred and eighty, 1 *Kin.* vi. 1. But we have no such Testimony to induce us to believe such a Mistake has been made, *Act.* xiii. 20. I cannot therefore imagine why so much Pains should be taken, and the Scripture so wrested to fix that Mistake on the latter Text rather than the former.

I have nothing more to add with regard to this last Table, but to give my Reason why I have added twenty Years to the Table of *Ludovicus Capellus*, between the Division of the Land and the Oppression of *Cushan*. And that is because it appears from the Scripture that *Joshua* lived, and *Israel* had a considerable Time of Rest after their Wars before any one oppressed them. For it is written, *Josh. xxiii. 1. And it came to pass, a long Time after that the Lord had given Rest unto Israel from all their Enemies round about, that Joshua waxed old.* Now it could not be said to be a long Time between the Settlement of the Children of *Israel* in *Canaan*, and *Joshua's* waxing old, if *Joshua* died immediately as the Children of *Israel* had been so settled, as *Capellus* in his Table supposes him to have done. For if *Joshua* died immediately as he had divided the Land between the Tribes, and *Cushan* oppressed them as soon as he died, *Israel* would have been so far from enjoying a long Time of Rest, that they would have enjoyed no Rest at all. Now it is certain that *Israel* was not brought under by *Cushan*, till they forsook the Lord and followed *Baal*, *Judg. iii. 7, 8.* But the People served the Lord all the Days of *Joshua*, and all the Days of the Elders that outlived *Joshua*, who had seen all the great Works of the Lord, *Judg. ii. 7.* Therefore for the long Time which *Joshua* lived after the Children of *Israel* were settled in *Canaan*,

with them; and so on the other Hand, if you
compare

The fourth TABLE, from the Division of Judah and Israel to the Captivity of Jerusalem.

A. M. according to LXX.	Julian Period.	A. M. according to the Hebrews.	KINGS of JUDAH.	KINGS of ISRAEL.
4532	3737	3146	<i>Rehoboam</i> began to reign, and reigned 17 Years, 1 <i>Kin.</i> xiv. 21.	<i>Jeroboam</i> reigned 22 Years incompleat, 1 <i>Kin.</i> xiv. 20.
4549	3754	3163	<i>Abijah</i> reigned three Years incompleat, 1 <i>Kin.</i> xv. 2.	
4551	3756	3165	<i>Aśa</i> reigned 41 Years, 1 <i>Kin.</i> xv. 9, 10.	<i>Nadab</i> reigned 2 Years incompleat, 1 <i>Kin.</i> xv. 25.
4553	3758	3167		<i>Baalha</i> reigned 24 Years incompleat, 1 <i>Kin.</i> xv. 33.
4554	3759	3168		<i>Elah</i> reigned 2 Years incompleat, 1 <i>Kin.</i> xvi. 8.
4577	3782	3191		<i>Zimri</i> 7 Days, <i>Omri</i> with <i>Tiēm</i> 3 Years.
4578	3783	3192		<i>Omri</i> alone 12 Years, 1 <i>Kin.</i> xvi. (xvi. 29.)
4581	3786	3195		<i>Ahab</i> 22 Years incompleat, 5 of which with <i>Omri</i> , 1 <i>Kin.</i>
4588	3793	3202	<i>Jehosaphat</i> 25 Years, 1 <i>Kin.</i> xvii. 43.	
4592	3797	3206		<i>Abaziah</i> 2 Years incompleat, 1 <i>Kin.</i> xviii. 51.
4609	3814	3223		<i>Joram</i> 12 Years.
4610	3815	3224	(2 <i>Kin.</i> viii. 16.)	
4616	3821	3230	<i>Joram</i> 8 Years incompleat, three of which with his Father,	
4623	3828	3237	<i>Abaziah</i> 1 Year incompleat, 2 <i>Kin.</i> viii. 26.	<i>Jehu</i> 28 Years, 2 <i>Kin.</i> x. 36.
4624	3829	3238	<i>Abahiah</i> usurps 6 Years, 2 <i>Kin.</i> xi. 13.	
4629	3834	3243	<i>Joaſh</i> 40, 2 <i>Kin.</i> xii. 1.	<i>Jehoahaz</i> 17 Years, 2 <i>Kin.</i> xiii. 1.
4651	3856	3265		<i>Joaſh</i> 16 Years, 3 with <i>Jehoahaz</i> , 2 <i>Kin.</i> xiii. 10.
4665	3870	3279	<i>Amaziah</i> 29 Years, three with <i>Joaſh</i> , 2 <i>Kin.</i> xiv. 1.	<i>Jeroboam</i> 41, 2 <i>Kin.</i> xiv. 23.
4666	3871	3280		
4681	3886	3295	Interregnum 12 Years, compare 2 <i>Kin.</i> xiv. 3. with 2 <i>Kin.</i> xv. 1.	An Interregnum of 22 Years.
4695	3900	3309	<i>Azariah</i> or <i>Uzziah</i> 52 Years, 2 <i>Kin.</i> xv. 1.	<i>Zachariah</i> 6 Months, <i>Shallum</i> 1 Month, 2 <i>Kin.</i> xv. 8.
4707	3912	3321		<i>Menahem</i> 10 Years, 2 <i>Kin.</i> xv. 17.
4722	3927	3336	<i>Jotham</i> 16 Years, 2 <i>Kin.</i> xv. 32.	<i>Pekahiah</i> 2 Years, 2 <i>Kin.</i> xv. 23.
4744	3949	3358	<i>Abaz</i> 16 Years, 2 <i>Kin.</i> xvi. 1. 7 with <i>Jotham</i> .	<i>Pekah</i> 20 Years, 2 <i>Kin.</i> xv. 27.
4745	3950	3359		
4755	3960	3369	<i>Hezekiah</i> 29 Years, 3 with <i>Abaz</i> , 2 <i>Kin.</i> xviii. 1.	
4757	3962	3371		<i>Hosea</i> 9 Years incompleat, 2 <i>Kin.</i> xvii. 6.
4758	3963	3372		<i>Salmaneſer</i> beſieged <i>Samaria</i> , 2 <i>Kin.</i> xviii. 9.
4767	3972	3381		<i>Samaria</i> taken and carried Captive, 2 <i>Kin.</i> xviii. 10.
4778	3983	3392		
4780	3985	3394		
4784	3988	3398		
4786	3991	3400	<i>Manaſſeh</i> 55 Years, 2 <i>Kin.</i> xxi. 1.	
4810	4015	3424	<i>Amon</i> 2 Years, 2 <i>Kin.</i> xxi. 19.	
4865	4070	3479	<i>Jofias</i> 31 Years, 2 <i>Kin.</i> xxii. 1.	
4867	4072	3481	<i>Jehoſaz</i> 1 Months, 2 <i>Kin.</i> xxiii. 41.	
4898	4103	3512	<i>Jehoaſim</i> 11 Years, 2 <i>Kin.</i> xxiii. 36.	
4899	4104	3513	<i>Jehoiachin</i> 3 Months, 2 <i>Kin.</i> xxiv. 8.	
4910	4115	3524	<i>Zedekiah</i> 11 Years, 2 <i>Kin.</i> xxiv. 18.	
4911	4116	3525	<i>Jeruſalem</i> beſieged by <i>Nebuchadnezzar</i> , and	
4919	4124	3533	Taken, 2 <i>Kin.</i> xxv. 1, 2.	
4921	4126	3535		

naan, and for the Time of the Elders which outlived him, I think we cannot assign less than twenty Years. Sir *Walter Raleigh* in his History (*Book II. chap. 6. §. 8. pag. 277.*) observes, that “ The Time of *Joshua’s* Rule “ is not expressed in Scripture, which causeth divers to conjecture diversely of the Continuance. *Josephus* gives him twenty five Years: *Sedar Ollam Rabbi*, the Authors of the *Hebrew Chronology*, twenty eight: *Massius* twenty six: *Maimonius*, cited by *Massius*, fourteen: *Johannes Lucidus* seventeen: *Cajetanus* ten: *Eusebius* and *St. Augustine* twenty seven: *Melancthon* thirty two: *Codomon* twenty five.” My Conjecture is therefore agreeable to *Eusebius* and *St. Augustine*. For I have here allowed seven Years under his Rule for the Conquest of the Land, and Division of it between the Tribes, and twenty more for a Time of Rest during his Life, and the Lives of the Elders which outlived him. Less than that, I think, cannot well be called a *long Time of Rest* for a Nation after its first Settlement.

NOTES on the fourth TABLE.

Though the Time that every King reigned is set down very expressly in Scripture, during this whole Period, yet when we compare the Reigns of the Kings of *Judah* with those of the Kings of *Israel* contemporary with them; and so on the other Hand, if you compare

compare the Reigns of the Kings of *Israel* with those of the Kings of *Judah* their Contemporaries, there arise Difficulties which are not to be solved without sometimes supposing that the Sons were crowned in the Life of their Fathers, and reigned jointly with them, and also admitting that there was an *Interregnum* of twelve Years in the Kingdom of *Judah*, and of twenty two Years in the Kingdom of *Israel*: And likewise that divers of them did not reign so many Years compleat as are set down for the Time they are said to have reigned, but died in the Beginning of their last Year. Thus it is said, 1 *Kin.* xv. 2. that *Abijah* the Son of *Rehoboam* reigned three Years; but it is evident he could not reign three Years compleat, because it is also said, that he began to reign in the eighteenth Year of *Jeroboam*, and that his Son *Asa* began to reign in the twentieth Year of *Jeroboam*: So that he could reign but two Years compleat, and Part of the third. Again *Nadab* the Son of *Jeroboam* is said, 1 *Kin.* xv. 25. to have reigned two Years. But as it is also said, that he began to reign in the second Year of *Asa*, and that *Baasha* slew him in the third Year of *Asa*, he could reign but little more than one Year. And by the same Method of comparing the Year of any King with that of his Contemporary or Contemporaries, and computing in what Year of his Contemporary he began to reign, and in what Year of his Contemporary

temporary he died, an easy Judgment may be made whether the last Year of his Reign was compleated or only begun, and such whose last Year was incompleat are noted in the Table.

So as to the Father and Son's reigning together, it appears that *Abab* must reign some time, together with his Father *Omri*; for though it be said, *Zimri* slew *Elab* in the 27th Year of *Asa*, and reigned but seven Days, 1 *Kings* xvi. 15. and that *Omri* was immediately made King by the Army; yet it is said, *ŷ. 23. In the thirty and first Year of Afa King of Judah, began Omri to reign over Israel twelve Years.* By which it appears that the twelve Years *Omri* is here said to have reigned, are not to be computed from the Death of *Elab* and the Army's proclaiming him King about the End of the twenty seventh Year of *Afa*, but from the Death of his Competitor *Tibni*, three Years after; that is, the Beginning of the thirty first Year of *Afa*, from which time it is said he reigned twelve Years. From whence it appears, that *Omri* lived and reigned to the first Year of *Jehosaphat* the Son of *Afa*; for *Afa* reigned forty one Years, therefore from the thirty first of *Afa* to the first of *Jehosaphat*, are but twelve Years inclusive. Yet *ŷ. 29.* it is said that in the thirty eighth Year of *Afa* King of *Judah*, began *Abab* the Son of *Omri* to reign
over

over *Israel*. From whence it follows, that he reigned four or five Years together with his Father. And it is probable, that *Omri* having before his Eyes the Fate of *Nadab* and *Elah* the Sons of *Jeroboam* and *Baasha*, who not succeeding till their Fathers Deaths were cut off, while they were yet hardly warm in their Thrones, made his Son his Partner in the Kingdom with him, that he might be so firmly established in the Throne before his own Death, that it should be no easy Matter to form a Party against him to cut him off as the other two had been. So in the Kingdom of *Judab* it is said, 1 *Kin.* xvii. 41. *Jehosaphat* the Son of *Asa* began to reign over *Judab* in the fourth Year of *Abab* King of *Israel*, and he reigned twenty five Years. And it is said, 1 *Kings* xvi. 29. that *Abab* reigned twenty two Years; therefore *Abab* died in the eighteenth Year of *Jehosaphat*, that is seven Years before *Jehosaphat's* Death; yet it is said, 1 *Kings* xxii. 51. *Abaziah* the Son of *Abab* began to reign over *Israel* in the seventeenth Year of *Jehosaphat*, that is a Year before his Father's Death, and reigned two Years, that is one Year or little more with his Father, and a short time after him; for his Brother, 2 *Kin.* iii. 1. *Jehoram* the Son of *Abab* began to reign over *Israel* in the eighteenth Year of *Jehosaphat*; so that *Abaziah* and his Father both died within the Year, the Father probably

bably at the Beginning of the Year, and the Son towards the End of it; for it is certain, *Abaziah* outlived his Father and reigned alone some Time: We may therefore say, that the first Year of *Joram* the Son of *Ahab* was concurrent with the nineteenth of *Jehosaphat*; then the fifth Year of *Joram* must be concurrent with the twenty third of *Jehosaphat*, and then 2 *Kings* viii. 16. *Jehoram* the Son of *Jehosaphat* began to reign Co-partner with his Father, as is there expressly said: For it is written, *In the fifth Year of Joram the Son of Ahab King of Israel, Jehosaphat BEING THEN KING OF Judah, Jehoram the Son of Jehosaphat, King of Judah began to reign.* And as *Jehosaphat* reigned twenty five Years, and as his Son began to reign with him in his twenty third Year, it is evident they were Co-partners in the Kingdom three Years. It is probable, that *Jehosaphat* having entred into strict Alliance with the House of *Ahab*, and his Son having married a Daughter of *Omri*, was wrought upon by the Artifices of his Daughter-in-Law *Athaliah*, (a politick ambitious Woman) to make his Son King in his own Lifetime, as *Omri* and *Ahab* had done. Sir *Walter Raleigh*, in his History of the World, shews that *Jehosaphat* made his Son *Jehoram* Co-partner with himself in his Kingdom twice, once in the seventeenth Year of his Reign, when *Ahab* made his Son *Abaziah* King, at

the Time when they were both preparing for a War with the *Syrians*; and therefore it is said, 1 *Kings* i. 17. *Jehoram* King of *Israel* reigned instead of his Brother *Abaziah*, in the second Year of the Reign of *Jehoram* King of *Judab*. But for some Misbehaviour *Jekosaphat* saw it necessary to reduce him again to the Condition of a Subject; however he afterwards made him his Co-partner again, and so he continued to his Death. And indeed there is no other Way of reconciling the two Texts, the one of which says that *Jehoram* King of *Israel* reigned instead of his Brother, in the second Year of *Jehoram* King of *Judab*; and the other, which says that *Jehoram* King of *Judab* began to reign in the fifth Year of *Jehoram* King of *Israel*. And when such a Precedent was set in both Kingdoms, of taking the Son into a Co-partnership with the Father, it is not to be wondered at, that it should be followed as well in these Kingdoms, as it was afterwards in the *Roman* Empire.

As to the *Interregnum* in the Kingdom of *Judab*, it appears from hence; *Jeroboam* the second is said 2 *Kings* xiv. 23. to have begun his Reign in the fifteenth Year of *Amaziah* King of *Judab*, and in the second Verse of that Chapter, *Amaziah* is said to have reigned twenty nine Years; therefore *Amaziah* died in the fifteenth Year of *Jeroboam* King of *Israel*. And it is said, *Y.* 21. of
that

that Chapter, that *all the People of Judah took Azariah and made him King instead of his Father Amaziah*. Consequently *Azariah* was the next that succeeded *Amaziah*, and was but sixteen Years old when he was made King: Yet it is said, *2 Kings xv. 1. In the twenty seventh Year of Jeroboam King of Israel, began Azariah, Son of Amaziah King of Judah to reign*; so that from the Death of *Amaziah* in the fifteenth Year of *Jeroboam* King of *Israel* to the twenty seventh Year of the same *Jeroboam*, that is for twelve Years Space there was no King in *Judah*. It appears from hence, that *Azariah* called also *Uzziah*, was but about four Years old when his Father was murdered, and being so young, the Conspirators, who were so powerful as not only to drive his Father from his Capital City *Jerusalem*, but from thence to pursue him to *Lachish*, and to slay him there, may very well be supposed strong enough to keep him from getting Possession of the Crown, till he was sixteen Years of Age.

The *Interregnum* in the Kingdom of *Israel* happened at the Death of the forementioned *Jeroboam*. For it is said, *2 Kings xiv. 23. Jeroboam* reigned forty one Years. Therefore as the Reign of *Azariah* King of *Judah* began in the twenty seventh Year of *Jeroboam* King of *Israel*, the Death of *Jeroboam* must be in the fourteenth Year of *Azariah*, and yet his Son *Zachariah* did not

reign till the thirty eighth Year of *Azariah* King of *Judah*, *2 Kings* xv. 8. Sir *Walter Raleigh* says, that after the Death of *Feroboam*, “ probable it is, that the Captains of
 “ the Army, (who afterward slew one ano-
 “ ther so fast, that in fourteen Years there
 “ reigned five Kings) did now, by headstrong
 “ Violence, rend that Kingdom asunder, hold-
 “ ing each what he could, and either despi-
 “ sing or hating some Qualities in *Zachari-*
 “ *ab*, until after many Years wearied with
 “ Dissension, and the Principal of them per-
 “ haps being taken out of the Way by Death,
 “ for want of any other eminent Man, they
 “ consented to yield all quietly to the Son of
 “ *Feroboam* ”. He also observes that the Pro-
 phesy *2 Kings* x. 30. “ having determined
 “ that Race in the fourth Generation.” *Ze-*
chariah being the fifth, including *Jebu*
 himself, this might be some Cause impeach-
 ing his orderly Succession, and might after-
 wards encourage *Shallum* to murder him,
 though it was no Warrant for him to do
 so.

These seeming to be all the Difficulties occurring in the Chronology of this Period, having thus accounted for them, I should proceed to the next, in which the Scripture gives but little Assistance. But whereas Dr. *Prideaux* in his two Volumes of the *Conne-ction of the History of the Old and New Testament*, has at the End of each Volume, placed a Chrono-



The fifth TABLE by Centuries from the Destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar to the Vulgar Æra of the Birth of Christ.

			MISCELLANEOUS OCCURRENCES.
A. M. according to LXX.	Julian Period.	A. M. according to the Hebrew.	
4995	4200	3609	The Jews obtain Sentence from <i>Darius</i> against the <i>Samaritans</i> about the Tribute of <i>Samaria</i> .
5095	4300	3709	<i>Pisithnes</i> rebels against <i>Darius</i> in the lesser <i>Asia</i> , and is vanquish'd and put to Death.
5195	4400	3809	<i>Antigonus</i> disposselleth <i>Ptolemy</i> of <i>Syria</i> , <i>Phœnicia</i> , and <i>Judæa</i> .
5295	4500	3909	Nothing is recorded to have happened in this Year.
5395	4600	4009	<i>Antiochus Cyzicenus</i> seizeth Part of the <i>Syrian</i> Kingdom.
5495	4700	4109	<i>Agrippa</i> the <i>Roman</i> General conquers the <i>Bosphorans</i> , in the Reign of <i>Augustus Cæsar</i> .
5508	4713	4122	<i>Christ</i> was born in the latter End of this Year, according to <i>Dionysius Exiguus</i> , who settled that which is the vulgar Æra of <i>Christ</i> , and is said to be four Years later than the true Year of our Saviour's Nativity.
5509	4714	4123	This Year is concurrent with the first Year of our Lord, according to the vulgar Computation.

Place this facing Page 45.

Chronological Table, compiled with great Care and Judgment, and has by his History proved this Table to have been drawn up faithfully and judiciously, and which he has adapted to the Years of the *Julian Period*, as I have here done the Years of the World both according to the LXX and the *Hebrew*, I shall not trouble myself *actum agere*, but shall only adjust the Years of the World according both to the LXX and the *Hebrew*, to each Century of the Years of the *Julian Period* in Dr. *Prideaux's* Table, from the Conclusion of my last Table to the vulgar *Æra* of the Birth of *Christ*. Now according to the last preceding Table *Jerusalem* was taken in the Year of the *Julian Period* 4126. And so it is in the learned Dr. *Prideaux's* Table. Therefore the *Julian Period* being set down for every Century of that Period according to his Table, the Years of the World both according to the LXX and the *Hebrew*, will fall in with it exactly agreeable to the preceding Calculations.

^k It is to be noted, that the *Greek* Computation which I have here set down according to the Chronology of the *Septuagint* is still used by the *Christians* of *Constantinople* and *Alexandria*, and indeed by the whole *Eastern Church*

^k See *Strauch. Brev. Chron.* lib. iii. cap. 4 §. 1. 2.

among those who are called the Orthodox, and hold Communion with the orthodox Patriarchs of those great Churches^l, and by the *Muscovites* who are also of the same Communion; and that they use it not only to shew the solemn Festivals of their Church but in their Trades and common Affairs, so that as we say commonly this is the Year 1723; they in the same manner say, this is the Year 7231^m. They have also adapted three Cycles of the Sun, Moon and Indiction to these Years of the World by which they compute, so that dividing the Year of the World by 28, 19, or 15, the Remainder gives the current Year of any of those Cycles according to their Account in the same manner as dividing the *Julian* Period by any of those Cycles does it in our Account.

ⁿ *Scaliger* therefore supposes the *Constantinopolitan* Computation was a Period merely artificial, (like the *Julian* Period, which he published as his own Invention, though it had been invented long before^o by *Robert Lotharing* Bishop of *Hereford*, *A. D.* 1085. in the Reign of *William the Conqueror*) and the unlearned that followed fancied that it was derived from the Creation of the World, with the same Unskilfulness as the *Jews* do

^l See *Pit's Atlas*, Vol. I. pag. 37.

Syntagm. lib. 7. pag. 206, 207. Edit. *Bevereg.*

Strauch. ut supra ^o See *Usher's Letters*, 190, 225.

^m See *Blasius.*

ⁿ See

their

their Reckoning p, whose Computation he supposes to have been originally an artificial Period, though I don't find he could discover for what purpose it was framed. But I am not concerned for the *Jewish* Computation whatever it is, however I think it is evident from these Tables that the *Constantinopolitan* Computation is not artificial like the *Julian* Period, but a fair Chronology of the Years of the World according to the Version of the *Septuagint*, which they follow. And that this Computation should make a *Julian* Period, or that every Year of the World, according to this Account, being divided by 28, 19, or 15, should leave for a Remainder the current Year of each of these Cycles, does not appear to have arisen from the Multiplication of those Cycles together, and noting the Time when they must all begin together, as the *Julian* Period which we follow has been found, which is therefore purely artificial; but seems rather to have come from the Alteration of the current Years of those Cycles, by which Means they might fix their Beginning where they pleased, and accordingly they thought it most convenient to fix them at the first Year of the Creation according to the Account they followed.

Thus for Instance, if any Person having Authority to settle or alter either the Civil

P See *Strauch*, lib. iv. cap. 2. §. 5.

or Ecclesiastical Year, should be disposed to make a *Julian* Period, that should begin with the Year of our Lord, it might easily be done; for whereas we say now that twenty four is the Cycle of the Sun, fourteen of the Moon, and one of Indiction for this present Year 1723, by which Means our *Julian* Period must begin six thousand four hundred thirty six Years past as in the Tables here, and as *Robert Lothering* and *Joseph Scaliger* here fixed it; so if it was ordered that the Cycle of the Sun should this Year be called fifteen, the Cycle of the Moon thirteen, and the Cycle of Indiction thirteen; we should have a *Julian* Period beginning exactly with the Year of our Lord, and those Numbers might easily be placed to fit our Paschal Tables as well as the other. And this seems to be what the *Constantinopolitans* and *Alexandrians* have done. They did not frame an artificial Period of these three Cycles, as *Scaliger* supposes; but they adapted the three Cycles to their Computation of the Year of the World, in such Manner as I have shewed they may be adapted to the Year of our Lord or any other *Epocha*: And therefore their Cycles of the Sun and Moon are different from ours, though their Indiction is the same, which last might happen so by Accident rather than Design. For whereas this Year our Cycle of the Sun is twenty four, and our Cycle of the Moon

fourteen

fourteen: Their Cycle of the Sun is seven, and their Cycle of the Moon eleven. And their Cycles differ in the same Manner from ours, every Year; so that though their Year of the World be indeed a *Julian* Period, the three Cycles being adjusted to it, yet it has not an imaginary Beginning like ours, which is wholly framed from the Cycles themselves, and begins (according to the Opinion of those that framed it) before the Creation of the World.

Another Argument which may convince us that this Computation of the *Greek* Church was originally drawn up as a real and true Chronology from the Creation of the World; and not framed for an artificial Period, as *Scaliger* supposes, is, that it differs but one Year from the Chronology of *Theophilus* the sixth Bishop of *Antioch* after *St. Peter*; and who was promoted to that See *A. D.* 168. For though *Ricciolus*, and from him *Strauchius* and other Chronologers say, that *Theophilus* makes five thousand five hundred and fifteen Years between the Creation and the Birth of our Lord; yet Bishop *Fell*, in his Edition of that Father's Book to *Autolychus* shews, that there are but five thousand five hundred and seven Years Distance, according to his Computation, which as has been said differs but one Year from the present *Constantinopolitan* and *Alexandrian* Computation. Now *Theophilus* writing to convince an

H

Heathen

Heathen of the Antiquity of the *Christian* Religion, would not pretend to do it by an artificial Period, but by a real and true Chronology. Besides the Cycle of the Sun, and of the Indiction, without which such a Period as *Scaliger* supposes could not be framed, were not in Use till many Years after the Time that *Theophilus* lived, so that he could have no Thoughts of any such artificial Period. From which I think it may be concluded, as well as from the preceding Tables, that those who first settled that Computation now used at *Constantinople* and *Alexandria*, and over all the *Eastern* Orthodox Church, did not design it for an artificial Period, like the *Julian* Period which we use, but did really believe it to be the true Chronology of the Age of the World according to the *Septuagint*, as I have here, I trust, proved it to be.

I acknowledge that in the Proof of this, I have made the Age of the World one hundred and eighteen Years more, according to the *Hebrew* Account, than Bishop *Lloyd* has done in that Chronology which has of late been bound up with many of our *English* Bibles. For he there makes our Saviour to have been born according to the vulgar *Æra* in the Year of the World four thousand and four; whereas, according to these Tables, it was in the Year four thousand one hundred and twenty two: I having made one hundred

dred and twenty Years more between the *Exodus* or Departure of the Children of *Israel* out of *Egypt*, and the building *Solomon's* Temple, than he has done; as rather chusing to follow *St. Paul* Acts xiii. 20. and the several plain Texts in the Book of *Judges*, than that single Text *1 Kings* vi. 1. which he and other modern Chronologers have been guided by: and for which I have given my Reasons in the proper Place. The Difference of two Years where these Tables fall short of his, either before the *Exodus* or after the Building of the Temple, is so small, that I have not thought it worth enquiring in what Place it has happened.

But the chief Design of this Essay was to vindicate the Chronology used in the *Greek* Church, and to draw up Tables exactly agreeable to it, from whence it might appear, that their Computation of the Year of the World stands upon a good Foundation and is not to be rejected, as what is not to be reconciled to the Scripture History, as some have represented it, but has as fair a Claim to Truth as any other Computation, neither can I find that any thing of this Kind has been attempted before in *English*, or indeed by any modern Chronologer, at least in these *Western* Parts. Indeed *Mr. Marshal* in his Chronological Tables, which he printed by Subscription 1712, does pretend to give us the Age of the World according to

the LXX, but he makes it to have been but five thousand two hundred and sixty Years, according to that Account, from the Creation to the vulgar *Æra* of *Christ's* Birth, which is two hundred and forty eight Years short of the *Constantinopolitan* Computation. For as he leaves out *Cainan* the Son of *Arphaxad*, he differs from the preceding Tables one hundred and thirty Years between the Flood and the Birth of *Abraham*, and as he has followed Archbishop *Usher* and Bishop *Lloyd*, he differs from them one hundred and eighteen Years more (as has been before observed) which makes in all two hundred and forty eight Years. But whether the Chronology which he has followed, or that which I have followed, has the best Reason to support it, is submitted to the Reader's Judgment.





A N

E S S A Y

O N T H E

Confusion of L A N G U A G E S :

A N D W H E T H E R

The Primitivve L A N G U A G E be
any where remaining.



H A T Man had the Use of Speech
as soon as he was created, and a
Language in which to express the
Sentiments of his Mind, consequent-
ly, that God indued him with this Speech or
Language at the Time that he breathed into
him the Breath of Life, is evident from the
History

History of the Creation as delivered by *Moses*. For *Adam* in the Day that he was created, before his first Sleep, or that *Eve* was formed out of his Rib, gave a Name to every Beast of the Earth and to every Fowl of the Air: ¶ *And whatsoever Adam called every living Creature, that was the Name thereof.* So that no one who knows and believes the holy Scripture can doubt of Man's having the Use of Speech, or his being inspired with the Gift of a Language from the very Time that he was first created: I say inspired with the Gift of a Language, because an articulate Speech or Language by which the Sentiments of the Mind are expressed betwixt one Man and another, and by which one Man discovers his Thoughts to another, is not natural but acquired: as we may be satisfied from those who are born deaf; who though they have the same Reason and Understanding with other Men, and discover that Reason by their other Actions, and study to make themselves understood by Signs, yet can form no articulate Speech, or make themselves to be understood by Words: Which yet they certainly would do, at least some of them, if any Speech or Language was as natural to Man as Reason is. Besides, if there was a natural Language in Man, or any other but what is acquired by Use and Custom derived

from those whom we hear to speak before us, all Men would speak that Language, and we might understand each others Speech from one End of the World unto the other. For if it was natural no Man could fail to speak it, neither could any one lose it by disuse.

It is true, when a Language is formed, it is easy to add new Words to it ; but then these Words proceed not from Nature, but from Institution and Use. No one will naturally know the Meaning of those new Words till they are taught. Thus indeed it is possible to frame a new Language, and indeed all the living Languages now in the World, or at least the greatest part of them have been framed anew by this and other Means ; so that if our Ancestors who lived some hundred Years ago, were now to rise from the Dead, and to speak the Language which they spake in their own Times, we should not understand them or they us. However, to frame or to alter a Language must be a Work of Time, and therefore as *Adam* had a Language immediately as he was created, he must be inspired with it ; for one Day, or rather a few Hours of a Day, could not be sufficient for him to frame a Language for himself. And indeed though Men are born with all the Organs proper for Speech, yet till they have heard articulate Sounds they know not how to frame such Sounds of themselves,

selves, as we may see in Men born deaf. For if Nature taught Men to form such Sounds, then those that were born deaf, would when they came to the Use of Reason form Words by which to express their Minds: Therefore as we have no Instance that any Person born deaf ever did frame Words for himself, we may conclude that Speech must be acquired by being taught, and that if the first Man had not been inspired or taught by God how to speak, his Posterity could never have invented a Language for themselves, notwithstanding they would have had the same Organs of Speech we have now.

That Language which *Adam* spoke himself he undoubtedly taught his Children, and this Language continued the same unto the Flood. It is possible it might receive some little Alteration in that time; that some in that Multitude of Men born in the Interval from *Adam* to *Noah* might invent new Words or Phrases, and be followed by others therein: But then such Words or Forms of Expression could not be many, or proceed so far to alter the Language as to make it another Tongue, so that those who lived in one part of the Earth might not understand any that lived in another part, as it is now, if they happened to meet together. For that which causes our Languages now to alter so much in an Age or two proceeds from the Commerce or Intercourse of one Nation with another,

another, and the Conquest of one People by another, and Incorporation of one with another; by which Means a Mixture of divers Languages is introduced, and the old Language gradually changed: For in Countries that have no Commerce or Intercourse with Foreigners, and which have escaped being conquered or incorporated with other Nations, the Inhabitants retain the Languages of their Ancestors from Generation to Generation with little or no Variation. Now this was the Case of the *Antediluvian* World; they had but one Language originally derived from *Adam*: And as there was no other Language to be mixed with it, by the Means before mentioned, or any other, let us suppose the World to have been never so well peopled during that Time, there could be but very little Alteration made in the Language, only as some new Words were formed upon the Discovery of any new Object or Invention, and these might be different in different Places. But these could not be so many or considerable as to affect the main of the Language, any more than the different Names of Trees or Plants or Utensils, which are various in different Parts of *England*, affect the *English* Language. So that if we were to follow the Chronology of the *Septuagint* for this Period, I see not how there could be more Languages than one before the Flood. But if we follow the Chronology of the *Hebrew* (which seems to be

I

more

more generally approved) there is yet a further Proof that the same Language continued from *Adam* to the Flood; for according to that Chronology *Methuselah* lived near three hundred Years with *Adam*, consequently spoke the same Language with *Adam*; and *Noah* lived five hundred Years with *Methuselah*, therefore spoke the same Language: So that the same Tongue which was spoken by *Adam* was spoken also by *Noah*, in whose Time the Flood came upon the Earth, and destroyed all but him and his Family.

After the Flood, this same continued to be the common Language of Mankind till the building of the Tower of *Babel*; for at that Time the Scripture tells us ^r *the whole Earth was of one Language and of one Speech*. At which time, in order to get a Name and immortalize their Memory, they resolved to build a Tower of a prodigious height, which I take to be the Meaning of those Words, *whose Top may reach unto Heaven*. For if they had really been so silly as to think it possible for them to build up to Heaven, they would have chosen a Hill and not a Valley to have built upon. But as the *Hebrew* Language has no Degrees of Comparison, so they used hyperbolical Expressions to express any thing extraordinary, such as great or mighty before God, high as Heaven, low as

^r Gen. xi. 1.

Hell, and the like; of which many Instances may be given. However this Vanity of theirs in purposing to build a vast high Tower only to make their Names famous, and give Posterity occasion to admire them, was displeasing to God, and he resolved to disappoint them. And the way by which he was pleased to do this was by confounding their Language so as they might not understand one another: For the Lord said, ^s *Let us go down and confound their Language that they may not understand one another's Speech. So the Lord scattered them abroad from thence upon the Face of all the Earth, and they left off to build the City.* By this Means then it was that there began to be divers Languages on the Earth.

Some modern Criticks, such as Father *Simon* and Monsieur *Le Clerc*, pretend that this Text does not prove that God is the Author of the Diversity of Tongues, but only of the Confusion and Dissension; and that this occasioning a Dispersion, a Multiplicity of Languages naturally ensued. These learned Criticks and their Followers are Men that seem to be prepossessed against Miracles, and would resolve all Things into natural Causes, as if God himself was obliged to work by those Means. It is also pretended that *Moses* nowhere speaks of a *Diversity of Languages* as we understand it, but only of a *Confusion* of

^s Gen. xi. 7, 8.

their Speech who were at *Babel*; which might well be although all used the same Language; that is, there might be a Confusion raised in their Minds that they could not understand one another; their Notions of Things being disturbed, so that though they heard one Word, they mistook it for another, they misheard or misapprehended every Thing that was said, as if one of the Builders called to his Waiter for a *Brick* or a *Stone*, the other constantly mistook him to call for something else, and he brought him it may be *Lime* or *Water* or *Sand*, or something contrary to what was called for. This brought them into a *Confusion*, that *Confusion* into a *Dissension*, that led to a Separation and *Dispersion*, and so put a Stop to their Purpose. And the Dispersion being thus caused by the Confusion and Dissension, a Diversity of Languages would naturally follow in time. For Time still continues to alter all Languages, as well as Rites, Laws and Customs. And as different Nations would necessarily and gradually fall into different Rites, Laws and Customs, so would they also naturally fall into different Languages, some changing the original Language in one Manner, some in another, till at last the Whole was changed in every Nation.

Again, if there were such a Division of Tongues miraculously caused at *Babel* (that, as it is commonly said, all those who were
of

of the same Language went together in their several Companies under their several Leaders) whence comes it to pass, that after the Dispersion, we meet with several of those by whom *Moses* tells † us the People were divided in their Lands; every one after his Tongue, after their Families, in their Nations, ‡ which used the same Language after their Dispersion? As all the Sons of *Canaan*, the *Sidonians*, the *Hittites*, the *Jebusites*, &c. used the *Canaanitish* Tongue †. In *Egypt*, *Mizraim* and *Pathrusim*; in *Greece*, *Javan* and *Elisa*; in *Chaldea*, *Aram* and *Uz*, had not six but only three Languages: Whence comes it to pass, if their several Tongues were the Cause of their Dispersion, that these several Heads of Families or Nations should, two or three or more, use the same Tongue?

Also, if Tongues were divided at *Babel*, as it is supposed, whence was it that the nearer any Nation lay to those who had the primitive or *Hebrew* Language, they did participate of that Tongue more than those who were more remote, as is plain in the *Chaldeans*, *Canaanites*, *Greeks* and others? Whereas, if their Languages were divided at *Babel*, those Languages would have been as different from the *Hebrew* as others.

† Gen. x. 5, 20, 31.

‡ Ver. 15, 16, 17, 18.

These are the Reasons given by those who would persuade us that there was no great Miracle wrought at *Babel*, no real Alteration made in the primitive Language by the immediate Power of God, so that any of the People there were deprived of the Knowledge they had of the Tongue they brought to that Place, or had a new Tongue given them in the Stead of it: Only their Minds became bewildred, and they were put into a Confusion, which might easily happen among such a Multitude by the Means of natural Causes; that Confusion caused Dissension, Dissension produced Dispersion, and then Time as naturally produced a Diversity of Languages.

But notwithstanding what has been thus so plausibly alledged against God's having miraculously caused a Diversity of Languages at *Babel*, I cannot but still be of a contrary Opinion. And the Reasons given by Father *Simon*, or Monsieur *Le Clerc* for the Diversity of Languages are by no Means satisfactory; nor could such a Diversity of Languages be introduced by such Means as they pretend. For there being but one Language originally in the World, whereby Men did represent their Conceptions to one another; we cannot imagine that Men should of themselves introduce so great an Alteration, as thereby to break or destroy that necessary Society and Converse with each other, which even Nature

ture itself put Men upon preserving. Do not Men at this Time study to understand the Language of those they have Occasion to converse or deal with? And if all had now one Language, can we suppose they would change it for another, which neither they nor their Neighbours understand? There having been that Freedom of Converse among Men, by Means of a Language common to them all, as the primitive Language was; it is not to be supposed, that they should of themselves cut it off to their mutual Disadvantage. But to this it is said, *that the long Tract of Time, and Diversity of Customs might alter the Language.* I grant this might make a considerable Alteration, but could not so wholly change it as to make the Languages of several Nations so different as we now find them to be. Had the original universal Language suffered no Changes, but such as might arise from the different Customs observed by the several Nations, our Language would have differed only, or in little more than in such Things wherein our Customs differed; and there would still have remained such an Agreement as whereby we might have understood one another. As to *Length of Time*, though Experience teaches us that it makes great Alterations in a Language, yet I believe it will be very difficult to find a Place, where mere Length of Time has altered any Language, and caused it to be out

of use, and introduced another in the Room of it. For that which has chiefly caused the Change of Languages, has proceeded from the Mixture of Foreigners with the Natives, or the Trading of the Natives with Foreigners, and learning their Language, and bringing in exotick Words and Phrases. Also in polite Ages, when Learning meets with Encouragement, Men study to polish and refine their Language, that they may be able to contend with their Neighbours in Purity of Style, and Easiness of Numbers. So that were there not Diversity of Languages, derived from some other original, this Mixture of Foreigners with the Natives, would make no Alteration: Traders to foreign Parts would bring in no exotick Words, if the Nations they deal with speak the same Language with their Country-men at Home; there would be no striving to polish our Language to make it run smoother and easier in order to vye with our Neighbours for Purity of Style or Easiness of Numbers, except there were some other Languages which we thought (at least in some Words and Phrases) to be politer and better than our own; and the Learned and Polite borrow Words and Phrases from that politer Language, which they use instead of the Barbarisms of their own. But though Languages do now receive great Alterations by these and the like Means in a few Ages or Generations; yet if there had been no Diversity

variety of Tongues first derived from some other Cause, new Languages would hardly have been introduced by any of these Means by which our modern Tongues do now in a little Time receive visible Alterations. And we may be satisfied of this from the *Welsh*, *Irish* and other Languages of People that have not mixed or traded with Foreigners, whose Languages have continued the same for above a thousand Years: There is another Cause also assigned for the Change of Languages, and that is *the Difference of Climates*, which is given as a Reason why the Northern People; especially those who live near the *Baltick* Sea, use Consonants and Aspirates so much, and pronounce different from others even the same Language; so that instead of *per Deum verum bibimus bonum vinum*, they say, *per Theum ferum pipimus pnum finum*. So some have observed of the ^x *Ephraimites*, that it was the Air was the Cause of their Liping and saying *Sibboleth* instead of *Shibboleth*. But this would cause only an Alteration as to some Letters and Syllables, and might a little alter the Pronunciation, but could not produce any Variety of Languages. So that, setting aside the *Confusion of Languages at Babel*, no sufficient Reason can be assigned for the Variety of Languages in the World.

^x Judges xii. 6.

Again, though it be granted that a Confusion in their Minds without distinct *Languages* were enough to make them desist from their Work, yet the Context *y* in that Place where *Mofes* has given us an Account of this Matter, does infer a Diversity of Tongues, as must appear to those that duly consider it: As from the first Verse; where it is not conceivable why it should be taken Notice of as a remarkable Circumstance, that they had all *but one Language* before they set about this Work, if there was not a Diversity of Tongues caused by the Work they went about. Also a little after at the sixth Verse, God takes especial Notice of this very Thing, that *they had but one Language*, and that so long as they had but that one Language, *nothing would be restrained from them which they had imagined to do*; therefore in the next Verse, he declares, he will *go down and confound their Language*, which must be understood of *multiplying that Language into many*; for it must be taken in Opposition to what is said in the other Verse immediately preceding. And what is there added, *that they may not understand one anothers Speech*, cannot be understood of a Confusion in their Minds to make them commit strange Blunders, but must mean an Alteration in the Speech or Language itself; so that though

y Gen. xi.

they gave never so much Attention to what was said, they should not understand the Words; the Language the one should speak should be a perfect unknown Tongue to him that was spoken to. Those who recede from the common Opinion, lest (as they pretend) they should give Advantage to *Infidels*, by attributing that to a Miracle which might be done without, seem to be more wary than wise in this Particular. For besides that it is certain, that Miracles may be in those Things which might be effected otherwise by natural Causes; as when they are produced without the Help of those Causes, and in a Space of Time impossible to Nature; it has not yet been proved, neither do I believe can be, how such Diversity of Tongues, as is in the World, would have been effected without a Miracle: Therefore we have just Ground to believe there was a Miracle in it. Nay even those who would have it to be no more than a Confusion in the Minds of the Builders, must acknowledge a Miracle in the Case; for could so many Men have their Minds so confounded all at once, as not to understand or apprehend one another's Meaning, speaking the same Language, without a Miracle? It was no more difficult to God to confound their Language than their Understandings. He could as easily multiply Languages, and deprive a Tribe or Family of their old Language, and give them a new

one in a Moment, as he could create a Man and give him a Language immediately as he was formed.

As to the Number of Languages the Scripture has not any where told us how many there were. And I see not any Necessity of asserting that every one of the Families mentioned in the tenth Chapter of *Genesis*, which according to the *Hebrew* are Seventy, and according to the *Greek* seventy two, should have a distinct Language: which, though it has been maintained by diverse both Ancient and Modern, yet I believe is generally now esteemed by the Learned to be no better than a groundless Fancy. Nor does *Moses* in the Genealogy give Countenance to this Opinion, but the contrary: For he observes that *Peleg* ^z had his Name given him, *because in his Days* (by which must be understood at the time of his Birth when that Name was given him) *was the Earth divided*; and yet the Sons of his younger Brother *Jochan*, who could not therefore be born till after the Dispersion, are numbred among the rest to make up the seventy or seventy two Heads of Families or Nations. It does not then seem to have been the Purpose of *Moses* to inform us by this Genealogy how many Nations or Languages the whole World was divided into immediately upon this Dispersion at *Babel*;

^z Gen. x. 25.

but only in general to acquaint the *Jews*, (for whose Use he wrote his Books more immediately and chiefly) who were the Heads, and Founders of those Nations which they had any Knowledge of. On this Account he is very minute and particular in describing the Posterity of *Canaan* and the Nations springing from him, though all of them possessed but a small Countrey, because they were the Nations the *Israelites* were to drive out and possess their Land; but for other Nations, though very large and extensive, he either passes them over in Silence or but just mentions them. And those Words of *Moses*, *These were the Sons of Japhet,* ^a *of Ham, or of Shem, after their Families, after their Tongues in their Countries, and in their Nations,* only signify that those Families and the Nations sprung from them had several Tongues, and that all of them did not speak the same Language, but not that every Family or Nation in particular had a distinct Language. Those of the same Language might be divided into two or more Nations or Governments, but then other Families or Nations had a different Language. Thus *Cush* and *Mizraim*, and *Phut* and *Canaan*, all the Sons of *Ham*, had different Languages, though *Sidon* and *Heth*, and other Heads of Nations who descended from *Canaan* had the same Language. In like

^a Gen. x. 5, 20, 21.

manner, as it is written in the Book of *Esther* ^b, where we read that *Mordecai* by the King's Appointment *sent Letters unto every Province according to the Writing thereof, and unto every People after their Language, and unto the Jews according to their Writing, and according to their Language*: No one can hence infer that, because the Realm of *Persia* had then one hundred and twenty Provinces, that therefore there were one hundred and twenty Languages different from each other spoken within that Empire. Undoubtedly several Provinces spoke but one and the same Language, only some there were that spoke different Languages from the rest; and if there were but twenty, or but ten, or but five or six several Languages spoken in these hundred and twenty Provinces, it is agreeable enough to the Account here given. As therefore the Scriptures have not told us how many Languages God was pleased to divide among the People at *Babel*, it may be Rashness to pretend to say how many there were. There might be more than seventy, or there might be fewer. This only we can be assured of, that there were enough to oblige them to desist from their Work, and to oblige them to give over their vain Enterprize.

As to the last Objection, which is, That

^b *Esther* viii. 9.

if Tongues were divided at Babel, whence was it that the nearer any Nation lay to those who had the primitive Language, the Hebrew, they did participate more of that Tongue than those who were more remote, as is plain in the Chaldeans, Canaanites, Greeks, and others? It may be answered, that it will be very difficult to prove that the primitive Language is or ever was any where remaining since the Dispersion at *Babel*, or that the *Hebrew* is that primitive Language, as I shall shew in its proper Place. Again, we know not what the original *Chaldee* or *Greek* Languages were in their first Original: I know of but one Word of the *Chaldee* Language which we have now remaining elder than the *Babylonish* Captivity, and that is very different from the *Hebrew*, as I shall observe by and by. And what Wonder is it if after the whole Nation of the *Jews* had been seventy Years together dispersed through *Chaldea*, there should be a large Mixture of *Hebrew* in the *Chaldee* Tongue? As to the *Canaanites*, their Language and the *Hebrew* was the very same, as I shall shew hereafter. And for the *Greeks*, they received their first Letters from *Cadmus* the *Phenician* or *Canaanite*; and if he first taught them to write, he might also very well and easily, I mean he and his Followers (for *Cadmus* did not go into *Greece* alone, but carried a *Phenician* Colony with him) mix his Language with theirs, and thereby bring many
Pheni-

Phenician or *Hebrew* Words into that Language. Besides, do we not see it in all Parts of the World, that the Nations which are near to one another have generally more Affinity in Language than those that are more remote, which proceeds from the Necessity they have for frequent Commerce and Conversation with each other?

Having now shewn from the Scriptures, that God was the Author of the first Language, that, as soon as he created Man, he not only gave him a Capacity to speak, and a Voice capable of uttering articulate Sounds, but also formed a Language for him, and at once infused it into his Mind, and, as I may say, put Words into his Mouth, and that afterwards as a Punishment on Mankind, and to check a vain Enterprize they had undertaken, he diversify'd this Language, and gave the People strange Tongues different one from another, insomuch that the one People could not understand the other's Speech; I shall in the next place inquire which was the first Language of the World? And whether we can say that any People retained the original Language after the Division of Tongues at *Babel*? If we follow the *Hebrew* Chronology, which is indeed that which is most generally followed, then it is certain that *Noah* lived above two hundred Years after this Confusion of Languages, and *Sem* near two hundred Years after him. And as there is no Notice
taken

taken of them as amongst those who were at the Building of the Tower; and as we have also just Reason to believe (they being both taken Notice of and commended in the Scripture for their Righteousness) that they could never have been drawn in to be Partakers in such a vain Enterprize, we may conclude they were not there nor any ways concerned in it. From hence it may be reasonably concluded that they partook not in the Punishment inflicted on those Undertakers, and consequently preserved their Language, that primitive Language, which *Noah* learned from *Methuselah* as he from *Adam*. I say this must needs be the Case, if we follow the *Hebrew* Chronology: But if we follow the *Septuagint*, or most ancient *Greek* Translation, which Translation was followed by our Saviour and his Apostles in what they have quoted out of the Old Testament in the New, then *Noah* and *Sem* were both dead long before this vain Attempt was put in execution. And this seems the most probable, for certainly if they had been living at that Time, *Noah*^c the *Preacher of Righteousness* would have exhorted them not to go about such a piece of Folly and Wickedness. And if he had done so, I cannot think but *Moses* would have recorded it as an Aggravation of the Crime of those who would proceed in such an Enterprize when

^c 2 Pet. ii. 5.

particularly warned against it by the common Father of them all. Since therefore neither *Noah* nor *Sem*, nor any of *Noah's* Sons is taken Notice of on this Occasion, I cannot think any of them were then living, and that the Chronology of the *Septuagint*, and not of the *Hebrew*, ought to be followed in this Period at least, there being such insuperable Difficulties in the Chronology of the present *Hebrew* Text from *Noah* to *Abraham*, as I could easily shew, if it was not foreign to my present purpose.

It is then proper, in the first place, to consider as a previous Question, Whether it can appear from the Scripture that any one Person or Family was not engaged or in company of those who attempted to build this City or Tower? And I think it is evident from the Scripture that there were none. This is the Account we have of it: *And^d the whole Earth was of one Language and of one Speech. And it came to pass as they journeyed from the East, that they found a Plain in the Land of Shinar, and they dwelt there. And they said one to another, Go to, let us make Brick, and burn them thoroughly. And they had Brick for Stone, and Slime had they for Mortar, and they said, go to, let us build us a City and a Tower. Now what is the Antecedent to these several Theys? Is it not the whole Earth? A Name of Multi-*

^d Gen. xi. 1, 2, 3, 4.

tude, and therefore properly requires a personal Pronoun and Verb of the plural Number. It was then the *whole Earth*, that is, all the People of the Earth gathered together and dwelling in a great plain Countrey, who were concerned in building this Tower and City. But it may be said that the *whole Earth* or *all the Earth* does not necessarily imply every particular Man, Family or Nation; that the Scripture frequently uses the Words *all the Earth*, or *all the People*, not in an *universal* Sense, which admits of no Exceptions, but only in a *general* Sense where there may be many Exceptions: And so where it says the *whole Earth* here, it may mean only a great Number or the Majority of Mankind then living upon the Earth. But I answer that it cannot be so understood here because of the Words immediately following, *The whole Earth was of one Language and of one Speech*. Now if this does not include every individual Man and Woman then upon the Earth, it will follow that there were more Languages than one in the Earth before the Attempt to build this Tower, consequently that the Division of Languages was made before this Time, and only those who assembled to build *Babel* were of one Speech before that Enterprize. And if the *whole Earth* be an *Universal* in the first Verse, and admits of no Exception there, the several *Theys* which refer to it as the Antecedent in the following Ver-

ties in our *English* Translation, or the several Verbs governed by it in the *Hebrew*, *Greek* and *Latin*, must be as *universal* and without Exception. For it cannot be that the *whole Earth* should be understood universally in the first Verse, and but generally in the rest, without some Mark or Token given to shew where we are to make the Distinction. It may therefore, I think, be very fairly concluded, that no Family then upon Earth was free from the Guilt of this Enterprize, or escaped the Punishment inflicted on the Offenders. And for that Reason, if for no other (but there are several other Reasons to be alledged) I conceive the *Septuagint* Chronology (though now little regarded) is preferable to that of the present *Hebrew* Copies, because thereby *Noah* and his Sons are acquitted from being concern'd in this impious Undertaking, which they cannot be, if we follow the *Hebrew* we now have.

Having therefore answered this previous Question according to the best of my Judgment, I shall now return to the main Inquiry, *Whether the first Language of the World was any where preserved?* The *Jews* and many *Christians*, both ancient and modern, are of Opinion that *Heber* and his Family were not among those who were concerned in the building of the Tower, consequently that the primitive Language from him called the *Hebrew*, was preserved in his Family, and so transmitted

transmitted to *Abraham* and his Posterity, particularly the *Israelites*, among whom it was preserved most uncorrupt and pure, who from thence were called *Hebrews*. They also endeavour to prove the *Hebrew* to be the primitive Language from the Etymologies of the Names of the first Patriarchs who lived before this Confusion of Languages. Thus it is said, *God formed Adam out of the Dust of the Earth*, by way of Allusion to the Word *Adamah*, which signifies *Earth* in *Hebrew*; That *Adam* called his *Wife* *Chava*, or *Eve*, because she was the *Mother of all Living*: And the Word *Chai*, whence that of *Chavah* is derived, is *Hebrew*. It is said also that the *Woman* is called *Ischa* from the Word *Isch*, which signifies *Man*. The Name *Cain* is derived from an *Hebrew* Word which signifies *Possession* or *Acquisition*: That *Seth* comes of the *Hebrew* Word *Schath*, which signifies to *substitute*; *Phaleg* or *Peleg* comes from the *Hebrew* Word *Palag*, which signifies to *divide*; That of *Babel*, from the *Hebrew* Word *Balal*, signifying *Confusion*: *Eden*, the Name of the terrestrial *Paradise* signifies in *Hebrew*, *Delight* and *Pleasure*. All these Derivations and Allusions have no Place but in the *Hebrew* Tongue; whence it follows that we must necessarily suppose that this Language was in use in the Times of the Patriarchs before the Flood as well as after, because their proper Names are derived from it. It is also alledged

alleged further, to prove this Antiquity of the *Hebrew* Tongue, that the most ancient People derived their Names from it, as St. *Hierom* proves in his Book of *Hebrew* Names. The *Assyrians* come from *Assur*, the *Arauites* from *Aram*, the *Lydians* from *Lud*, the *Medes* from *Madai*, the *Jonians* from *Javan*; and the Men to whom these Names belonged, were born and named before the Building of *Babel*.

But to this it may be answered, that there is no Ground in Scripture to induce us to believe that the primitive Language or Religion was preserved in the Family of *Heber*; for it is certain that the true Religion was lost, or at least most grievously corrupted in that Family as well as in all others; for the Descendants of *Heber* were Idolaters as well as others: Even *Abraham* himself was so, till God was pleased to call him to the Knowledge of his Truth, and command him to leave his native Country. This the Scripture expressly teaches, ^d *Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, your Fathers dwelt on the other Side of the Flood in old Time, even Terah the Father of Abraham, and the Father of Nachor: And they served other Gods.* It is evident therefore, that the Family of *Heber*, from whence *Terah* and his Sons *Abraham* and *Nachor* descended, had lost the

^d Josh. xxiv. 2

true Religion as well as others. Neither did they retain the *Hebrew* Language, but what they spoke was the *Chaldean*, a very different Language from the other. ^e We have a convincing Evidence of this Difference, when *Laban* of the Family of *Heber*, who remained in *Chaldea*, and had preserved the Language of his Ancestors, gave the Name of *Jagar-Sabadutha*, to the Heap of Stones which they gathered together; whereas *Jacob* called it *Galaad*, both of them signifying *the Heap of Witnesses*: That Heap of Stones being a Monument or Testimony of the Covenant there made betwixt them: It is then certain, that in those Days the *Chaldee* Tongue, which *Nachor* and *Terah* the Descendants of *Heber* and Ancestors to *Abraham*, and which *Laban* still spoke, because he resided in *Mesopotamia*, was different from that which *Jacob* spoke, which was the *Hebrew*: Consequently if the *Hebrew* was the original Language spoken before the Dispersion from *Babel*, (which shall be examined hereafter) it is certain it was not preserved in the Family of *Heber*: For his Descendants, as appears from *Laban*, spoke another Language. Nor was there only this Difference in a single Word, but in the whole Language. For the *Aramick*, *Chaldee* or *Assyrian* Tongue was so different from the *Hebrew* or

^e Gen. xxx. 47.

Language of the *Jews*, that the common People of the *Jews* did not understand it. And when ^f*Rabshekah*, the King of *Assyria*'s General, would have excited the People to a Rebellion, he spoke *Hebrew* to King *Hezekiah*'s Deputies, that the People might understand him: And they prayed him to speak in the *Aramick* or *Syrian* Language, for they understood it, and not to speak in the *Jewish* Tongue which the People on the Wall understood. The Prophet *Jeremiah* also foretelling the Ruin of the *Jews* by the *Chaldeans* says, & God would bring upon them a Nation from far, a mighty ancient People, whose Language they know not, neither do they understand. It is therefore I think very plain, that neither the primitive Language nor Religion was preserved in the Family of *Heber* rather than in any other Family. And from whencesoever *Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob* received the *Hebrew* Language, it is manifest they received it not from the Sons of *Heber*, the Ancestors of *Abraham*, for they spoke a Language very different from it.

Neither are the Names given to the ancient Patriarchs in Scripture a sufficient Proof, that they spake the *Hebrew* Language, or that they were originally called by *Hebrew* Names. For *Moses* might change ancient Names into *Hebrew* Names of the same Sig-

^f 2 Kings xviii. 26.

^g Jer. v. 15.

nification

nification: And we have diverse Examples of this Custom from *Greek* and *Latin* Authors, and even from the Interpreters of the Scripture. Thus it is, that *Aquila* to imitate the Allusion, which is in the Name of *Isch* and *Ischa*, that is *Man* and *Woman*, made use of the Terms 'Ανὴρ and 'Ανδρῆς. The Author of the *Latin* Vulgate has also imitated the *Hebrew*, by translating *Ischa* into *Virago*, derived from the Word *Vir* as the *Hebrew* is from *Isch*. Thus also the Evangelists changed the Name of *Cephas* into that of *Petrus*, to preserve the Signification of the *Syriack* Word *Cephas*, and the Allusion to *Petra*: And the Woman who was called *Tabitha* in *Hebrew* was called *Dorcas* in the *Greek*, being of the same Signification. It is said also in *Exodus*, that *Pharaoh's* Daughter gave *Moses* that Name, because she drew him out of the Water; but *Pharaoh's* Daughter spoke not the *Hebrew* Language, but the *Egyptian*, and no doubt gave him this Name from an *Egyptian* Word of that Signification, which *Moses* himself changed into the *Hebrew*. Thus about the Time of the Reformation, *Erasmus*, *Melancthon* and others changed their *Dutch* Names into *Latin* or *Greek* of the same Signification. For *Erasmus's* original Name was *Gerardus Gerardi*, or *Gerard* the Son of *Gerard*; this he changed to *Desiderius Erasmus*, the one *Latin*, the other *Greek* of the same Signification. The

other's Name was *Swartzerd*, and he called himself and was called by others *Melancthon*, which is derived from the *Greek*, and of the same Signification in that Language, that the other is in *Dutch*. The *Septuagint* have translated the Name of *Babel* by the Word $\Sigma\upsilon\chi\upsilon\sigma\iota\epsilon$, which signifies *Confusion*, as *Babel* does in the *Hebrew*. And some *Greeks* have translated *Esau* or *Edom*, which signifies *red*, by *Erythrean*, which has the same Signification in *Greek*. There is a great Number of this Sort of Changes to be found. The Name *Adam*, which is not a proper Name, but the appellative Name of Man, which was given to the first Man by Way of Excellence, might have been changed without any Difficulty; and the ancient Name, as well as that of *Adam*, might have been derived from the Word, which then signified the Earth; as the *Latin* Word *Homo* is derived from the Word *humus*, which signifies the Ground. But suppose that *Moses* did not change the Names, it will only prove that some Words of the original Language were preserved in the *Hebrew*, and there is as good Proof that some of them were preserved in other Languages, which differed from the *Hebrew*. I have already shewed that the *Chaldee* was a Language so different from the *Hebrew*, that those who understood the one did not understand the other; yet many of the forementioned Names, as *Eve*, *Cain*, *Phaleg* and *Babel*,

bel, are as easily derived from *Chaldee* Words as from *Hebrew*. And the Etymology of the Name *Tubal-Cain* (an *Antediluvian* Name) may be found in the *Arabick*, where *Tubal* and *Kunaon* signify a *Plate of Brass*, but not in the *Hebrew*. So that if we fetch our Proofs from the Etymologies of some Names, the *Chaldee* and the *Arabick* may bid as fair for the primitive Language as the *Hebrew*.

And as there is no Proof sufficient to convince us that the *Hebrew* was the original Language spoken by *Adam* and *Noah*, and others who lived before the Confusion of Languages; so there is very good Proof that it was not that Language, for indeed it was the Language of *Canaan*, and is called so by the Prophet^h. Now we cannot suppose that God would shew such a particular Favour to *Canaan*, whom *Noah* cursed soon after the Flood, together with his Posterityⁱ, as to preserve the primitive Language in his Family rather than in any other. This Language *Abraham* learned when he sojourned in that Land, and his Posterity preserved it. For I have already shewed that the *Chaldee* was the Language, which *Abraham's* Ancestors used in *Mesopotamia*; consequently which he himself learned from them, and used till such Time as by God's Command-

^h Isa. xix. 18.

ⁱ Gen. ix. 25.

ment he went away from his Kindred, and from his Country, and came into the Land of *Canaan*. After he came there, God having promised to give him that Country and to plant his Posterity there, he learned and spoke the Language of that Country, and it became the Language used in his Family; so *Jacob* his Grandson learned it, as has been shewed, and gave Names to Places in that Language, while *Laban* preserved the Language of their common Ancestors. For *Laban*, who continued in the Country first planted by their common Ancestors, could not change the Language which they spake, and introduce another in that Place. But *Abraham*, who was removed into another Country, lived there near an hundred Years, traded there, and daily conversed with the Inhabitants of that Place, could not help learning their Language; and *Isaac* and *Jacob* who were born there, and though they required but small Portions of Land there, yet on the Account of the Promises looked on it as the Place of their Inheritance, learned the Language undoubtedly from their Infancy, and it became the native Language of them and their Posterity. Therefore as it is evident, that *Jacob* and *Laban*, though both descending from the same Stock of *Heber*, yet used different Languages, *Laban* speaking the *Chaldee* and *Jacob* that which is now called the ancient *Hebrew*; it must needs be that *Jacob* had learned

learned another Language. And where should he have that other Language, but in the Country where he had his Birth and Education. And this, if we had no other Proof, would be sufficient to prove that the *Hebrew* Tongue was the original Language of *Canaan*.

Another Proof may be taken from the Names of Men and Places in the Land of *Canaan*, whereof Mention is made in *Genesis* and *Joshua*. As the proper Names *Melchizedech*, *Adoni-Bezeck*, *Abimelech*, &c. the Names of the *Canaanitish* Kings are *Hebrew*; and the Names of Towns, as *Jericho*, *Salem*, *Sichem*, *Bethlehem*, &c. which were the Names of those Towns while the *Canaanites* possessed them, and are *Hebrew* Names, and of *Hebrew* Original.

A third Proof may be drawn from hence, that it is no where observed in Scripture that the *Israelites* and *Canaanites* had different Languages, and did not understand one another, as it is observed with relation to the *Chaldeans* and *Egyptians*. The Scriptures speak often of the Conferences of *Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob* with the *Canaanites*, and always as if they understood one another; nor is it ever said that they made use of Interpreters. When *Abraham*^k and *Abimelech* made a Covenant together, they did not give two different

^k Gen. xxi. 31, 32.

Names (though of the same Signification) to the Place where they made their Contract, as *Jacob* and *Laban* afterwards did. But as *Abraham* called it *Beer-sheba* or the *Well of the Oath*, so *Abimelech* gave it no other Name. *Jacob* and *Laban* gave different Names to the Heap of Stones they erected, but signifying the same Thing, because they spake different Languages: But here *Abraham* and *Abimelech* agree in the same Name, to signify the same Thing, therefore they spake the same Language.

A fourth Proof is founded on the History of *Joseph* and his Brethren. It is said that *Joseph*, not willing to make himself known to them spake to them by an Interpreter. If the Tongue which they spake had been peculiar to their Family, (and that it must be if it was not the Language of the *Canaanites*, for I have proved that it was not the Language of *Abraham's* Ancestors) where could *Joseph* have found an Interpreter in *Egypt* that understood it? It was therefore the Language of *Canaan* where they then dwelt, and so an Interpreter might easily be found.

A fifth Proof is taken from the Conformity there is between the *Punick* or *Carthaginian* Tongue and the *Hebrew*, for it is agreed on all Hands that the *Carthaginians* were a Colony of the *Phenicians* or *Canaanites*. And *Procopius* in his *History* of the *Vandals* says, there were two Pillars anciently to be seen in
those

those Parts with this Inscription, in the *Phenician* or *Hebrew* Language, *We are they that fled from the Face of Joshua the Son of Nazz the Robber.* So that if Credit is to be given to this *Inscription*, the *Carthaginians*, and those who settled on the Coast of *Africk* bordering on the *Mediterranean*, were originally those Nations of the *Canaanites* which *Joshuah* drove out of that Countrey when he gave the Possession of it to the Children of *Israel*. But however that be, and whether the *Canaanites* settled there at that Time or some other Time before or after, it is certain those Coasts of *Africk* were a Colony of the *Phenicians* or *Canaanites*, their very Names *Pæbni* shew them to have been so, and all Authors that have spoken of their Original have asserted it; and I know not that it was ever questioned. Now *St. Augustine* and *St. Jerom* both assure us that the *Punick* Language was very near the same with the *Hebrew*. *St. Jerom* says, ¹ *They are called Pozni corruptly instead of Phozni, whose Language for the most part is nearly allied to the Hebrew.* And *St. Jerom* was the best skilled in the *Hebrew* Tongue of any Man in his Age or for some Ages before or after, having translated the whole Bible out of that Language. *St. Augustin*, who was an *African*, says, ^m *Him, the Hebrews call Messias, which Word agrees with the Punic Tongue, as do many other Hebrew*

¹ Lib. v. in Jerem. cap. 25. ^m Contra lib. Petil. c. 104.

Words, nay almost all of them. It may be said that it might be *near the Hebrew Tongue*, which is all that these Fathers assert, but this does not prove it the same. To which it may be answered, that these Fathers lived near a thousand Years after the *Babylonish Captivity*, at which Time the *Hebrew Tongue* ceased to be a living Language, and no Books remained written in that Language but the Scriptures of the Old Testament. What Wonder then if the *Punic Tongue* had received considerable Alterations in so long a Space of Time? Therefore as it was then nearly allied to the *Hebrew*, we have no Reason to question but it was originally the same. We have still a Fragment of the *Punic Language* remaining in *Plautus's Pænulus*, beginning *N'yth alonim valonuth*, &c. which are plain *Hebrew Words* signifying, *I worship the Gods and Goddeses*, &c. And the whole Fragment has been proved by those who were well skilled in that Tongue to be no other than *Hebrew*. From whence it is evident that *Hebrew* was originally the Language of the *Canaanites*, consequently that *Abraham* and his Posterity learned it there: For they spoke another Language whilst they lived in *Ur* of the *Chaldees*, as is evident from what has been observed before from the different Languages of *Laban* and *Jacob*.

However there still remains one Objection to be cleared, and that is, *If Hebrew was not the original Language of the World, and preserved*

preserved in the Family of Heber, whence did it derive its Name? Surely the Language of Heber, and not the Language of the Canaanites, should be called the Hebrew Tongue. But to this it may be answered, that it was not called the *Hebrew Tongue* for some Ages after the Children of *Israel* were in full Possession of the Land of *Canaan*; and I do not remember that it is called so once in the whole Old Testament, though it be there (as has been observed) expressly called the *Language of Canaan*ⁿ. Therefore being not called the *Hebrew Tongue* till so many Ages after it became the Language of the Posterity of *Abraham*, who were called *Hebrews* from him, it might very well derive that Name from thence, though it was originally the Language of the *Canaanites*. Nay, that Language which is called the *Hebrew* in the New Testament was not the Language we are now treating of, but the Language which the *Jews* spake at that Time, a mix'd Language compounded of this and several others: So that I know not whether the Language in which the Old Testament was written was ever called the *Hebrew Tongue*, till since the New Testament was also written, that is, many Ages after it had ceased to be a living Language.

It may perhaps be farther urged, that admitting this to be so, yet how came the Children of *Israel* to be call'd *Hebrews*, from *Heber*, rather

ⁿ *Isai* xix. 18.

than any other of that Patriarch's Descendants, unless it was that they preserved the Religion and Language of their Ancestor more pure and uncorrupt than the others did? But I answer, that I have already sufficiently proved that the *Israelites* received neither their Religion nor Language from so remote an Ancestor as *Heber*; that *Terah* the Father of *Abraham* was an Idolater, and it is certain that the Covenant God made with *Israel*, whereby he chose them to be his People, can be carried no higher than to *Abraham*, and from him, not *Heber*, they also derived the name of *Hebrews*. For *Habar*, from whence *Heber* and *Hebrew* are derived, signifies to *pass over* or to *come from another Place*, or *go to another Place*, and the Substantive deriv'd from it signifies *those which live beyond some great River or some Sea which must be pass'd over before they can come to us*, as we would say here *a Man from beyond Sea*, that is a *Stranger or Sojourner* come to sojourn among us from beyond Sea. And in this Sense it was that *Abraham*^o was called the *Hebrew*, which the *Septuagint* has therefore rendred τῷ πρῶτῳ the *Stranger or Sojourner*. And as he and his Seed were *Strangers* in a Land not their own by the Space of four hundred Years, the Name of *Hebrews* or *Strangers* was affixed and became appropriated to them: And they continued it after they were fully fixed and settled in the Land of *Canaan*,

^o Gen. xiv. 13. xv. 13.

that they might always remember that they were originally Strangers both there and in the Land of *P Egypt*: God himself having given it as a Reason why he required them to be kind to *Strangers*, because they had been long *Strangers* themselves. And what so proper to put them in Mind of their having been *Strangers* for so long Time, as their continuing to themselves the Name of *Hebrews* or *Strangers*? Hence then it was that *Abraham* and his Posterity by *Isaac* and *Jacob* were called *Hebrews*, and not from *Heber*. For no Reason can be given why *Abraham* should have the Name *Hebrew* from *Heber*, who was, though an Ancestor, yet a very remote one from him, and that none of *Heber's* nearer Descendants should ever be called so. But we have seen that there is very good Reason why he and his Posterity should be called *Hebrews*, as they were *Strangers* that came into *Canaan* from *beyond the Euphrates*.

Those who object that *Sem* is called *the Father of all the Children of Heber*^r, as if the Word *Heber* were in this Place the Name of that Patriarch, beg the Thing in Question. For the Word *Heber* in this Place signifies *from beyond*, and the Sense is *the Children or Inhabitants beyond*, or *beyond the Euphrates*. For *Moses* might well think it proper to acquaint us that the Nations beyond the *Euphrates* were the Posterity of *Sem*, but he

^p Exod. xxii. 21.

^q Levit. xix. 33.

^r Gen. x. 21.

could have no Inducement to tell us that he was the Father, or Ancestor of the Children of his great Grand-son. To that which some others object, *that if the Name Hebrew derive its Origin as is here maintained, it had been no more proper to the Posterity of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, than to those of Lot, Ishmael and Esau; for Ishmael and Esau were the Son and Grand-son of Abraham, and Lot was a Stranger in Canaan, as well as he, and came from the same Place with him:* It may be answered, that those will lye under the same Difficulty from this Objection, who derive the Name *Hebrew* from the Patriarch *Heber*; for *Lot, Ishmael and Esau* were his Descendants, as well as the *Israelites*. However, we need not fence against this Argument by retorting it. For there is very good Reason why this Name should be fixed to the *Israelites* and not to the other, because the Children of *Israel* continued to be Strangers and Sojourners four hundred Years together; and also continued distinct in their Religion and Customs from all other Nations; whereas the Posterity of *Lot, Ishmael and Esau* were in a little Time settled in the Countries of *Moab, Ammon, Arabia and Edom*, and abandoned the Religion of their Fathers, and embraced that of other Nations, that is *Paganism or Polytheism*. But the Children of *Israel* always dwelt alone †, that

† Num. xxiii. 9.

is, in such a Manner as to be ever distinguished from other People, *and were not reckoned among the Nations.* And thus it was that the Name which was first common and appellative, did by Custom become proper to the Children of *Israel.*

These Reasons I think are sufficient to prove that there is no solid Foundation for that Opinion, which maintains that the *Hebrew* is the primitive Language which *Adam* himself spake, which was transmitted by him to all the *Antediluvian* Patriarchs, then was preserved by *Noah* and his Sons, transmitted by *Sem*, *Arphaxad* and *Salah* to *Heber*, and preserved in his Family after the Confusion at *Babel.* But as there is no Ground to think that *Heber's* Family was exempted from the Punishment inflicted on the Builders of *Babel*, and it is certain that neither the true Religion, nor the Language which we call the *Hebrew* was preserved in his Family unto *Abraham's* Time; (for his Posterity, and particularly *Terah*, the Father of *Abraham* served other Gods, and spake the *Chaldee* Language) also that what we call the *Hebrew-Tongue* was the Language of *Canaan*; and there is no Reason to think that *Canaan* should be so particularly favoured as to have the primitive Tongue continued to his Posterity, when it was confounded in all other Families or Nations: We may very safely conclude, that *Hebrew* was not the original

Tongue spoken by *Noah* and the *Antediluvian* Patriarchs. It is Honour enough for it, that after it became the vulgar Language of *Abraham* and his Posterity, God vouchsafed to reveal his Laws in that Tongue, and that the most ancient and many of the most sacred Books are penned in it, even all the Books of the Old Testament.

And if the *Hebrew* Language be not the primitive Tongue spoken by *Adam* and the *Antediluvian* Patriarchs, there is no other can lay any just Claim to it: Nor do I think it worth my While to confute what some have said in Favour of the *High Dutch*, and others of the *Celtick*, but shall conclude that it was entirely lost at *Babel*, or at least that no one can tell where it was preserved, which is much to the same Effect.

F I N I S.



6X113-210

University of California
SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
405 Hilgard Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90024-1388
Return this material to the library
from which it was borrowed.

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



A 000 286 568 1

Univ
So
I