OF MANUSCRIPTS AND MEN: THE EDITORIAL HISTORY OF ISAAC NEWTON'S CHRONOLOGY AND OBSERVATIONS

by

CORNELIS J. SCHILT*

Linacre College, University of Oxford, St Cross Rd, Oxford OX1 3JA, UK

This article introduces the editorial history of the most important of Isaac Newton's posthumously published scholarly writings, a history so far unwritten. Often attributed solely to Newton's executor, John Conduitt, the *Chronology of Ancient Kingdoms Amended* (1728) was in fact co-edited with Martin Folkes, the antiquarian, who would eventually follow in Newton's footsteps and become President of the Royal Society. Likewise, the *Observations upon the Prophecies of Daniel and the Apocalypse of St John* (1733) was edited by at least half a dozen of Newton's closest friends and colleagues. During the eighteenth and nineteenth century, but in particular during the twentieth, these publications were treated as solely Newton's, and analysed as such by both contemporaries and modern historians. However, as this paper shows, the *Chronology* and in particular the *Observations* were as much the product of their editors as of their author, and should be considered as such. Reconstructing the editorial history of Newton's posthumous publications reveals a fascinating tale of how his friends, relatives, and colleagues tried to piece together meaning from the thousands of manuscripts with which they were confronted, a challenge that continues to this day.

Keywords: Isaac Newton; chronology; theology; John Conduitt; Martin Folkes; editing

THE *CHRONOLOGY*, AMENDED

In early 1727, scholars in Britain and abroad were eagerly awaiting the full text of Isaac Newton's chronological studies.[1] Many of them had first learned of the great man's interest in ancient history in the fall of 1725, when the *Abregé de la Chronologie* was published. An illegal French translation of an abstract of his studies Newton had written for Princess Caroline in 1717, the *Abregé* contained a myriad of historical dates that differed significantly from established scholarly consensus. Most notably, Newton placed events such as the Argonautic Expedition and the Fall of Troy nearly three hundred years later than luminaries like Dionysius Petavius, thus significantly contracting Greek history and by association that of the other

* cornelis.schilt@history.ox.ac.uk

Mediterranean civilizations.[2] Since Newton had only provided a short introduction to the work, the French scholar Nicholas Fréret found it quite hard to fathom how Newton had arrived at such remarkable dates. In his commentary appended to the translation he chastised the author for what he perceived as sloppy scholarship based upon unwarranted inferences and selective reading of key historical passages. Newton in turn was not amused by the illegal publication and the criticism he received from Fréret, and rebuked the latter's analysis in a letter published in the *Philosophical Transactions*: '[T]he observator hath mistaken my meaning... and hath undertaken to translate and to confute a paper which he did not understand, and been zealous to print it without my consent; tho he thought it good for nothing, but to get himself a little credit, by translating it to be confuted, and confuting his own translation.'[3] Newton also insisted that, contrary to the idea given by Fréret, he was not working towards the publication of his chronological studies. Indeed, it might have been the appearance of the *Abregé* that spurred the nearly eighty-three year old to prepare his work for the press, rewriting much of it in the process.

Thus when Newton passed away in March 1727, his heirs anxiously desired for his work to be published, primarily for financial motives. John Conduitt, and his wife Catherine, nee Barton, Newton's half-niece, were probably the exception to this venality. They had taken care of Newton in his dotage, with Conduitt succeeding him as Master of the Mint upon his death. Conduitt showed a genuine interest in both Newton, the man, and Newton, the scholar, as is evident from the many drafts for a biography and from the way he annotated the manuscripts. As his executor, Conduitt had unparalleled access to the millions of words Newton had left, and spent much time trying to understand how he meant his writings to be understood and published.[4] Enlisting the help of Martin Folkes, whom Newton had appointed one of the Vice-Presidents of the Royal Society in 1723, Conduitt must have begun the task of preparing Newton's chronological studies for print fairly soon after the latter's death.[5] All in all, it took less than ten months for the *Chronology of Ancient Kingdoms Amended* to appear, in January 1728, no mean feat considering the tens of thousands of folios Newton left as draft materials. However, it seems reasonable to assume that Folkes and Conduitt knew what to look for, as Newton had been working on the manuscript until shortly before his death. There were in fact only two sets of manuscripts that presented themselves as candidates, with one in what appeared to be an advanced state of completion and clearly postdating the other.[6] It was also the one manuscript Thomas Pellet, FRS, who was brought in by the family to inspect Newton's papers, decided was worthy of publication, with a handful of other papers to be considered later.[7] Its ninety-two folios contained a neat text, with only minor deletions and interlinear additions, and just a handful of more substantial additions on the versos. Moreover, although Newton had not provided a chapter overview with this particular version, the first three chapter

headings, ‘Chap. I. Of the Chronology of the first ages of the Greeks’, ‘Chap. II. Of the Empire of Egypt’, and ‘Chap. III. Of the Assyrian Empire’ – all written very neatly – mimicked those of the older manuscript, with the fourth chapter, ‘Of the contemporary Empires of the Babylonians & Medes’ a contraction of what were originally two separate chapters. Chapter five, providing a description of the Temple of Solomon and the Temple as seen in the visions of Ezekiel, was apparently added by Newton at a late stage, although the editors must have discovered that the Temple materials were already present in the second manuscript as part of the chapter on the Babylonians. Finally, since it was clear that Newton had begun rewriting the materials on the Persian Empire – in the second manuscript still connected with the Medes – the editors completed the work by choosing one of the many draft chapters on Persia found among the other manuscripts.[8] They did feel the need to include a few lines about their policy by adding a short Advertisement to the *Chronology*, explaining that ‘[t]he Sixth Chapter was not copied out with the other Five, which makes it doubtful whether [Newton] intended to print it: but being found among his Papers, and evidently appearing to be a Continuation of the same Work, and (as such) abridg'd in the Short Chronicle; it was thought proper to be added.’[9]

As an introduction, Folkes and Conduitt added a version of the *Short Chronicle*, the abstract Newton composed for Princess Caroline*.* Some chapters of the main work needed polishing up, where Newton had replaced pages with variant versions taken from other manuscripts, or was still in the process of editing. They added several references where they felt the author had left these out, deleted others, and inserted or expanded Greek quotations where Newton had only provided a few lines.[10] Perhaps they considered that Newton had been too sparse with his references, or they realised he had not had time to complete them, as was indeed the case. In the chapter on the Temple, Folkes made emendations where he thought the main text was unclear, or, in his view, plainly wrong. In a description of the dwellings of the priests, Newton wrote that these had ‘cloysters on the outside [a]nd the pavement & buildings upon it were encompassed on the outside with a marble rail…’[11] Folkes underlined most of this passage and added his corrections in the margin, changing the line to ‘cloysters *under them*: and the pavement *was faced on the inside* with a marble rail…’[12] In a further emendation, Folkes replaced ‘peoples’ with ‘Altar’, resulting in a reference to a non-existing ‘Altar Court’. One must assume Folkes meant to replace ‘peoples *court*’ with ‘Altar’, as Newton did himself a few pages later, but this was lost on the person overseeing the actual printing.[13] Since Newton left blank spaces for references to the various parts of the accompanying drawings of the Temple, the editors replaced his sketches with neat plates and subsequently filled in several of the blanks with the coordinates from the original drawings, which they then copied onto the new set; but in particular towards the end of the chapter they simply ignored Newton’s intended references.[14]

THE MANY EDITORS OF THE *OBSERVATIONS*

Soon after the publication of the *Chronology*, Conduitt and Folkes turned their attention to an even more daunting task: Newton's studies of the prophecies in Scripture. Here, they were confronted with a manuscript corpus that easily dwarfed the chronology-related materials. Moreover, this time they did not have the benefit of a late publication attempt by the author, although it seems he was indeed in the process of rewriting his studies of Daniel and the Apocalypse when he passed away. As it stood, they had to make sense of a myriad of draft chapters and sections, each representing a particular stage in the development of Newton's ideas. Newton's theological studies have received ample attention over the past decades, in particular through the works of Rob Iliffe. Long seen as the product of his dotage – not in the least thanks to the 'enlightened' campaigns of eighteenth century French scholars like Jean-Baptiste Biot – Iliffe and others have shown how from the 1670s onward, Newton immersed himself in Church history and in the deciphering of the prophetical language of the books of Daniel and Revelation, and their interpretation for past, present, and future.[15] One key motivation for Newton's interest in the history of the Church was his slowly emerging antitrinitarianism. Although the exact causal relationship is unclear, Newton was particularly obsessed with the establishment of the dogma of the Trinity during the fourth century and its doubtful historiographical credentials.[16] He devoted thousands of folios to show how the shrewd Athanasius (c. 296-373), later Bishop of Alexandria, had been instrumental in introducing what Newton considered the epitome of all idolatry, the worship of Jesus Christ as God the Son, using all sorts of dubious means.[17] Moreover, in a series of letters to John Locke, to which I return below, he attempted to prove how two pivotal Biblical texts, used in contemporary discussions about the Trinity, had been amended sometime after the fourth century, since they were conspicuously absent from the debates held at the Councils of Nicaea (325) and Constantinople (360).

The *Observations upon the Prophecies of Daniel and the Apocalypse of St John*, published in February 1733, contained chapters taken from all over Newton's studies of the prophecies and the history of the Church.[18] Following a general introduction 'concerning the compilers of the Old Testament', the first part of the volume dealt with the prophecies and visions from the book of Daniel. This included chapters on the statue that appeared in the dream of Nebuchadnezzar and the related vision of the four animals, on the ten horns, and on the little horn – traditionally identified with four major monarchies, ten successor states, and Antichrist – but also on more obscure details such as the honouring of 'mahuzzims', or, in Newton's words, 'the worship of the Images & souls of dead men'.[19] The second part included three chapters that dealt with the prophecies in Revelation, and how they related to the writings of the Old Testament. Clearly, not all of these textual elements had originally been intended by

Newton as chapters, with many bearing the word 'Section' in their draft title, subsequently elevated by the editors. That these editors did not just include Folkes and Conduitt, but several other prominent members of Newton's inner circle, becomes clear when we inspect the various notes dispersed throughout the corpus.

Benjamin Smith, the son of Newton's half-brother also named Benjamin, is widely considered to have been responsible for the publication of Newton's *Observations upon the Prophecies*.[20] 'A hellion who brooked no restrictions', as Richard Westfall described him, he appeared a particularly troublesome character who eventually became a clergyman, possibly ordained by William Stukeley.[21] How and in what capacity he was actually involved with the *Observation*s is unclear; since his name appears under the dedication to the Lord Chancellor, Peter King, Baron of Ockham and a cousin of John Locke, historians have assumed he must have contributed in one way or another. However, from the story that can be pieced together from notes dispersed all over the manuscript corpus, his involvement seems to have been minimal. Indeed, as one contemporary source recounted, he left England shortly after Newton's death, to return in 1732, by which time the copytext for the volume had been prepared. Somehow the manuscript came into Smith's possession, which he subsequently presented to King in the hope of a significant reward. Instead, King offered him a mediety of the Rectory of Linton in Yorkshire of £100 per annum, which he grudgingly accepted; much less than the £500 he had banked on. For the rest of his life, he complained about what he perceived as gross injustice.[22] Yet from the surviving manuscripts and proofs, it appears he had no reason to complain, as his contribution to the volume seems to have been marginal at best.

Instead, among the prophecy-related drafts there are two series of folios with notes and suggestions relating to the publication of the work, containing five different hands – none of which seem to be Smith's. The first hand is that of Martin Folkes; see the memo in **Figure 1**. Here, Folkes proposed the two-part scheme that was eventually adopted, and also suggested as a general title 'Discourses or Observations on the Prophecys of Daniel & the Apocalypse of St John.' He subsequently introduced a chapter schedule, which, with the inclusion of one additional chapter, 'Of the Times of the Birth and Passion of Christ', which the editors had checked by a Mr Darby – presumably John Darby, one of the London printers – 'to see whether any of these… be proper to be printed', became the framework for the *Observations*.[23]

Included with the drafts as they appear today are '3 Proposals of y^{e} Order of Printing', detailing several setups with either one or two books, and appendices; see **Figure 2**.[24] One of these, 'Titles in y^{e} 3^{d} proposal', is the one suggested by Folkes, including his remark that 'in the second copy [the most considerable thing I see are] the first 20 lines of page 33. which gives a sort of general notice of what follows and which I would therefore insert instead of the 3 first

of page 67. of the old after which the old is the fullest.'[25] The other two content proposals, drafted alongside the one copied from Folkes, contained similar compilations of chapters – or parts thereof – taken from either the 'old' or the 'new' version. Clearly, the editors found two versions for a work on the prophecies among Newton's papers, an older and a newer copy, and decided to select from both.[26] On the opposing page, two tables listed the 'Titles in y^{e} old' and 'Titles in y^{e} New', including the appropriate page numbers, which the author of these lines copied from the manuscripts he had received; see **Figure 3**.[27]

On the other side of the page that contains the three proposals, a list was drawn up with several emendations to sections from both the old and new copy, accompanied by a name in an unknown hand. That name reads 'E. Macclesfield' and refers to Thomas Parker (1666–1732), first Earl of Macclesfield, FRS, and former Lord Chancellor, who had been one of Newton's pallbearers, and had received both copies on 4 May 1729.[28] Indeed, as the librarian, Edward Edwards, had found out in 1864, 'One of the latest of [Thomas Parker's] personal labours was the collation of Sir Isaac Newton's Observations on Daniel and the Apocalypse, from two distinct and very different MSS., but the task remained incomplete…'[29] From the overview Macclesfield provided, it is possible to reconstruct the old and new version Apparently, the old version, headed by the general title 'An Acc.^{t} of the Empires of y^{e} Babylonians, Medes Persians Greeks & Romans according to y^{e} descriptions given of them by Daniel', consisted of eight sections with a detailed explanation of the prophetical elements in Daniel, followed by two further sections connecting these prophecies with those in the book of Revelation, for a total of eighty-six pages.[30] In the new version, these sections had become chapters, eleven in total, of at least thirty-nine pages, but no longer bearing the original title. Lest we assume Newton condensed his earlier draft, he had in fact turned from half to full folios; thus the chapters in the new were of approximately the same length as those in the old.

However, there was one important difference between both versions, slightly obscured by Macclesfield's rendition of the old. In the original, the general title was preceded by 'Chap. VII'.[31] Clearly, the old version was meant to follow on from six previous chapters – and John Conduitt had more than a hunch of what those six chapters contained. From his 'Remarks upon the Prophecies', covering nine small pages, it is clear he did not inspect just the two versions marked as 'old' and 'new', but also various other manuscripts.[32] Folkes and Macclesfield might not have had access to these – they were probably only shown the old and new versions, although Folkes would later inspect other papers – but Conduitt certainly had, as Newton's executor. Moreover, he might have discussed their content and coherence with their author. Near the end of the older *Chronology* manuscript, he found a deleted paragraph in which Newton expressed his intention to continue with a short account of the chronology of the Persians, Greeks and Latins as found in the book of Daniel, who wrote 'with more

understanding then any profane writer ever did.' Underneath this deleted section, Conduitt wrote that '[t]his is a proof that he intended his prophecies as a sequel to the Chronology.'[33] With the deleted section at the end of Chapter VI, it is clear that what the editors of the *Observations* identified as the old version was in fact Newton's original continuation from the *Chronology*, Chapter VII, before he recast his writings on the prophecies in Daniel as a separate volume.

Apart from his detailed analysis of the various papers, there are also notes that show that Conduitt discussed the manuscripts with at least two other persons. In one of his characteristic memoranda, he wrote that 'Sect. X. in the new copy entituled of the Apocalypse of John seems to be an abridgement of sect. 9. in the old copy... Dr Clarke is for printing, both one after another – the new first & then the old'; see **Figure 4**.[34] Dr Clarke, whose name returns in another memorandum, must refer to Samuel Clarke, Newton's staunch defender in the debate with Leibniz on the *Sensorium Dei* and on many other topics, and his parish priest during his later years.[35] Benjamin Smith later recalled that 'of all his intimate friends… he (Sir Isaac) had the greatest regard for Dr. Clarke.'[36] That Clarke received and read both versions is clear from a slip of paper, oddly misplaced among Newton's mathematical papers, which contains his suggestions on which parts to include: 'From p. 1 to pag. 24 new [26 old] print the New. Then interpose Sect. IV of the old…'; see **Figure 5**. From the final lines, one might infer that Clarke had a rather intimate understanding of Newton's writings during the last weeks of his life, or ventured an educated guess: '...go on with the old, pag 75 to the End. For the New is perfect no further; the Author then dying.'[37] In his notes Conduitt copied Clarke's suggestions verbatim, and Parker likewise included Clarke's proposal alongside Folkes' chapter structure.[38] The slip itself appears to be half of a letter dated 7 March 1727/8 relating to the workhouse in the parish of St James, Westminster. Since Clarke passed away in May 1729, plans for publishing the *Observations* were evidently well underway by then. Indeed, William Whiston, who was not directly involved with the publication, remarked that the work was initially meant to appear in 1730; but for reasons unknown it took another three years before it came out.[39] This would explain why William Kent, in his design for Newton's monument erected in Westminster Abbey in 1731, included not three, but four books, the fourth one simply titled 'Divinity', either because the title had not yet been decided upon, or because that information had not been made privy.

There are two more autographs amongst the editorial notes for the *Observations*. Underneath a deleted chapter heading, in Newton's hand, there is a list of abbreviated chapter titles – 'Ram & Hegoat... Ten Horns… Scripture of Truth...'[40] Some of these entries are followed by 'printed', sometimes with a page number. One chapter, 'Empire of the Latines', appears twice, the second time followed by 'much varies from w^{t} is printed & is as long again.' The list

represents a series of sections or chapters inspected after the proofs for the *Observations* were printed, as the page numbers match. Here then we might have Benjamin Smith, involved with the final stages of the publication and going through the related draft materials, but since his autograph is unknown there is no way to verify this.[41] The final hand among these editorial notes refers to 'The introduction, Of the Church', which, according to the author, 'was manifestly intended to be a preface to the Discourses in Daniel and should therefore be placed before them.'[42] Following some further notes, the short contribution ends with 'B^{p} Sherlock', that is Thomas Sherlock (1678–1761) who became Bishop of Bangor on 4 February, 1727/8, having previously been Master of St Catharine's College, Cambridge (1714–19) as well as Dean of Chichester (from 1715).[43] Sherlock's advice on the introduction, presumably included with one of the versions, was indeed accepted, though the title changed to 'Introduction concerning the Compilers of the books of the Old Testament', made up by Folkes.[44]

CONSTRUCTING THE OBSERVATIONS

That Conduitt and Folkes should be considered as main editors is evident. Folkes' hand is all over the manuscript that served as the basis for the printed text, including an inserted sheet with several paragraphs for part 1, chapter 10, 'Of the Prophecy of the seventy Weeks', collated from the old and new copy and from various other manuscripts.[45] The massive manuscript known as 'Of the Church' – which starts with a variant version of the introduction to the *Observations*, suggested by Sherlock – has annotations by Pellet, Folkes, and at least one other editor, and seems to have been first consulted when the proofs for the *Observations* had been printed already. At the beginning of a section related to the Roman Empire and the establishment of the papacy, Folkes wrote down: '22 Pages... Printed from y^{e} Hand in p. 5 to y^{e} hand in p.15 & makes up the chapter 8 in the Prophecies of Daniel, but should be reprinted'. And indeed, preceded by some draft materials, what follows are twenty-three numbered folios, with a little hand added in the margins of pages 5 and 15 corresponding with the materials in Chapter VIII of the first part of the *Observations*.[46] However, there are many differences between this text and the printed version; also, the version from 'Of the Church' is almost ten pages longer. Meanwhile, Conduitt must have been involved in the identification and management of the various manuscripts, including the old and new versions, making these available to Smith, Folkes, Macclesfield, Clarke, Sherlock, Pellet, and others.

It is clear Folkes and Conduitt went to great lengths to revise the text, first editing the manuscripts and subsequently a series of proofs, both with an eye on improving its readability and checking the text for factual inaccuracies.[47] For example, Conduitt marked a passage from a long Latin quotation – an edict from the Emperor Valentinian III – underneath which he wrote to Folkes: 'I know not what to do with this place it evidently seems to me to be nonsense

as it is but not having the book I know not how to correct it, If I was in town I would get it collated with the book, which most probably is in Sion Colledg Library. I think you should send here and get the Library keeper to collate the passage. I suspect in transcribing S^{r} Is. has dropt a line, however I can make nothing of it.'[48] And indeed, Newton *had* dropped a line whilst copying from his earlier drafts, which do contain the missing passage. Apparently, Conduitt managed to get hold of the volume, presumably the 1571 Stephanus edition of *Imperatorum Theodosii, Valentiniani, Maioriani, Anthemii Novellae constitutiones XLII…*, and discussed the topic with Folkes, the latter replying in the margin of the same page, 'Pray, let the words you mentioned to me be put in their proper place.'

Sending the proofs to Conduitt and Folkes – almost always in that order – the printer too had the occasional query. Noting Newton's sometimes idiosyncratic rendering of Biblical texts, he wrote to Folkes, 'Sir, The texts cited vary pretty much from the common Translation; must we set them according to the printed Bibles, or Stick close to the Copy? Please to let us have this Sheet again as soon as you can', to which Folkes replied, 'I think the texts of scripture should be agreable to the english bible, when there is no particular reason to the contrary; but sometimes there is as in the last quotation of this sheet where he understands some passages different from the common translation.'[49] The passage Folkes referred to was taken from Daniel 11, which contains a prophecy involving a 'king of the north' and a 'king of the south', considered by Newton and contemporaries like Henry More to refer to Seleucus and Ptolemy, two of Alexander's generals, and their successors.[50] In the passage, the daughter of the king of the south visits the king of the north to broker an agreement between the two reigns; to no avail, because, as the text reads in the KJV, 'she shall not retain the power of the arm; neither shall he stand, nor his arm: but she shall be given up, and they that brought her, *and he that begat her*, and he that strengthened her in [these] times.'[51] Newton's version of the text instead read 'he [Callinicus] that brought her, *&* ***he whom she brought forth***, *&* ***they*** that strengthned her in [those] times, [or defended her in the siege of Daphne]'.[52] As the printed text shows, here the editors respected Newton's rendering; obviously, the meaning of the text had changed – father became son – but this had no direct consequences as neither father nor son played a role in what followed. However, they did replace how Newton had begun the passage, 'And after certain years…' with the KJV's rendition, 'And in the end of years…' thus changing the temporal location of the prophecy. Although Newton never clung to a solely preterist explanation of the prophecies, insisting that the prophecies in Daniel had all been fulfilled during the centuries after the Exile, as for example Hugo Grotius did, it is clear that he considered several of the prophecies in the book of Daniel and the book of Revelation to refer to both historical and futural events: 'For all Daniel's prophecies reach to y^{e} end of the world.'[53]

Thus, the existence of a historical king of the north was important for Newton's understanding of the Apocalypse.

In the proofs, mention is also made of a Mr. John Richardson who received at least some of the sheets, sent to him by an unknown Mr. E.[54] It seems likely that this is the John Richardson who was apprenticed to John Darby from 1726 to 1733. He is possibly the same John Richardson who would later become a partner of William Innys, heir to John Innys, who had also been involved with the second edition of *Opticks* (1713) and the third edition of the *Principia* (1726), and was responsible for the printing of the *Philosophical Transactions* of the Royal Society at the time.[55]

What Martin Folkes and John Conduitt, assuming their role as main editors, did *not* do, was pay respect to the section and chapter structure Newton had created. 'Of y^{e} Prophetick language' was labelled by Newton 'Sect. 1' in the old version, and 'Chap. 1' in the new.[56] Yet Folkes chose to add a chapter before that, the aforementioned 'Introduction concerning the Compilers of the Old Testament', following Thomas Sherlock's advice, and hence renumbered the subsequent chapters.[57] Such a renumbering was perhaps rather innocent, yet other chapters were more rigorously reordered. Newton never went beyond a chapter XI or section VIII in the materials selected by the editors; yet the first part of the *Observations* included no less than fourteen chapters.[58] Chapters XII to XIV were originally labelled by Newton Sections VI-VIII as part of a single chapter, with VII and VIII versions of the same section which he renumbered. The printed Chapter X, 'Of the Prophecy of the seventy Weeks', was a complete fabrication by Folkes. Taking as its basis the first pages of a work titled by Newton 'The History of the four monarchies compared with Sacred Prophecy', of which the first Chapter read 'The History of the Persian Monarchy compared wth Daniel's weeks', Folkes simply deleted both titles, adding paragraphs taken from other manuscripts. He even deleted a passage where Newton, having discussed the application of the period of seven weeks mentioned in Daniel 9:25 to the time of Christ's second coming, wrote that '[t]his clause… I had rather leave to be explained by time then venture upon a rash interpretation of what I do not yet understand.'[59] Likewise, Chapter XI, 'Of the Times of the Birth and Passion of Christ', was an artificial construct devised by Folkes and at least one other editor. Never described as such by Newton, Folkes created the title from the first lines of an intended Section I. He subsequently decided to ignore much of Newton's own editing, including a page-long addition on one of the versos, instead following the advice of an anonymous editor who wrote underneath it, 'I imagine all this page is to be out.'[60] Finally, the choice to end the first part of the *Observations* with the two chapters on *mahuzzims* seems rather arbitrary.[61] From drafts found in other manuscripts, it appears Newton instead intended to continue his narrative with a chapter on 'the host of heaven', thus suggesting another connection with his writings on the history of the Church.[62]

The second part of the *Observations*, titled 'Observations upon the Apocalypse of St John', contained only three chapters: an introduction by Newton to a much larger work on the Book of Revelation – which Folkes renamed 'Introduction concerning the time when the Apocalypse was writ' – and two sections relating John's prophecies to the Law, the Temple, and the words of Daniel.[63] For some reason, the editors decided to also include a variant version of the final pages of the last chapter, without further explanation. Whereas the first part of the *Observations* consisted of a very detailed analysis of the visions and prophecies in Daniel, the second part contained only a fraction of what Newton had written about the Apocalypse, thus barely meriting the second half of its title. It does seem that the editors at some point did consider the printing of a much more elaborate treatise on the topic, including the history of the Church. A folio that once acted as a file for the old and new versions which Macclesfield received reads 'A copy of y^{e} Revelations of John almost if not quite compleat to be considered before y^{e} prophycyes are printed'… Pages 135 besides 10 Pages in lose sheets', most likely referring to what is now Keynes Ms. 5.[64] Although this particular hand cannot be identified, there are ample notes in Conduitt's hand analysing and discussing the materials now contained in the Bodmer manuscript.[65]

For all their efforts, it is clear that the *Observations upon the Prophecies of Daniel and the Apocalypse of St John* was a work not just edited, but *constructed* by Folkes, Conduitt, and their collaborators. They interpreted two sets of manuscripts as two versions of a single work that dealt with the prophecies, to which they added the preface from yet another work and several sections taken from other manuscripts. Indeed, most of the text was Newton's, but the order and context in which the materials were presented, differed significantly from how Newton had set up his materials. It is slightly mysterious why the editors chose to compile a copy text in the first place. There were other texts available that passed through their hands, which were in a much more complete stage of writing, such as Keynes Ms. 5 mentioned above. In the first of nine chapters found there, Newton introduced a framework for the interpretation of Scriptural prophecy, which he subsequently applied to the visions described in the book of Revelation. Indeed, the treatise could have been expanded and updated, replacing older drafts with more recent versions, but at least the editors would have had Newton's division for guidance, instead of mixing up sections and chapters as they did.

Oddly enough, whilst with the *Chronology of Ancient Kingdoms Amended* the editors felt compelled to add a few lines explaining how they selected the final chapter from among the materials present, apart from a single line about the inclusion of the variant version of the final pages of the last chapter, no such advertisement was included with the *Observations*, despite their major editorial interventions.[66] Initially, whilst selecting from the 'old' and 'new' copies, Conduitt clearly intended to provide some editorial remarks. Suggesting that two sections from

the old copy should be inserted in between chapters of the new, he added that '[n]otice may be taken by way of preface or by a marginal note' to inform the reader.[67] The absence of such a notice meant that any reader picking up their copy from one of the ten London booksellers that stocked the volume would have ample reason to believe that they had just purchased a work composed by Isaac Newton.

AFTERMATH

After the publication of the *Chronology* and the *Observations*, it seems Newton's heirs made some further attempts to publish his scholarly writings – notably his 'Of the Church', as mentioned earlier – but abandoned their enterprise. John Conduitt died in 1737, and his wife Catherine soon after. Yet Catherine did leave a codicil to her will, in which she charged Arthur Ashley Sykes, a friend of Samuel Clarke and religious controversialist, with the publication of all of Newton's theological papers, including 'one of the three that bear Record in Heaven', 'a peice called paradoxicall questions concerning Athanasius, another the history of the Creed or criticism on it, and a church history compleat, and many more Devinity tracts.'[68] It appears that the codicil was ignored by Catherine's daughter, Catherine – Kitty – who married John Wallop (from 1743 Viscount Lymington when his father had been made first Earl of Portsmouth). Only in the autumn of 1755 did Wallop hastily send several of the manuscripts to Sykes, making sure to draw up a list first in order to keep track of which materials were included.[69] The heirs' request to examine these papers was likely triggered by the recent unauthorized, anonymous, and incomplete publication of Newton's 'An Historical account of two Notable Corruptions of Scripture', the letters he sent to 'a friend', John Locke, in 1690, of which the manuscript referred to by Catherine as 'one of the three that bear Record in Heaven' contained several drafts.[70] Here, Newton discussed how two key passages in Scripture that dealt with the dogma of the Trinity, 1 John 5:7 and 1 Timothy 3:16, had originally read differently in the Greek and Latin versions of the text. Although he initially agreed to have the letter published, anonymously, he soon retracted his permission; but a copy of the letters remained with Jean Le Clerc, the Dutch Remonstrant theologian. Several years later, Newton again contemplated publication of the tract, but thought better of it once more and abandoned the enterprise.[71] When the work was finally published, in 1754, its existence had been a public secret for decades; still, it caused quite a stir, especially among Church of England theologians, who summarily dismissed Newton's arguments. Samuel Horsley, the later bishop of Rochester, dutifully included it in his comprehensive five-volume edition of Newton's works, but in his sparse annotations expressed nothing but disdain for Newton's scholarship.[72]

It is curious though that the papers allegedly in Sykes' possession when he died in 1756, and which subsequently became the New College papers, included none of those mentioned in

Catherine Conduitt's codicil, nor – with a single exception – those listed in November 1755 by the Portsmouths.[73] Apart from 'N^{o}.8 A book of Chronology &c.' it appears that all other manuscripts had been returned to them and eventually – after the 1936 Sotheby's auction – ended up in the Bodmer and Yahuda collections.[74] The New College papers, on the other hand, contain what are now four volumes with drafts related to the 'Originals', that is, the chronological project Newton was working on between 1702-06, and to the 'Short Chronicle', the *Chronology*, and 'Two Notable Corruptions', which matches the description given in a letter dated 27 March 1757 by the Rev. Jeffery Ekins, who obtained the papers after Sykes' death.[75] If the manuscripts listed in November 1755 were indeed sent to Sykes, they were also returned straight after his death, and never became part of the Ekins papers. How the other materials ended up with Sykes, and why they were not returned, is equally mysterious. In his letter, Ekins mentioned Catherine Conduitt's codicil, and how she had appointed Sykes to revise the manuscripts before publication. In the next line he wrote that 'some few of these [papers] were found in the hands of [her] executor after his decease, & are at present in my possession.' That executor would have been the Rev. Alexander Chalmers, whom Catherine had appointed as her sole executor – and guardian to her daughter – in 1739; it is possible that Sykes obtained the papers from Chalmers after the latter's death in 1745.[76] In his letter of March 1757, Ekins confessed that he had no idea what had happened to the Conduitt papers after Catherine's death in 1740. Unbeknownst to Ekins, by then a Dr Phil Barton had been able to get hold of Lord Portsmouth who informed him that 'all the papers he ha[d] w^{ch} relate to S^{r}. Isaac Newton' had lately been 'under the Perusal of a Gentleman who died before y^{t} Perusal was finished', but that they were now back at his seat in Hampshire.[77] That gentleman must have been Sykes, which suggests that at some point he might have had most if not all of the manuscripts originally in Conduitt's possession. What part of the manuscripts he actually consulted, remains unclear. Sykes never finished his task, although there is evidence that he perused the manuscripts for his own gain. His *An Enquiry when the Resurrection of the Body, or Flesh, was first inserted into the Public Creeds*, published posthumously in 1758, seems to have been more than just a little inspired by Newton's writings on the topic.[78]

CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, I have tried to trace the editorial history of Isaac Newton's posthumously published *Chronology of Ancient Kingdoms Amended* and *Observations upon the Prophecies of Daniel and the Apocalypse of St John*, and identify the many hands involved. From the notes left dispersed through the corpus, it has become clear that the editors struggled to make sense of what Newton had been up to, but also imposed their own ideas. Yet it would be too easy to chastise Conduitt, Folkes, and the various others involved for their editorial politics. In

particular with the religious materials, they were confronted with an overwhelming amount of papers, and seemingly earnestly sought to distil Newton's meaning and intention, painstakingly reading, amending, and correcting the text as they saw fit. Discussing one of the manuscripts at his disposal, Folkes wrote that 'it will surely give more satisfaction and better carry on the thread to have everything in its own place than broken to pieces'; ironically, this seems exactly what the editors did.[79] After the Sotheby's sale of 1936, Newton's scholarly writings ended up in archives all over the world, sometimes physically 'broken to pieces' to enhance their monetary value. Although their combined release on microfilm in 1991 was of great value for comparative study, it is only today that Newton's writings have been reunited once more. The online transcriptions of the *Newton Project* and the digital availability of major collections, such as the Keynes and Yahuda papers, allow unparalleled access to Newton's writings.[80]

At some moment between 1728 and 1754, another editor appears to have been considering some of Newton's writings for publication. Among the New College papers are five pages of editorial remarks related to a version of the 'Originals', in a hand that is not John Conduitt's, although traditionally attributed to him; nor does it appear to be Sykes'; see **Figure 6**.[81] After a detailed content description, the editor weighed the pros and cons of another publication. From studying the manuscript, it had become clear that much of the material had already been printed in the *Chronology*, '& perhaps more correctly'. Yet the very fact that these were writings of Isaac Newton meant that they 'must certainly contain something very valuable to the publick.' He was especially taken with the second chapter, because, as he wrote, 'this... may in itself be consider'd as a complete work: as it seems to comprise the history of Egypt from the remotest antiquity down to the final overthrow of that kingdom by the conquest of the Persians.' That he seriously entertained publishing the chapter may be gathered from his introduction, suggesting that it might be printed with 'the unpublished Paper of S^{r} Isaac relative to the Ep. of S. John', a reference to the 'Two Notable Corruptions of Scripture', which implies that he was writing before or in 1754.[82] Although his identity remains a mystery, the sentiment he expressed – that Newton's papers 'must certainly contain something very valuable to the publick' – held sway for Conduitt, Folkes, and other students of Newton's writings, back then, and today.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am very grateful to the librarians and staff of the Wren Library in Trinity College, Cambridge, the manuscript archives of King's College, Cambridge, the Bodleian Library and the Library of New College, Oxford, the Huntington Library in San Marino, CA, the National Archives in London, and the Hampshire Record Office in Winchester; the editors and transcribers of the

Newton Project; and to Cambridge University Library, the Warden and Fellows of New College, Oxford, and the National Library of Israel for their permission to include the various images. My profound thanks go to Rob Iliffe for his comments on an earlier version of this paper, and to two anonymous referees who provided many insightful suggestions.

---

[1] This paper touches only briefly on the contents of the *Chronology* and the *Observations* and does not deal with their reception history. For the *Chronology* and related writings, I refer the reader to J.Z. Buchwald and M. Feingold, *Newton and the Origin of Civilization* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2012), and to C.J. Schilt, 'Prophecy, History and Method: How and why Isaac Newton studied Chronology' (University of Oxford, 2018). For a highly detailed analysis of Newton's prophetical studies, the reader should consult R. Iliffe, *Priest of Nature: The Religious Lives of Isaac Newton* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2017). Other publications of Newton's scholarly writings during the eighteenth century include his 'Dissertation upon the Sacred Cubit of the Jews and the Cubits of the several Nations…' included by John Greaves in his *Miscellaneous Works*… Vol. 2 (London, 1737), pp. 405-433, and *Four Letters from Sir Isaac Newton to Doctor Bentley. Containing some Arguments in Proof of a deity* (London, 1756). Another publication, *Two Letters of Sir Isaac Newton to Mr. Le Clerc* (London, 1754) is discussed in this paper. For how Newton's religious writings were received, see S. Mandelbrote, 'Eighteenth-century reactions to Newton's anti-Trinitarianism,' in *Newton and Newtonianism. New studies* (ed. J.E. Force and S. Hutton), pp. 93-111 (Kluwer, Dordrecht, 2004); id., 'Newton and Eighteenth-century Christianity', in *The Cambridge Companion to Newton,* second edition (ed. R. Iliffe and G.E. Smith), pp. 554–85 (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2016); M. Feingold, 'Isaac Newton, Heretic? Some Eighteenth-century Perceptions', in *Reading Newton in Early Modern Europe* (ed. E. Boran and M. Feingold), pp. 328-45 (Brill, Leiden, 2017). Manuscript references are to Trinity College Library, Cambridge (TCL); Cambridge University Library, Cambridge (CUL), available via http://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/collections/newton/; the Yahuda collection in the National Library of Israel, Jerusalem (Yahuda), available via http://web.nli.org.il/sites/NLI/English/collections/Humanities/newton/Pages/list.aspx; the Keynes collection in King's College Library, Cambridge (Keynes); to New College Library, Oxford (NCL); the National Archives in London (NA); the Hampshire Record Office, Winchester (HRO); the Babson collection in the Huntington Library, San Marino, CA (Babson); the Bodmer Collection of the Fondation Martin Bodmer in Geneva (Bodmer); and to the Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, University of Texas, Austin (HRHRC). Transcriptions of most of the manuscripts referred to in this paper can be found on the site of the Newton Project, www.newtonproject.ox.ac.uk. Julian calendar dates (Old Style) between and including 1 January and 24 March are given with double years, as in 15 February 1727/8, with the year dated from 1 January.

[2] Newton's dates for these events were 937 and 904 BCE, respectively; Petavius had arrived at 1226 and 1184 BCE. G. Cavalier and N. Fréret, *Abregé de la Chronologie de M. le Chevalier Isaac Newton, Fait par lui-meme, & traduit sur le Manuscrit Anglois* (Paris, 1725); D. Petavius, *Rationarium Temporum* (Paris, 1633), pp. 36-40. Earlier in his chronological research, Newton had depended on Petavius; see Buchwald and Feingold, *op. cit.* (note 1), pp. 247 ff.

[3] I. Newton, 'Remarks upon the Observations Made upon a Chronological Index of Sir Isaac Newton, Translated into French by the Observator, and Publish'd at Paris', *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond.* 33, 315-21 (1725), at pp. 315, 320.

[4] Already during Newton's lifetime, Conduitt began collecting materials for a biography of Newton, a project left unfinished; see the materials in Keynes Mss. 129 and 130.

[5] R. Westfall, *Never at Rest: A Biography of Isaac Newton* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1980), p. 864; Folkes would eventually become President in 1742, succeeding Hans Sloane.

[6] CUL Ms. Add. 3987 and 3988. From Zachary Pearce's *A Commentary with notes on the Four Evangelists...* (London, 1777), p. xlii, we know that Thomas Pellet was also involved and considered co-editor with Martin Folkes, but there are no editorial remarks in his hand in the manuscripts that

would become the *Observations*. As I show elsewhere, CUL MS. 3987 is Newton's reordering and partial rewriting of the materials from CUL Ms. 3988, most likely in response to the *Abregé de la Chronologie*; see Schilt, *op. cit.* (note 1), pp. 147-48 and in particular pp. 225-26.

[7] In the list of manuscripts Pellet drew up, he described the manuscript that served as copy text, No. 80 (now CUL Ms. 3988) as 'Containing an abstract of the Chronology being twelve half sheets in folio & the Chronology being ninety two half sheets in folio,' which suggests that Newton had already selected a version of the *Short Chronicle* to be included with the *Chronology*; Keynes Ms. 127A(4), n. f. See also S. Mandelbrote, *Footprints of the lion: Isaac Newton at work* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001), p. 129.

[8] For a more elaborate study of the Temple by Newton, see Babson Ms. 434, titled '\Prolegomena ad/ Lexici Prophetici partem secundam… in quibus agitur De forma Sanctuarij Iudaici'; HRHRC Ms. 132 includes notes on the measurements of the Temple, while Yahuda Ms. 26.3 contains various drafts of the chapter as it appeared in the *Chronology*. See also R. Delgado-Moreira, 'Epistemological and rhetorical strategies in Newton's theological writings' (Imperial College London, 2006), pp. 110-67.

[9] I. Newton, *The Chronology of Ancient Kingdoms Amended* (London, 1728), sig. a4^{v}. See also Pearce, *op. cit.* (note 6), p. xliv, who quoted the above and added: 'This is the account given by the Publishers, and it agrees with mine, as far as it goes: if this then be the true account, it appears, that the five first Chapters of the Chronology of Ancient Kingdoms had the finishing Hand of the great Author: and it is most probable, that his Death only prevented his writing over the sixth chapter, and adding it to the others.' See also n. 7 above, where Pellet counted ninety-two folios in the *Chronology* manuscript, which corresponds with CUL Ms. 3988, ff. 13^{r}-108^{r}, ignoring ff. 102^{r}-105^{r} which contain the plates for Chapter 5.

[10] CUL Ms. Add. 3988, ff. 36^{r}-37^{r}, 41^{r}-42^{r}. Examples can be found in CUL Ms. Add. 3988, ff. 29^{r} (added reference), 34^{r} (deleted reference), 55^{r}, 79^{r}, 89^{r}, 94^{r}/94a^{r} (expanded Greek quotation). See also Pearce, *op. cit.* (note 6), p. xlii: 'the editors... did in some places put References to Authors in the margin of the Work; which are printed now as Sir Isaac's References.'

[11] CUL Ms. Add. 3988, f. 98^{r}.

[12] Ibid., italics mine. See Newton, *op. cit.* (note 9), p. 332, for the printed result.

[13] CUL Ms. Add. 3988, f. 99^{r}, italics mine; Newton, *op. cit.* (note 9), p. 336. In the manuscript, Folkes only underlined 'peoples'.

[14] See CUL Ms. Add. 3988, ff. 106^{r}-107^{r}; Newton, *op. cit.* (note 9), pp. 343-46. Although the plates of the Temple have traditionally been ascribed to Newton, they were drawn by an artisan based on Newton's drafts, with the accompanying text supplied by the editors. See CUL Ms. Add. 3988, ff. 102^{r}-103^{r}, 105^{v}; compare with Babson Ms. 434, ff. 7, 13-14, 91-92; Yahuda Ms. 14, ff. 5^{r}-7^{r}.

[15] Iliffe, *op. cit* (note 1), pp. 219-314; id., ''Making a Shew': Apocalyptic Hermeneutics and Christian Idolatry in the Work of Isaac Newton and Henry More', in *The Books of Nature and Scripture: Recent Essays on Natural Philosophy, Theology, and Biblical Criticism in the Netherlands of Spinoza's Time and the British Isles of Newton's Time* (ed. J.E. Force and R.H. Popkin), pp. 55–88 (Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1994); id., 'The Religion of Isaac Newton', in Iliffe and Smith, *op. cit.* (note 1), pp. 485-523; S. Hutton, 'The Seven Trumpets and the Seven Vials: Apocalypticism and Christology in Newton's Theological Writings', in *Newton and Religion: Context, Nature and Influence* (ed. J.E. Force and R.H. Popkin), pp. 165-78 (Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1999); S. Mandelbrote, 'Isaac Newton and the Exegesis of the Book of Daniel', in *Die Geschichte der Daniel-Auslegung in Judentum, Christentum und Islam* (ed. K. Bracht and D.S. du Toit), pp. 351-75 (Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 2007); S. Snobelen, ''A Time and Times and the Dividing of Time': Isaac Newton, the Apocalypse and 2060 A.D.', *Canadian Journal of History / Annales Canadiennes d'Histoire* 38, 2-13 (2003). For Biot's relegation to the margin of Newton's theological studies, see also R. Higgitt, *Recreating Newton: Newtonian Biography and the Making of Nineteenth-Century History of Science* (Pickering and Chatto, London, 2007), pp. 19-42; C.J. Schilt, 'Created in Our Image: How Isaac Newton was Fashioned as a Scientist and Forgotten as a Scholar', forthcoming in *History of Humanities* (2019).

[16] Richard Westfall, in his authoritative biography of Newton, connected Newton's refusal to take holy orders – a requirement to retain his Fellowship at Trinity College – with his antitrinitarianism; see

Westfall, *op. cit.* (note 5), pp. 315, 331-34. Mordechai Feingold and Rob Iliffe have since shown that the connection cannot be substantiated and that Newton had other reasons to seek dispensation, which he was eventually granted in February 1674/5; see M. Feingold, 'Science as a Calling? The Early Modern Dilemma', *Science in Context* 15, 79-119 (2002), at pp. 96-97; Iliffe, *op. cit* (note 1), pp. 128-38.

[17] R. Iliffe, 'Prosecuting Athanasius: Protestant Forensics and the Mirrors of Persecution', in Force and Hutton, *op. cit.* (note 1), pp. 113-54; id., *op. cit* (note 1), pp. 123 ff; Schilt, *op. cit*. (note 15).

[18] *London magazine, or, Gentleman's monthly intelligencer*, Feb 1732/3, p. 102. A pirated Dublin edition was published later.

[19] I. Newton, *Observations upon the Prophecies of Daniel and the Apocalypse of St John* (London, 1733), pp. 194-231; Yahuda Ms. 7.1n, f. 9^{r}; see Dan.11:36.

[20] See e.g. Mandelbrote, 'Eighteenth-century Christianity', *op. cit.* (note 1), p. 554.

[21] Westfall, *op. cit.* (note 5), p. 857.

[22] T.D. Whitaker, *The History and Antiquities of the Deanery of Craven in the County of York* (London, 1812), pp. 462-63. It should be noted that Whitaker had his information second hand, from a mutual friend, the Rev. William Sheepshanks, A. M. Prebendary of Carlisle. See also J. Nichols, *Illustrations of the Literary History of Eighteenth Century… Vol. 4* (London, 1822), pp. 32-34, which uses Whitaker as its source, having printed the *History of Craven* a decade before.

[23] Yahuda Ms. 7.2f, f. 11^{r}. According to C.H. Timperley, *A Dictionary of Printers and Printing…* (London, 1839), p. 632, John Darby II died in 1730; however, other sources report 1733, which seems a more likely date since his name appears on volumes printed in that year – including the *Observations* – and disappears thereafter; also, his apprentice John Richardson was taken over by John Wilson (most likely the John Wilson who was himself apprenticed to Darby between 1715 and 1722) on 5 June 1733, presumably shortly after Darby's death; see D.F. McKenzie (ed.), *Stationers' Company Apprentices, 1701-1800* (London, 1978), p. 99; D.F. Norton, 'John Wilson, Hume's first printer', *The British Library Journal* 14, 123-35 (1988), at p. 130.

[24] Yahuda Ms. 7.2j, f. 95^{v}.

[25] Yahuda Ms. 7.2b, f. 2^{v}.

[26] These two versions seem to correspond with Nos. 58, 'Nine chapters being one hundred & forty half sheets & two pieces in folio the title of w^{ch} is concerning the language of the prophets', and 81, 'Forty half sheets in folio being the History of the Prophecies in ten chapters & part of the 11th unfinished' of the list of manuscripts drawn up by Thomas Pellet, Keynes Ms. 127A(4), n. f. See also C. Hutton, *Mathematical and Philosophical Dictionary*, 2 vols (London, 1795), vol. 2, pp. 155-157; Westfall, *op. cit.* (note 5), pp. 872-73; S. Dry, *The Newton Papers: The Strange and True Odyssey of Isaac Newton's Manuscripts* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2014), pp. 11-13.

[27] Yahuda Ms. 7.2j, f. 96^{r}.

[28] Yahuda Ms. 7.2f, f. 1^{r}.

[29] A.A. Hanham, 'Thomas Parker, first earl of Macclesfield (1667–1732)', *ODNB* (online, 2009, consulted December 2018); E. Edwards, *Libraries and Founders of Libraries* (London, 1864), p. 341.

[30] Yahuda Ms. 7.2j, f. 96^{r}. The old version consisted of what are now Yahuda Ms. 7.1d, ff. 4^{r}-27^{r} and 31^{r} (Sections I-III), and CUL Ms. 3989 (the copytext), ff. 31^{r}-45^{r}, 68^{r}-90^{v}, 101^{r}-120r (Sections IV-X). From the new version I have been able to identify Chapters 1-6, which are now CUL Ms. 3989, ff. 7^{r}-29^{r}, and Chapters 7-9, now Yahuda Ms. 7.1e, ff. 1^{r}-7^{r}. There are rough drafts for chapters X and XI in Yahuda Mss. 7.2j, ff. 1^{r}-2^{r}, and 7.2h, ff. 5^{r}-^{v}, but these do not seem to be the versions inspected by the editors.

[31] Yahuda Ms. 7.1d, f. 4^{r}.

[32] Yahuda Ms. 7.2b, ff. 3^{r}-7^{r}; the passage is on f. 6^{v}.

[33] CUL Ms. Add. 3987, f. 123^{r}.

[34] Yahuda Ms. 7.2b, ff. 4^{v}-5^{r}.

[35] S. Snobelen, 'Isaac Newton, heretic: The strategies of a Nicodemite', *British Journal for the History of Science*, 32, 381-419 (1999), at p. 399. The Leibniz-Clarke debate has been actively studied; publications include, but are not limited to, A. Koyré and I.B. Cohen, 'The Case of the Missing

Tanquam: Leibniz, Newton & Clarke', *Isis* 52, 555-66 (1961); A.R. Hall, *Philosophers at War: The Quarrel between Newton and Leibniz* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1980); E. Vailati, *Leibniz and Clarke: A Study of Their Correspondence* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1997); R. Ariew (ed.), *G.W. Leibniz and Samuel Clarke: Correspondence* (Hackett Publishing Company, Indianapolis, 2000); A. Janiak, *Newton* (Blackwell, Chichester, 2015), pp. 117-38.

[36] Whitaker, *op. cit.* (note 22), p. 462.

[37] CUL Ms. Add. 3964.5, f. 16^{r}.

[38] Yahuda Mss 7.2b, f. 7^{r}, and 7.2j, f. 95^{v}.

[39] W. Whiston, *Historical Memoirs of the Life of Dr. Samuel Clarke* (London, 1730), p. 96; see also Mandelbrote, 'Eighteenth-century Christianity', *op. cit.* (note 1), pp. 558-59.

[40] Yahuda Ms. 7.2b, f. 9^{r}.

[41] The hand returns in Yahuda Ms. 7.2f, f. 8^{v}, in a series of files the editors used to collect both 'Sections of the new copy not printed' (f. 13^{r}, in Conduitt's hand) and variant versions of the texts.

[42] Yahuda Ms. 7.2b, f. 10^{r}; see CUL Ms. Add. 3989, ff. 1^{r}-6^{r}. A variant version can be found in Bodmer Ms., ff. 00-001^{r}-2^{v}. The Bodmer manuscript foliation is based on the new set of high quality colour images available from the Fondation Martin Bodmer, which is currently being transcribed by the Newton Project and will be published online soon. The images are grouped by manuscript division; thus '00-001^{r}-2^{v}' refers to manuscript division 00, folios 1^{r}-2^{v}. Preliminary and additional folios have been numbered 000a^{r}, 000a^{v}, 000b^{r}, etc, preceded by the relevant manuscript division.

[43] C. Haydon, 'Sherlock, Thomas (1677–1761)', *ODNB* (online, 2009, consulted December 2018); E. Carpenter, *Thomas Sherlock 1678–1761* (SPCK, London, 1936), p. 23; J. Nichols, *Biographical and literary anecdotes of William Bowyer…* (London, 1782), pp. 466-71.

[44] CUL Ms. Add. 3989, f. 1^{r}, still bears the original title.

[45] CUL Ms. Add. 3989, ff. 46^{r}-^{v}. The first paragraph on f. 46^{r}, and the first two lines of the second, were most likely compiled from Yahuda Ms. 7.1f, ff. 1^{r}-3^{r}. The remaining lines on these page seem to originate from f. 47^{r}, where Newton wrote 'The Prophecy of Daniel's weeks I translate & interpret thus'; Folkes has 'This prophesy I translate & interpret thus'; see also Yahuda Mss. 7.1j, f. 23^{r} ('...the whole I just translate and interpret…'), and 7.1c, f. 7^{r} (the deleted paragraph). The text on f. 46^{v} is taken from Yahuda Ms. 7.1c, f. 8^{v}. See also Yahuda Ms. 7.2b, f. 2^{v}.

[46] Bodmer Ms., ff. 11-000a^{r}, 11-006^{r}, 11-016^{r}. See M. Goldish, 'Newton's 'Of the Church': Its Contents and Implications', in Force and Popkin, *Newton and Religion*, *op. cit.* (note 15), pp. 145-64; id., *Judaism in the Theology of Sir Isaac Newton* (Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1998), pp. 110-17.

[47] The incomplete proofs, HRO Ms. 15M84/NC10, were printed from the edited text of CUL Ms. 3989, with page numbers corresponding to the eventually published volume, and include pp. 25-40, 73-96, 105-112, 121-160, 169-192, 201-208, 217-232, and 281-323.

[48] HRO Ms. 15M84/NC10, p. 110; see also Bodmer Ms., f. 11-015^{r}, and Yahuda Ms. 7.3e, ff. 1^{r}-2^{r}, where Newton referred to the volume as 'Novel.'.

[49] HRO Ms. 15M84/NC10, p. 169.

[50] Newton, *op. cit.* (note 19.), pp. 172-78; Henry More, *A plain and continued exposition of the several prophecies or divine visions of the prophet Daniel*… (London, 1681), pp. 162-65.

[51] Daniel 11:6, KJV, italics added; original italics replaced with square brackets to avoid ambiguity (words in italics in the KJV were added by the translators; they do not appear in the Hebrew).

[52] CUL Ms. 3989, f. 71^{r}, italics added.

[53] CUL Ms. 3989, f. 48^{r}; in the *Observations* (p. 132), the editors had deleted 'all'. See also Keynes Ms. 5, f. 137^{r}. For Grotius' preterism, see e.g. J.-P. Heering, *Hugo Grotius as apologist for the Christian religion: a study of his work* De veritate religionis Christianae, *1640* (Brill, Leiden, 2004); and also J. van den Berg, 'Grotius' views on the Antichrist and Apocalyptic thought in England', in *Hugo Grotius, Theologian: Essays in Honour of G.H.M. Posthumus Meyjes* (ed. H.J.M. Nellen and E. Rabbie), pp. 169-83 (Brill, Leiden, 1994), at p. 179.

[54] HRO Ms. 15M84/NC10, p. 32. The initials are unclear, but the surname begins with an E. At the bottom of the proofs for pages 73-80 – the final pages of Chapter 6, 'Of the ten kingdoms represented by the ten horns of the fourth Beast' – Folkes wrote: 'I am very sensitive of Mr. E's query upon the

copy but know not what to say to it, so you must print off as it is.' One possible candidate is the Rev. Jeffery Ekins, for whom see below.

[55] McKenzie, *op. cit.* (note 23), p. 99; B. Martin, *Miscellaneous Correspondence… Vol. IV* (London, 1764), p. 1106. According to Pearce, *op. cit.* (note 6), pp. xliii-v, Newton had promised John Innys the printing of the *Chronology*. Evidently, Conduitt and Folkes decided to ignore Innys' plea and instead opted for two other printing houses, J. Tonson in the Strand and J. Osborn and T. Longman in Paternoster Row.

[56] See Yahuda 7.2j, f. 96^{r}; and CUL 3989, f. 7^{r}.

[57] Yahuda 7.2b, f. 1^{v}, has the new title; so has Yahuda 7.2j, f. 95^{v}.

[58] Keynes Ms. 5, f. 122^{r}, contains a chapter XI (originally VIII), 'The Prophesy of the three Woes at the voices of the three last Trumpets explained.'

[59] CUL Ms. Add 389, f. 48^{r}. See also Yahuda Mss. 7.1j, f. 24^{r}, and 25.1c, f. 8^{v}, where the passage returns. In none of these did Newton delete the passage, so the decision seems to have been entirely the editors'.

[60] CUL Ms. Add. 3989, ff. 53^{r}- 54^{r}. The crossed-out addition is on f. 55^{v}.

[61] Yahuda Ms. 7.1n, f. 9^{r}; the title is a partial reference to Dan. 11:36.

[62] See e.g. Yahuda Ms. 15, f. 104^{r}, and the various headings in the Bodmer Ms.

[63] CUL Ms. 3989, ff. 93^{r}, 101^{r}, 109^{r}.

[64] Yahuda Ms. 7.2f, f. 1^{r}; Keynes Ms. 5 consists of a more or less complete and coherent text covering 137 folios, preceded by six folios of drafts. In the original order, these loose folios were included at the end of the manuscript, as a marginal note on the first folio (I^{r}) confirms: 'This Chapter y^{e} same as Chapter 1st in the preceding Book.'

[65] See e.g. Yahuda Ms. 7.2f, ff. 5^{r}-7^{v}.

[66] 'The last pages of these Observations having been differently drawn up by the Author in another copy of his Work; they are here inserted as they follow in that copy, after the 22^{d} line of the 261st page foregoing.' Newton, *op. cit.* (note 19.), p. 309.

[67] Yahuda Ms. 7.2b, f. 6^{r}.

[68] NCL Ms. 361.4, fol 139^{r}, underlining in the original. The 'Church History compleat' is presumably a reference to the Bodmer Ms., or to Yahuda Ms. 15. Sykes also defended Newton's *Chronology* in his '*An examination of mr. Warburton's account… of… Sir Isaac Newton's chronology* (London, 1744), pp. 222-364; see also Buchwald and Feingold, *op. cit.* (note 1), p. 397.

[69] Keynes Ms. 127A(4) contains a list with eleven items dated November 1755, which were sent to Sykes. As a little note now glued to the back and dated Feb. 1770 explains, the list was kept by the then Lady Portsmouth, 'as she knows not whether the papers specify'd were return'd by Dr. Sykes.' See also Mandelbrote, 'Eighteenth-century reactions', *op. cit.* (note 1), p. 103; id., 'Eighteenth-century Christianity', *op. cit.* (note 1), pp. 565-66.

[70] [Anon.], *Two Letters of Sir Isaac Newton to Mr. Le Clerc…* (London, 1754), pp. 13-14; H.W. Turnbull et al. (eds.), *The Correspondence of Isaac Newton*, 7 vols (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1959–77), vol. 3, pp. 83-147. The draft manuscripts are now NCL Ms. 361.4, ff. 1^{r}-121^{v}. For a detailed analysis of the letters and their history, see R. Iliffe,' Friendly criticism: Richard Simon, John Locke, Isaac Newton and the Johannine comma', in *Scripture and Scholarship in Early Modern England* (ed. A. Hessayon and N. Keene), pp. 137-57 (Ashgate, Aldershot, 2006); Mandelbrote, 'Eighteenth-century Christianity', *op. cit.* (note 1), pp. 569 ff. See also F. Manuel, *Isaac Newton, Historian* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1963), pp. 14-15; Mandelbrote, 'Eighteenth-century reactions', *op. cit.* (note 1), pp. 105-09, and id., 'Than this nothing can be plainer': Isaac Newton reads the Fathers', in *Die Patristik in der Frühen Neuzeit* (ed. G. Frank et al.), pp. 277-97 (Akademie Verlag, Stuttgart, 2006); S.D. Snobelen, ''To us there is but one God, the Father': Antitrinitarian Textual Criticism in Seventeenth- and Early Eighteenth-century England', in Hessayon and Keene, *op. cit.*, pp. 116-36, at pp. 128-35; C.J. Schilt, 'To Improve upon Hints of Things': Illustrating Isaac Newton', *Nuncius*, 31, 50-77 (2016), at pp. 63-64. For Newton and Locke, see also K.I. Parker, 'Newton, Locke and the Trinity: Sir Isaac's comments on Locke's: A Paraphrase and Notes on the Epistle of St Paul to the Romans', *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 62, 40-52 (2009).

[71] See Mandelbrote, 'Eighteenth-century Christianity', *op. cit.* (note 1), pp. 574-75.
[72] S. Horsley, *Isaaci Newtoni opera quae extant omnia*, 5 vols (London, 1779–85), vol. 5, pp. 493-550.
[73] Cf. D.T. Whiteside, *The Mathematical Papers of Isaac Newton, Vol. 1: 1664–1666* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1967), pp. xxiii-iv, at n. 27; R. Iliffe, 'A 'connected system'? The Snare of a Beautiful Hand and the Unity of Newton's Archive', in *Archives of the Scientific Revolution: The Formation and Exchange of Ideas in Seventeenth-Century Europe* (ed. M. Hunter), pp. 137-58 (Boydell & Brewer, Woodbridge, 1998), at p. 141; Dry, *op. cit.* (note 26), p. 28.
[74] Keynes Ms. 127.4(A), n. f. For the Sotheby's auction and the subsequent dispersal of Newton's scholarly manuscripts, see P.E. Spargo, 'Sotheby's, Keynes and Yahuda – the 1936 sale of Newton's manuscripts', in *The investigation of difficult things: Essays on Newton and the history of the exact sciences, in honour of D.T. Whiteside* (ed. P.M. Harman and A.E. Shapiro), pp. 115-34 (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1992); Dry, *op. cit.* (note 26), pp. 142-60.
[75] Ekins had been appointed one of her three executors by Catherine and John Conduitt's daughter, Catherine (Kitty) Wallop, in her will, drawn up in 1750. Ekins' heirs donated the papers to New College, Oxford, in 1872; they are today NCL Mss. 361.1-4. See NCL Ms. 361.4, f. 141^{r-v} for Ekins' letter to Wilcox. For a concise but detailed description of the relation between the Newton, Barton, Conduitt, and Ekins families, see J. Morgan, 'Seeing the Light: Being the story of Sir Isaac Newton's prisms and papers and the means by which they came to New College', *New College Notes*, 9, 1-14 (2018), at pp. 11 ff. For a detailed reconstruction and analysis of the 'Originals', which included such manuscripts as 'The Original of Monarchies (Keynes Ms. 5) and 'The Original of Religions' (Yahuda Ms. 41), see Schilt, *op. cit.* (note 1), pp. 115-73. See also D. Brewster, *Memoirs of the Life, Writings, and Discoveries of Sir Isaac Newton*, 2 vols (Edinburgh, 1855), vol. 2, p. 342; Dry, *op. cit.* (note 26), p. 28.
[76] NA PROB 11/700, ff. 261^{v}-264^{r}; I am very grateful to Jason Morgan for bringing this to my attention. Cf. Whiteside, *Mathematical Papers*, xxiv, who claimed that William Hanbury in a letter to Robert Smith, mathematician and Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, confirmed that Catherine had appointed Sykes as executor; however, nowhere does the letter mention Sykes. See William Hanbury to Robert Smith, 8 March 1757, TCL Ms. R.16.38.410.
[77] Phil Barton to William Hanbury, 15 March 1757, TCL Ms. R.16.38.415; see also TCL Mss. R.16.38.413 and 414. Barton, referred to as 'Dr' below the letter (which is a scribal copy of the original), most likely refers to Philip Barton (1694 or 1695–1765), Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, 1733–1765, and a keen antiquarian; see J.M. Horn (ed.), *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae 1541-1857: Volume 8, Bristol, Gloucester, Oxford and Peterborough Dioceses* (IHR, London, 1996), pp. 89-92, and W. Poole, 'Barton's coins: Eighteenth-century numismatics in New College, Oxford', *Journal of the History of Collections*, 30, 385-93 (2018), at p. 386; see also Nichols, *op. cit.* (note 22), pp. 585-86. It should be noted that Catherine Conduitt's maiden name was Barton, but I have been unable to establish a family connection; see also Morgan, *op. cit.* (note 75), pp. 11-14.
[78] Iliffe, *op. cit.* (note 73), pp. 141-42; Brewster, *op. cit.* (note 75), pp. 341-42; Mandelbrote, 'Eighteenth-century reactions', *op. cit.* (note 1), p. 108; id., 'Eighteenth-century Christianity', *op. cit.* (note 1), pp. 565-66; Dry, *op. cit.* (note 26), p. 28; A.A. Sykes*, Enquiry when the Resurrection of the Body, or Flesh, was first inserted into the Public Creeds* (London, 1757). See also J. Stephens, 'Sykes, Arthur Ashley (c. 1684–1756), Church of England clergyman and religious controversialist', *ODNB* (online, 2011, consulted December 2018); Goldish, *Judaism*, *op. cit.* (note 46), p. 110 n. 4; Manuel, *op. cit.* (note 70), p. 181; Westfall, *op. cit*. (note 5), p. 491. Of Sykes' *Enquiry*, John Disney, in his *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Arthur Ashley Sykes, D.D.* (London, 1785), pp. 344-45, wrote that '[h]is brother, Mr. George Sykes, appears as the editor; but very little trouble, it is apprehended, devolved upon him. I have been assured, that this tract was composed chiefly from the papers of Sir Isaac Newton; and it is very possible, from certain other circumstances, that such information may be true…' There are indeed parallels between Sykes's treatise and Newton's writings on the topic in the Bodmer Ms.
[79] Yahuda Ms. 7.2b, f. 1^{r}.

[80] The Yahuda collection had been available on microfilm from the early 1970s, but remained obscure; see R. Iliffe, 'Digitizing Isaac: The Newton Project and an electronic edition of Newton's papers', in Force and Hutton, *op. cit.* (note 1), pp. 23-38, at p. 26.

[81] NCL Ms. 361.1, ff. 88^{r}-90^{r}. On f. 87^{r} there are notes by a New College Librarian, referring to the subsequent pages as 'probably in the handwriting of John Conduitt'; Manuel, in *Historian*, *op. cit.* (note 70), pp. 14-15, asserted that these papers were studied by Conduitt in May 1729 and that the editorial comments were his. There are indeed marginal annotations by John Conduitt in the manuscript, comparing it with the published *Chronology*, but all of these appear on folios that were included with the manuscript at a later date. I compared the hand with Bodleian Ms. Eng th. C.25, ff. 179-81, A.A. Sykes to Thomas Brett, 18 April 1715, but cannot make a positive identification.

[82] NCL Ms. 361.1, f. 90^{r}.

FIGURE CAPTIONS

Figure 1. Part of Martin Folkes' proposal for the *Observations*. Yahuda Ms. 7.2b, f. 1^{v}, courtesy of The National Library of Israel, Jerusalem.

Figure 2. Thomas Parker's '3 Proposals for y^{e} order of Printing' of Newton's prophetical studies. Yahuda Ms. 7.2j, f. 95^{v}, courtesy of The National Library of Israel, Jerusalem.

Figure 3. An overview of the section and chapter titles in the 'old' and 'new' copy of Newton's studies of the prophecies in the book of Daniel, drawn up by Thomas Parker, Yahuda Ms. 7.2j, f. 96^{r}, courtesy of The National Library of Israel, Jerusalem.

Figure 4. John Conduitt's analysis of Newton's prophetical studies, referring in a 'Mem^{m}' to Samuel Clarke. Yahuda Ms. 7.2b, f. 4^{v}, courtesy of The National Library of Israel, Jerusalem.

Figure 5. Samuel Clarke's suggestions for which parts of the 'old' and 'new' manuscript to include in the *Observations*. CUL Ms. Add. 3964.5, f. 16^{r}.

Figure 6. An unknown editor's notes to Newton's chronological papers. NCL Ms. 361.1, f. 88^{r}, courtesy of the Warden and Fellows of New College, Oxford.